I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: All right, I know we are about 20 minutes early from our usual starting time but we’ll see if we can start a new tradition of getting started on time. Before we start, I just want to make sure that you remember that, when you speak, say your name into the microphone before you start and this will help us keep track of who is saying what when we get the transcripts. It’s sometimes a little hard to figure out whose saying things. We’ll remind you three or four times every meeting because it’s easy to forget. But please try to remember to say your name before you speak and that’s included if you are making a motion, seconding a motion, okay? Thanks.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Jim Corwin has moved the approval of the agenda. He didn’t say his name into the microphone first because I gave that instruction about 35 seconds ago. Okay, I need a second.

R. Lopez: Second

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any discussion of the agenda. Actually, before we do that, we have some walk-in items. Let’s see what the walk-in items are. We have a motion to approve the agenda with the walk-in items which are just copies of the reports that weren’t ready on time to go out in the agenda packet. Ok, any discussion of the agenda? You all think it’s a pretty good agenda. All in favor say aye.
Members: Aye

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

Note – Four walk-in items as follows:
VII. B. BOT-AASAP report for August 25, 2011 meeting
VII. C. BOT-FFO report for May 12, 2011 meeting
VII. C. BOT-FFO report for August 25, 2011 meeting
VII. E. BOT report for June 9, 2011 meeting

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 20, 2011 FS MEETING

A. Rosenbaum: Next item is the approval of the minutes that you haven’t read from the April 20th Faculty Senate meeting.

J. Corwin: Moved to approve the minutes.

S. Willis: Second

A. Rosenbaum: All right, I can see we’re off to a good start with this say your name business. It’s not your fault I know, there aren’t microphones at every place so it makes it more complicated. Any corrections, changes, modifications, any comments, additions, subtractions from the minutes? Okay, hearing none, all in favor of adopting the minutes?

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? Any abstention? Okay the minutes are adopted. For future reference, I know that these minutes go back a long ways because we are approving minutes from the April 20th Faculty Senate meeting. In the future, we send out the minutes to you, you might not want to read the whole minutes, they are sometimes a little lengthy, you’re welcome to but please at least read the parts that may have your name attached to them so that we are certain that what we have attributed to you is accurate. We do have, obviously, a transcript of the meetings, so we can go back and check, so there is no problem in correcting this. If you think something has been misstated in some way, please let us know when we ask about the minutes. The other thing I want to remind you is the minutes are not verbatim, so those minutes are really an abridgement of a much larger transcript. So I do take some liberties with that. For the most part, I try to make the faculty sound like they have taken grammar and English at some time. When we speak out loud, very often we don’t pay attention to those things. And when you see the transcripts, you would be appalled. I know that I am appalled by some of the things that I say in the transcripts. So they are massaged a little bit and so, in the interest of making sure that they remain accurate, just check to make sure that I haven’t attributed anything to you.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies – presentation
A. Rosenbaum: The first item is, I have been asked by Lisa Freeman, who is our Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, for a few moments. She would like to speak to us about changes in the research and artistry awards program. Dr. Freeman joined Northern Illinois in July of 2010 as the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. She is also a professor of Biology here at NIU and in 2002 she was named the Outstanding Woman Veterinarian of the Year by the Association for Women Veterinarians. So I wanted to ask her how many women veterinarians are there?

L. Freeman: More than half of the veterinarians in the U.S. are women right now. But that was not the case when I was a veterinarian.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, but quite a distinction nevertheless. She is a researcher and she has done work on the roll of ion channels in the development of diseases such as gastrointestinal ulcers and ovarian cancer. She has written more than 50 peer reviewed publications; invited reviews in book chapters and, as I said, she has asked for some time today. Oh, and also she was named by Governor Quinn to the Illinois Innovation Council. Has that met?

L. Freeman: Several times and I don’t have any slides on that but I’d be happy to take questions.

A. Rosenbaum: OK, so without wasting anymore of her or your time, let me ask Lisa to come up and tell us about the Research and Artistry awards.

L. Freeman: I can stand here and yell I think. Can everybody hear me? I taught classes of 110 students so I usually don’t drop my projection.

A. Rosenbaum: We’re not going to get you on the thing if you don’t.

L. Freeman: Anyone ever see the Mel Brooks movie, “High Anxiety”? I’m going to try not to trip on the microphone cord. It’s really a pleasure to speak to you today. I’m just a little bit past my first year at NIU and I really couldn’t be happier with my decision to accept the position here. Over the course of the year, I’ve had a lot of conversations, made some observations and I’m really here to talk to you today about some of the changes that we’re making in how the division and some of its programs operate, particularly the programmatic changes that impact faculty, and tell you how we arrived at the decisions that we made and take any questions that you might have.

If you look at the Division of Research and Graduate studies, the units under us and the people under me who really impact faculty are the Graduate School, which is obviously very important for the academic and research missions of the university research, scholarship and artistry, and graduate student training; the Office of Sponsored Projects which is very important for faculty who are seeking external funding to facilitate their scholarly efforts. The Technology Transfer Office which is there to help faculty who make discoveries in archives or in laboratories or create teaching materials, protect their intellectual property and/or translate their discoveries to society. We have the University Press reporting in our structure and, although the University’s press
serves faculty both inside and outside Northern Illinois University, faculty who are publishing scholarly books, it also is there as an advisory capacity. And then Compliance and Integrity, which is something that people don’t really like to think about but it’s very, very important to make sure that the students and the faculty who work here understand how to protect human subjects, animal subjects, understand the responsible conduct of scholarships and if they have challenges happening in their own laboratories or classrooms or if they have unfortunate interactions with people at other universities where they’re to support them.

When you look at an organizational chart like the one on the previous slide, everything looks very siloed. It looks like I’m on the top of an empire and we have these different people and units that don’t interact. That’s really not the case. Before we leave this slide, I also want to point out two important changes that happened over the course of the last year. Dr. Brad Bond, who was serving as the Associate Dean for the Graduate School, assumed the title of Dean of the Graduate School and, with it, more of a responsibility for vision and programmatic development within the Graduate School. That was something that I felt very strongly about. He was certainly functioning as a dean of the Graduate School was functioning and, if you have to wear the hat of both research and graduate studies given the differences in the portfolios and demands, there is certainly overlap and a need for communication and we’ve preserved that with this reporting structure. But we didn’t want either graduate studies or research to suffer because there was one person theoretically at the helm of both.

The other thing is Dr. David Stone now carries the title of Associate Vice President for Research, not merely the Director of Sponsored Projects. That’s very important for recognizing, again, what he was already doing is what an Associate Vice President for Research would do at most research universities; responsibility for research development; working about core facilities; faculty start up packages. The Director of Sponsored Projects is a title that is viewed as very much contracts, grants and minutia by the external world, and I felt it was important that our people were recognized for what they were actually doing.

It was very important to me that we make an effort to really increase communication among the units within the Division of Research and Graduate Studies. Those arrows are there because none of the units that fall in our division can actually do their jobs if there isn’t an incredible amount of interaction. Graduate students need to be trained in research ethics and compliance; they often need help finding money to support their travel and their scholarship; faculty who submit grants need to know the rules for protecting IP that they may have; they need to understand what the compliance requirements are. And so everybody really needs to work together all the time to really serve the faculty and students of this university. So collaboration was something that was very important to me.

The University Press, although its primary mission is publishing scholarly books, they also do some publishing some works of fiction but more importantly, they are also there to help advise NIU faculty; faculty who have book contracts elsewhere; faculty who are new to NIU and are striving to get their first book contract. There’s a wealth of information about publishing books in the University Press and that should be something that’s delivered to our faculty.
The other thing I just want to say is that we do have a vacancy right now in our office at the level of Assistant Vice President for Compliance and Research Integrity and we’re searching nationally for that position and we’re very hopeful that we’ll have a good candidate pool. The early returns suggest a national pool of highly qualified individuals will be available.

The other thing I really asked our office to do was try to engage students wherever possible, so we’ve added graduate students and interns to all the units within the office so that they can experience what the world of scholarship is from the viewpoint of research administration.

