I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Welcome back everybody. I’m glad to see so many of you not affected by the flu. Hopefully, you aren’t affected by the flu; otherwise we’ll all have it.

Meeting called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first item of business, of course, as always, is the adoption of the agenda. We have one walk-in item. It’s from the FAC to the IBHE and it goes under VII. A. Before I say that, I should remind you again, since it’s a new semester and your minds are all dulled from weeks of vacationing, that before you speak, say your name into the microphone because we need to have it on the record and also do we have a reporter from the Star here with us? Star reporter, identify yourself. There we go. All right, so you know we have a reporter from the Star here just so you remain aware of that. So I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the one walk-in item.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: And I need a second.

M.E. Koren: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor say aye.
Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed, abstentions? Okay, we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 28, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: The approval of the minutes from the November 28 meeting which I can’t remember. I don’t know if any of you have read them, but I need a motion to adopt the minutes, to approve the minutes.

T. Arado: I move.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, a second?

V. Naples: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: And any corrections, changes, deletions, insertions? We used to have a little disclaimer on the minutes that we don’t put on there anymore, so again, I’ll just remind you. The minutes that you are getting in the mail and reading as soon as you get them are really an abstraction of the full transcript of the meeting. So it’s not an attempt to recreate the entire meeting. It’s merely intended to give the flavor of what was covered. I’m going to try this semester to make the minutes shorter. I think I’m including too much in the minutes. If anyone really wants to know what’s going on, we post the entire transcript. So if anyone has a question of something that was said in the meeting, the entire transcript is posted and you’re welcome to go through that. So I’m going to make an attempt, even though it seems to be against my nature, to shorten the minutes and basically hit the high points and not give you so much detail about who said what. However, if you said something that you would like in the minutes when we call for the approval of the minutes and for corrections and additions and subtractions, feel free to ask us to include something that I might have omitted. So if there is something that you have said that is either incorrectly quoted or if you were not quoted at all and you would like to be on record, then this is the time to bring those items up. Any corrections, changes, additions? Yes, Mili?

M. Kostic: Will you call those minutes summary of the minutes since they will not be the minutes?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, it’s not a summary of the minutes; it’s a summary of the transcript. We have a full transcript. This is kind of a distillation, not so much a summary, sort of a distillation of the transcript. So that’s what I would call the minutes. Anyone else? Okay all in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

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

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Rosenbaum: In terms of announcements, I’ll bring you up to speed just quickly on the search for President Peters’ successor. The search committee has now met, I think, three times. We are in the process at this moment of soliciting applications for the position. That will remain open until February 15. So right now, we have 27 people who have been contacted or who have expressed interest, and we have six completed applications. So we have quite a number of people who have either been nominated or who have expressed interest and six of those have completed applications. My understanding of the process is very often people do not submit their applications all that quickly. There is a concern about being outed. Most applicants for the position do not want it known that they’re applying for the position because clearly it would affect their standing back in their home universities and so very often people wait until the last minute to submit their papers. We expect that we will have quite a number of applications before this is all said and done.

The other thing is that the search firm that we are working with has suggested that a lot of the best nominations come from within the faculty of the university and so, if you are aware of good candidates for this position or if you know people in your department who are aware of good candidates for the position, then you should get those to either myself or to Bob Boey who is the co-chair of the search committee with me. So if you give us those names, we can transmit them to the search firm and they will take it from there. You don’t necessarily have to get permission from whoever it is that you want to nominate. The search firm will contact them and if they are not interested, they’ll say they are not interested. You can also make a nomination anonymously if you wish. Usually the nominations are made and whoever makes the nomination’s name is associated with that person in our materials, but it doesn’t have to be that way. If you know of people, feel free to get a nomination to, I guess I would be the easier person to get it to since you don’t tend to see Bob Boey that much. He’s a member of the Board of Trustees.

