I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: All right, let’s come to order to our February meeting.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda and you all should have received actually in the e-mailed electronic agenda a copy of the draft of the University Mission Statement and that has been added to the agenda under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration; and we’ll have a discussion about that mission statement. Hopefully you all had a chance to take a look at that and will be able to talk about that a little bit. I need a motion to accept the agenda. Please remember when you either speak or make a motion to say your name into the microphone so that we have it on the recorded record and I need a motion to accept the agenda with the walk-in item.

R. Lopez: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosita Lopez. Okay I need a second. I’ll second it myself if we don’t have a second. Any conversation, questions, discussion of the agenda? All in favor of approving the agenda with the University Mission Statement under item five signify by saying “aye.”

Members: Aye
A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition or abstention? All right the agenda is adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 25, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have approval of the minutes of the January 25 Faculty Senate meeting which were distributed to you electronically. I need a motion to approve the minutes.

S. Willis: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue Willis moves.

D. Valentiner: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any changes, comments, questions, corrections, additions to the minutes? All right, this is like the fifteenth month in row that we’ve had no corrections to the minutes. Excellent. I’m going to put something in the next set of minutes and see who picks it up. All right, all in favor of approving the minutes say “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay the minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: As for President’s Announcements, I don’t have a lot of announcements for you. The one item that I do want to call to your attention to is last week the president sent out a report that was prepared by – this seems to be giving me some feedback. It’s all right? It’s feeding back to me. The president had sent out a plan that was proposed by two professors at the University of Illinois and this was a recommendation or a suggestion for a reformation of the pension system that would serve as an alternative to Senate Bill 512. Remember Senate Bill 512 was one that we did have a number of concerns about and it was not passed in the last session, but there were concerns that this would once again rear its ugly head. The proposal that was made is a very interesting proposal in that it seems to have been very well thought out and addresses some of the most significant issues that we as faculty members have. So there are concerns that the pension reform whatever it is, guarantee a secure retirement package for employees, that the package be financially sustainable, that it be constitutional, and that the package be one that keeps us as a place where recruited faculty members would want to work. So it has to be an attractive retirement package. There are a lot of concerns that the Tier 2 plan that was put in place for new faculty last January 1, I believe, is that correct, is really not a very attractive retirement plan. So, if you haven’t read this plan, I would really strongly recommend that you read through it. It does involve some sacrifice, such as an increase in the contributions by employees. However, the increase is three percent as opposed to Senate Bill 512 which is eight percent. So it is a much more modest pass-along. It also includes contributions by the university, itself, and so that would have impact on the university’s budget. And so it is a plan, though, that seems to share the responsibility among a number of different groups rather than
placing it all on retirees and rather than placing it all on the state. It also protects the existing benefits that have been accrued by employees which is very important to us. So I think many of us were concerned that whatever pension reform was put into place, not be retroactive and not affect accrued benefits by faculty members. This plan does address that and is protective of accrued benefits. You know I’ve read through it a couple of times and it seems like a reasonable compromise which means it will probably be completely unacceptable to the legislators. But, again, I think it’s important when we sort of opposed Senate Bill 512 one of the comments that was made, “well why don’t you propose something that’s better,” and so, if we need something that’s better as an alternative to 512, my reading of this is that this is substantially better than 512. So it’s important for us to be educated about this. This is going to become very active in the next couple of weeks I would think. I think I told you last time that Steve Cunningham is willing to come in and talk to us as soon as there is anything substantive to talk to us about and we will be able to have questions and answers with him. At any rate, I thought this was a, certainly an interesting proposal, not nearly as draconian as 512 and one that we might be able to live with a little bit better than some of the other things that we’ve heard bandied about. Anyone whose read it or hasn’t read it that has some questions or comments about this that they’d like to make? Sue?

S. Willis: I was just wondering if you know whether any legislator has any intention of actually submitting this or some modification of it as a bill.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t know that. Does anyone know that? Deb have you heard anything about that?

D. Haliczer: No, I haven’t.

A. Rosenbaum: So, no, I don’t know the answer to that. At least I haven’t heard anything. I don’t know. President Peters, when he put this out, didn’t sort of indicate that it had traction with any particular legislators either so I don’t know; it may be too soon for that.