I’ve spent a lot of this year too on a listening tour. When I was a young child, my mother told me every good conversation starts with listening and I actually believe that. And so I sought the opinions of what we could be doing better, what we were doing well, from pretty much the perspectives of all of our internal stakeholders; the President’s Cabinet, the Dean’s Council, the College Senates; this is unfortunately my first opportunity to be at Faculty Senate, but I have gone to University Council meetings. I’ve talked to the Board of Trustees; the committee members; I’ve been engaged in strategic planning, not only through Vision 2020, but I actually sat on a college level task force in the College of Education at the invitation of the dean and faculty. I’ve gone to the training and chat sessions that the Office of Sponsored Projects runs; interacted with Graduate Council and then had an open door policy in terms of individual faculty. And I was able to learn a lot about what was working, what could be better and what the university saw as its needs.

One thing that was apparent to me from these conversations is that there has not been a continued dialog at the level I think there should have been between faculty and the service units in my office. So to accomplish that, I created two new advisory bodies – the Research and Graduate Studies Development Council and the Research Instruction and Public Service Advisory Council. And I’m going to explain what those are in just a minute. There’s always been the Graduate Council advising the Graduate Dean. I’ve attended those meetings and those meetings do an excellent job at looking at graduate education, graduate student research, graduate student faculty interactions, but there are issues related to external funding to intellectual property to responsible conduct of scholarship to funding for artistry and humanities that don’t always come out in Graduate Council and so we created these two new bodies. We also created a working group between the Office of Sponsored Projects and Grants Fiscal Administration because it was clear from all of my conversations at all levels, senior leadership down to individual students and faculty, that those units could coordinate their efforts better and we wanted to provide a means for that to happen.

So let me talk about the two advisory councils that have been now meeting for about eight to ten months. The Research and Graduate Studies Development Council and in our office we call them the DC and the AC; the Research and Graduate Studies Development Council is the DC; is really there for two-way sharing of information and constructive dialog and really to inform our operations at a tactical and operational level rather than a strategic level. It meets monthly so we can have quick feedback from the boots on the ground on what’s going on. And the structure is such that the associate deans in the colleges who have research and/or graduate studies in their portfolios and the directors of the interdisciplinary units or centers on campus the ones that are recognized through the strategic planning process or by the IBHE sit on that council and it’s a
place to share best practices, share frustrations, talk about what’s worked in one college and what might work in another. If questions come up and we need feedback from someone from Sponsored Projects or someone from the Graduate School or we need input from business managers, this is a group that has those kinds of discussions. And when I did anonymous polling of them to look at the priorities, one of the things that came up in terms of priorities, I think is number one was the summer research and artistry program, faculty travel, helping support faculty and then some other sort of tactical and operational issues. This council meets monthly, as I said, so that we really get kind of quick feedback on things.

The next body, the Research Instruction and Public Service Advisory Council, is really there to provide advice more on a strategic level. These faculty are invited to serve and they were selected because they’ve been successful at NIU throughout their careers. They’re excellent scholars, artists and researchers and they understand things at the level that you only understand once you have achievement within a system for a sustained period of time. The two groups do work together. The Research Graduate Studies and Development Council and the RIPAC exchange ideas, problems that arise at the council level, the DC level go up to the AC, AC comments go back and so we try to keep current and we try to keep everybody working collaboratively really because our goal is to increase productivity and really pleasure in doing research and innovation at NIU.

So far we’ve gotten a lot of good feedback from both of these groups. They’ve identified a lot of the same issues. This group has 16 members and they are chosen on the basis of their accomplishments but there’s certainly also consideration given to balancing different areas of research and scholarship and artistry. This group only meets once a semester. So the things that sort of float through the Development Council come up to this group and we tend to talk about larger issues in a very, very open forum.

So a couple of things that have come out of discussions with the groups I’ve shown you, the various internal stakeholders and constituents. The first that I want to just make you aware of is the change to the way that faculty travel funds will be distributed. And let me tell you, if you don’t remember how faculty travel funds were distributed when I arrived here, there was a memo that went out in August and faculty travel funds were distributed on a first come, first serve basis. There was actually no strategic decision making employed other than whatever pile of travel requests got there first was honored. There were colleges that had well-oiled machines poised for the memo to come out collecting faculty travel requests and delivering them in bulk within ten minutes of our announcement being issued and, not surprisingly, those colleges had disproportionate amounts of the travel funds.

I don’t really think that my office is in a position on campus to make good strategic decisions about where faculty travel funds should go in the units at a time of limited resources. I think we’re there to support the investment strategies of the people who would know better and, in my mind, that’s the department heads in the colleges. They know the difference between meeting A and meeting B. They know if a faculty member has her tenure and promotion decision coming up and a trip to an international meeting will mean more to her than a trip for a senior faculty would mean. Those are the kinds of decisions we want. The kind of strategic inputs we want made into the distribution of travel funds.
What we decided to do was basically give block grants to the colleges and the library, another important academic unit, to support faculty travel with a stipulation that we would be willing to provide up to $750.00 a year and that’s based on the fact that the standard line item budget in a grant budget for a domestic trip is $1,500.00 with the proviso that there would be a one-to-one match by a combination of the college and the departments; that the funds would be administered by the colleges; that the deans and department heads would be empowered to develop the procedures within those units that made sense for them; and that there would be verification reporting back to us that, indeed, the funds were used to support a faculty member making a presentation that the match actually occurred.

This year, we’ve made $100,000.00 available, that’s what we’ve made available in general, I think it’s a little higher maybe than what we made available the year before I got here, and we did the distribution to the colleges based on the number of tenure seeking and tenured faculty in those colleges. We really couldn’t use the previous distributions to make decisions because of the strategies that certain colleges had to advantage themselves within the system. I actually have the breakdown of dollars if anybody wants I’m happy to share that.

The other changes that we’ve made, and the announcement came out yesterday, are to the Research and Artistry Grants program. And, again, the changes were made with the idea that our investment needed to be strategic and that the process needed to be unassailable in terms of its integrity. And I felt, upon reading the way research and artistry grants were reviewed when I got here, that there was the potential for at least the appearance of conflict of interest. And having gone through a cycle where we actually asked the colleges to describe in detail their individual processes, I can say that there was not consistency and having department and college level reviews, having in some cases, pre-selection criteria and some case rewrites and others not, I felt it’s a process that, at the federal level, would be viewed as conflicted. And I felt it wasn’t the best process in terms of the use of faculty time and in terms of the integrity of the outcome.

We’ve modified the review process; that’s the big change for this year. There will be no department or college level review. There will be external peer review. The way this is going to work is Associate Vice President Stone and I and faculty, who are selected from the two councils I described, will look at the grants when they come in, will look at the external reviewers who are suggested by the people who submit grants, everyone’s asked to submit three to five names, will guarantee that qualified reviewers are found. We’ll send these out for review and when they come back in, we’ll read the external reviews and it will function really the way federal grant reviews function at the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I’ve had a couple of phone calls in the office from people who are concerned about the change and whether the change would advantage or impact sciences versus social sciences versus humanities versus performing arts. And I really talked extensively to the deans and I’ve looked at what the agencies who provide funding all of the areas do and I believe this is a fair process. I’m certainly interested in hearing what you all think about that.
Some of you may also remember that last year we had three categories for grants: opportunity grants, enabling grants and completion grants, with the first being an investment of up to $15,000.00 for projects that would allow NIU faculty to receive new external funding, more external funding or build new partnerships or bring the university’s name to greater prominence.

We had a category called enabling grants; I heard that faculty were offended by that word in some cases so we’ve changed it to facilitation grants and these are a grant program that’s focused specifically on the disciplines where it’s more difficult to find external funding. It’s not news to anybody that there are a lot more opportunities for physical scientists and life scientists and engineers to get funding than for humanist and humanistic social scientists so this allows there to be a grant pool where there’s apples to apples rather than apples to oranges. The maximum award in that category was $10,000.00 and that reflects a difference in the type of infrastructure investment that’s often needed between those disciplines.

And then there’s a completion category that’s open to everybody and it’s there for times that you have a project underway and you ran out of resources because it took more time or something went wrong or life happens while you’re a faculty member. Those are up to $10,000.00 and those are available to anybody with a project where there’s a clear outcome and deliverable that can be achieved.

