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I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Let’s come to order. I know it’s a little earlier than we usually start, but the President only has about 45 minutes before his next meeting, so we don’t want to cut too much into his time.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first item is the adoption of the agenda. We have four walk-in items. Those are Earl Hansen’s report on the FAC to the IBHE, Kerry Freedman’s report on the Board of Trustee’s subcommittee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel, Todd Latham’s report on the BOT subcommittee on Legislation, Audit and External Affairs and the report, I think, Laurie is going to give the report, is that right? Yes, Laurie, the report from the Resources, Space and Budgets committee. So, I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the four walk-in items, and remember we have to say our names into the microphone so that transcribers get it. Anyone want to make the motion?

J. Novak: (moves to accept the agenda)

J. Kowalski: (Second)
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and we’ll take Jeff as a second. All in favor?

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? Okay, we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 27, 2010 FS MEETING
(sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next is the approval of the minutes of the October 27th meeting. You should have all gotten the minutes. I need a motion to adopt the minutes.

B. Lusk: (Moves to approve minutes)

A. Rosenbaum: Brigid Lusk, okay. Second?

J.D. Bowers: (Second)

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, good. Any changes, comments, corrections, omissions, things you would like omitted? No? It’s all good? All in favor of adopting the minutes?

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? Okay, we have minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business, President Peters asked for some time to address the Senate. I believe he’s mostly going to talk to us about the Vision 2020 initiative. I think he is interested in the input that we can provide. I hope many of you read President Peter’s statement on the Vision 2020 initiative, which was posted on the homepage of the Office of the President. So, hopefully we are all up to speed on this and we have questions and input for Dr. Peters. So, it’s my pleasure to turn the microphone over to John Peters.

J. Peters: Thank you. I am pleased to be before you even though the weather is changing finally. It’s a little bit nippy out there. It’s hard to believe how fast the semesters go by. I chalk it up to age, but they sure seem to fly by faster. The days are longer and the weeks are pretty long and the semesters fly by. So, we’re already into spring break and then graduation and then our to-do lists are longer than the beginning of the semester. I’m finding it difficult to keep up, especially when you have to deal with crises every now and then; it kind of takes it out of your rhythms. Anyway, it’s good to be with you and I will thank Alan for making the time, and I wanted to talk about Vision 2020, what it is and what it is not, and how we’re proceeding, answer questions. This is just the beginning of the input. There will be many, many points in this process as it evolves, and I’d certainly like to complete most of it by the end of this academic year, but that may not be possible. That doesn’t give me too much of a stomachache because these things kind of take time, but we are sort of rolling now. The issue Toni Keller did put me back a little bit. It
actually took about three weeks out of my scheduling, but I’ve picked up on it now. When I, this summer, when I was thinking about my annual State of the University Address, I was not comfortable with doing the same catalogue of accomplishments that we have had the past year or the obvious budget and the dysfunctional political environment that we operate with and the uncertainty of whether there’s public support for American public higher education. These are things that are always on my mind and I’m sure they’re on your mind too.

I wanted to do something a little bit different and so I always spend the summer reading all the reports and materials that people prepare for me and all of the task force reports and commission reports that I collect during the year, and they’re voluminous, and I usually spend two weeks reading all that stuff. This year, it struck me that we had the wonderful academic strategic plan, the Great Journeys, and then we had all these wonderful spinoff taskforce groups, baccalaureate review, student success, the focusing on interactive research programs. The work, hard work, that had been done on enrollment management and continues to be done, the focusing on advisement and student success initiatives, the master plan for the campus, the evolution of a series of fiscal improvements, physical improvements, particularly in residence halls because we had a source for generating income, the coming on of Cole Hall and finally the approval for Stevens, the anticipation of perhaps a computer science or maybe I’ll call it Technology Learning Center and I thought, you know, that’s a lot of stuff out there. What we really need to do is put that all into a big basket or a sieve and shake it all up a little bit and then put benchmarks for each one of those things out there to drive us forward. In other words, not create anything new, but let’s see what we have out there and benchmark ourselves against like universities or aspiring universities. That’s hard to do because we have a lot of unique characteristics and then put it out there and align our priorities and our resource base, as weak as it is, and make some progress. That seemed to appeal to a lot of people.

The other advantage of that, I thought at the time and I still believe, is it gets a lot of people involved in a conversation and that’s important because you never know. You start something and you never know where you’re going to end up when you have a conversation at a university. You may think one set of principles or actions or strategies are correct and then what you find out is that the context changes on you and you have to realign. That’s really the problem with long-term strategic planning. Five years ago, if we would have done a strategic plan, we would have to alter it because of the context of what is changing and it’s changing rapidly. I want to just start out, so, what Vision 2020 is, is not strategic planning. There may be elements of it that have to be planned, but what it is, is a look-see at what we’ve already done, pick out the best elements or those things we can work on, benchmark them, get some milestones, compare ourselves to our peer group, get them out there and have a kind of a five- and ten-year vision of what we want the place to look like, what we, you want this place to look like and obviously, that’s hard to do because if we have 3,000 faculty and staff, you may have 2,900 visions of what the place should look like. But there is a consensus emerging. I mean, there are some core values, engaged learning is a big one, service to the region is there, that’s just what we are. So, I think we ought to capitalize on that.

Now, this all takes place within the context of a continual and rapidly deteriorating commitment on the part of the state and the federal government to support public higher education. I mean, it’s been going down for many years with some rapidity in different states, and that is not
necessarily the fault of any particular policy makers, a lot of it has to do with macroeconomics and the growth of other priorities for the country, like healthcare, K-12, wars, that sort of thing. In terms of national priorities, maybe state priorities, the role of the public universities is hard to find in terms of priorities. Now, you try to change that as best you can, but it’s a difficult fight because of the, you know there’s anger out there, and there are stressed resources out there, and we’ve been forced, when I say “we” I mean public higher education, all of us, we’ve been forced to raise tuition to offset declining state dollars. That has not endeared us to anybody and, of course, you can never raise tuition high enough to offset, dollar for dollar, what was coming in from the state. It has forced us to engage in behaviors that make us look like and act like a private institution, to the point where, using this as an anomaly, there are several private universities in the country, if you stack federal aid to students, and then state aid to students and then earmarks and help to private institutions to the point where a private institution may be more dependent on state and federal dollars than a public university in its state. I mean, I don’t want to name names, but you know, you can figure it out. When you think about that, that’s rather interesting. A lot of it is under the guise of aid to students and individuals and not aid to institutions.