Another item, many of you have probably gotten this in the mail. I don’t know if you have done it already, but SUAA sent out a survey. Have people seen this? The essence of the survey is they want to know, if we are engaged in a negotiation around pension benefits, what are we most willing to give up? What will we give up in this negotiation? So it lists a number of things that include things like age of retirement, cost of living increases, the final salary on which your pension is based, a lot of key items there. They are interested in our feelings about what’s negotiable and what’s not. So if you have seen this and haven’t filled it out, you should probably take a look at it and fill it out. Personally, as I filled it out, I didn’t want to give up any of those things. So I’m reading these things and it’s like I really don’t want to give that up. And, again, part of that is just anger at the legislature because it’s their fault that we have to give anything up. But, nevertheless, the situation is what it is and something is going to have to give somewhere and so the more control we have over the process, the better we are. Those of you who haven’t done it, you might want to take a look at that SUAA survey and, as painful as it is to say, I’m willing to give up this or that, fill it out.

My understanding is that there is not any new development. Apparently, both the veto session and the lame duck session went by without the legislature being able to come to any agreement on pension reform. That hasn’t happened, but it’s just a matter of time. Something’s got to happen. We’ll keep you posted. It’s very important that we remember how much impact we have been able to have by calling up our legislators and screaming bloody murder when they try to do
something that we don’t like. It’s no accident that we don’t have a pension reform bill. It’s
because every time they try something, SUAA and many of the folks that work for the
universities are getting on the phone and contacting their legislator. We have people that are
really keeping close watch on this. Those of you who pay attention to our Blackboard website,
we post lots of things on there that relate to the pension issues and so whenever there is
something that requires immediate attention, typically you are getting notified by SUAA but
we’re also putting that most of the time on the Blackboard, the senate Blackboard website.

It’s, I think, worth your while to check the Blackboard website once in a while. I don’t know
how many people are doing that but we are posting important stuff there. Sonya Armstrong is
going to give us the FAC to the IBHE report later on. She asked us to post a set of slides
regarding performance-based funding which is, again, very important to us. I don’t know how
many were able to see those slides, but they have been posted on our Blackboard website and
that gives you an opportunity to read through some of this stuff before you come to the meeting
so that you will be able to ask questions of Sonya if there is something there that you have
concerns about.

The next item, of course, you’re all aware of NIU’s participation in the Orange Bowl. It was a
very exciting event for the university and I know a lot of faculty members were there. A lot of
administrators were there. We sent a large group of students. The NIU representation at the
Orange Bowl was nothing to sneeze at. I think people were very concerned originally that NIU
doesn’t travel well, that there would be lots of empty seats and that NIU would not be well
represented. That was absolutely not the case. NIU was very well represented. I believe we had
many compliments from the Orange Bowl committee about how well we represented for NIU. It
was a very exciting event despite the fact that we didn’t win. But again, we also didn’t embar
rass ourselves; and we, I think, showed very nicely for the MAC. I think it was a good job. Matt
Streb, as you know, is the faculty representative to the Athletic Board. His name was actually on
the big message board on the stadium. They listed the faculty representative to the Athletic
Board by name on the board in the stadium. I’ve asked Matt if he’d be willing to talk to us a little
bit about the logistics of the Orange Bowl and sort of bring us up to speed. I know many of you
have heard rumors about what we spent, what we made, whether we’re making money, whether
we’re losing money, how many people we sent and all this other stuff. And so I’ve asked Matt if
he’d fill us in and he’s agreed to do so. Matt.