And really we felt that last year those categories worked pretty well after the initial sort of furor over just doing something different, I think the process ran pretty smoothly and I’m going to show you the data. I do want to point out the submission deadline is November 4th because as many places as I put that people will still ask. This was the research awards in fiscal year ’10, so this is actually the year before I got here data. And you can see in that year there were $240,000.00 roughly awarded and that the bulk of it went to Liberal Arts and Sciences, and this is a consistent trend, and that the rest of the pie was shared in various degrees by the other colleges. I think there were a lot of folks who were afraid that the changes we made last year with the categories were really going to skew the distribution and I don’t think that actually happened. As you can see we awarded actually $375,000.00 last year. We were able to put more money into the pot because we’ve been gaining in the amount of indirect cost recovery that we make on grants in the office. That the bulk went to Liberal Arts and Sciences and I can tell you that historically the trend has been between 35 and 50 percent of the funds to go to Liberal Arts and Sciences so this is not anything new. And again, the rest of the pie was split. This year Education had more and Engineering had less, but it was flipped the year before and those things tend to vary because we just don’t always get the same number of faculty from each unit submitting grants.

We funded pretty much and equal number of opportunity and enabling grants and we didn’t even really do that on purpose. We let quality be our driver. The Graduate Council Committee who was responsible for making these decisions read every single one of the 67 grants in addition to just looking at the rating sheet and we drew the lines where there were clear differences between one grant and the next grant in the category. And then we had 12 completion grants. So I think the data suggest that it was a relatively balanced process. I didn’t show it, but we had I think two-thirds new faculty or what you would call Category I faculty and about a third Category II
faculty and again that’s where it’s been consistently. We look at these at a way to help launch our new colleagues on campus and their careers.

I think I’m going to end there and just take questions that anyone may have about these processes or others. Thank you for your time. I appreciate the privilege of addressing this body and, again, if you think of something after I leave, my door is always open and I always answer my e-mail within 48 hours.

A. Rosenbaum: No questions for Lisa? Yes we have a question.

R. Lopez: Lisa, you mentioned, by the way thank you. That was a really good, very well laid out presentation. I was trying to take notes, so I may ask you….

L. Freeman: You’ll get copies of the PowerPoint. I’ve already shared it with Patricia and again just e-mail me or call if you have follow-up.

R. Lopez: Thank you. I did have a question on the external peer review kind of process. Can you just say a little bit about that?

L. Freeman: Sure, this is commonly done at research universities, so it’s not like we’re inventing the wheel, but we are asking faculty when they submit their grant to suggest three to five people who are not collaborators, who they would consider qualified to review the grant and we’re guaranteeing that at least one of those people will be a reviewer of the grant. We will probably see two or three external reviews for each grant.

What will happen is we will get the grants into our office in November. We will look at the subject areas and distribution of the grants and let that guide who we pull from the advisory bodies to sit on the council so we have a fair representation across the disciplines. So we will send them out for review, we’ll chose who the reviewers are going to be. Liz is already starting to accumulate a list of qualified people in different areas and will continue that as the grants come in. Then we will wait for the reviews to come in.

The reviewers will be instructed to use a five point scale. It’s available in the RFP; it’s what we’ve always done. We will read the written reviews that come in and use those to decide what the ranking and the relative funding lines will be. This is what’s pretty much done at federal agencies and it’s done successfully. When we really decided we wanted a less conflicted, less complicated process, we spent a fair amount of time reading what was done at different universities and then getting on the phone and calling people. We spoke to some universities that had all internal review panels. In some cases, they were divided by discipline so there was generally a Humanities and Performing Arts panel, a Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences panel and a lot of those universities, people still felt that there was conflict, that their colleagues who knew them who saw them every day could not be as objective about the research on the paper as someone who didn’t and I couldn’t argue with that. I feel having external reviews is important to the integrity of the process but we do need people serving sort of at a program level to take what’s there and figure it how we’re going to use that funding to move forward, so that’s our thinking in going in this direction.
R. Lopez: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions? Okay, thank you very much Lisa.

L. Freeman: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, welcome back for another exciting year of Faculty Senate. We have a lot of new members and so I just wanted to make a few general comments. We have a pretty full agenda so I’m not going to take too much time with this. First, I wanted to remind everybody that we are covered by the Northern Star. We have a Northern Star reporter with us. It’s not always the same Northern Star reporter so you can’t always say he’s not here so we’re not covered, it could be somebody else. The reason I mention this is because there is at least some chance that things that you say can make their way into the school newspaper and so that’s fine, I have no problem with that, but you should be at least mindful of that possibility. I know that I, myself, forget that all the time and that’s not a good thing. So when you read something that you said in the Northern Star that you wish you hadn’t read in the Northern Star that’s why you want to be aware of the reporter. We are technically not an open meeting and so we are really not covered by the Illinois Open Meetings Act, but traditionally we have always invited the Northern Star to come to these meetings and, unless someone wants to make a motion to change that, we’ll continue to allow Northern Star to cover us.

Because we have some new members of the Senate, I’m going to today say a couple of things about the Senate and about our committees for their benefit. The first thing I want to emphasize is that Faculty Senators represent their departments. The origin of the Faculty Senate is that it originally did not exist. We had the University Council which we still have. The faculty represents the largest contingent on the University Council so we have 32 faculty representatives on the University Council. What happened was the council members, those faculty members on the University Council being a large group, began to caucus before meetings in order to make decisions about how they wanted to vote on certain issues and what types of things they wanted to bring up. That eventually evolved into what was called the Faculty Assembly. And the Faculty Assembly persisted into at least the late ‘90’s and I’m not sure exactly what the date was when it became known as the Faculty Senate.

But at any rate, the difference between that caucus and the Faculty Senate is that on the University Council, we do not have representatives of every department. As you know we have representatives of colleges and so the Faculty Senate actually has a representative of every department in the University. Your role is to do two things. One is to represent the wishes and ideas and issues that are coming out of your department that your department wants brought forward to the Faculty Senate, but also for you to bring information back to your department and so when Lisa, for example, talks to us about changes that are being made in the Research and Artistry Grants or in the way other things are done at the University, this is a mechanism for getting that information back to the faculty as a whole.

It has been one of my objectives for us to really operate as a Faculty Senate. In other words, when we vote on things, we’re voting the wishes of the faculty as a whole and a good example of
that is what happened last year. Many of you heard about our plus minus grading situation and we passed a resolution advocating that the system of grading be changed to included pluses and minuses. We made sure that each of the Faculty Senate representatives went back to their departments and took a vote and then represented that vote and so, for the first time, we actually had what to us seemed to be a good representation about what the wishes of the faculty in general are.

Now, I’ll tell you a little bit later what the status of that is, it’s not completely satisfactory, but it is still a work in progress. But, nevertheless, the principle was an important one and I would like for us to represent the faculty and that means Faculty Senate members going to their departments, asking them about the issues that are coming up and representing what the faculty and their departments want. So when we pass a resolution we are reasonably confident that that is the wishes of the faculty at large. We very rarely have the opportunity to take a poll of the faculty and so this is a proxy for that. So it would be really most helpful if we take that job seriously and if you do report back to your faculties what is going on in the Senate, we try to send the agenda items out reasonably early. Even if they are not getting to you early enough for your faculty meetings, you can sometimes get a sense from previous meetings what kinds of issues the Senate is dealing with and you can also bring issues to us. I really feel that one of our objectives is to not simply deal with issues that are dropped on us from above by the administration but rather to begin issues at our level that are of import to the faculty and then send those up to the University Council and to the administration as things that the faculty would like to see happen.

There are many issues that confront the faculty. Some of the things that we are going to be facing this year do have to do with things like recruitment and enrollment. What is the impact of that on standards? Faculty set the standards for admissions at this university. If enrollment becomes an important issue, which it obviously is, it is up to us to make sure that we are maintaining the standards that we feel the faculty want to maintain, so we have to be mindful of that. As many of you know, we started talking a little bit about this last year, the legislature in Illinois passed legislation that will lead to performance-based funding of universities. There is now a committee that has been developed by the legislature. There are three university presidents on that committee. President Peters is not one of them. So NIU does not have a president represented on that committee. This committee is going to be making decisions about what the standards are; the way universities will be evaluated in terms of performance. It sounds like, at this point, the main issues have to do with how many people we graduate, how many people are passing, how many people are dropping out. There is always the potential that that could be translated into pressure on faculty to reduce standards, to give higher grades, and so these are issues that we are going to have to be paying close attention to. It’s my hope that we will be functioning, like I said, like a Senate and that we will be representing the faculty. And so when we speak, we are speaking for the faculty and that will require you to not just come to these meetings and get merit points, it will require you to actually go back to your departments and talk to your faculty and come to us and represent your faculties thoughts and wishes.