Then, of course, you have the growth of the for-profits that has really, competition, that has really made it very difficult in terms of the competitive world. Part of it has to do with turning higher education into a commodity and not an experience that we all believe in, a campus integrated experience. No, it’s a ticket puncher. If I get my degree, I can get a job. There’s always been, the U.S. has always been pragmatic, Americans have always been pragmatic about that, but I think there is a consequence for that.

Then, bringing it down to Illinois, we’ve had a very difficult and frustrating time because of the uncertainty over the past several years of what exactly our budget is and not only what is our budget, but are we ever going to get any payments that are owed to us. So, I just got back from, what was the old Land Grant meetings, I think it’s called APLU now. I’ve been going since the early 70s, and the conversations have changed over time. I’ve talked to many presidents who have had, over the past three years, since the financial meltdown, some before, having to whack out 30%, 35% of their state budgets, but no one has then had to worry that what remained would not be paid in a timely way. So, our budget has been reduced somewhat ever since 2000, and that’s not a good thing for us, but what is frustrating, as you all know, is the cash flow issue, that last year, right up until the end of the year, we were owed in the neighborhood of $35 million, and finally the state caught up with us except some marginal dollars from last year, but as we sit today, we still haven’t received a state payment for this year and that’s over $40 million now. Alright and so, you know what’s happened, you can imagine running your own household, you have to take care of the basics, you’ve got to pay your mortgage and you’ve got to pay those things, your bills, and so what we’ve had to do was delay any kind of discretionary spending for all the things that make a university great, equipment, making classrooms smart, you name it, you just run down the list, even basic stuff, and we’ve had to smooth our payments because if we have an obligation, we’re going to pay it. We’re not going to not pay people, because most of the people we owe money to outside of rather big enterprises like our energy bill, which is $10 million a year and if you don’t pay it, you get a penalty, so they’ve got that figured out. But you know, small business people who have contracts with us to provide services.
So, I guess what I’m saying is not much has changed in terms of the context. There was an election, and we’re kind of waiting to see what that means for us, but there is still a $13-$15 billion deficit that the state is facing that they have to address. If you order things, a big thing is pensions and whether or not there is some sort of budget cutting, revenue enhancement of some sort, whether that’s a state income tax or gambling or whatever the flavor of the month is. It’s going to take all of that a number of years to dig out of the hole. So, the conclusion is I hope we get to predictability, whatever it is, and I don’t see our state budgets turning for three to four years.

Alright, so given that, let’s take matters into our own hands I was thinking and figuring out how we can be sustainable and what will it take to be sustainable and I’m very pleased to say that we’re in remarkably, given all that, we’re in remarkably good fiscal shape. There are no threats of immediate layoffs or furloughs. We have to watch every penny and it makes a lot of people mad because we can’t spend it over here, we have to put it in payroll. If you think about the priorities, the first thing you’ve got to do is I’ve got to make payroll, $9-$10 million every two weeks with no money coming in from the state. Then, I’ve got to pay the bills for energy for all of that. Then if things are left over, then we can do a little spending. Right now, I can’t tell you when we’re going to, no one in the state will tell us when we are going to receive a payment.

So, anyway, that was the context of the reason, in part, for Vision 2020 but mainly it’s because I think the institution has matured to the point where it really ought to think about what’s it’s going to be like in 10 years. The things we do now, I think, are going to be very important and I think, if you read all those reports, like I did this summer, you do get a good feel for where we’re going. Alright, so that, I wanted to give you some of the context. It is not a new strategic planning effort. Now, there may be things we’ve got to go back and gap. That’s okay, because you know, it was an academic strategic plan and not necessarily one for buildings and grounds, although we have all those things, it’s just we didn’t include that.

So, my concept, which at first was, I thought it was small and elegant and quick and then I started to talk to people and now it’s gotten big and unwieldy and not so quick. Does that surprise you in the academy? Even our canine dog wanted to be on one of the committees. No, I’m teasing. Through all of this, I haven’t lost my sense of humor. So, we’re going to have a steering committee, and it’s going to be about 38-40 people. But they’re only going to meet three or four times. Probably we’re going to be going up with it on Friday if I can figure out how to use my computer, and it’s taken me a while because I’ve taken a lot of input and talked to a lot of people and listened and made a lot of changes based on listening. I’ve found it very valuable to listen to people. I got a lot of unsolicited emails, some of which are fit for public, some are not. That’s a university. But, people from every aspect of the university, there’s good representation from various faculty groups on there, plus students, alumni, administrative people, and I’ve had to, on the Steering Committee, put people on there who are very much involved in the development of our strategic planning documents, the Baccalaureate Review, the Great Journeys, Enrollment Management. The reason is, I didn’t want to lose that expertise and reinvent the wheel. I wanted continuity but I also wanted people who were new to it, who hadn’t seen it, so they could raise the tough questions, to get a freshness.
Now the role of the Steering Committee will be to validate the focus, which I’ll talk about in a minute and to validate the workgroups that I participate. There are seven of them now. I think the last time I talked to Kerry, there were six. We’ve had cell division since then. So, at some point, you’ve got to cut this off or I’ll have 20. To validate their work, but then the real work will be done by the workgroups and I’ll talk about that in a minute. Then the Strategic Steering Committee, or the Steering Committee will come together to receive the work products of the groups and then we’re going to create really what is a set of benchmarks or a dashboard for the university in these various areas and we’re going to throw it out there for the public to comment on. I’ll probably go around and talk to a lot of groups about it. Then, we’ll have a penultimate document and then I’d like the trustees to embrace it. I think that’s very important. The trustees are not involved in the process, but they will be getting updates continually. So, if they hear or see something that they find missing or gives them heartburn, we need to know that because we’re going to ask them to embrace this. So, that’s my thinking on it, the role of the Steering Committee. They won’t meet more than three or four times. Because if you have outside people, and some are national, you can’t have Wednesday afternoon meetings all the time. Alright that’s the Steering Committee.

