FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
Wednesday, January 25, 2012, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryant, Cozad, Griffin, Hansen, Latham, Quick, Streb, Sunderlin

OTHERS ABSENT: Freedman, Haliczer, Prawitz, Small, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Well, welcome back. I hope you all had a good break and are ready to get to work on the business of the faculty.

Meeting called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first thing we need is to adopt our agenda. I need a motion to adopt the agenda, and I want to remind you that you have to say your name into the microphone because these are transcribed and I know, in the couple of weeks since we last met, people might have forgotten that you have to have a microphone when you speak and you have to tell us who you are. So, say your name and then say you move whatever. So, make the motion. Rosita? You need the microphone.

R. Lopez: I move to adopt.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, move to adopt the agenda. I need a second.

J. Kowalski: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Jeff Kowalski fresh from sabbatical seconds the motion. Any discussion? All in favor, say, “aye.”
Members: Aye.

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

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2011 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the minutes of the November 16 meeting. If you’re anything like me, you don’t even remember November 16. So, I need a motion to approve the minutes. Anybody?

R. Lopez: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosita once again, full of energy.

S. Willis: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue Willis is seconding. Beautiful. Okay, any comments, changes, corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes, say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? No opposition. The minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: A couple of announcements. First of all, I think we want to congratulate the NIU Huskies football team on their excellent performance and their victory in the Go Daddy Bowl in Mobile. Very exciting season by the NIU Huskies. We also have a guest. I suppose I’ll sort of go out of my own order a little bit. Mary Cozad is here today to say a few words to us about the Relay for Life, so if we can give her a microphone – sitting at the end of the table there – and so this way she will be able to get on with her life.

M. Cozad: Yes, I have sort of a proclamation and handout about the anniversary of Colleges Against Cancer and our annual Relay for Life. This year marks the 10th anniversary of Colleges Against Cancer, a major branch of the American Cancer Society, founded in the fall of 2001 by two Illinois college freshmen, Rich Bajner, a health administration major at the University of Illinois, and Amy Garrison, a management major here at Northern Illinois University. Colleges Against Cancer put on the first college-based Relay for Life, the fundraiser for the American Cancer Society right here in the spring of 2002. Now, the organization has branches nationwide at every major university and community college in this country. We have put on a Relay for Life event here in April since 2002 with dozens of students, staff, and faculty teams. I’m the faculty advisor, and I have been since the beginning. The late professor Michael Morris, a Spanish professor and Faculty Senate member, was very active in Northern’s Relay.

Community-based Relay for Life events have been in existence since 1985. Relay is the major fundraiser for a very worthwhile organization, the American Cancer Society, which provides...
research money, cancer education programs, and services to thousands of cancer patients throughout the country. Relay is an enjoyable overnight celebration with games, music, entertainment, and food as well as a chance to hear about progress in the fight against cancer. At several of our Relays, NIU faculty members who have completed ACS-sponsored research have been recognized. Please consider forming or joining a team in your department or administrative office. For information, or to form a team, go online to www.relayforlife.org/niuil. Join us in the fight against cancer and have fun in the process. This year’s date is April 21-22, and I do have a handout. I have this as a handout so you can take this back and share it with your departments or your offices or with other people.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, does anyone, first of all, have any questions about the Relay for Life, any questions for Mary? You can put those on the table where the cookies are and then, if anyone wants them, they can pick them up on the way out. Unless, did you want to distribute them?