J. Kowalski: I read through it briefly and I will go back to it; but my first impression was consistent with your own in that is that it certainly seemed that it was making a good attempt to recognize the need for reform but to, yes, make those reforms more equitable and that they were not nearly as harsh as the Senate Bill 512 would be. So it certainly bears everybody taking a close look at it. It may be something that then people might want to contact legislators, not as official representatives of NIU, but as private citizens and let them know about it.

A. Rosenbaum: Of course, we all know that. I think the other thing that I liked – or one of the other things I like about it – is that this is a proposal that is put forward by two professors at the University of Illinois so it’s good to see the state or if the state does pay attention to this, actually paying attention to some of the expertise that we have at the universities instead of depending on legislators to come up with these plans that they seem to cook up in their kitchens or whatever. So it’s nice to see some expertise being brought to bear on the problem and it’s a very thoughtful piece of work that acknowledges what some of the real problems are. So there are legitimate problems that we have to consider. We can’t just say we want everything kept the way it is, that’s not going to fly and it’s not going to work for the State of Illinois. There has to be some real give-and-take and this I think really does that, to an extent, that I have not seen yet in
proposals that have been put forward by the more legislative types. Any other comments or thoughts about this? If you have any trouble finding it, I know some of you might have discarded it or erased it, if you have problems with it we can forward a link to you. So if you don’t have this and you want the link, we can send it to you. Just let us know and Pat can send that out. Okay.

The next item is that, as far as I know, there have been no either break-throughs or problems with the situation with increments for this year. So those seem to be going forward. Various departments have been asked to submit paperwork that sort of indicates that those raises are most likely going to happen provided that the Board of Trustees gives its approval. I haven’t heard of any obstructions to that plan so that seems to be good news right now and we’ll have to wait until the Board of Trustees meeting in March before we have a final word on that but that’s only a couple of weeks away. But all indications are that this seems to have support and that people are sort of assuming that, if the Board of Trustees go along, that we’ll be okay with it so that’s a good thing.

The last item is that meetings have been going on around this accreditation review. Personally, I am on the Mission Statement Committee and have been attending a number of meetings of the Mission Statement Committee. We have now generated a University Mission Statement draft and we’ll talk about that, but there are lots of other committees going on. Many of you have been asked to be on those committees and I think it’s important that we have faculty representation on these various committees. Thank you all for participating those of you who are involved in those committees. That’s really all that I have for today. Anyone have any questions? Something maybe that I can answer that I didn’t note.

Our Raise Equity Committee met on Friday. We are moving along towards the spot where we hopefully will have something to present to the senate. I think I mentioned last time, we have to get permission from the committee and the president or at least support for bringing forward the report and presenting it in public. Right now it’s in draft format and everyone has been asked to maintain the confidentiality of that while it’s still in draft form. But we’re hopeful, I’m hopeful, that we’ll be able to bring this to the senate hopefully at the next meeting or the one after it at the latest. That is actually becoming a reality or much closer to becoming a reality so we have that to look forward to.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Draft of revised University Mission Statement – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. The next item is the draft of the revised University Mission Statement and in the paper that was sent out with the agenda, I tried to give you a little bit of information about the committee, about the previous mission statement, the charge to the committee from the Board of Trustees and from Provost Alden. The committee met I think three or four times. It was a pretty diverse committee. There were representatives, as it says here, I think I told you who the committee is so you can see that for yourselves and what we came up with as a working mission statement is the draft that you see that is on the back of this front page. The idea was to get this draft to the different constituencies in the University. This is being vetted by all of the different
groups I think, Todd, you guys have this for Operating Staff did you receive that? Excuse me, for SPS Council? And Andy, is Andy here? No. Well I’m assuming Operating Staff got it as well. This is being sent around and the purpose of this is for people to weigh in on the mission statement. My instructions are to have a discussion with you about this and to bring your suggestions, comments, criticisms, whatever, back to the committee so they can be incorporated or at least considered by the committee. So I’ll open up the floor for comments. Make sure you have a microphone if you make a comment about the mission statement or if you have any questions about either this one or the previous one that you would like to ask me, I will try to answer those for you. Jeff.

**J. Kowalski:** This is just a comment, having read this I see nothing to object to particularly, but as I read through the list of bullet points and the set of institutional values, there is certainly a part of me that would like to see something perhaps added to the third one where, in addition to simply referring to a broad spectrum of learners to be competitive in a rapidly changing workforce, we might perhaps add “and contributing members to a democratic society.”