M. Streb: Thanks Alan. I guess there’s two things I want to make clear right up front: First, we
don’t know how much money we’ll make or whether we’ll lose anything or whether we’ll break
even for quite some time still. It’s still very early in the process. One thing that I can tell you, and
this is the second point, is that we are not going to get rich off of being in the Orange Bowl. I
think when the Orange Bowl was announced, I think many of my faculty thought: Oh great,
we’re going to have more money for faculty travel and we’re going to get my political theory
line back and all that type of stuff and that’s not going to be the case. And here’s why. When you
go to the Orange Bowl, the university has to buy 17,500 tickets and those tickets range between
$85 and $210 a piece. You also have to pay for a certain number of rooms in a hotel for seven
nights and they are not putting you up in a Days Inn. Right off the bat, before we’ve even fed a
student, before we’ve done any sort of transportation or anything like that, the university already
owes $2.9 million. Now we owe a great deal of thanks to the Mid-American Conference because
this was a very big deal for the Mid-American Conference. We are the first school to go,
represent the conference, in a BCS bowl. The Mid-American Conference has been very supportive of us and has come to help us cover the cost of those $2.9 million. What the Mid-American Conference has said that they will do is that they will pick up the $2.9 million and they’ve also told us that they will give us an extra $850,000. Now we haven’t seen any of that money yet, but that means that they are going to give us $3.75 million. If you look last year, the University of Connecticut represented the Big East, went and played in the Orange Bowl. That school lost $1.8 million by appearing in the Orange Bowl. When the University of Hawaii went to a BCS bowl several years ago, that school lost more than $2 million. So if it wasn’t for the Mid-American Conference helping us out, we would be in that situation as well. We’re not going to lose $1.8 million on our participation in the Orange Bowl thanks to the MAC.

A lot of people said: “Well wait, I thought there was all this money, though, that you get from going to a BCS bowl, right? And there is a lot of money, but the Mid-American Conference, when all is said and done, will get about $8 million. But about half of that, as I just said, has already been spent helping us cover many of our costs. So now you’ve got about $4 million that will be left to be distributed among the 13 members of the MAC. We have 12 regular members, the University of Massachusetts also plays football, they’re a member of the MAC in football. The presidents are in the process of trying to figure out how they are going to divvy up that revenue. We still have bills that we’re paying. We had to charter the team down there and you have to pay for the team and their meals and everything. That’s why I’m saying, we’re still unclear exactly how much we’re going to be in the red, how much we’re going to be in the black, whether we’re going to be able to break even or not. But what is very clear is we owe a great deal of thanks to the Mid-American Conference because we would have been in a much different situation had they not stepped up to the plate.

One thing that we don’t know is kind of the indirect profits that we get from the Orange Bowl. I think University Relations right now is in the process of trying to figure out how much money of kind of free media exposure did we get in that month or so after the Orange Bowl was announced. We were a national story, we were in the New York Times, we were in the Wall Street Journal, we were in the USA Today, we were on ESPN every night. That’s something that you can’t – well you can – measure, and they are in the process of trying the measure that. We saw an increase in NIU merchandise that was sold after our appearance in the Orange Bowl. Every time you put a Huskie dog on a sweatshirt, the university gets a cut of that. Fanatics.com which is a popular athletics apparel website, the week after we were announced in the Orange Bowl, our sales went up 274 percent from the previous year. So again, there was certainly, if you went over to the Village Common Bookstore just about every day there was a line of people buying NIU stuff. So that’s something that we may see some benefit from.

There was a lot of discussion about applications to the university being up after the Orange Bowl. That was true, there was a spike of applications immediately after the Orange Bowl. Whether that was because of the Orange Bowl or something else, we don’t know. That’s kind of gone back to normal, though. It doesn’t look like there’s a huge increase in applications right now. But again, it’s certainly a very positive thing for the university. In terms of how many people went down, Alan was right, I think we represented ourselves very well down there. The 17,500 tickets, we distributed about 15,300 tickets. About 8,000 of those tickets, though, were given to charity – the Boys and Girls Club and several other charities that the Orange Bowl works with. So we had about 7,300 tickets that we distributed to, I won’t call them NIU fans
because all the charities were there in Huskie red and black as well. But we had 2,800 students go down to the Orange Bowl which was phenomenal. We actually sold about 3,700 tickets to our fans. We’ll never really know though how many Huskies were actually in Miami for the Orange Bowl because many of our fans went down there and they went through places like Stub Hub or Gold Coast Tickets or whatever where you could buy an $85 ticket online for $10. So not everybody bought through the university so we don’t have a very clear sense of exactly how many people from NIU were down there.