**M. Cozad:** I was thinking of distributing them. People might forget. To raise funds for the American Cancer Society, you have to be a little pushy.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, excellent. While she is doing that, I will move ahead with the president’s announcements. You may recall last semester, we, well actually it was longer ago than that, but I guess it was last spring, the Provost put together the blue ribbon panel on workload. David Wade, who is here, and a member of our senate, who was a member of that workload, blue ribbon panel on workload, he gave us an update last year, which suggested that perhaps the workload panel’s work was not really moving forward and had sort of bogged down. I spoke to Provost Alden about that last semester, and he assured me that the work hadn’t bogged down, that there was a draft document, and he was waiting to get that draft document back from a number of different people who were involved in the process. He thought that we would have a document for the senate to vet sometime last semester. That didn’t happen. We expected it sometime at the end of October. I spoke to him the other day, and he assures me that the draft document has been sent to the UCPC and also to the Dean’s Council for review and is due back to him by February 15. At that point, he feels that the document will be ready for vetting by a number of different groups including the Faculty Senate. So, we can expect, probably sometime during the third week in February, that this document will come back to us, and we will be able to review it and also to express any concerns or comments that we have about it. According to the provost, we should not expect any dramatic changes, that he feels that the workload that is going to be in this report is essentially the workload that the university has always considered to be the faculty workload, which is a 3/3 workload. Before anyone gets anxious about that, because I know many of you do not teach 3/3, essentially, those nine credits per semester is the sort of rack rate for faculty and then those are always discounted based on things like graduate teaching, participation and dissertation, committees, research work, etc., etc. So, essentially, we have been operating under 3/3 workload all along anyway and yet that is always modified. Some departments have much lower than 3/3 workloads and other departments actually have higher workloads. So, the idea of this is to really provide sort of a basis from which discussions can go on. So, departments that have lower than 3/3 workloads, the chairs will be empowered to discuss with the faculty what the basis should be for having less than a 3/3 workload. So, according to Ray Alden, and I have not seen this document, there should not be any huge changes that the faculty will be concerned about. Of course, we can’t always predict what the faculty will be
concerned about, and so we will have to wait and see what the document is like. That’s about all I know. David, do you have anything you want to add to any of that? There is a microphone over here if you want to.

D. Wade: I would just like to say, Alan, I appreciate you informing me as to what is happening with the workload committee since all efforts on my part to achieve any information have been thwarted. I would be as interested as you to see what draft we’re talking about. If it is the last draft that came out of the committees, okay, and we did finish a final draft, and I would assume that’s what it is. Since that time, though, as far as a scuttlebutt, and that is the best I can do, as much as I can gather from inside tracks, is that they, the provost’s office identified a subset of the people who were on the committee, none of whom were faculty members, to deal with this last draft. I don’t know whether they made any changes with it or not. If they have, then I will be reading a new draft too because they certainly did not make any efforts to include the committee as a whole in anything beyond whatever the last thing was that we did, which was not even last semester, which was the end of the fall term of last year. So, I mean, I wish I could tell you more. I feel like an idiot mostly half the time since I’m on a committee and I don’t know what they’re doing, and everyone I ask can’t tell me, including administrators, including Ray Alden, twice.

A. Rosenbaum: You know, again, I have told you what I know. I don’t know anything beyond that. I know that Ray has sort of indicated to me that he has tried to keep his fingerprints off of this thing until it goes through all these different whatever those organizations or sources are that are getting a hand on this and that, once he gets it back, he will put his imprint on it. But you will certainly be in a good position to let us know whether or not this represents the committee’s work or whether this represents a departure from what the committee thought was a good idea.

D. Wade: I can’t wait.

A. Rosenbaum: We’ll all join you in that. But, as soon as we have that, we will post that on the Blackboard website. You will be notified that it’s on there and we’ll be able to have a discussion at senate if that’s what people want to do.

Next, just a very brief update on the status of the salary increments that some of you have heard about. I don’t know how widespread this is. Are people aware that there is a faculty salary increment in the process for both faculty and staff? What I had been told most recently by President Peters is that nothing is official until the Board of Trustees approves it, that he is optimistic, that the details that you have heard, assuming you have all heard the details that have been sort of disseminated, that he is very optimistic that the board will be supportive of it. You should also keep in mind, though that we have a number of brand-new board members including one that is going to be sworn in on February 2. So the president doesn’t exactly know what all of the board members may be thinking. So, he can’t be 100 percent certain that this board will support it, but he obviously felt confident enough in that to begin allowing that information to get into the public domain. What you have heard about the raises probably is accurate, assuming that the Board of Trustees concurs and approves that. So, the hope is that the Board of Trustees will approve this at the March meeting and that if they do, that those raises will be retroactive to January 1. For faculty at least, there will be both an across-the-board component and also a
A. Lash: What percent?