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, one of the things the committee tried to consider in being asked to update the proposal, excuse me the mission statement, was what might have changed since 2003, which is the last time the mission statement was even revised at all. And we thought that some of the things that had changed were the use of technology in education. We thought that the university is trying to point more towards distant learning or distributed learning, whichever phrase you like, and so we tried to get in the idea that we want this to be available to people who are not necessarily resident students on the campus but rather we wanted to begin making our services and our product available to people in the workforce who are trying to get an advanced degree, get a masters, get an M.B.A. and who are working during the day and maybe living in Chicago or Springfield or wherever. So those were some of the key things and we tried to capture that in this broad spectrum of learning. The idea of, how did you put it, contributors to?

**J. Kowalski:** “Contributing members to a democratic society” or words to that affect.

**A. Rosenbaum:** What? Okay we can certainly bring that back. There was a question about citizenship and we, at one point, had the term, “citizen,” in there as a way of sort of getting at this sort of obligation to ones fellow.

**J. Kowalski:** It could be shorter and maybe it’s implicit, but maybe it isn’t. That’s my thought.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. You have to say your name.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** I think when you mention that we would like to be “a premier institution in the Midwest,” you are limiting yourself. Make it in the world. Why the Midwest? This is a mission. I mean this is a goal – to be the best in the world.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We kind of didn’t want to over shoot our abilities and one of the things to keep in mind here that, one of the main purposes of this mission statement is to guide the HLC in its accreditation review so they are going to look at what we say and they are going to judge us in terms of how well we’ve met our mission and how well we’ve done what we say we want to do,
so I think we wanted to aim a little bit lower so it might be easier for them to say, “Yes you’ve clearly established yourselves as the premier student-centered research intensive university in the Midwest, or not.” “In the world” might be a little harder for us to demonstrate. It’s nice to think high, aim high.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: But using the same logic, make it “in DeKalb” for example, “the best institution in Dekalb.”

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we didn’t want to aim too low; we tried to sort of aim in the middle ground.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Let’s make it “Illinois.”

A. Rosenbaum: In Illinois?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Yes, because I think this normally, although it’s just world right now, but this can serve you in the future. You can argue using this that you would like to achieve higher goal rather than that you are aiming low. So this is what I believe it should.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, the Midwest is bigger than just Illinois, so if we change it to Illinois we’d be aiming lower. So you’re saying we should aim lower?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: No, no, we should make the nation. United States.

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe we could say then “one of the premier.” Is that legitimate wording? Can you be “one of the premier”?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: If we were to say “in the nation,” we would have to say “one of the premier.” Is there general feeling about this? Does this sound too limited, because we want to represent the Faculty Senate’s feelings, not necessarily each individual. Yes, Debra.

D. Zahay-Blatz: I know how much work you all put into this. It’s so difficult to put a mission statement together, and the real problem is always making it sound unique because it’s very easy to make it very generic so it doesn’t sound your institution. I just happened to Google “student-centered research-focused university Midwest” and Western Michigan University actually comes up three of the five times in the top Google search results. So I think you need to just go back and make sure that it’s a unique positioning because these can be too generic. There is a book by two marketing professors, one from Harvard, where they put the mission and vision of the company in front of their consulting client and everybody nodded, “Yes this is our mission and vision,” and it turned out to be the mission and vision of their next nearby competitor because it was so, that’s in Competing for the Future by Prahalad and Hamel. That’s what I would say. This to me seems very generic. It doesn’t speak to what NIU is all about.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, what would you want to add to make it more germane to NIU?
D. Zahay-Blatz: Well, we say just in our college, “where the classroom meets the business world.” I think we really have this uniqueness of giving a solid academic education, but also preparing students for the business world, in our case, or to be productive members in a democratic society to kind of put it all together.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we have that in here, at least part of that.