Then there is going to be a set of working groups that pretty much mirror the planning documents that we have produced in the areas that would make sense. That cuts across students, faculty issues, curriculum type issues, facilities issues, space issues, dollar issues, resource issues.

The Steering Committee are going to tighten these up a little bit, but I’m going to tell you a little bit about what my thinking was. These are in no particular order but I will start with those that are of particular relevance to faculty. I have a group that, for a lack of a better term, it might change, it’s called Academic Programming. That workgroup, which will be dominated by faculty, has to look at the key priorities that have come out of the Great Journey Strategic Plan that involved the academic climate and the academic experience of our students, and that identifies some key things and some measures for those like, for instance, and I don’t want to be, I don’t really want to dictate this, I’m going to give some examples, I mean I’ve got a lot of examples, and my examples aren’t necessarily the best ones, but I will get the ball rolling. For instance, the global experience, there’s a lot in the Great Journeys about that. How many students do we want to participate in Study Abroad by 2020 and then the question is, is that a relevant number? How do we do it? How do we go about it? What are the implementation strategies? I just saw, by the way, on that regard, I saw some disturbing statistic. When I was on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission a few years ago, we would set a goal of having, I don’t know how many million, 17 million go by 2010, and part of that we anticipated there would be an annual 10% increase in Study Abroad students over the next 10 years. That happened ever year; last year it declined by 10%. You know, there are lots of reasons, I’m sure. I haven’t analyzed it or read anything, but it’s economics or is it the danger level in the world, I don’t know, but that’s not a good thing. Honors experience, to what degree can we measure the integration, the development and the integration of honors experiences at the university, and we don’t need a lot of planning for that, we just need to do it. How are departmental and college programs, how can we stimulate them, how are the integrated with the university experience. We’ve had a lot of work done on that. There is a lot of good planning, so I think we need to get to it.
Another thing that I’m concerned about and asked the Provost to look into and he’s doing that with Anne Kaplan is I asked a simple question, where is NIU with regard to online learning. I’ve asked that all the time, and I always go, “Oh yeah, we’re all for it.” We love it, I mean we’ve got it, but I don’t know. I mean, can you answer that question, ask that question to yourself? You may do it in your course or your department may do it, but I need an answer to that because it’s critical today and online learning, it’s becoming part of the repertoire of almost all newly trained faculty and it’s so ubiquitous. But what’s NIU’s, where’s our stake in the ground? How much are we going to invest; very expensive? I know there’s a study going on, but I think that ought to be benchmarked. I think it’s going to be the hallmark of any postsecondary educational enterprise in 10 years, the degree to which you are using various online strategies and I don’t particularly know exactly what I mean by that. That can be from a course that someone uses some technology in the instructional design to a complete course. Most of it is somewhere in the middle but it’s an interesting question that needs an answer. Engaged learning, you know, we are so famous now for USOAR and all of our involvement of undergraduates in our research in our cultural activities. Alright, if that’s the way it is, let’s measure it and set some goals. Should we have every student should be expected to have some sort of an engaged experience, depending on the area, some are a little more difficult than others. So, I think we need to think about that.

There are many things coming from the Baccalaureate Review report. All across the country, new pathways are being developed for students as they pursue their degree. They need landing spots and I think our Baccalaureate Review is doing a good job in doing that. I have always felt, I don’t know how you feel about it, quite unfortunate that someone matriculates at a university and they float around and they never find a landing spot and then after 60 or 70 hours, they leave because they couldn’t get comfortable with a degree program or they couldn’t get into a degree program they wanted to get into. Landing spots. I think it’s our responsibility to think that through. I think 20 years ago, we didn’t pay much attention to that. I think we have to today. We’re expected to. Alright, so you get the academic program, you get the feel for that. That could be general education, I don’t know, it could be other things like the general education reforms that we’re going through, more flexibility in general education across colleges. I could include more flexibility with community college students coming in. We’ve really studied all of these things, and there’s a lot of good thinking out there. That’s one committee, and I’m spending more time on the faculty-oriented committees.

What I call faculty activity, excellence and rewards. I am very student centered, you know that, but I’m a faculty member first. I’ve always been that and faculty members drive the quality of the institution. That’s it, and we have to attract and retain the best faculty to fit the NIU mode, which I think is engaged learning, and we need to make sure that our salaries are competitive with our competitor group, whatever that is, there’s some disagreement about what that is.

I always like to use the Mid America Conference because I think the strength of the Mid America Athletic Conference, you know what I think it is, I think it’s its academic programs. I like what I, I feel very comfortable with Miami University and Ohio University in Bowling Green. I like that. Plus, we’re also in a high-cost area, so we need some Illinois seasoning in that group. So, we really need some goals for competitive faculty salaries and that’s really going to be hard because we’re going to have to take that out of our hide. We’re going to have to figure a way of paying that because I don’t see a lot of state money going into that. External funding
goals for research, for research-active faculty, in areas where there are federal dollars. I think that should be a norm that if there are federal dollars out there, that we should seek them because there are some research programs we just are not going to be able to afford, and there may be private support available. In engineering, it’s industrial support. There are some areas where it’s not there, and we have to recognize that. You know, likewise on the research side and the technology transfer side. It’s obvious. Patents, licenses, spinoff companies. You know, we’re an emerging research university and we don’t have that kind of research infrastructure that Madison does or some others like that. But, we’re doing okay. I think goals for faculty gaining national recognition and then recognizing it and rewarding faculty is a good benchmark to have and some of it, as we are trying to do a better job, and we will do a better job of publicizing and communicating to various publics how excellent our faculty are, particularly when they win awards. We’re doing, we’ve sort of flipped the way we do media to not writing press releases to I guess what they call earned media, that we would like to know that if we have a professor who is studying gerontology and there’s some new topic that comes out that needs public comment, we want the national press to know, we’ve got professor X who’s an expert and can go on TV or radio or whatever.

I would think another goal or benchmark, since we are regional and being in a region that’s the fifth global market in North America, that’s not a bad thing, and we can contribute to the solution, and have been, whether it’s in engineering or education. I don’t know about you, but I’m still frosted, burned up, no, hot. I was hot about this failed methodology about teacher education programs, and I got a chance today to get involved because the president of that organization sent me a personal letter with a personal copy of the report and this person has teed up the report for me, so I’m ready to go into action and hopefully the College of Education will give me the correct ammunition. So, that’s what I mean by faculty work, excellence, rewards. Okay, you’ve got a picture there. How can we benchmark the quality of our faculty and reward them.