A. Rosenbaum: I believe that it’s again, going to be sort of staggered so that if you make, I think it’s below $110,000, I believe it is 2.5 percent. I think if you make above $110,000 but less than $170,000 I want to say, but that might not be exactly right, it drops to 2 percent and then above another certain figure I think it drops to like 1.75 percent. I don’t think anyone amongst the faculty has to worry about that last drop. But, if you do, congratulations, and you’ll get a slightly lower raise. Then, the merit, from what I understand from the provost, the UCPC has a say in how merit is done for faculty. So this came out of the UCPC, and I think what they came up with, and again, none of this is firm enough that you should say, you know, “Rosenbaum says,” and is the Star here, the Northern Star? Do we have a Star reporter? Okay, this is not official, that the merit portion that, what would be happening is that this is going to be a plan that is devised by the deans in each of the colleges and so that aspect of it will be sort of in the hands of the deans. What he expects will be the case is that, if you are average in terms of your merit, you will get 1 percent and that will go up from there to a maximum, I think of 3 percent. So, the people that have very high merit will be at about a 3 percent level and then it will be staggered in between. Different deans will do this in a different way. So, some deans will have just set cut points, other deans will use a more continuous distribution, but everybody who is at least average in terms of merit will get at least an additional 1 percent on top of the across-the-board raise. So, that’s kind of the amounts that they’re talking about but again, please remember the key phrase here is, “approved by the Board of Trustees.” So, until that happens, nobody can do anything and none of that is official. So, that’s the status of that.

Along the lines of salary, you may recall, if your memory is good because this has been going on for a long time, we have a Salary Equity Committee that has been looking at whether raises are distributed fairly across the different divisions within the university. That Salary Equity Committee was formed, I think, about two years ago. It has been working. We have a very strong and good contingent among the faculty. We have a number of faculty members on the senate, Charles Cappell, George Slotsve, Rosemary Feurer, are all on that committee along with Balla Hosmane, and they have done a tremendous amount of work analyzing the data that was given to them, given to the committee by the university. They have a report, which you have heard alluded to at various meetings, and we have now got a date for the full committee meeting, that means not only the faculty representatives but also the representatives from operating staff, SPS, and from the provost’s office. That full committee meeting will take place, I believe, on February 6. Once the committee has gotten this data, has had an opportunity to discuss the data, has had a chance to consider recommendations, the Faculty Senate committee will present the report to the Faculty Senate. So, you will have the ability, not only to see the report, but the data and the analyses that went into it. You will be able to know at that point, hopefully, what the recommendations of the full committee are, and then we can discuss whether or not that is satisfactory to the Faculty Senate or whether we feel we want to make additional changes or suggestions or whatever. So, that will be our first step, and then we’ll take it from there. That
should happen hopefully in time for our, when’s the February meeting, is it early? We may be able to have that for us the 15th, the next Faculty Senate on the 15th. So, that’s the process that we are involved with now. So we will get that report, the committee will get that report to the senate as soon as practical after the full committee receives it. We have committee members here, so if any of them want to make a comment, they’re welcome to do that. Is Charles here? Charles, you or Rosemary or George want to have anything to say about that? No, that’s fine? Very good. Okay, so believe it or not, that’s actually happening. We are optimistic anyway.

Okay, the next item of interest. Many of you are aware, because you have had a sabbatical leave, what the rules for sabbatical leaves are. They are articulated in Article VIII of the bylaws and also in the APPM. One of the things that we have to keep in mind, the sabbatical leaves are, in many universities, an endangered species, given the tough economic climate that universities face. It’s not that easy for them to support sabbatical leaves. Our board and our president have been very supportive of sabbatical leaves. So, to my knowledge, we had, I think 50 of them last semester. I don’t know that a request for a sabbatical leave has been turned down at the level of either the board or, well I guess the board. So, they have been very supportive. They have asked in return, that faculty report on the results of the sabbatical leave. For the most part, faculty have been very contentious in doing that. We have at least two faculty members that make a presentation to the Board of Trustees at one of their meetings explaining how they used the sabbatical and what they accomplished with it. So, it’s been a very good relationship. Apparently, we have a few faculty members who refused to provide these kinds of reports. Whether they refused to provide the reports based on some principle or whether they were sitting on a beach somewhere for the entire semester, I don’t know the answer to that. Goodness, let me strike that from the record. Obviously, all faculty are using sabbatical leaves as they are intended. Okay, nevertheless, for some academic reason, some faculty members, very few by the way, are not filling out the reports. The UCPC has made a recommendation that Article VIII, Section 4.4 of the bylaws be changed, and it will include really two changes: one, that at the conclusion of the sabbatical, faculty members will provide a brief report of the scholarly purpose of the sabbatical; and then two years later, they will file a report on the outcomes. Of course, this is to give the board an idea of how many of these things that might have been submitted for publication during the sabbatical or immediately after actually found their way into print somewhere. So, this will be the presentation of this material to the board will not be by a faculty member; it will be anonymous. It will be sort of aggregated data, so the purpose is not to embarrass a particular faculty member. So, this change in Article VIII of the bylaws goes directly to the University Council. Because it’s a bylaw change, it will require two readings. The first reading will take place next Wednesday at the first meeting. So, if faculty members have issues or concerns about this, I just want them to be prepared to sort of make those concerns heard at that council meeting. Yes, Deborah? You’ve got to turn on the microphone.