Overall, I think it was a great experience for our university. The football team represented themselves very well and, Alan, if you just give me one more second I’ll never pass up a chance to highlight our academic achievements of our student athletes. This past fall semester, the department GPA, the athletic department GPA was above a 3.0. That’s a cumulative GPA for all of our student athletes. Eleven of our teams had a team GPA about 3.0. Five of those teams actually had team GPAs above 3.5 and we had 62 of our student athletes that had a 4.0 in the fall semester. So again, there’s a lot, I think, to be proud of about our student athletes. Thanks very much and I’ll certainly answer any questions if anybody has anything.

A. Rosenbaum: Now that we have plus minus grading, those grades are going to go up. Any questions from that? Any questions about the Orange Bowl or any of the athletic issues? Thanks Matt.

A. Rosenbaum: The last item I want to mention is that many of you have seen this is in the paper, but James Norris who was the dean of arts and sciences for a long time, passed away. He was also, at one point, executive secretary of the University Council and president of the Faculty Senate. He died on January 16. I didn’t know him. I know him from his picture. I’ve seen him walking around campus. He’s been retired since 2000 I believe, so he hasn’t been an active faculty member for a number of years. But there will be a service for him. I think the information about that is on the NIU Today website. I don’t know if anyone knew him or would want to say anything. Yea, Deb?

D. Haliczer: Dean Norris was an excellent dean. He cared deeply about faculty rights and was a strong advocate for the faculty against the administration. So you all should be very proud of him. He was in the history department so I was a student in the department in my youth and he was a good guy so we miss him.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. Anyone else have a comment? If you have any trouble finding the information and you want to know about the memorial service, you can call us and we can help you get that information.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – call for nominations – Page 3
Written letters of nomination should be submitted to Faculty Senate President Alan Rosenbaum no later than noon, Monday, February 11, 2013

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up is Item V. which is Items for Faculty Senate Consideration and we are, and this is sort of a good lead in from Dr. Norris, we are at that time of the year when we
nominate people for the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. You may recall last year, those of you who were on the senate last year, we sort of changed the award somewhat. If you look at the item that’s in the agenda, it talks about the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Award and we went through the history of that. This was originally developed as a way of honoring somebody who was kind of giving the administration a run for their money.

In more recent years where the relationship between faculty and the administration has been less contentious, we have had many years where nobody was nominated for the Bob Lane Award. And so last year we talked about changing it to recognize the contributions of a faculty member who is really going above and beyond in service to the faculty. As you know, many of you are certainly worthy of this award. You know who you are. These are the people who are constantly putting their name forward; agreeing to be on presidential committees; agreeing to help us decide who should get the presidential professorships; participating in the reaccreditation process; participating on search committees; and all of this other stuff. It very often is the same people that come forward. Others of you are doing yeoman’s work as chairs of committees either on the Faculty Senate or on the University Council. So we have many people who are really putting in a great deal of time. Everyone has the same amount of work for their job: We all have to do our research; we all have students; and yet many of you are stepping forward and putting in a tremendous amounts of time on the various committees of the university and, God knows, we have enough committees.

We have sort of changed this award to recognize the contributions of a faculty member and it can still be used to nominate somebody who is a thorn in the side of the administration. We haven’t eliminated that possibility from the award, but we’ve expanded the award to encompass more contributions than just being a pain in the butt. We agreed last year that the way this would work is that we would announce the call for nominations at our January meeting, which is what we are doing right now. We are asking that anyone who makes a nomination, do so in a letter that should be sent to me and we will put those letters of nomination in the February agenda so you can look for them when you get the agenda. You can read them and at our February meeting we will vote on who we feel should receive the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award for this year.