Alright, I’m watching my time, I’ve got about 10 minutes left. I’ll just zip over some of the others. In terms of students, student recruitment, retention and success, you know, we’re in a very competitive market for students, qualified students, and we really need to, we have a lot of good reports, Dave Changnon and Gip Seaver gave a good report to one of our board committees last week about all the academic success programs that we’re putting in place and the early warning programs. Many of you are involved in that; I think that’s a very good thing. You know, we have worked very hard this year, this past year, on student recruitment and we’ve made some strides. If we hadn’t done that, I don’t know where we would be in terms of recruitment because the number of high school graduates is going down. This is a competitive market. There are new competitors. The on-campus experience is expensive, more expensive than other options, and they work at it every day. It’s everyone’s responsibility. We have reports on that and we’re going to have some benchmarks. Part of that has to do with, I’ll give you some ideas of what we’re talking about in terms of student recruitment like size of freshman class, what’s the optimal size that would take advantage of our residence halls, the size of the transfer class. We have a huge influx, 40%, of students from community colleges, academic preparedness of the freshman class, whatever measure you want to look at, GPA, percent graduating in the top 10%, class rank. We really, although we don’t talk about it much, I think we need to do some focusing
on our graduate and professional programs. It’s a little harder to get a hold of but I think we ought to do that.

Then getting on to something that concerns me greatly is retention and success. The percent of freshmen who return for the second year, the percentage of students who graduate in four, five or six years, and the preparing something I told the Space, Budget and Resource committee last week or a couple weeks ago, we have to prepare for a change in the way we’re going to be funded, and that is on outcomes rather than input. I don’t know how long this is going to take, but I think it will happen, and it will take a few years, but the focus will be no longer, “What’s the size of your class,” but rather, “Well tell me, how many students who signed up for American Politics completed the course?” So, the focus is going to be on completion rates, which you could just think of all kinds of bad things about that, but done properly, it’s not a bad thing to focus on. I mean, how can we get students through? How many do you graduate in four years, five years and six years? Satisfaction measures although those are ephemeral and a little hard to get at. Are students satisfied? Do they get jobs? You can think up a whole range of outcome measures that now have been adopted in 11 states that will hit Illinois sooner rather than later, so we might as well start thinking in those terms so we’re not caught off guard. The success rate of at-risk students, I mean if you take Obama and everyone else at their word, we really need to put emphasis on the aspiration level and those students who are not pursuing a postsecondary education or those who start who do not complete. It’s a national priority and what piece of that does NIU bite off? I think we need to pay some attention to that. I could go on and on on that one.

Alright, let me move on a little bit to another committee. Student experience. You know what that means, the percentage of students satisfied with their housing and dining options, the level of integration of the academic experience in the living experience. Are we taking the classroom to the residence hall? Percent who participate in intramural activities and extracurricular activities, Greek life programs, student leadership programs, alumni satisfaction with the NIU experience. There’s also an emerging concept that some of the more progressive universities are working on and that is a wellness concept where not only do you go somewhere to work out, but you’re also thinking about a wellness situation, good nutrition, mental health, everything associated with that. You see that at some of the progressive universities now, wellness centers, and I find that pretty appealing, just because of the huge costs that are involved in healthcare down the road for all of us. I think it’s something a university could do and could help with.

Okay, the student experience, now there are a couple of others I want to talk about. Facilities and environment. We have an extensive array of buildings, $0.5 billion in deferred maintenance. We’re about to enter into contracts to build some new residence halls, to renovate Cole Hall, Stevens Hall, and I want to make sure that we make the right choices for buildings that are handicapped accessible, that are green, that are technologically infused. Many people talk about that and so that’s what the Facilities Committee will do. The diffusion of wireless or whatever the latest technology is. If you don’t have the latest technology at a university, you’re behind. The degree to which a campus is green or environmentally friendly. We do some things, many things. I think we ought to raise it to a new level. I call it campus beautification. You know, the bones of the campus are really quite nice but because we have very little money, we can’t plant as many flowers, we don’t mow the dandelions on time. Well, I think maybe that’s a high
priority. Maybe we ought to think about that a little bit. I do think the bones of the campus are quite beautiful. Also, transportation, intermodal type, we’re going to do something with bicycle paths and parking is always an issue, but that’s what Facilities and Environment is going to do.

There are two others and then the other is sustainability and by that, if we’re going to realize our goals, we really have to make sure that we are economically sustainable given my preamble about state spending and so we’re going to have to find new sources of revenue and we’re going to have to be more efficient than we’ve been. We’ve got a good start on private fundraising starting about a half a century late with fundraising, but we’ve got True North, we have a great capacity. We have a lot of alums that we’re engaging now who are donors. You have a good feel that in and of itself won’t help. External funding, grants, contracts have to be upgraded obviously. Fee for services that we perform, we have to look at that. I think we, I don’t know where we are in terms of tuition, but we’re probably at very little room there. I just can’t see us charging much more for tuition relative to our, or students just can’t come. I get a lot of letters now, I never used to, about, “Can you help, you know Johnny would love to come but we just can’t do it anymore.” They’re heartbreaking. We are a public university. I’d like to show those letters to public officials and, of course, they will come back and say, “Quit charging so much tuition.” Efficiencies and cost reductions have to be looked at.

The last group would be, I won’t talk much about it, and that’s engagement and what we do in the hinterland and how we serve off the campus.

Alright, so that’s what I’m thinking right now and those workgroups will be populated with a lot people, a lot of faculty, a lot of students, and they’ll probably, they’ll do their own work, they’ll hold hearings and then out of all that will come a set of maybe 50 key benchmarks that will characterize the university based upon our planning documents for the next 10 years, and I’m personally sort of involved in this and sort of trying to sell it and get people involved. So, it is, again, the most important thing I want to leave you with, it is not new strategic planning, but I have to admit that when you choose a benchmark, you are choosing one priority over another, so you have to have your say.

Alright? I’ll be visiting you again on this, but I wanted this group to hear that. I’d take any questions. I have six minutes, or seven. Yeah? And remember my hearing is not the best.