**D. Zahay-Blatz:** Thanks for the update, Alan. I just wanted to say, when I had my sabbatical and gave them my report, which I guess was a year ago in January, I got a letter back that said, “Thank you for your report and we want another report in two years, saying if the material got into print,” just what you said. So, it sounds like they’re doing this anyway.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, I guess the difference is between doing it informally and then doing it with a bylaw to support it.
**D. Zahay-Blatz:** Okay.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So, anyway, this is what is, this is coming up from the provost’s office from the UCPC then to the provost to the University Council.

**D. Zahay-Blatz:** Okay, I don’t have a problem with it. I hope it gets in print. I’m working on it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, anyway, again, I’m just trying to, this is not a call to arms, this is just a heads-up that this is going to the University Council and again, because the University Council faculty members are senate members, if you have some concerns about this, which again, I didn’t see it as something that was very concerning, but if you do, then we need to make that known at the University Council. Okay, any other questions about that?

All right, next, you may recall again, this is really testing your memory. We have a lot of, you might recall, items. We had some issues with the library around the disposal of journals. The Faculty Senate raised a bit of an issue around this. We eventually had a kind of an agreement with the Library Advisory Committee to make sure that that was going to really happen and that we had some kind of a connection. They agreed that we would have a liaison from the Faculty Senate to the Library Advisory Committee. That person is Sue Willis, and so I’ve asked Sue to give us a brief report on the activities of the Library Advisory Committee and whether or not the library is doing what we had asked and whether we have an issue that is still of concern to the Faculty Senate. So, Sue?

**S. Willis:** Okay, the Library Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet monthly during the academic year, except it winds up being sort of three times in the fall and three times in the spring and then, if there’s nothing on the agenda, the meeting gets cancelled. So, I think it met once last fall, and there is a meeting scheduled in another week or two this spring unless it gets cancelled. So, as far as I can tell from sitting in there, there have not been fresh issues that have come up with the de-accessioning of journals or other materials. The, what can I say, the library staff are certainly sensitized to the issue now. They seem to be still a little unclear on exactly where the boundary lines are. They get rid of stuff all the time, and I think the issue a couple of years ago was not that they got rid of anything, but that they got rid of a lot of stuff all at once and so I think they’re still a little bit unclear on exactly where is the boundary line between just kind of normal getting rid of stuff that is falling apart or that they don’t have room for and when it’s something that is quite out of the ordinary. So, I think having eyes and ears there is a good idea, even though at the moment, I have nothing in particular to report about. They certainly are moving more and more to having a lot more open space in the library and study spaces where students can set up their laptops and nosh on snacks and work together and things like that. So, there seems to be less of an emphasis on actual physical materials and more on study space.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, since the students are doing that in the library, maybe we can move the books into the student union.

**S. Willis:** Well, there you go.
A. Rosenbaum: All right, any questions for Sue about anything library related?

Okay, well a couple of relatively quick items. I met with Steve Cunningham very briefly. He is anticipating that the pension debacle will start to heat up again over the next couple of weeks. At this point, he doesn’t have anything. It’s not as though anything in particular is going on. Steve has been doing, I think, a lot of work to try and make this as un-invasive as possible in terms of its impact on faculty. I invited Steve to come to an upcoming meeting of the senate as soon as he has some substantive material to present to us. So, as soon as something does start happening down in Springfield, Steve Cunningham will join us and will be available to not only tell us what’s going on, but to answer questions that faculty have. So, there’s nothing going on right now, as far as I know or as far as Steve knows and as soon as something is going on, we will stay on top of it. So, we can expect a visit from Steve probably, possibly at the next meeting, depending on how quickly the legislature takes up this pension reform.