We do not have to make an award. It’s not required. We should also point out, I don’t know how many of you have seen it, but we have now created a plaque that has little brass name things on it. It is downstairs in the Holmes Student Center. I don’t know how many of you have seen that, but you should take a look at it. It lists all of the recipients of the Bob Lane Award going back to when we called it a number of different things. All of the recipients now have a little plaque and so that’s a way of again, formalizing this award and making it more than simply a certificate. Our last year’s recipient was Charles Cappell. Feel free to send letters of nomination for anybody. It doesn’t have to be a faculty senator. It can be anybody in the university who is on the faculty and who is contributing to the faculty in a substantial way. We’ll take those nominations until February 11. Feel free to send those in. Any questions about the Bob Lane Award or what you have to do if you want to nominate somebody?

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – reports:
  December 7, 2012 – Pages 4-8
  January 18, 2013 – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Next we’ll get to our reports from advisory committees. We have two reports from Sonya Armstrong who is our representative to the FAC to the IBHE. There is a lot of action in the FAC lately, the IBHE as well. We would do well to pay attention to the materials that Sonya is bringing to us. Sonya.

S. Armstrong: For the December meeting, it’s kind of old news at this point, much of it. What I did want to point out is that each December we do meet in Springfield with the entire staff of the IBHE so that’s an opportunity for me to bring back any concerns we have to the IBHE staff. Additionally, we meet with the IBHE, I believe it’s every April, so regularly we are seeing the staff. If you have questions or comments or topics that you want me to bring to the staff, please let me know because I do get to see them regularly.

I’m going to skip to the January report just because it’s more current. The public four-year pocket continues to struggle with two policy white papers that we’re drafting and I’ve been asked to call for faculty to provide input, resources, just suggestions, in general, on two topics. One would be the pension system and we’re currently working on a white paper that we would put forward as a suggestion, as a faculty endorsed suggestion for reforming. The second one is one that I have mentioned before and that is the value of higher education. Ultimately what we’d like to do is craft this in such a way that it could go out to newspapers as an editorial and such, just to really alert the public of the value of higher education and that’s been a real struggle to try. If you have any suggestions or resources, please do forward them to me.

The rest of the meeting was really spent talking with visitors. We had Senator del Valle come in and talk about the P20 Council. I think the most important item that you’d want to know about is that the P20 Council meetings are open to everyone and we actually got an explicit invitation that we could, anyone could attend those meetings if you are interested. I also posted a link to the MAP Task Force report. It’s kind of a lengthy report but I think it effects us all so it’s worthy of a look at least at the executive summary. Also Alan you mentioned the performance-based funding PowerPoint. I got that third-hand from the Steering Committee so I did not get to observe that presentation but, if anyone has questions, I can certainly take them with me to the next meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t want to put you on the spot, but can you summarize, one of the issues with the performance-based funding is: As they were developing the parameters, there were questions whether the parameters would be favorable to NIU or whether they would disadvantage NIU. For a while, there was concern that the way it was going was this was going to seriously be an advantage to the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana and not an advantage to NIU. Has that changed or is that still the situation?

S. Armstrong: I don’t know the answer to that. Informally, it depends on who you talk to. I don’t know the answer but I can certainly look into that.
A. Rosenbaum: And are those parameters that are in that PowerPoint, are those finalized, have they been approved, or is that still a work in progress?

S. Armstrong: No, these are from the Steering Committee, these will be recommended to the board. I believe the next board meeting is February 5. The recommendation is that we maintain the half of one percent allocation from the overall higher ed budget and so we are maintaining for this year. That’s the recommendation and then there will be changes once more data are collected for following year. That’s the recommendation that’s being put forward at the board meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: One of the concerns I think was that, when they say a half of one percent, it doesn’t sound like very much and people don’t get up in arms about it, but once those parameters are put in place and they start increasing the percentage, then it becomes a major problem. So it would suggest that we have to go after the parameters and make sure that those are favorable and forget about the fact that it’s only one half of one percent because that may be a temporary situation. Before we know it, it’s five percent or ten percent. I think it’s critically important that we are aware of what those parameters are and, if they are not favorable to NIU, that we have something to say about that. Can we find that out?