Another issue that some of you are aware of, President Peters talks about this all the time, I’m sure he will mention it again in his State of the Union address, we are again facing budgetary problems. As you have probably heard many times, the State has not yet paid us for monies
owed last academic year, the fiscal year 2011. They owe us at this point, I believe, somewhere around $42 million, give or take a few thousand dollars. They are supposed to be paying that money to us by December 31st. We are now in the 2012 budget year. We are through the first month of that. As you know the fiscal year starts in July and, so far, the State has been paying some of the bills for FY2012 although they have not finished paying for 2011. This is a major concern. When you go to Board of Trustees meetings, the thing that is front and center is funding and whether the State is going to give us the money that we are entitled to, what the impact will be on our budget going forward. We were actually quite lucky this year because, at least on paper, we were only given about a 1.15 percent decrease in our budget and that was really much, much lower than the administration has expected and was worried about. But now whether they actually give us that money and we don’t have further cuts, that’s a matter of wait and see. The budget situation is a significant one.

The faculty, I think and we’ve been talking about this for a while, have to be very vigilant about these issues. We have been lucky in that we have not had furlough days; we’ve not had faculty layoffs. There are also questions, though, about whether the numbers of faculty have grown or shrunk and, unfortunately, it looks like they’ve shrunk. The University continues to support replacement of positions for people who have retired or been denied tenure, but I don’t know that we are increasing the number of faculty members. We’re going to have to really stay on top of the budget situation and you’ll be hearing more about this as we go along.

One of the big issues that you heard about last year was the Vision 2020 initiative. I don’t know how many of you who have read the reports of the sub-committees. They were all published to the web. What the Vision 2020 Steering Committee did was we got a list of, and I am on the Vision 2020 Steering Committee along with other people that are on the Faculty Senate, we got a list of the items that were listed as priorities by each of the panels and we were asked to prioritize them and to tell the President which ones we thought were most imperative, which ones were high priority and which ones were lower priority. So the entire Steering Committee did that. The results of that were that the two most imperative priority items were student success (graduation and retention rates) and faculty salaries. The Vision 2020 Committee was very aware that faculty salaries are an important issue if we are going to go forward and improve the quality of students that apply to NIU, which is another one of their objectives. Then there is nothing at the University that’s more important than a quality faculty in order to attract and retain quality faculty. Faculty salaries and benefits are a very important issue and that was one of the two imperatives for the Vision 2020. So we’ll be hearing more about that. It will be interesting to see how that plays out given the current financial situations.

For the FY2012 internal budget, there was no accommodation for salary increases. The University proposed a three percent salary increase, IBHE nixed it and so the budget went through without a salary increase for faculty and staff. That doesn’t mean there won’t be one, it just means that it’s less likely, it means whatever salary increase there is will have to come out of internal funds, so will not be funded by the State and, given that the State keeps cutting back on the monies, the idea that there will be enough money to do salary increases is certainly questionable. There is this balance that they are going to have to strike between trying to improve faculty salaries and staff salaries and at the same time deal with decreasing support from the State of Illinois.
So those are some of the things that we are going to be dealing with. I said that I would mention the status of plus minus grading, so for those who were on the Senate last year, I want to tell you what happened. We passed the resolution that said that the faculty were fully supportive of a plus minus grading system. That went to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and to APASC. APASC was given the charge of dealing with that by the UCC. APASC voted it down. They actually didn’t vote it down, what they voted was to do nothing. So they didn’t vote on the Faculty Senate’s resolution, they voted to do nothing.

We found out about this and I went and spoke to APASC and they tried to talk about some of the reasons that they had. They didn’t believe the Faculty Senate’s poll of the faculty was an accurate one. They did a little poll of their own and, in their poll, they felt that the support was not there. They also got a fair number of complaints by the students. Students were not in favor, for the most part, of the plus minus system. The students, I believe, we are going to have a report by a student representative later in the program. I don’t know if the students ever got a full vote. Did you ever take a full vote?

A. Quick: Yes (inaudible nod)

A. Rosenbaum: So, you have a vote. So you will tell us what the vote of the students was on plus minus grading? We know that the vocal students were opposed to it, we don’t know if the student body as a whole was opposed to it so we are going to be very interested in hearing Austin Quick’s report on that.

I then went to the UCC and sort of by that time I had learned that the poll that had been taken by APASC was really not a very accurate one and not very representative. I was successful in arguing that UCC not accept the minutes of APASC and UCC did not. They sent it back and said they wanted APASC to form a joint committee with the Faculty Senate to iron out the problems and it sounded like they were supportive of plus minus grading and so we need to form that committee. Charles Cappell who is our Chair of Academic Affairs will be on that group along with Steve Martin. Charles and Steve really did the bulk of the work on putting together that report on plus minus grading, that excellent report that was used as the data for the vote. We will have one other person and APASC will have three people, and those committees will get together and, hopefully, we will have plus minus grading.

The second piece of that is apparently the Graduate Council was much more favorable about the plus minus grading so it’s very likely that the Graduate Council will approve the plus minus system and we will have that at least for graduate students while we continue to work on the plus minus grading for undergraduates.

Consistent with what I was talking about before in terms representing the departments, you should continue to poll your departments. We don’t want to misrepresent the wishes of the faculty. If the faculty as a whole is not in favor of plus minus grading, we do not want to go through the trouble of changing the catalogs and changing some of the rules regarding staying within a major or being certified as a teacher in Illinois. We’re going to have to do some changes to get the plus minus grading through. So if you get the sense that that vote was somehow not an
accurate one in your department, please make sure that we are aware of that. We can do a re-vote, if necessary. We want to do this the right way. So that’s the status of plus minus grading.

A couple more items: Last year we got a report on the workload task force, you remember this task force, I think it was called the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Workload. David Wade was our representative to that committee. David came back to us at the end of last year and was concerned that the wishes of that committee were being ignored or that committee’s conclusions were not being put forward. I spoke to Ray Alden about that and Ray had a somewhat different opinion. He felt that that is still going forward. I asked him if he would give me a comment for the Faculty Senate and I will read you his comment.

He says that “I believe that we are close with the main policy document but I have asked a small sub-committee to come up with an appendix with more quantitative default guidelines so that each college can react and make recommendations for appropriate changes to suit their particular disciplinary needs. I hope that we can have the entire document completed and vetted by the ad hoc committee within the next month or so. From that point on, I will begin circulating it for comments so it will no doubt come to the Faculty Senate for our comments as well.”

So that has not been completely shelved. I’m not completely sure what he means by the “small sub-committee” or what he means by an “appendix with more quantitative default guidelines,” but, at any rate, that has not been shoved under the carpet, if that’s an expression. And that will be coming up to us within the next, I would say, month or so. That’s the status of that.

What else? One thing I wanted to tell you about is you all are aware that we have the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. The University Advisory Committee consists of the presidents of the three councils, that would be myself, Todd Latham and Andy Small, who is replacing Jay Montero as President of the Operating Staff Council. We also have three faculty representatives on that committee. Currently those are Rosita Lopez who’s on the Senate, Greg Waas who’s the Chair of the Department of Psychology and Kerry Freedman who was on the Senate, she’s no longer on the Senate. Kerry is in Visual and Performing Arts and she’s been a very vocal spokesperson for the faculty. The Constitution says that the UAC is supposed to meet regularly with the President who is supposed to serve as the intermediary between the UAC and the Board of Trustees. That has not happened and the UAC, in the past, has functioned really as reporters on what goes on at the Board of Trustees and the Board of Trustees subcommittees. UAC has not been functioning as it’s supposed to function.

So we spoke to the President and we said that the UAC needed to meet with him on a regular basis before Board of Trustees meetings so that the Board of Trustees could ask our input and counsel on issues coming before the board and we could funnel those through the President to the Board of Trustees. We are trying very hard to make the UAC function the way the UAC is intended to function and so, if people have items to get sent to the Board of Trustees, that would go through the UAC.

Last year we asked for some changes in the nepotism, the wording of the nepotism policy that went through the President to the Board of Trustees. It could have gone through the UAC but that is the procedure by which the faculty gets to talk to the Board of Trustees. We do not have
any control of the Board. The Board of Trustees is omnipotent. So we can’t tell them what to do, we can only give our advise and make suggestions and so we are trying to use the UAC in the way that it was intended to be used.