I want to welcome Matt Streb. Matt is in the back there. Stand up, Matt. Some of you know Matt. He is a professor and chairman of the Department of Political Science. He is here with us as the faculty athletics representative to the senate. He was appointed by President Peters, and he is replacing Jan Rintala who was in this position for many years and has now retired. So, we welcome Matt, and if you have any questions about the athletics or whatever, Matt is our representative. Again, he is a nonvoting ex-officio member of the senate. So, he better not have one of those little remote control devices on him. So, welcome Matt.

Another item, this is again in the area of a heads-up. As you all know, David Wade has been our Faculty and SPS personnel advisor. He is completing his term. He is not eligible for reelection, and so we will have an opening starting in July for a new Faculty and SPS personnel advisor. We will not need people to declare themselves. I think we won’t need to know that until March, is that it, March? So, people can think about it. If you know people that are interested in the position, you can let your constituents know that this position is opening up. David, do you want to say anything about the position?

D. Wade: Well, sure. I don’t know how much you know about the position, but I had faculty colleagues who had done it before and, of course, I knew Alan, so I knew a little bit. But just a heads-up of what you’re looking at. I would have thought it would have been a lot more adversarial representing faculty in disputes with other cohorts. Really, a great deal, it was surprising to me, was a great deal of the work is more empathic. It’s as much listening as it is acting. Most of the people I talk with are in distress. They feel either misunderstood or crazy, and a great deal of my time is understanding whether they have any basis to feel either. In most cases, they do not, but many of you have had run-ins with administrators at various levels, and you know you’re right and they’re either not hearing it, not listening to you, or making you feel like you’re insane. So, a lot of it is as much listening as it is calling people on the phone, fire breathing, engaging in adversarial confrontation, that kind of thing. A great deal of time is spent convincing people who are in conflict to actually deal with the person with whom they are in conflict. A lot of people want other people to deal with the people they’re in conflict. Sometimes, that’s appropriate and sometimes it isn’t. It’s pretty much my job somewhat in conversation to figure that out. A lot of it is really telling them what the process is, telling others what I can do and can’t do, what’s going to happen from here, what’s the next step, how do the
steps work out, sort of an institutional history of what’s happened in the past in this kind of domain. So, of the people who are thinking about doing this, if you’re not a good listener, you’re not empathic in the slightest, I’d stay away from this job. I’d take Alan’s job. He’s a fire breather. A lot of it is that. Another thing I would always encourage is somebody who’s been here a while. It helps to understand sort of how the Constitution and Bylaws works. Shared governance here is a fundamentally different process than people experience in a lot of places. A lot of administrators come to NIU from other places, and they just can’t believe that shared governance is really true, that they can’t just unilaterally do whatever they want. So, that is, that’s a bit of a process and if you don’t understand kind of the history and process of NIU, that could be a little problematic. So, it is helpful if you’ve been in shared governance at the university level, particularly, to understand the role of the APPM and the Constitution and Bylaws and the Board of Trustees rules. There’s a whole bunch of sets, and that’s not even counting all the department and college personnel and policies and procedure. You know, it’s a steep learning curve, but I’ll tell you, it has been an incredibly gratifying and fulfilling job, I have to tell you. Of all the things I’ve done and all the years I’ve been at NIU, this is as much, as fulfilling and satisfying as anything I’ve done, so I can’t encourage enough to think about doing it. You know, it is an on-demand phenomenon, so I mean you never know from day to day what’s it’s going to be. It could be a lot, it could be a little. You could go months without talking to anybody and suddenly, you’ve got 17 meetings in a week. So, you know, if you’re looking for a steady Eddie, this isn’t it. It tends to group around promotion and tenure and various periods of time, but a lot of it is political. It’s not tenure and promotion. I thought it would be much more of a lot of complaints about formal stuff and it really isn’t. A lot of it is collegiality issues, just an inability to work and play well with others or complaining about others who are unable to work and play well. Surprisingly, a surprisingly large number of those kinds of things. So, I’ll answer any questions if you have any, but I can’t encourage you enough. I’d do it three more years if I was going to do it if I could. I mean, I think it’s just a wonderful opportunity.