D. Zahay-Blatz: That’s what I would just say for my feedback.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we actually thought about that quite a bit and one of the things we did is we looked up the mission statements of I don’t know, 10 or 12 other universities, and it’s pretty hard to tell them apart. So, pretty much every university has a relatively similar mission. So it’s a little difficult to be completely unique. Even in the example you gave, I would be surprised if there weren’t any other universities like, for example, Northeastern, that doesn’t have sort of that same sort of mission. It was really very difficult to find anything that was absolutely unique to NIU and so what we tried to focus on this idea of the “premier student-centered research-focused public university” because that was kind of the Vision 2020 statement and one of the things that we were asked to do was to sort of be responsive to both the Vision 2020 statement and also to the strategic plan, the Great Journey Strategic Plan. So our mission that was given to the committee was to sort of be responsive and make sure we are incorporating those two pieces of guidance in coming up with the mission. We really got that from the Vision 2020 initiative and it actually is pretty unusual that you find universities that are both student-centered and research intensive. Those two things don’t go together very frequently. So most research intensive universities have a faculty that buys out of most of their teaching requirements, if they can, and it’s very rare you have like the small classrooms that we have here where large numbers of the courses, I’m glad Austin is not here because he’d go after this, most of the courses taught by faculty members and still have that research intensive element to it. We kind of thought that, in itself, if you actually were to achieve that, was pretty if not unique, pretty unusual. But I will certainly bring your comment back to the committee.

D. Zahay-Blatz: Yes, and I am just giving you my feedback. Apparently, Western Michigan also thinks they have this so I just wanted to bring that …

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe we could add we’re better than Western Michigan somewhere into it.

D. Zahay-Blatz: That’s right and we’re not in Michigan.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

D. Goldblum: That was a marketing perspective, now a geography perspective. The final bullet point where you have – you start with “regional, national and global,” I was also interested in maybe putting “local” in there. We have a lot of students who do internships and student teaching immediately in DeKalb.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay so you don’t think local is captured by regional?
D. Goldblum: I don’t think so.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay so add “local” to “local, regional, national and global.”

D. Goldblum: At the risk of making it too long, yes.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, David, thank you. Sue.

S. Willis: Okay, well just one quick response that I had to the business perspective, I think the two things that contribute to making us unique are location and value. I think we are unique in being positioned where we are in the general Chicago area and also from, now this is a physics perspective I guess, close to two major national laboratories and being a public university with the associated costs that you don’t get say at Northwestern or the University of Chicago.

The other thing that I wanted to say, well a couple of things. This bullet list says that it’s a list of values and I’m wondering if there is a better way to describe what that list is. It doesn’t really strike me as being a list of values. Although I don’t have an alternative to propose right off the top of my head. But it seems that it ought to be sort of aspirational and so I’m looking in particular at the next-to-last one where it says “the use of current technologies” which strikes me as being not particularly aspirational. So perhaps we could say something like we have more ambition than to be just sort of barely keeping up with technology I guess.

A. Rosenbaum: The distinction that the committee was working with, we originally started out with the idea of a vision statement separate from a mission statement, with the vision statement being aspirational and the mission statement being more nuts and bolts what we do. We ended up sort of putting them together in such a way that the first part of it is more aspirational, that first paragraph, whereas the rest of it is more mission oriented. So instead of separating them out, we combined the vision and the mission into one statement. The idea of that use of current technologies, the way it’s aspirational is the suggestion there is that we will keep current on technology so we will try to always maintain the most up-to-date current technologies to be used in our pursuit of our research teaching and service missions. So that’s kind of how that got in there. I agree with you, maybe the word values is wrong, the intention was we were trying to say that we value these items. Not so much that they have values in a traditional value sense but if someone has a better word for that would be good.

S. Willis: It just seems like there might be a better word than current that would make is sound more …

A. Rosenbaum: Do you have a suggestion?

S. Willis: I was going to say “cutting edge” although that’s kind of tacky.

A. Rosenbaum: We tried to avoid tacky.

S. Willis: “Innovative” somebody said. I don’t know; something that sounds like we’re on the leading edge instead of just keeping up.
A. Rosenbaum: “Emerging”? Is that what someone said? Okay so we can note that down that we want a better word than current.

S. Willis: Or “the most current technologies” or something.

A. Rosenbaum: Is that Abhijit back there? I can’t tell. Can you grab a mike?

A. Gupta: Abhijit Gupta from Mechanical Engineering. I just share my opinion. I respect the previous comment adding “local,” but my concern is the very fact our university name is Northern Illinois so we should start with “regional” as opposed to “local.” “Regional” always encompasses “local” and probably – I personally feel “local” may not add much of value to this mission.