Okay, I mentioned before that we have added something new to the agenda and that is we have the Student Association making a report to us every month to tell us what is going on among the students. This evolved out of some meetings that I had with Austin Quick and the Student Association staff and President. Personally, I was not really very aware of how evolved the Student Association is. I don’t know how many faculty members are aware of the Student Association. I think this debate about plus minus grading brings to a head the lack of contact between faculty and students. So I thought it would be interesting and important for us to have a report from the Student Association. And every month Austin will join us, he will make that report, and he will be here and can answer questions for us and can serve as an intermediary between the Student Association and the Faculty Senate. We are trying this on an experimental basis. We’ll see how it works from both sides. We’ll see if the Student Association likes it and we’ll see if we like it. This is not necessarily going to be a permanent thing but it will be something that we will try.

That’s all I want to say. I want to get to the rest of the agenda. Before I do that, one more item. For the last two years, I have been working to get the Art Department to display faculty works in the University Council office. I thought that this would be an appropriate way to decorate the University Council office. The Art Department has now sent us a number of works by faculty artists and they are hanging in the University Council office. I would encourage you to stop by the office and take a look at the artwork from our faculty and say hello and see the office.

I should also, again, introduce Pat Erickson who is our administrative assistant both to the Faculty Senate and to the University Council. Pat is the one who is communicating with you and sending stuff out to you and so she’s alone in the office except for me and so it gets lonely at the top. So if people want to drop in and chat with us, that would be great. If you have any problems or issues, Pat is certainly the gateway to the University Council and the Faculty Senate.

I also want to introduce Ferald Bryan who is our Parliamentarian and Ferald has been a UAC representative. His term ended last spring and he’s going to be giving us one of the reports from one of the subcommittees. It’s Ferald’s last report from last term and, who knows, he may be on the UAC again. I think he loves the UAC so, who knows.

And, of course, we also have Tim Griffin up here. Tim is the Ombudsman. He is here to address issues for faculty, staff and students and so if you need confidential advice and counsel, Tim is a good person to go to and he attends our meetings. In addition to the voting members, which are the representatives of each of the departments, we do have some non-voting members here at the council. Ferald, Tim and usually Deb Halicer who represents HR, Todd Latham and well I guess Andy is not here today, right, they are also ex-officio or non-voting members of the Senate.

Okay so now you’ve met everybody.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION
A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is this item for Faculty Senate consideration which is the approval of the Vice President and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. I have asked George Slotsve, George is in the back, George do you want to stand up, George to be Vice President yet again. He was Vice President last year and he has agreed to do it. And I’ve asked Wayne Finley from the Library to be our secretary. The secretary of the Faculty Senate really serves one function and that is to take notes when we go into executive session on the last meeting of the year, so it’s not a labor intensive job and he doesn’t get paid. I’m asking the Senate to first approve, well make the motion to approve, and then to confirm George Slotsve and Wayne Finley as Vice President of the Senate and Secretary of the Senate respectively. I’ll make the motion myself since it’s my selection. I will move that we approve George Slotsve as Vice President and Wayne Finley as Secretary of the Senate. I need a second.

D. Valentiner: Second

A. Lash: Second

A. Rosenbaum: Any discussion? Anybody hate either George or Wayne? No, we all love George and Wayne. Hearing no discussion, all in favor say aye.

Members: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay we have a Vice President and a Secretary.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Standing Committees for 2011-2012 – Pages 4-7

A. Rosenbaum: The next item, the approval of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees. All of you now know you have been appointed to a standing committee. There are rules for appointing people to the standing committees, we have followed those rules. Some of you, unfortunately, have multiple committee assignments. This is because we only have a few representatives from VPA, we only have a few representatives from the Library, we only have one person from the Law School, so these people are invited to be on almost all the committees and they will pick and chose the ones that they want to attend. But each of you has been appointed to a committee. The list of the committees is in the packet. This is a consent agenda so we will approve all of them simply by approving the consent agenda. If anybody has a problem with a committee you can ask for this to be removed from the consent agenda. So there is a procedure, we would have to take a vote to open up those items and remove them from consent agenda. So my first question, does anyone want to ask for any of these items to be changed? Okay, I need a motion to approve the consent agenda.

J. Novak: So move.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I need a second. Somebody.

S. Willis: Second

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any discussion? There’s no discussion, of course, what am I talking about. All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? We have a consent agenda approved.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 8-14

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next item we have a report from Earl Hansen who is our faculty representative to the FAC to the IBHE, so this is the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE and we have Earl’s report. Earl.

E. Hansen: Okay, thank you. I’m not going to bore you with eight pages of reading here. The reports from the three meetings that have taken place since the last time I gave a report are in the minutes. If you have any questions about them, please feel free to contact me regarding that. A number of the topics that have been discussed here have been discussed by the Faculty Advisory Council. In addition, I received correspondence related to the article in The Chronicle of Higher Education about the University of Texas and its adoption of the published performance data on the professors on their campus. If anybody wants that link, contact me and I’ll send it to you or I’ll just send it to Pat and you can get it from her. In following up on that, one of the notes I just received yesterday, or today rather, from one of the officers of the Faculty Advisory Council is that they are pushing the almanac issue from The Chronicle of Higher Education with the data that it has in it. I can send you information on that too. Some of the data that’s interesting is financing in Illinois is down by four percent during the 2010-2011 school year. The projected high school graduates in Illinois will be down by five percent in the next ten years and compared to states like Arizona, Nevada, Florida, Texas, Georgia those states are going to grow 20 to 40 percent in high school graduates that will have an effect. Illinois is one of 16 states where the percentage of adults with Bachelors degree or higher is over 30 percent. That may be dropping when I read the article in the Chicago Tribune about students being prepared to go off to college and have some success. If you haven’t read the article, I suggest you grab a hold of the Tribune and read it. IIT in Illinois has the highest percentage of international students with 50 percent of their student population are international students. The 43 percent of the minority students in the State of Illinois are enrolled in for-profit institutions and a great deal of MAPS money goes that way as opposed to coming into public institutions. Illinois has two of a total of 25 institutions in the nation that generated license revenue in 2009. Northwestern University is ranked number one in the nation with over $161 million in such income and the University of Illinois at Chicago in Urbana are listed at 24th with $13 million in such income. Just for the heck of it, Cuba’s higher education enrollment is 61 percent exceeds those of many western nations and that includes the United States which is sitting here with 57 percent. That’s just information that if you want this
stuff let me know and I’ll be glad to ship it to you. It’s more FYI than a lot of other stuff but I just can’t see sitting here and rambling on about all these things to you unless you want it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, does anyone have questions for Earl? Okay I have one questions Earl. Clearly the IBHE is a very significant player in things that are very important to us. I was surprised that the IBHE simply could have said no three percent raise and then it goes away. Furthermore, they’re clearly involved in this performance-based funding thing. So the IBHE is an important organization.

E. Hansen: It’s the major player.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, one of the things I would like to be able to do or like the Senate to be able to do is to have a heads-up on what’s coming up at the IBHE meetings so that we can send input through you to the IBHE so it’s not simply a matter of us hearing what the IBHE did but rather us being able to have input through you as to what they are doing and what’s going on at that level.

E. Hansen: That’s fine and I’m gonna jump into one of the notes here then because it’s in the minutes here on page 11. There is a series of bullets there. The very last one on there is something that was discussed what we needed to do with the IBHE and items related to higher education in the State of Illinois. The bottom one says “a need to present our practical accomplishments” and I really think that that’s something we all fail to do in higher education. A lot of these people on the IBHE have no idea what goes on on a university campus and why we do some of the things that we do. It’s up to us as faculty members to make those points known. If we’ve done something practical here that is increasing job markets for our students or something like that, that ought to be out there with bugles and horns and what have you to the IBHE so they know what’s going on.

These are the types of discussions, and we’re going to have a big discussion on this in Macomb in the September meeting. We’re trying to find out exactly what you just said. Dan Pritchard will be at that meeting and we’re fortunate that we get our legislators involved coming to our faculty advisory council meetings. That’s not necessarily so in other parts of the state. It’s also certain community colleges are trying to become four year institutions and they want to eat out of two different troughs. They want to get into the state funding of higher education, yet they still want to be funded from their local tax base. So there are issues like that that are on the horizon out there, are going downhill at times, and when I have something of substance where I can come back and give you something that’s actually happening or going to occur other than just a heads up, I’ll be glad to do that.