A. Rosenbaum: If you do come up with questions or if you have some interest or if you know someone who has an interest…

D. Wade: One other thing, they do pay you for this by the way, and it’s not an insignificant amount of money. Just as a side, not that that matters.

A. Rosenbaum: If you do have any questions, feel free to call either myself or David, and we’ll tell you what we know about the position, and if you know somebody else that’s interested, you don’t have to be a senate member to do this. This is open to any tenured faculty member in the university. Okay?

Two quick items, one is, some of you who have been here a while know that many years ago, there was a faculty newsletter called the Faculty Bulletin. The Faculty Bulletin was actually begun in 1940 and went out of circulation in, I think, 1996 or 1998. Since then, we have not had a faculty newsletter. The reason for the Faculty Bulletin was much larger. It included things like the minutes of the University Council. In its heyday, it had poems written by faculty members, short stories; it was really more like a literary magazine. We’re going to restart something like that. It’s going to be called Faculty Matters. It’s kind of the new rendition of the Faculty Bulletin. It will be an email sort of, I guess, I don’t want to call it a journal, but it will be
emailed to you and it will basically, the purpose will be for faculty members to sort of get a handle on what is going on at the University Council level, Faculty Senate level. So, for example, when the council passes something, there really aren’t any mechanisms for the entire faculty being informed of that, and so this is what we’re going to try and do. We’re going to try and make sure the faculty know that we passed a policy on guests in class or that we have a policy on sabbaticals or whatever. So, you should start looking for this. We’re still waiting for the mailing list. We have to get the email addresses for all faculty members before we can send it out. That’s not as easy as you think, but I think we will get them, and I think that this will be coming to you, into your mailbox probably within the next couple of weeks. So, we have a draft of the first issue, and we’re going to try and put it out once or twice a semester or as needed to update people on things that are going on that are of interest to teaching faculty. Okay? So, look for it, don’t just put it in your junk mail folder or whatever, not before you read it. After you read it, you might want to. Anyway, so you can look for that.

Lastly, there are two informational items that we’ve provided in this agenda. One of them is, as I told you last time, the plus/minus grading system was approved by the Graduate Council for graduate teaching only at the moment. You can see the policy that was approved. We have put that in the agenda for you as an informational item, and we’ve also put our meeting schedule, some people have apparently lost the meeting schedule that we send out, so that’s there also. So, that’s all, that’s quite a bit, but that’s all I have for this month.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: We have nothing on the consent agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen


A. Rosenbaum: The next item from our advisory committees, we have the reports from the FAC to the IBHE and since it’s been a while since we met, we actually have three reports, one of which is the walk-in. I should have probably mentioned that when we approved the agenda, but I didn’t. So, anyway, Earl and Sonya will be giving us the reports from the FAC to the IBHE.

E. Hansen: Okay, I’m going to make this short. The meeting at Aurora University on November 18 I attended. The notes are there. The basic question there is performance-based funding. If you read that, that seems to run through the theme of the entire meeting. We had concerns about the number of transfer students and specific merits to be used in evaluation and coming up with numbers for the performance-based funding aspect of it. You all know that IBHE is the Illinois Board of Higher Education, but you probably don’t know on that fourth line in the bottom on that first page of the memo, it says, “IPEDS,” and that’s the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, which collects data from the schools in the State of
Illinois and that’s what they use as a basis for this funding aspect. They are talking about an expectation of a 5 percent limit on the funding, and this could go up in the future. They’re using the State of Tennessee as a benchmark in regards to putting this thing together and over on the last page, page 5, there are five bullets at the top, the points that were made. But I think more important than that is that, if you went to the bottom of the page where it says “performance funding,” and there is a website there, that you go to that and access that and see what’s being done in other states. I think that’s probably the most significant thing in here to enlighten you quickly as to what’s going on in that. I’ll let my cohort in crime go on. We did attach a letter from the chair from the University of Illinois just so that you would see that this type of letter is posted on the Faculty Advisory Council’s website, the correspondence and things like that. It links. If you want to follow this, by all means, go to that site. If you have questions, you need to contact Sonya or myself and we’ll try not to confuse you if we’re not too confused ourselves. You’re up.