Secondly regarding the Google search on which university name pops up first, that is also, though I’m not a computer science faculty so they can correct me, it’s based on many things including I’m thinking quite a few as old days there used to be matrix etc. how if someone uses a search engine, which name will pop up first and which ones pop up later, so it’s not just what’s in the statement, it’s how it is coded, how whether sometime even money is paid to some other company, things like that. So it’s beyond what I know. I don’t want to comment I’m just saying a lot more goes in how the names pop up in search engine which I’m not an expert.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and it is also the case that, as we start using this, as this becomes the mission statement, as this works its way into sort of our branding materials, we may start to pop up more frequently in that regard also. Debra?

D. Zahay-Blatz: Hi; just to comment I do teach internet marketing as my specialty so it also is regional as well so the search results are coming up, not because we’re in DeKalb, they’re coming up that way. They’re not going to show us a university in California, for example, and this was not the paid search results. That’s all I wanted to say and I’d be happy to talk to you about it. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosita.

R. Lopez: Okay, in looking at bullet four, I see the word, “transmission,” which has sort of a transmitting, handing down this scholarship and artistic expression, expansion and application, and I’m wondering if we shouldn’t use something more connected with actual learning like “transformation” or “transforming” or something like that. The “transmitting” just has this sense of handing it over, it’s just me, I just feel like there should be a…

A. Rosenbaum: Better word than “transmission”?


A. Rosenbaum: Okay, David.
D. Valentiner: When I think about part of the uniqueness of NIU, is that it’s a large public institution in the state but, unlike other large public institutions, you know a lot of the other institutions accept and train a disproportionate number of individuals from advantaged backgrounds. And I think that we are kind of trying to balance to provide a high quality education and also to provide training to people who come from disadvantaged backgrounds at least in proportion to which they are represented in the population, in the taxpayers and so on. So to me it seems as though that’s part of the identity of NIU. I think that’s part of how maybe state legislature have seen us and have rewarded us and that’s kind of a value that we have to the state. And so, given that that’s part of our identity and part of how we’re valued, it seems that could be part of what our mission is, that we should own this thing that we do better than everyone else.

A. Rosenbaum: And you know I think that you are right and that is one of the things that the committee was trying to work into this and I think we tried to work it in with this community of diverse people but maybe we’re not stating it as explicitly as we should state it. I think that’s what you are saying that…

D. Valentiner: It didn’t come through for me that that’s a big part of what we are about and I think that would set us apart and that would make this, I mean that is part of who we are and that’s part of what we do.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, good comment. Yes, Rosemary.

R. Feurer: It strikes me, Alan, what you said is not in here. The critical thing about NIU is actually not here – that we are faculty that our courses that are faculty taught. If that is, indeed, what makes us unique that we are doing that, it ought to be here. And I say that because, if we as a faculty want to make an impact on this statement, we ought to really do everything we can to preserve that given what we know which is that the numbers of faculty are going down and the numbers of administrators are going up. So if we want, I think this is an opportunity for us to say something about that. And I don’t know about the wording but, if we can say that our courses, unlike, we don’t have to say what we aren’t, but that we are, our courses are taught by full-time faculty members, if we can say that to the extent that can say that in a mission statement, that would be a really great benefit for the future. If we can implant that in the mission statement maybe when it comes time for faculty positions we have more leverage. I would really like to see something about critical thinking; that we imbue critical thinking in our students. I don’t see it in here. I’m trying to find where it might be because that issue of, I agree with the comments about transmission of knowledge, that’s not what I’m doing, it’s not the only thing I’m doing I mean. But we have to equip our students not just to be able get jobs but to be able to be contributing members of democratic society. I like that, but I think “critical thinking members of society.” I know that is clumsy; I don’t want to make the statement too clumsy, but I really feel that that classic aspect of any university mission is in peril and so I would really argue for that being in there someone.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay again, I am going to bring all of these comments back to the committee. I’m just trying to give you an idea of how the committee thought about some of this material. One of the things that we were very concerned about is that, since this is going to be used to evaluate us, in terms of our accreditation, that we did not want to put in things that were not
things that we would score highly on. For example, we would have to know how many of our courses or what percentage of our courses are actually taught by full-time faculty members as opposed to adjuncts or graduate students, etc. So that would be something we would not want an accreditation committee to say that, “Your mission is to have your faculty teaching and 50 percent of your classes are being taught by non full-time faculty members.” We were very mindful, I’m not saying that’s the number, I’m just saying we would not want to be found out to not be accurate. Northern Star you hear me accurately on this? We don’t know what the exact numbers are. So we were very mindful of that. We tried to get this idea of connections between faculty and students into this engaged learning bullet, so we wanted to make it clear that we value engaged learning and getting students involved in research early in their careers and closer contact between faculty and students. So we tried to capture that in this engaged learning item. That’s the way we tried to balance it but I certainly can bring your comment back to the committee and see if they want to make some changes in that regard. Other comments about this?