A. Rosenbaum: As you all know, we have a Faculty Senate Blackboard community. Those of you who are new to the Senate may not be aware of this, but if you open your blackboard, you will find that there should be a Faculty Senate link. I have been posting lots of stuff on this Faculty Senate link. I don’t know how many of you check it, how often, but this is a very good way for us to communicate since we only meet once a month. So if Earl sends us questions for the IBHE for the FAC for the IBHE meeting, I can post those on Blackboard, you can give feedback, we have discussion threads on Blackboard and we can actually get information to Earl
for the meeting. I would encourage you to please go to the Faculty Senate blackboard site, check it from time to time. Every time I post something new I send out an e-mail. The e-mail has that GUI whatever I think title so many of you may be junking it without realizing what it is. But that is a notice that something has been posted on the website.

There’s a lot of stuff that we have to worry about. There are changes coming in the retirement plan, there are times when we want to get on the horn and get our legislators give them a piece of our mind. I’m posting this stuff on that Blackboard website so I would really encourage you to pay attention to that and this is one of the ways we can sort of get this information from Earl to the Senate and then back to Earl, feedback back to Earl in some reasonable fashion without having to wait for a Senate meeting and then the next Senate meeting to get feedback. So I really want to keep using that Blackboard community and please check it. I was a little dismayed that a lot of people don’t seem to check that Blackboard community and it’s a very good way for the Senate to communicate.

We are going to try and keep these reports quick I would hope. The problem is that we have some elections. We have to make some elections and some selections and we need you to be here for that. I know people start to leave very often either because they get tired or because they have other appointments, but we need you to be here for those votes so we are going to try and get through this quickly.


A. Rosenbaum: Next report is from the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Ferald is going to give us the report from the May 12th meeting and Andy, is Andy not here? Andy’s not here but we have his walk-in from the August 25th meeting. So, Ferald, would you like to give us the report from the May meeting?

F. Bryan: Yes, thank you. Most of this is well-known information so I will make this very brief. It is the May 12th meeting and this committee in May approves the tenure and promotion with tenure name so those were all approved. The biggest discussion was about the reorganization the College of Education, and I was very careful to check with the Dean’s office and her report, her PowerPoint, about the intent of the reorganization. So please read that very carefully. There was also considerable discussion from the Board about the change from an Ed.D. in Educational Psychology to a Ph.D., and the Board showed its willingness to really ask hard questions and, in fact, while they approved it, they did want their questions answered by the time of the full board meeting in June. So those were the two major items, I’d be happy to answer any questions if you had any about the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee meeting from May.

A. Rosenbaum: Questions? Okay we have Andy’s walk-in which you can read.

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee reports. You have in the packet Greg Waas’s report on the May 12th meeting and you have my report from the August 25th meeting. They are both walk-ins. I’m not going to give you that report because the same stuff that is in that report then goes to the full board. So I’ll give you a report on the board meeting, a brief report on that. But what happens at these sub-committees is the sub-committee approves things but they have to go to the full board for actual approval. The BOT sub-committee reports are almost identical to the BOT meeting itself and so we’ll skip those for the moment. But you can read them at your leisure. I know you have nothing better to do, so nothing like a good FFO committee report when you are trying to go to sleep.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Pages 17-18

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next the BOT Legislation, Audit, External Affairs Committee, Todd Latham is going to give us the report from May 12th and we do not yet have an August 25th report. Todd.

T. Latham: Thank you. The report before you was the last voting meeting of the Board of Trustees from May 12th. I just will also do an overview.

Item 7.a. was approved to bring NIU policies in regulation and compliance with Public Act 961513 also known as civil unions.

Item 7.c regarding the General Assembly report, much of the focus was on pensions. That’s very much an area for which you should be concerned especially going into the October 25th veto session. I don’t think that this has gone away. It will come back as soon as possible. Please note that ____ experienced a 50 percent increase from retirement applications as reported by Dr. Cunningham. Of the 712 participants in the five Illinois pensions, 212 are ____ participants.

Please be mindful that momentum is still going on as well as discussion downstate that could implement changes to the Tier I employees which are all employees hired before January 1, 2011. Nothing for the congressional report under the audit findings, there were five. I’ll let you read through those.

For those of you that are not aware of required time reporting, I put the link in there. That’s a scenario where salaried individuals like myself fall SPS, have to report how we utilize our time and how much time we worked in a typical work day.

The last item was regarding the new Blackboard mobile application which many of you have now used and been familiar with in your classes. We received a demonstration of that.

Finally, in conclusion, I want to kind of just make you aware of some of the issues that you need to pay attention to regarding the legislative front. Of course, as mentioned by Alan, the performance-based budgeting is going to be implemented in Fiscal Year 2013. This is now Fiscal Year 2012. It’s a matter of defining the metrics as he had mentioned.

Regarding pension reform, please pay much attention to what’s going on with that. It really will
affect the areas of contribution and funding. Under employee benefits, again, we’re talking about long-term benefits such as health. I know that when you looked at the benefits choice period that’s still somewhat in limbo, that has not been decided but there will be more information forthcoming. There is discussion about retiree benefits, about taxing employee benefits of the retired as well as possibly making them provide some type of contribution regarding to their health. Please consider joining the NIU annuitants and being involved in that process. They are a voice for you that can act for you on your behalf in a more vocal process without the constraints of some of the ethic issues that we much comply with and I remind you that tomorrow at 3 p.m. is the President’s State of the University. Please go there and listen to what the President has to say.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Todd?

T. Latham: And I’m on vacation thank you see you later.

A. Rosenbaum: “I’m outta here.” Just to emphasize one thing that Todd said, there are changes that are already in the works. Many of you know that they have changed the money purchase figures that they are using to calculate retirement benefits. Those will go into effect July 2nd, so if you retire before July 2nd and some of you can do that and others of you can’t, you will be much better off than if you retire after July 2nd. There is a concern at the university that there will be a large number of retirements coming through which the concern is that this will cut a lot of the senior faculty and a lot of the expertise from the faculty. There are very important issues for the well being of the university as well as for individual well being.

You should pay really good attention. We will try and post this stuff on the Blackboard community when we become aware of it but you should also not just erase anything that’s coming from Steve Cunningham’s office. Steve is our liaison with respect to retirement issues and, when he sends something out about retirement, that is state of the art. So that’s what’s going on right now, cutting edge. Do not ignore those things. We will keep you updated as much as possible as things come through because if this legislature is anything like it has been for the last couple of years, they tend to pass things in the middle of the night and then get out of town. So things happen quickly and so if we are going to call our representatives and legislators and all of that and give them our opinions, we very often have very little time to do that. Pay attention to this stuff, it’s really going to be our bread and butter. We’re talking about retirement funds. You may not be old enough to retire but by the time you get up there this system will be decimated unless we are really paying attention.

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next report is on the BOT. It’s of interest to know that we have had two new trustees. We had two trustees retire and we got two new trustees. The two new trustees are Trustee Marshall and Trustee losco. The retiring trustees are Barb Vella and Myron Siegel. So we have two new trustees, one of them, Trustee losco, was sworn in at the June 9th meeting along with Jaemin Robertson who is our new student trustee for this year. Chair Strauss expressed confidence in the university’s ability to withstand the current financial crisis and he
acknowledged the expertise of our administration, especially President Peters, Vice President Eddie Williams and Vice President and Provost Raymond Alden.

The President noted that this issue about performance based-funding and there is concern. He is very concerned that whatever the metric is that this committee adopts, that it not be unfavorable to NIU and so he is watching that closely. He also noted that Dave and Linda Nelson who are long-term benefactors of NIU have given a $100,000 endowment to support scholarship program to support students who are endanger of dropping out. So that relates to our retention objectives.

He talked about the cash flow as I am sure you will hear in his State of the University address. There was interim approval of the FY ’12 operating budget. There was an agreement with the NIU Foundation and you can read pretty much the rest of it.

The other thing as was mentioned by Todd, the subcommittee recommends the tenure, the Board grants tenure, so nobody who was up for tenure or promotion actually had it until the Board of Trustees meeting on June 9th at which time the Board did approve the tenures and promotions as well as the reorganization of the College of Education.