S. Armstrong: I attended the December meeting in Springfield on December 9. To be honest, there wasn’t a lot of action at that meeting. Everybody was pretty much ready to go. The morning session was really spent thanking the IBHE guests who were there and also a representative from the Illinois Community College Board. There were some concerns raised about the turnover at IBHE. Those were taken care of mostly, and then the rest of the meeting was all about this performance-based funding. I’ve included some highlights in the report, but at this point, these are all moot points because the performance-based funding subcommittee has since met, and these recommendations that the caucuses posed, you know, we’ve already moved beyond this. We’re actually at the point where they’ve got published recommendations for the exact metrics. So, and I think the January meeting, which Earl is going to report on, might update that a little bit more.


E. Hansen: Don’t count on it because neither one of us went to that meeting. It was a rather snowy day out here and the meeting adjourned before 12:00 and started at 8:30. But, the IBHE staff was in Chicago on Wednesday night for Thursday’s activities, and they hung around for the Friday meeting and those who were riding trains went to the meeting and those that were driving cars stayed home. So, we were in the latter category. In essence, they again talked about the metrics and the weighting of the issues on it. At the very bottom of the first page and then carrying over to the second page, let me preface this, since we weren’t at the meetings, what I’ve done is cut and pasted from the unapproved minutes from that meeting, and that’s what you’re seeing, the content there. I can’t give you any additional data or information other than what I put there. I tried to cut to the chase on the running dialogue by giving you the question, and then the person from IBHE who responded to that question. So, you at least have a feeling or an idea of what took place. I apologize for not being able to come up with any more wealth of information for you, but that meeting was quite short by looking at the minutes because the minutes usually run 8 or 9 pages. In this case, the minutes were about 2-1/2 to 3 pages. So, what you have is what I know, and that’s not saying much for either one of us.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for either Earl or Sonya?

B. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 8-9

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up, a brief report from Austin Quick from the Student Association.

A. Quick: Thank you. I really have nothing that we didn’t already discuss in the last University Council.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so.

A. Quick: What I will say is, very good, I did meet today with University Affairs Committee regarding the Code of Conduct for faculty staff, and we are moving along with that. So, if you have any questions for me…That’s pretty much all I have, I just want to keep it down to a minimum.

A. Rosenbaum: Wow, impressive. Any questions for Austin?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

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

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 10

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up is me, Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees met on December 1. One of the major issues that the Board of Trustees dealt with has to do with the fact that as we have mentioned before, as you’ve probably heard, we are in the process of preparing for the HLC, Higher Learning Commission, accreditation process. The accreditation process begins with developing or establishing the mission statement of the university. The mission statement of the university serves as the template against which the university is evaluated in the accreditation process. President Peters was charged with putting together a committee to revise the role and mission of the university and to sort of begin that process. Other points of interest during the meeting, the president has asked the Board of Trustees to approve NIU’s alcoholic beverage policy, which the board did. The alcoholic beverage policy really refers to the criteria that are used in determining which nonstudent-related functions at the university can serve alcoholic beverages. So, this is in response to a state, some legislation from the State which requires the Board of Trustees to have a set of guidelines for determining those activities that are committed to serve alcoholic beverages. We will be serving Faculty Senate merlot at the next meetings. No, no, don’t get excited. So, anyway, the Board of Trustees approved that. That was really the essence. There was also, the Board of Trustees is engaged in revising their own Board of Trustees Bylaws. Only the Board of Trustees can revise the Board
of Trustees Bylaws. Jerry Blakemore, the general counsel, has been instrumental in trying to get the board to revise its bylaws, and so that was a rather extensive part of the Board of Trustees meeting. So, they’re working on that. Rosita Lopez was at the meeting and may have a comment for us about that as well, so Rosita?