B. May: Bullet point 4, sorry to prolong, but “transmission,” then “expansion,” then “application,” wouldn’t you transmit after you expand?

A. Rosenbaum: I imagine.

B. May: Do you really expand or do you invent or acquire?

A. Rosenbaum: Do what?

B. May: I’m not sure I like knowledge that’s expanded as opposed to invented or acquired without nit-picking, just the notion of a research focus suggests making new knowledge if such a thing is possible.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, we’re trying to get at the idea of expanding what we know so that’s how that sort of got into there.

D. May: I guess I would just prefer something like “acquisition” or “invention” as opposed to “expansion.”

A. Rosenbaum: “Creation.”

D. May: Yea, something like that.

A. Rosenbaum: “Creation of new knowledge.” Okay, any other comments, contributions or things that we don’t like about it? Okay, well we have all of these comments and I will bring them back to the committee and again, this is being also vetted by the other groups, many other groups, not just the three employee groups, but it will go to the Council of Deans and all of that. There are going to be a lot of different people bringing input into this and so we will keep you posted on how this evolves as we go along. It’s going to happen quickly because this has to go to the Board of Trustees I think they wanted a draft by our March 1 meeting so you’re not going to have to wait very long to find out what happens to this one, but thank you for your comments.
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, somehow we don’t have a report from the FAC to the IBHE, sorry. I hate to disappoint.

B. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 3-4

A. Rosenbaum: Next report, we have a report from our Student Association. Austin quick is not here; we are going to call on Seth Peritz, is that correct, to give us the Student Association report.

S. Peritz: Hi, my name is Seth Peritz, I’m a senator for the Student Association as well as chairman of a couple of the committees involved in the Student Association. This last meeting we confirmed one of the new Supreme Court justices, George Gomez, and actually this is from January. There was also another Supreme Court justice confirmed last meeting, which was on Sunday and I cannot for the life of me remember her name. Both of them are members of the College of Law program right now and we were excited to put in two members who seemed very active in the community and who were really interested in making a difference on campus. We allocated $5,000 to the NIU men’s rugby team for a, I believe, it’s a national tournament that they are participating in, which was kind of a big deal. They had not expected to be anywhere near this good this year; they’ve really been winning quite well this year.

A. Rosenbaum: That can go to their medical expenses, I assume.

S. Peritz: No, actually, that’s not what it goes to. They have to buy new uniforms for this as well as room and board.

A. Rosenbaum: I was kidding.

S. Peritz: I’m sure, but we also confirmed Jasmine Harvell as an election commissioner for the S.A. spring elections which are going to be held in March, I believe it’s the 27th and 28th of this year. We are working on setting up a board to help Jasmine as well from the senate. From the executive branch, we are preparing the students once again for the March elections. We are working on getting tickets together for them to run and we are looking forward to a tough race. The student satisfaction project just got rolled out today, actually. We started handing out surveys in the Student Association office. The idea being that with the help of the students views we can improve some of these services that we feel a lot of the students don’t like are being worked on. We’re also going back to a program that has been done in the past that we haven’t been doing recently, which is the auditing of S.A.-funded organizations. This is not just limited to the organizations themselves, we are also auditing the S.A., itself, Campus Activities Board, I believe ice hockey team and I don’t remember the list off the top of my head. The Campus
Parking Committee is working to improve lighting and security in the parking lots with the issues we’ve been having with that of late. I yield.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Seth about goings on among the students?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 5-7

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have our Board of Trustees subcommittee meetings. The subcommittee meetings took place I think on February 2. The first one, I think neither Kerry nor Andy is here, is that correct? Did either of them send anyone in to give that report? We don’t have anyone from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. The one thing I do know about that meeting was that they approved all of the sabbatical leave requests that were put before them. Those will have to go to the full board for approval but there were no concerns about that. They also, and this is apropos to the discussion that I think we had last time, a number of faculty members presented reports on what they did on their sabbatical leaves, which is always a highlight for the Board of Trustees, they really enjoy that. That was the main thing that I know about from Academic Affairs. Other than that, you have the committee report on pages five through seven.