**P. Henry:** I’ve got a microphone.

**J. Peters:** Sometimes that doesn’t help.

**P. Henry:** You just mentioned there at the end that workgroups will be holding hearings but is there another way, if we have an issue that we’d like to bring to the attention of a particular workgroup that we can direct our questions?

**J. Peters:** There’s going to be multiple entry points to get ideas, I’m going to have a big website where you collect ideas. Whether each workgroup wants to be part of that website is up to them. I want them to be comfortable in their workgroup, but there will be a way of getting it too. So, if you get it to me, you get it to the Steering Committee and then I’ll get it to the
workgroup and say, “Would you take a look at this and make a recommendation?” Yeah, Sue Willis?

S. Willis: Sorry. I have trouble with my voice, so I hope that between your hearing and my voice, we can get it together. But anyway, how will the workgroups be populated?

J. Peters: How?

S. Willis: Right, how, you’ve got your Steering Committee now, I presume?

J. Peters: Yeah.

S. Willis: But how about the workgroups?

J. Peters: Yeah, good point. I’m going to name co-chairs of each workgroup and I’m going to give a tentative list, barebones list of workgroup people to them who, and they’re basically people who have asked me if they could be on committees, and then I’m going to say, “What do you think about this? Augment it.” But I can tell you, if there are eight workgroups and there are 10-15 people on each workgroup, you’ve got a lot of people involved. I watch for balance although I have to admit, I don’t know everybody and I don’t know everything, but I asked kind of, are all the bases covered. When somebody asks me to be involved, I think they should be involved, even if they give the co-chairs heartburn. That’s a good question. Thank you Sue. I read, I don’t know, in the Northern Star they didn’t think it was such a good idea to do Vision 2020 and all that and I understand that perspective. I think it’s exactly the right time to do this. I think this is exactly the right time for us to think about what we want to be as an institution because if we don’t, we’re going to be a victim of a collapse here of the public higher education system. If we know, I mean look at the positives we have. We still serve a great region. We have a lot of strengths. We’re not perfect. I like our students a lot. I think we have very good programs. I think we’re more flexible than a lot of public universities that are older than us or more research oriented than us. I think that’s good because I think that’s what the new Land Grant mission is. I think we’re the new Land Grant if you think about it. There are a lot of great Land Grant institutions in the country that hardworking kids from first or second generation families, from rural or urban areas can no longer get into, and that’s not what the Moral Land Grant was all about. It was about bringing education to the industrial and the agricultural classes. It changed the country. I’m not criticizing the great Land Grant. I’m a product of it. How many are the products of it? I bet you half of you people are products of the great Land Grant system. Well, we’re part of that too and I think we’ve got a huge contribution to make and I’m excited about it.

A. Rosenbaum: John, when you talk about faculty being involved, I think sometimes there’s a sort of difference of opinion on what faculty are considered to be faculty. So, for example, you mentioned before that you consider yourself a faculty member and I think most provosts and vice provosts and vice presidents also think of themselves as faculty members, but for the purposes of representation on the committee, I think the faculty thinks of faculty members as being up to chair but not much beyond that. So, I think that as you people these committees, we want to make sure that we don’t end up with sort of a situation where you think they’re faculty or
someone else does and the faculty doesn’t think they’re faculty. So, I think it’s important that we’re clear on that point.

**J. Peters:** That’s a good point. I look at this holistically that it’s NIU. Every type of category of people has to be represented on this. It is important that we have a lot of, I guess, what, pure faculty representation? I also, having been in the business a long time, know that it’s also important to have individuals who hold academic administrative rank who were faculty members, because they bring two different perspectives together. I wish sometimes you could be in my job for a couple of weeks and see the various differences of opinions and cultures that are out there. There’s the pure administrative mind, which is more corporate, there’s the bureaucratic mind, there is the, there are various flavors of academic administration and in my career, I’ve found most deans are more faculty oriented than department heads. That was a joke, but without dodging the question, there’s going to be lots of representation from faculty, what you would define as faculty. You’re right, I’m not a faculty member. I wish I was. I was a faculty member for a lot of years and sat on too many mediocre dissertation committees and graded many papers so I understand it, but I have to be kind of a different perspective and make sure there’s a good blend. One thing I don’t want, I don’t want this bogged down in process. We won’t get there if we have process that has to have approval here and there, it won’t work. But then again, it’s not strategic planning, it’s benchmarking. Yeah, JD?

**J.D. Bowers:** If I can go off script maybe a little bit John, back to your point about this report on teacher quality, what, I mean I’m as angry as you are, and the report is severely flawed. In fact, they failed to acknowledge that Northern even has secondary education programs. But what is the university’s response to this because this report came out three days after we were approved by NCATE resoundingly so and praised for the quality of our programs. It seems like we sort of got kicked around. We didn’t get out the positives quick enough and the negative came right on the heels of that.

**J. Peters:** You’ve asked some fundamental and essential questions and I know I’ve asked our people in charge of these programs to give me some ammunition. From a political perspective, I think I see what happened. I think a very good group of people got bushwhacked by a very bad methodology and it got picked up by the media and the media loved it and we got sandbagged and then any attempt to explain it. I mean, you just can’t go to the Chicago Tribune and say it was bad methodology, that just makes it worse. So, have we got anybody from the Northern Star here? What you have to do is the following: What the media says and what the media says. What I care about are those superintendents in those school districts and those parents and those students who, for over 100 years, have benefitted from the quality product that we produce at NIU and we don’t do it just in the College of Education. There are five colleges that produce educators and you put your finger on it, historians and mathematicians. So, what you’ve got to do is get to the superintendents and the principals and say, “I want to hear what you say about this. I want you to write a letter to the Chronicle and tell them what good teachers Northern has produced over the last 100 years.” That’s the way you have to attack this. Plus, I do want to find out who these people are and where the money is coming from, who is supporting them and would it surprise you to find out there’s an ideological agenda here? I don’t know but inquiring minds would like to know. But, you know, you get kind of tired of these reports and you know, it was a two-day story, but the damage was done. Well, was it really damage? When it comes
hiring time, we’ll see what happens, but I think we have to get to our friends the recipients of our, well, I think the difficulty as parents and students now are saying, “Should I go to ISU, you know, Illinois State or Northern Illinois or Western Illinois or Eastern Illinois or U of I and get an undergraduate degree in education when they say it’s not good?” That’s the danger. So, now we’ve got a lot of work to do and I can’t wait for appropriation hearings. Yeah?