There was also a tuition recommendation. Many of you know that we have a truth-in-tuition policy in Illinois which freezes tuition for a student at the rate that they come in under and it is then frozen for nine semesters. They have nine semesters under the tuition that they came in on. This really impacts on our ability to increase money for the university. We can’t change tuition for students that are already in place. We can only change tuition for the incoming class, and so the tuition change was a 6.8 percent increase which translates to about $270.00 per semester. That was approved.

They also approved Bradley Bond as Dean of the Graduate School and many of you know Shirley Richmond was replaced as Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences and her interim replacement is Mary Pritchard who has stated that she has no interest in the permanent position. There is currently the formation of a search committee and there will be a national search to replace Shirley Richmond.

Lastly, the election of Board of Trustees officers was deferred until the September board meeting. The Board of Trustees is actually working on revamping the Board of Trustees by-laws and that’s one of the reasons I think they waited until the September meeting for their elections.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the reports of the standing committees. I don’t think we have any actual reports but I did want to introduce the committee chairs and so I’ll name them and ask them to stand up. And, if you are on one of their committees, you might want to get together with them after this meeting to talk about what would be a good meeting time for your committee in the event that you have to meet. The Chair of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Rosemary Feurer, is Rosemary here? Okay we’re off to a flying start on this idea.
B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Charles Cappell, Academic Affairs. If you are on Academic Affairs, you might want to touch base with Charles.

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Michael Kolb, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Economic Status of the Profession, Michael Kolb. If you are on that committee and you want to meet with Michael afterwards.

D. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Rules and Governance, Gretchen Bisplinghoff is in the back of the room.

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum, Liaison-Spokesperson – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Resources, Space and Budgets, we have David Goldblum who is our liaison and spokesperson. Laurie Elish-Piper is also here, Laurie is the University Council Chair and therefore the chair of this committee. We’ve been talking about co-chairs but, unfortunately, that’s not the way it is but I believe they will act as co-chairs even if not so titled. So if you are on Resources, Space and Budget, touch base with David and Laurie. That committee, by the way, is continuing to be active in trying to have some input into the budgetary process here at NIU.

F. Student Association – Elliott Echols, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 19-20

A. Rosenbaum: Now, for the first time, I would like to introduce Austin Quick who is the Speaker for the Student Association Senate. Elliot Echols is the President and he is not here, but Austin will be presenting a report on the Student Association and Austin, go right ahead.

A. Quick: Thank you. I just want to say thank you. It’s a great honor to come before you. I see a lot of you obviously at University Council, but it’s great to actually be here and not see what you talk about tomorrow in the paper. So I can actually see it for myself all the business that you are doing today. First off, let me just tell you about what we do.

The Student Association is really trying to improve our image around the campus both with students and also with faculty. I did meet with Alan and Patricia this summer. We discussed how to work together better. We’re going to give more reports on what we’re doing so again you’re not just reading it in what the Northern Star writes and jus have more collaboration. We’re really in big support of the fact that our University is a great place. We read a lot of things about how we have a lot of improvements to be made, but we think we have a lot here both with our resources in faculty and staff and our students. With that, we hope we open doors and really work together.
But I will talk about briefly the plus minus system that was one of the things you brought up. When we heard about it last, it was brought to our attention and we decided to do a poll with students. We held raffles and all kinds of things to get students to come out and actually vote on this issue. When we did the polls and I’ll get you the numbers and send them off to you, when we did those it was overwhelming, most students said no. The one group of students demographically, if I remember right, was that were in support of the plus minus system were those in the honors program. They were in support of that. But your typical, average student, which I am, voted it down.

The big reason was, and this is something I’d like to have an open dialog in the future, one of the things that keeps coming up in our meetings and I put in here in our report, over the summer we’ve met. Since I’ve become speaker one of my big things is to promote more collaboration, not only the university but elected officials at the state and federal level and local. We’ve met this summer with four different congressmen from the area both our congressmen from this district and the surrounding districts. We’ve met with Bob Pritchard, multiple state senators and other state representatives, and it keeps coming up with us is we definitely see that there needs to be an improvement with the type of students that we are putting out, the education level.

Funny story, I just recommended a guy for an internship with a congressional office and they got back to me and said did you really just send that writing sample? And I read it and he said this was atrocious and I talked to the student and he said I got an A on that paper. So these are the types of things that we definitely would like to work on but the issue that we have and this is just one of the things that I will talk more in the future is specifically in my college, I’ll speak just from my experience in my college in Liberal Arts and Science. We have a lot of classes in the 300- and 400-level in the undergraduate system who are taught by GAs. There is no permanent faculty involved whatsoever and that is a problem that we has was we are being graded on things and we're paying for 300 and 400 level classes where we think you get, I’ll be honest, we’d like to hear from you, you are experts in your fields, and we’re taught by a student who and I just talked to a lot of the GAs, they just took the class the semester before and now they’re teaching us. So if we are going to hold people to these higher standards, which the plus minus systems does, we need to make sure we’re giving them the quality education also and that was the concern for students that we had. Again, I’m only speaking from my colleges’ experience. I’m a political science major and most of my classes have been taught by GAs so that was our concern was if we are going to be held to this higher standard, where is the higher standard for the output we’re getting, because all the students are doing the GAs they are just teaching us what they learned in the book, where you have done the research and are knowledgeable. So that’s an area where we can discuss further with the plus minus but we definitely had a lot of feedback on that and students were concerned of this change because it does change things for people and where the other concern of that was it seemed, and I’m speaking from memory, that different colleges had the choice whether or not they were going to do the plus minus if it passed.

A. Rosenbaum: No, faculty had a choice because it’s academic freedom issue so faculty can give whatever grade they want.

A. Quick: That was a concern also that there wasn’t an across-the-board no matter what class, what happens if you take a class in another college for something else and it didn’t have it
registered, so I guess there just needs to be more information to us. Just a couple of areas I want to tough on and first off, Earl had mentioned in the Chicago Tribune today there was an article. Kyle Beck was actually the one in the picture on the front so that was just kind of ironic. But he’s not a bad student, the headline said students are doing poorly; he’s a 3.0 student so he’s okay. So it’s just ironic that he mentioned the article today. Just in general, we’ve been here for a while and I don’t want to take up a lot of your time, I’m going to give you my e-mail address so if there anything that you would like from us, please contact us, we definitely want to have open dialog. My e-mail address is aquick@niu. Anything we can do if you’d like to discuss anything with us on the student level that we can bring to the student level, we definitely would like to hear from you. But again, I thank you for allowing us the opportunity. Anything we can do to help and make this place the best institution both for you because you’ll be here long after we are and make this the best place we can for future students, I would love to help and I know President Echols is very much in support as well. Thank you. We usually say in our senate I yield.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know Austin, that writing sample that got an A probably would have gotten an A- if we had plus minus grading. It wouldn’t have been that embarrassing.

G. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the last item of business unless someone has something for us, we have a couple of elections and I’m going introduce Therese Arado who is the Chair of our Elections and Legislative Oversight.

But before we do that, I just wanted to tell you a little bit about what these elections are about. I don’t know how many of you are familiar with the different grievance procedures and hearing panels and all of that, but I think you should at least know what it is that you are voting for. So the first item that G.1. Those are hearing panel members and they are specifically designated for two types of hearings. One of them is due process hearings and these are hearings that involved dismissal of a tenured faculty member for cause. If the University tries to dismiss a tenured faculty member, they are entitled to a due process hearing and that those people that we’re electing in that item G.1. is the group that those panels will be drawn from if there is a firing. It also applies to non-tenured faculty members who are let go before the end of their contract. And the last thing that this hearing panel, this particular hearing panel does, are hearings or grievances that involve academic freedom. And so if you want to see these, the due process hearings or Bylaws, Article 7.3. The academic freedom are Bylaws, Article 10.