D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Page 8

A. Rosenbaum: The Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee; I attended that one. The major things that were done at that committee, as you can see in the report, were the approval of the student fee recommendations. The student fees will be increased on average of about two-and-a-half percent. The major contributor to this seems to be the health insurance premiums which have really gone up dramatically I think 17-and-a-half percent this year. From what we’ve been told, the main problem is that last year apparently the students’ money that was paid out exceeded the money that was taken in by the insurance company, so there are quite a lot of expenditures and they renegotiated the contract and apparently this is a substantial savings from the 40 to 60 percent increases that most insurance companies were asking for. So this is quite a good bargain I think for the students. The student health insurance costs I think are somewhere in the vicinity of $850 or $900 a year. They get 12-month coverage for that. They are covered during the summer as well as during the semesters. The students were involved in all of these fee increase discussions and approved of the fee increases. The 2013 room and board rates also will increase but only by about one-and-a-half percent which is really quite modest as well. There was no increase in the board rates. I understand that they are going to be throwing out less food and they are going to try and save some money that way. There is no increase in food. There is a 1.5 percent increase in the room rates and this has to do a lot with operating costs, energy costs, contractual services, etc. Those were the main things. The mass transit contract was approved. The university does about 30 million copies a year. We approved both the Board of Trustees; I should say, approved the copier contract for the coming year as well as the purchase of copying paper and at that point President Peters noted that we do about 30 million copies a year which he thinks is way too much and he seems to feel that, over the next couple of years, the university should be moving much more towards these pad types, like IPad kinds of things, whatever those
are called, the generic term for them; and that when we have committee meetings such as this, instead of having a hard copy of the agenda, we’ll all go to our IPads and flip down to the notes. It sounded like the president is pushing for this kind of technology in the university so that we are not making thirty million copies a year. We also have a new member of the Board of Trustees, I think I might have mentioned. Did I mention this last time? Yes, I did. He is a technology person and we’re hopeful that that will lead to sort of improving the state of our technology at the university. Those were the main things that happened in the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 9

A. Rosenbaum: Legislation, Audit and External Affairs; we have both Todd and Rosita. Rosita are you going to give the report?

R. Lopez: So, basically, the meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Strauss as the committee chair, Iosco, was not able to attend the meeting. Basically, Trustee Strauss shared the highlights of Quinn’s State of the State speech, urged us to read in detail this address and didn’t share too much specific. But it was the public pension reform issues that he talked about. Also, Lori Clark shared a little bit with us on what’s happening as far as the Medicaid and pension reform, the revocation of general assembly scholarships and the revocation of state employee dependent tuition waivers. President Peters shared his opposition to eliminating this employee privilege and so we don’t know much more yet. Lori will keep us informed. We thanked her for her report. Then Brad Hoey from director of communications and marketing shared the importance of sharing our stories, resources, talents, skills around the university if we are going to be branding and marketing initiatives at NIU. He shared a quick little story about an NIU student from South Korea, very talented, but who also faced very severe financial hardships that would have hindered her completion at NIU. Her story was highlighted, shared in the Northern Today and by sharing her story the Foundation was able to help her complete her studies here at NIU. She will also be performing at the NIU Red and Black event. He basically is really stressing that we share the good things around us so that those can get publicized and it helps us. Meeting adjourned at 12:37 and that is the conclusion of my report.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Rosita? I didn’t take questions when I finished my report so are there and questions on Finance Facilities I can take those. Okay, good. The next Board of Trustees meeting will be March 1 and so, at our next meeting, we’ll have a report on the Board of Trustees meeting which means we’ll say all the same things we just said except they will be official.

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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 – report

A. Rosenbaum: Reports from our standing committees, we don’t have many reports. We do have one from Resources, Space and Budgets so David.