**A. Gupta:** One suggestion I can think of, and because a lot of things on the NIU website. For example, you may have quotes from people who are NIU graduates and are teaching in very good schools. For example, I’m familiar with many teachers at IMSA, which is probably the premiere institution in Illinois and maybe in the country, they have a lot of NIU graduates who are teaching there and even so is for two of our school districts. Some of them are there on the NIU website. That might help. Maybe it’s there, but I don’t know.

**J. Peters:** I’m going to get Max McGee who is a strong supporter of NIU. Or, I was going to call up Arne Duncan. I told this story, did I tell this story to the Space Committee, but you know, several years ago, Arne Duncan came out, begged me to come out, because he wanted to recruit more of those good NIU teachers to Chicago Public Schools, and he brought a bunch of bureaucrats out with him, and we had lunch, and we sat down and we talked to students and I think he did that for several years because he wanted to personally recruit our good students who, you know, for some of them going to Chicago Public Schools, maybe that wasn’t really high on their lists of places they wanted to start out teaching, but Arne made it worth their while with all sorts of nice perks and inducements. If you put, if a reporter called Arne Duncan and asked him what he thought about NIU’s College of Education graduates, I know what he would say so yeah, Max McGee, he’s the head of IMSA, we have a lot of good people there. Alright, and we do play football. I’m sorry I took up so much of your time. This is very important to me. I’ve tried to clear the deck so I could spend as much time on this and I really would love to hear your ideas. Pragmatic, let’s move the institution forward, make some good decisions, things will change, but I think talking about it is a good thing. Alright, see you.

All: Applause.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we really don’t have a ton of time left, so we’ll try to get through the items fairly quickly. There are just a couple of items I want to pick up from last time. One is you might recall Earl Hansen who is our Faculty Advisory Committee rep to the IBHE, raised an issue about reporting troubled students to the administration, and we have been trying to find out, I think Earl wanted to know if we had a policy in different universities throughout the state or sort of examining whether they have policies and although we don’t have a specific policy, I thought that what was said might have been a little misleading because we do have some procedures that you all received at the beginning of the semester so there are procedures in place for reporting troubled students that might be a danger to themselves or others. But, it’s, at this point, I’m not certain of the status, but nobody has been able to tell me that this is required of faculty but rather there are sort of guidelines. So, I didn’t want it left on the table that we didn’t have anything when, in fact, we at least have some guidelines that I don’t know if the word is we are expected to follow or it’s suggested that we follow them. So, I’m trying to get some additional enlightenment on this from the administration and I’ll sort of update you on that, but
you should all be aware of this if you aren’t already. I’m assuming people got this and they know what it’s all about.

Okay, next I asked about, we mentioned the issue of guests in class and the question was whether the Senate wanted to take this up and by take it up, we mean that there is not an official policy that states that it is up to the instructor of the class to determine who could be in the class by way of unregistered students, friends of students, children of students, etc., and so we talked about it a little bit and then the idea was that Senators would go back to their departments and sort of get the sense of whether this is an issue that we want to consider. So, I’ll just open the floor briefly. Does anybody have any thoughts on this? Did people query their departments to see if there was interest in such as policy? Anybody have anything on this? In the back, yes? I can’t see who it is.

T. Fisher: I did query my department and I was a little surprised. There were two or three strong reactions out of a faculty of I guess like 12 right now, with not knowing that police could go in any classroom. So, they’re strongly in favor of having it at the faculty’s discretion in terms of what we’ve been doing but perhaps there should be something in writing in case they want to indicate they want to, for instance, if police would notify them in advance or something like that, they would think that policy would, you know, the instructor having that discretion would be appropriate.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, can we turn the volume up a little bit? Not my volume, the other volume. Anyone else have something, any input from their departments? Yes?

J.D. Bowers: Can you clarify, are police officers going into the classrooms? I mean, I’ve heard this made as a statement but I haven’t confirmed. It this actually true?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, again, all I know is they’re not going into classrooms in large numbers. I don’t know how often this is happening so I can’t say that. Sue, do you have any sense in that?

S. Willis: I do have a friend who is on the NIU Police Department and what she tells me is that the Police Chief is encouraging them to actually take classes so that, enrolling for credit openly in classes, which certainly as employees of the university, they have the perfect right to do, so he is encouraging them to take advantage of that. I believe he is actually allowing them to take….

A. Rosenbaum: Do people have a sense of this from the various departments? I mean, is this a widespread problem according to your departments?

S. Willis: My recollection is that it initially was a response to the shootings in February of 2008 to have, particularly in large lecture classes, to have at least the possibility of having trained response people there. Whether they’re still doing that or not I do not know and I did not ask my friend that question but she did say that essentially all the police are enrolled for credit in NIU classes.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosemary Feurer I think is the one who raised that last time, so is Rosemary here? Yes, Kerry?
K. Freedman: I recommend that this go to committee. I think there is a general sense that the faculty, that this decision and any situation should be at the discretion of the faculty member who is instructing the class.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, are you making a motion that we send it to committee?

K. Freedman: Yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: Would you suggest that we send it to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee? I mean it sounds like a faculty right.

K. Freedman: Yeah, that sounds good.

A. Rosenbaum: So your motion is that we send this question of guests in class to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Do we have a second?

P. Henry: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Pat, okay. Discussion.

P. Henry: Just one point and that is that I think an issue that needs to be considered is liability. If something is, I mean if somebody’s kid falls off a chair and hits their head, does the university get sued into bankruptcy?

A. Rosenbaum: So that would be something that the committee would want to take up, certainly.

P. Henry: Exactly.

T. Griffin: I think people who are supposed to be in the classroom who are registered or are teaching, one set of rules applies; but somebody who isn’t perhaps something else.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments or questions, discussion? Okay, all in favor of sending this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities say aye.

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed?