And so the first thing we are going to do is we are going to identify 20 faculty members for this panel. Now these 20 faculty members are not drawn from the Faculty Senate, they are drawn from the University faculty at large and so every summer Pat gets a list of all of the faculty that are eligible in this category, they are numbered. She then goes to a random number generating website and we get 34 numbers which we then match up to faculty members and that’s where that list comes from. So this is a random selection from the faculty at large and you will be voting for 20 from this list of 34. So that is the .G1.
The second one is the by-lot election of Faculty Grievance Committee members. These are grievances that involve anything other than academic freedom filed by a faculty member, so in other words, if an SPS employee files an academic freedom grievance, this would be included but not faculty members. Personnel decisions, dismissals for cause of a faculty member can be done here as well. Violations of academic freedom of non-faculty members, dismissals for cause of non-faculty members as well, Not the ones whose term have run out and this also includes grievances related to harassment, discrimination, reprimands, items placed in an employee’s personnel file. If you want to look at the grounds that are covered under this particular category, they are in Bylaws, Article 11.

So we’re going to be identifying or drawing from lot, 15 faculty members. When these grievances occur, sometimes it is a grievance between a faculty member and an administrator, in other words, SPS. When that happens, there is a committee of five that will include faculty members and also representatives from SPS. So it might be three faculty and two representatives of SPS. Each of the councils will identify a list of 15 and that is what we use in comprising the committees to hear the grievances. So if you grieve against someone who is not a faculty member, that committee will have to have members from either operating staff or SPS. So we have 15 from each of the councils and what we are going to be doing is drawing by lot those members from the Faculty Senate.

Lastly, under G.3., we have the election of University Council alternates. When a faculty member of the University Council is unable to attend the meeting, they are not allowed to send a proxy. They must notify our office, we go to the list of alternates, and we get an alternate to stand in for them. If someone is out for the semester because of illness or pregnancy or some sabbatical or whatever, we appoint an alternate from that list. This is done by college. The rules are that the alternates shall be elected by and from the respective faculty on the Faculty Senate. Now we will pick panels, the constitution allows us to assign one person to each faculty member; we’re not going to do that. We are going to pick a panel from Arts and Sciences, from the College of Education and so those votes are going to be by college and you’ll see those ballots I think are color-coded and you’ll make sure you’ll have the color-coding for your particular college. So that being said, Therese is our Chair of Elections and Legislative oversight and she will take over the proceedings.

1. Hearing Panel election – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting

T. Arado: Alan, I was hoping you would just keep going and get it done for me. If you haven’t already found it yet, the Hearing Panel election ballot is already at your table with the papers and this is something that you just need to select twenty people listed on this list and then leave the form at your table and it will be collected afterwards. This is only for voting members of the Senate to fill out. If you are not a voting member, just leave a blank form there, but just mark 20 members on there and then it will be collected afterwards.

A. Rosenbaum: And, remember, all department representatives are voting members.

2. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Committee members
**T. Arado:** Okay, while you’re all working on that one, I’m going to move to the by-lot election of the Faculty Grievance Committee. These are pulled by lot and these are for the Faculty Grievance Committee. I’ll read the names once they are pulled out.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Good luck to all of you.

**T. Arado:** There we go, just pull random names. Fifteen. Thank you and I apologize for ruining names. Debra Zahay-Blatz, Marketing; Vicki Collins, Educational Technology; Richard Greene, Geography; George Slotsve; Kryssi Staikidis, Art; Melissa Lenczewski; Lynette Chandler; Rosita Lopez; Ibrahim Onyuksel; Charlotte Rollman; Eric Mogren; Gary Chen; Gretchen Blisplinghoff; Carl Von Ende; William Pitney.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Congratulations to all the lucky winners.

3. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting

**T. Arado:** Okay, on the next election, this is going to be done by the colored ballots that Alan was mentioning. I will need you to raise your hands based on your college when I ask for them. College of Business, anyone from the College of Business that’s a voting member? And who is blue because you have blue as well? So we have just two College of Business over here? And it indicates on the ballot how many people to vote for, so please just look at the top part and it will say how many to vote for. College of Education. Once you mark the names on those, the appropriate number, you can leave those at the spots as well and they will be collected. College of Health and Human Sciences. College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Everyone from Arts and Sciences get a ballot? Okay. College of Engineering. And College of Visual and Performing Arts. Okay so everyone who needed a ballot received a ballot?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Anyone not have a ballot? We have someone without a ballot or a question?

**L. VandeCreek:** The Libraries?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t think you have enough people.

**T. Arado:** Oh, correct, I’m sorry I thought you said there was one sheet. Correct, it’s just like College of Law, we don’t get one either.

4. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee for a one-year term. Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies will choose one member from the two nominations to serve on this committee for one year.

**T. Arado:** The last of the four items on here, it’s a nomination of two Faculty Senate members. So this is where I would need two people to nominate their neighbor, nominate themselves. Of the two people who would be elected to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee of the two nominations, one will actually be selected. So if you nominate yourself,
it’s only a 50/50 chance. So do I have someone who is willing to nominate themselves, someone else?

??: Can you say more about what they do?

T. Arado: Alan can you say more about what they do?

A. Rosenbaum: The Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee?

T. Arado: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: I think it’s, I don’t know. My assumption has been if there are concerns about ethics or something in research that that committee would be involved in it but I don’t know. Wait a minute we have a description. The Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee reports and is an advisory to the Graduate Council. Duties, the purpose of the NIU RCS is to provide awareness of complex ethical and related dilemmas that can occur in the scholarship process and to suggest ways to address them. The goal is to create a shared culture of responsible scholarship. The program will not develop explicit rules that restrict intellectual activity. The RCS program at NIU will make the university community aware of changing governmental and institutional rules, regulations, policies and ethical professional standards that guides scholarship and will illustrate the normative issues that cut across scholarly disciplines. Awareness of ethical and responsible conflict of scholarship includes; maintaining awareness and professional responsibilities, creating a shared culture of reasonable scholarship, responsible scholarship, identifying and responding to potential ethical problems, recognizing and understanding cross disciplinary issues and standard, communicating to the NIU community the content of applicable internal and external policies. So that pretty much clarifies it I think, doesn’t it?

T. Arado: And this committee only meets as needed. It doesn’t have a monthly, semester or anything like that.

A. Rosenbaum: The current person that’s in the position is Joel Jefferies. So if anyone wants to know how big a chore this is, Joel would be somebody you could ask.

B. Pitney: I’d be willing

R. Lopez: (also volunteered)

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you both we appreciate it.

T. Arado: I think that concludes my duties at the moment.

A. Rosenbaum: By the way, Therese is from the College of Law, so I thought it was good that we had a College of Law person as Chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight. We are also going to try and get the legislative oversight part this year. This is something in recent years we have not done and so Therese’s committee will try to give us updates on legislation that is of import to us on a monthly basis so that will be part of that committees charge and it won’t simply
be that they spring into action when we have to have an election. So we’re going to get a little bit more legislative oversight from that committee.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: I have one more thing before we adjourn and that is we’ve been asked by the Provost’s office to appoint a representative to the Board of Trustees Professorship Selection Committee. So we have Board of Trustees professorships that are awarded every year. We need a Faculty Senate representative. This does not have to be a tenured faculty member nor does it take a full professor. They’ll take anybody. We just have to designate somebody so it doesn’t even have to be a Faculty Senate member. If you want to nominate somebody who is not a Faculty Senate member you can do that as well. Does anybody have any interest? This committee meets once in December and once again in either January or February. It’s not a weekly or monthly obligation. Probably if you get to know the people who are on this committee, maybe they’d be more likely to vote for you if you come up for BOT professorship. Anybody?

J. Novak: (volunteered)

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you John. We have no unfinished business, we have no new business. Any comments or questions from the floor? Seeing none I will

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Meeting schedule, 2011-2012 – Page 21
B. Annual Report, Affirmative Action & Diversity Resources Advisory Committee
C. Annual Report, Academic Planning Council
D. Annual Report, Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
E. Annual Report, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Annual Report, Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
G. Annual Report, Graduate Council
H. Annual Report, Office of the Ombudsman
I. Annual Report, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
J. Annual Report, University Assessment Panel
K. Annual Report, University Council Personnel Committee
L. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
M. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
N. Minutes, Athletic Board
O. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
P. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
Q. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
R. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
S. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
T. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
U. Minutes, General Education Committee
V. Minutes, Honors Committee
W. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
X. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
Y. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
Z. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
AA. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: We have no unfinished business, we have no new business. Any comments or questions from the floor? Seeing none I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

S. Willis: So moved

D. Valentiner: Second

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor say aye.

All: Aye

Meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.