D. Goldblum: We had a short meeting last week and this report reads like previous reports. You’ll be surprised that NIU is still owed about $55 million by the state. We received about $38 million for this fiscal year. They did pay us all of last year’s commitments by the end of 2011. The MAP funding that we hadn’t received last semester did arrive and we are now paid in full for the fall by the state. We are still waiting for the spring payment from the state. We had a discussion about some of the uncertainties regarding the state budget, NIU’s budget, with Dr. Williams and he said there are too many proposals up in the air about reforming pensions and funding the university to really make any conclusive statements at this point. But I guess we are waiting to see what the governor will say next month when he talks about the state budget. He also highlighted some of the capital projects. We all know Cole Hall is now open. First year residence hall is scheduled to open in August and he did say that we are going to see some more performance contracts, quite a few more roofs, perhaps some electrical projects and steam projects using the performance contract mechanism they’ve been using in the past and that’s the end of the report.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions David?

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have no unfinished business at the moment.

X. NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed change to NIU Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 4, Operating Procedures of the Faculty Senate – FIRST READING – Pages 11-12

A. Rosenbaum: We have two items of new business that are relatively straight forward. The first one is very simply a housekeeping measure. The agenda, the order of the agenda, is specified in both the university bylaws and the Faculty Senate bylaws. The University Council is working on changing the University Council agenda. We want to change the Faculty Senate bylaws to bring the agenda items in line with what we are currently using as agenda items. What we are trying to do is just change the bylaws to reflect what you see before you and what we’ve been doing all along. This requires two readings because it is a bylaw change so we are
presenting it today and at our next meeting we will vote on it. So, if anyone has any questions about it or problems with it, now is the time to raise those issues and we can certainly consider changing them before we vote on it next time. Does anyone have any comments? I didn’t anticipate that anyone would really care much what we put on the agenda or the order of the agenda. Okay, that was our first reading. I hope you enjoyed it. If you didn’t read it, you might want to just look at it between now and next month. Charles do you have a problem with that?

C. Cappell: I do have a ticky-tacky comment. In the advisory committees, the Student Association report is always listed in the agenda. Are they an official advisory committee of the senate?

A. Rosenbaum: They are not an official advisory committee of the senate; no, they are not. We are doing it experimentally this year so we had not yet decided whether the experiment was a success or not. We can continue to keep them on there as they are now, as an advisory committee without necessarily changing the bylaws to include them. I would say that this is still a work in progress.

C. Cappell: Perhaps in the agenda they could just be listed under other informational items or something so that you could approve the change and not conflict with it when you list them.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I don’t know if there is a problem in keeping with them where they are even if we sort of formally adopt this change but we can talk about that further. Thank you. Any other concerns about the agenda? We'll give that some further thought, Charles, thank you.

2. Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – position announcement and NIU Bylaws, Article 9 – Pages 13-15

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the final item of new business you should all be aware of, we put this in the Faculty Matters, which you all should have gotten, and you also hopefully read it. In there we did put a brief description of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor position and the requirements of that position. We are accepting nominations and those can be self nominations. So anybody who is interested in this position should write a letter to me articulating your interest in the position and we will – what’s the deadline for that Pat, do you know? March 14. So if you are interested in this position, this is as David Wade mentioned – I don’t know whether he mentioned it at senate or whether he mentioned it at council – it is a paid position and so it comes along with actually three months of salary. So you receive one month of salary for the fall semester, one for the spring semester and one for the summer. It is also an 11-month position. It is pretty well compensated and if anyone is interested in it send me a letter and you will at some point be in a group of perhaps more than one person and you’ll have to articulate the reasons why the senate should elect you as Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. Although it does have SPS in the title, the position is restricted to a tenured faculty member. We have also put this in the NIU Today so, if you have any questions about it, it’s described in the bylaws and if you have any questions I’d be happy to talk to you about it. I was the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor before David Wade so I was three years in the position so I have a fairly good sense of what that position involves. It’s a very important position to faculty members so it’s important to us and also I think to SPS. We really want to have someone in that position that will represent
the faculty and advocate for the faculty and so if you feel that is something you would like to do and would be good at, throw your hat in the ring. Any questions about Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor position?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, comments, questions from the floor any items that people would like to bring up? You’re just waiting to get out of here aren’t you? It’s like a class right at the end. Don’t anyone ask any questions.

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: I need a motion to adjourn. David Valentiner, Rosita Lopez second. Anyone opposed? We are adjourned. See you next month.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.