Unidentified: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Alright, show of hands, people who are opposed. Okay, we have two opposed. The motion carries. We’ll send this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.
The next issue, this is sort of just a follow-up on the ongoing issue with the library resolution that was passed last year. This has been given over to the Libraries Advisory Committee. The Libraries Advisory Committee has been charged by the Provost with developing a policy for informing the faculty about plans to dispose of large amounts of materials. There seems to be some debate on that committee. The Dean of the library has invited us to have a liaison between the Faculty Senate and the Libraries Advisory Committee. So, he has agreed to that and so we are going to be looking for somebody to serve as liaison between the Libraries Advisory Committee and the Senate. The Dean had suggested that this be somebody who had, at some time, been on the Libraries Advisory Committee, which is fine. I don’t think we’re obligated to that but it would make sense that somebody that was familiar with the Libraries Advisory Committee and its workings might sort of have a head start on serving in this function. So, if you are someone who is interested in serving in this role, please let us know and we’ll try and decide who would be a good person to do that on the executive committee if that is okay. So, if people are interested, let me know, and you can send me an email or call me, whatever. Any comments on this? Questions? I think it’s a good idea for us to have a liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee, so I think this is a good thing and I appreciate the fact that the Dean is in agreement that this should occur.

Okay, next item, and this is an item to think about for our next meeting, which is in January. A number of years ago, the Faculty Senate authorized a committee to develop a policy for students who wanted to file grievances against faculty members. The Senate authorized, I think it was an ad hoc committee, so it was not, it wasn’t given to one of our standing committees. Tim Griffin, our Ombudsman, was on that committee. I was not, so I have very little knowledge of this. I have been trying to get up to speed on that. The person who was in charge of that committee was Buck Steven in the Mathematics Department, so I’ve been in touch with Buck to try and get a handle on what happened here. I’ve asked Tim to just take a moment to sort of talk about what happened and what the issues are that might cause us to want to reinvigorate this committee so we haven’t done that yet but Tim, if you could just take a moment and then we’ll talk about it a little bit at length in January.

T. Griffin: Sensitive to the time of day, I will attempt to be brief. There were a number of issues raised by a number of people several years ago in this body and from a number of different perspectives. One of them was the fact that students were held to a particular code of conduct in our community that was not applied to faculty and staff, for example. We call it the Student Code of Conduct. We don’t have a code of conduct for every member of our community, just one that applies to students, different ostensibly ones apply to different members. There were also issues related to the fact that a grievance procedure, which had recently been rewritten to become more incorporative and broader to include staff, for example, as well as faculty, did not include students and some individuals were concerned about that exclusion from the then new grievance procedure, which is now one of the articles of our bylaws, the Constitution & Bylaws of the Institution. Finally, there were issues related to the fact that some students on rare occasions, had alleged and some staff members, frankly, on rare occasions, had alleged treatment by some faculty members outside the formal context of research, service and teaching, that arguably would be grievable in under-expectations for conduct of either staff or students but no mechanism existed to allow any kind of formal grievance to be filed in those situations. As a result of all these different perspectives and others, Alan sprung this on me after I got here
tonight; I’ve not done my homework, I’m relying solely on my memory for this, but it seems to me, off the top of my head, that those were some of the issues that were raised and discussed briefly in the conjunction and support of the formation of this ad hoc committee to which he referred earlier. Is that what you want?

A. Rosenbaum: That’s fine. So the question is, again, do we want to resurrect this committee or do we not. So, you might want to give some thought to that. We have two months before our next meeting and so we can think about whether or not we want this committee to again, we’ll have to form a new committee. The people that were on that committee, many of them are no longer at the university and so we’ll have to start over again and we’ll have to decide whether we want to do that. Clearly, if we go down that road, we’re going to have to have protections for faculty members as well and I think this might be one of the things that might have bogged the process down. We don’t want to get into a situation where faculty can be victims of witch hunts either. So, there’s a lot to think about there and I don’t want us to do it now because we’re really running late, but after the holidays, we can talk about it.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: OK, so we have some reports from advisory committees. Advisory committee people, please, let’s not reiterate the details that are already in your report but let’s just hit the highlights and take some questions. So the first one is Earl Hansen’s report on the FAC to the IBHE. Earl?

E. Hansen: The meeting was in Bloomington last Friday and President Bowman of Illinois State University spoke and most presidents speak for about 10 or 20 minutes. He went for a good 45 minutes because he kept asking questions, and pertinent questions that I thought might interest you, are in the body of the paper. The one thing was he was talking about the privates in the northeast and north central area of the country are most in jeopardy and that the privates are targeting those students with preparations that may be less than what we are targeting at state universities and that was one reason why MAP money might be going to other institutions and we had a discussion when I left the building here the other day, a question was asked on where we were with MAPs and I talked to the gentleman from the Illinois Student Assistance Commission and a member of the P-20 Council by the name of Andrew Davis, he talked about coming up here. We talked about why don’t you just give us a response back to the questions that were asked and that’s where that is for those two that were making comments in here, that’s all I have for you on that one, trying to answer your questions for you. A lot of the discussion that went on in there, and I have two typos that I want to correct, on the third paragraph right above where it says, Tribune, the word is Linda and it should be Lisa and where I have Gerald two lines above that or three lines above that on the right, that is Gerald Brookhart, the Regional Superintendent of Schools in Peoria and he basically said the same thing that John was saying in
here today in relation, get our alumni out there, get our people out there and tell them what positive things we are doing. That part of the discussion did go on there. The reaction that the faculty in here was pretty much the same as the reaction that was down there to the Tribune article of everybody that turned out a teacher, I don’t care whether they came from Knox College or if they came from UIC or what, but the biggest thing I got out of this whole thing is we need to go back to our home bases and we need to address the fact that we have good people out there and we need to get them involved in what we’re doing. Last but not least, the gist of the conversation down there was dealing with the curriculum in the K-12 schools and went on and on all day on that one. And in that regard, Sonya asked me a question a while ago about, since she is doing research on it, do you want to take one minute and kind of expound on what you’re doing or give us an enlightenment? I should have warned you.

S. Armstrong: Yeah, I think really the issue is just there is essentially an argument going on in the field that remediation, which I actually use the term, developmental education, is a waste of taxpayer’s money, is repetitive from high school. You’ve probably heard these arguments before and so I was interested that so much of this conversation is focused on developmental remedial education and the issue is to what extent is it actually repeating what is covered in K-12 context.