R. Lopez: Thanks, Alan. Okay, yeah, you do a good job of covering pretty much everything that happened except that, after the general counsel, Jerry Blakemore, presented the bylaws and the proposed amendments, there seemed to be confusion – or at least some opposition – to the wording by, especially Trustee Marc Strauss. And this, I would say, started a lot of conversation, impassioned conversation, if you will, on the bylaws. So, as a result, they are still in the process of looking at that, and we’ll see what happens at the next meeting. This is a third reading, as Alan mentioned, and it also went through all of the trustees. But, for whatever reason, it was some of the wording that caused some of the, I don’t know what’s the right word, opposition maybe, or concern, or challenges into accepting the wording as is. It was a good meeting to be at. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions about the Board of Trustees meeting for either myself or Rosita? Todd, you were there as well. Do you have anything you want to add?

T. Latham: I have no comment.

A. Rosenbaum: Todd has no comment.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we really don’t have many other committee reports. We have a lot of stuff working through the committees that will be coming up to us in the next couple of meetings. Keep in mind that the spring semester is when a lot of the work that’s been going on in the committees comes to the floor of the senate. So, we expect a number of things to be coming up.

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report
B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
C. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – no report
D. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report
E. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – report

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is our Elections and Oversight committee. Therese Arado is our chair, and we have some business for our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Therese, you want to take over? Do you want to come up, is that what you said?
**T. Arado:** I just couldn’t hear myself. I wanted to hear myself. I get to draw lots for the evaluation committees for both the faculty and SPS personnel advisor, David Wade, and for our president of the Faculty Senate and executive secretary of the University Council, Alan Rosenbaum. I have lots in envelopes here to draw, so, I’m going to draw out the names, and I will announcement. So, if you’re here, you can stand up, take a bow. I will start with faculty and SPS personnel advisor, and Rosemary, I’m going to enlist you as I take my little names, so I have a backup here. I have to draw three of these names for faculty and SPS personnel. Kryssi Staikidis, that’s one. You can keep me on track that I pick the right number too. There’s a lot of little pieces of paper in this folder. Karen Brandt from the College of Health and Human Sciences.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We’ll let the lucky winners know who they are, whether they’re here or not. Not attending the meeting is not a way to get out of this.

**T. Arado:** And leaving in the middle of the lot pulling doesn’t work either. Rebecca Houze, College of Visual and Performing Arts. Those are the three that will be on the evaluation committee for faculty and SPS personnel advisor. You will get notification of this as well. It’s not just me saying your name now. Correct me if I’m wrong, but you will report back in the May meeting on the evaluation committees.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The last meeting of the semester.

**T. Arado:** Now, I’m going to pull the names for the evaluation committee for executive secretary University Council and president of Faculty Senate. This comes from three groups; one is a student, two are from the University Council members, and two are Faculty Senate members. So, we’ve got the student name first. Mike Theodore is our student member. Okay, University Council members: Brad Sagarin, College of Liberal Arts and Science; and Tomis Kapitan, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. I feel like the lottery lady. Okay, now I’m pulling two from the Faculty Senate envelope. Richard Poole, Theater and Dance, that’s one; and Michael Kolb from Anthropology. So, those are the five who will be the executive secretary University Council and Faculty Senate president evaluation committee, and the other three will be SPS faculty personnel advisory committee.

1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the executive secretary of University Council and president of Faculty Senate – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 and NIU Bylaws Article 13.6.3.10 – Pages 11-12

2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the faculty and SPS personnel advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 and NIU Bylaws Article 13.6.3.10 – Pages 11-12
**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Therese, do you have anything on legislative oversight that you want to share with us? Is there anything else that you want to add, not about that but about what’s going on legislatively?

**T. Arado:** Legislature has been pretty quiet. They have been on hiatus. Actually, I want to investigate a proposed bill that I just saw come out about intellectual property and information database that I’ll report on probably at the next meeting. That’s just a proposed bill. It hasn’t gone anywhere yet.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, thank you.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have no unfinished business.

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have no new business.

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

**A. Rosenbaum:** Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Anybody?

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council  
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee  
C. Minutes, Athletic Board  
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee  
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education  
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education  
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification  
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience  
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum  
J. Minutes, General Education Committee  
K. Minutes, Honors Committee  
L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council  
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council  
N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council  
O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel  
P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee  
Q. 2011-2012 Meeting Schedule – Page 13  
R. Minutes, Graduate Council – regarding grading system updates – Pages 14-17

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, in that case, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

D. Valentiner: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: David Valentiner is moving that we adjourn. Second?

A. Lash: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? At the risk of your life. All right, we are adjourned. Have a good month.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.