E. Hansen: Thank you, I’m done.

A. Rosenbaum: OK, any questions for Earl? Okay, thank you Earl. We will continue to try to get the answers to this question about the MAP funding and we’ll report to you as soon as we have that or if it happens before our next meeting, it will be posted on Blackboard, which you are all now, of course, in the habit of reading regularly. So, we’ll put it up there if we get anything.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have Kerry Freedman’s report on the BOT subcommittee, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel. Kerry?

K. Freedman: I am actually a member of the School of Art and because of that, I felt compelled to read something about Toni Keller because several of the people actually in this room have asked how we’re doing. So I actually put this statement in that I read just so you would know that we’re doing okay. I spoke to the administration person who organizes the BOT meeting and she said she would like to have the statement read, so I included the entire statement. There were just a couple of minor things, for example, Vice President Buettner said that the off campus site visit from the Higher Learning Commission went well. In fact, it went so well that the guy left early, he didn’t even go to the last site. I didn’t put that in the report. Vice Provost Cassidy spent quite a bit of time talking about the process, basically explaining the process of program review, so I have written as much of that out as I thought reasonable. Probably the most important presentation was Gip Seaver’s presentation having to do with the Office of Student Academic Success. So, I spent quite a bit of time on that. That was actually a PowerPoint presentation so there isn’t a written document around like the Cassidy presentation and so I wanted to just point out a couple of things there. One, we have talked previously on a couple of occasions about the idea of at-risk students. From Seaver’s perspective and the Office of Student
Academic Success perspective, students who are at risk are students who will not graduate within four years. So, they’re using a very particular definition of at risk, but I just wanted to point out because that issue had been raised at some earlier meeting of the Faculty Senate. That’s the primary purpose of this new office, this office started only 18 months ago and so a lot of what he was talking about had to do with goals of the office and results coming out of these, several of these task forces that John mentioned today. So, that was, that’s mainly what that summary was all about. I was allowed to ask one question. I was told when I took this position on, I would be allowed to ask one question at each meeting, so I asked my question, and my question was whether or not we’d be asked to reconsider academic standards in order to improve retention because this office really is about student retention. They want to keep students in school so I was concerned that we’d be asked to lower our standards in order to do that and both Seaver and Alden said, “No, we would not be asked to lower our standards.” So, that’s my report.

A. Rosenbaum: And they won’t be lowered, right?

K. Freedman: I that was what they told me when I asked the question, and I have written it down on paper.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Kerry?

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 – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: OK, next Todd Latham is going to give us a very brief report on the Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee meeting. Todd?

T. Latham: Alright, fasten your seat belts. University report item 7A. This was an address by Dr. Cunningham to this committee. It identified potential changes in the regulations of the Board of Trustees to matters regarding employee benefits to the employees themselves and their families. This essentially was the attempt to address the ongoing and complex issue of domestic partner benefits. The first bold areas that basically addressed policy, policy of peer groups, policies dealing with domestic partnership, NIU commissions, statement of benefits and Board regulations. Then we moved on to another area that dealt with fiscal impact so the question then becomes if we implement domestic partner benefits, what does that mean to us? What is the fiscal impact that was identified requirements. So, these are all items that they couldn’t come to a consensus on. They concluded the discussion. They will then resume it at their next meeting dealing with the student area of the draft, which we did not get to.

So, Ken Zehnder, 96 General Assembly. Ken basically said that the election had outcomes that will change things. It will change representation. He identified how alumni faired in the elections to us as a presentation and that there would be some changes on the committee representation. He identified the Higher Education Committee as one of those. Items that the assembly is in veto
session, items that will be considered will be the pension borrowing, university borrowing, debt collection procurement, the administrative burden, higher ed funding, redistricting and areas we should be concerned about is the MAP funding and ISAC funding. The congressional report, items to think about that is a lot of our funding for some of our federal funded areas and appropriations will be addressed in the lame duck sessions, those affect the departments of Health and Human Services, Transportation, Defense, so that’s money coming to NIU that we need to be concerned about that’s earmarked but hasn’t been granted. Under the internal audit update, basically there were 17 audits proposed. We ended up with 14 of those between the fiscal year of 2010 and 2011 and was due to two projects that were postponed by the university and one that was delayed due to staffing, a staffing decrease from 5 to 3 employees. Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Any questions for Todd?

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

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

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

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

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jozef Bujarski and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs – report – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** OK, the last report from Laurie Elish-Piper who is the Co-chair of the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. Laurie?

**L. Elish-Piper:** Yes, the report is pretty self explanatory. I’m just going to point out three key things. One was that when we met this past Thursday with President Peters and Provost Alden, we requested that our committee have significant involvement in the Vision 2020 process and we were told that specifically, our committee would have representation on two of the working groups that pertain to our charge, the Facilities and Environment Committee or Task Force rather and the Sustainability one. Additionally, we had two issues that we had brought to the group before that we needed to come with follow-up answers for. One of them was in relationship to questions regarding the True North Campaign and a lot of faculty and staff inquiring as to what the final outcome of that process was. We were told that in response to that question, the NIU Foundation will be preparing and distributing a report to faculty and staff about the True North Campaign in general as well as specifically the Faculty and Staff Campaign. Then, the other issue was that we had been given the task of looking at the sustainability of intercollegiate athletics and we had one task left to do, which was to look at athletic donations, that was a request from this body. We were able to get information, and it’s presented there in the bullet points for you, so you can see where the money came in, that most of the donors gave to NIU only, not specifically to Athletics and a very small percentage of donors contributed both to Athletics and academics. Based on that information and the previous information that we
reported, our committee feels like we’ve investigated that issue and we didn’t see anything that we thought required further investigation or further consideration by our committee.

A. Rosenbaum: OK, any questions for Laurie?

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

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Athletic Board – September 15, 2010 minutes
B. Academic Planning Council – October 4, 2010 minutes
C. Undergraduate Coordinating Council – October 7, 2010 minutes
D. Academic Planning Council – November 1, 2010 minutes
E. Affirmative Action and Diversity Resources Advisory Committee – Annual Report

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I don’t think we have any other business. There are no other questions? Our next meeting is January 19th, so you have two months off. Have a great holiday. Come back rested and ready to do the work of the people in January. I need a motion to adjourn. Somebody?

S. Willis: (motion to adjourn)

A. Rosenbaum: I need a second.

N. Castle: (second)

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, all in favor?

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Have a good holiday.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.