S. Armstrong: I will, I actually usually sit next to the representative on the Steering Committee so I will talk with him about that.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions for Sonya about the FAC or the IBHE? Again, I’ve said this before at the risk of repeating myself: The IBHE has a lot to say about the functioning of our university. They approve programs; they have a lot to say about approving our budget. They turn down our budget requests every year for raises. They are a powerful body and there are always questions that come up as to whether the people who are on that are really informed well enough about what goes on at the various universities and it’s the job of the FAC to really make sure that they are up to speed on the impact of the things that they do on the university. It’s a very important group. We have not over the years, I think, paid enough close attention to the IBHE and again, we’re very delighted that Sonya really does have her eye on the ball here. We need to really make sure that we are aware of what is going on and things like performance-based funding are one very good example of things that they can do that have a profound impact on us or can and that we really need to be aware of what they’re doing and to make sure we have our say. Any other questions? Thank you Sonya.

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 9

A. Rosenbaum: The next report, I’m not going to spend much time on this, this is the BOT report. You have it in your agenda. This was the December 6 meeting. The board, at this point, aside from taking care of the usual budgetary issues that they have to deal with, is focused very much on the presidential search. After that December 6 meeting, the Board of Trustees met with the search committee and hammered out the position description for the president. One thing I would like to report to you is that they were very cooperative with the committee. There was not a contentious flavor to the position description and the work that the senate did was very important to that process. What I mean is we had really one full meeting to discuss the position description and we were able to go in there very prepared with the Faculty Senate’s list that was
developed in collaboration with your various departments. And so we had all of our ducks in order and so we were not caught by surprise and we gave our list to the search firm and they are the ones who put together the position description, the draft that we worked from, and pretty much everything that we wanted is in that position description. It was a lot of work. We had a very good meeting. Some of you might remember that meeting, it went on for quite some time, but it was well worth the effort in that the faculty voice was very well represented in this position description. At this point, the Board of Trustees seems to be very agreeable to the suggestions that the faculty has made. There does not seem to be a point of contention. It’s been a very collaborative process and I really want to commend the Board of Trustees because they do not have to engage in a collaborative process, but they are choosing to respect shared governance and to engage in this process in a collaborative way. So far it’s been a very good experience. I think we have a large search committee. Unfortunately, it’s very large, 28 people, but very strong faculty representation on that committee. They increased the size of the committee I think, I don’t know if I told you this but since the last time we met, I think the committee was increased from 23 to 28, but faculty picked up, I think, an additional three of those five positions. There are more faculty on that committee than any other single group. Faculty have maintained the majority on the search committee and so far it’s been a very good committee. We’ve been working well together and been working well with the Board of Trustees. That’s the main issue that’s going on with the board. Any questions?

B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report

J. Novak: VII. letter B., did we skip that?

A. Rosenbaum: No, oh yes, I did skip that. Thank you. My mistake. The Student Association, James Zanayed is the speaker replacing Austin Quick who many of you may remember, but he is not here today so Mike Theodore is going to give the Student Association report. Mike.

M. Theodore: Thank you very much. Like you said, James Zanayed is taking over for Austin. He is looking forward to working with the faculty on many issues. Unfortunately, he wasn’t able to make it today. If you’d like to talk to him about any issues, you’re welcome to contact his office to set up an appointment to meet with him and talk to him about any issues you’d like to. He wanted me to highlight today several things, a few of the several things we’re working on.

One of the things he’s been taking a special look at has been an amnesty policy. This is not only with NIU but with the surrounding area for amnesty relating to calling in a particular crime. This is to urge more people to contact things. We’ve already been talking with the DeKalb Police Department about several initiatives to try to get people to call the police or call the paramedics if there is an incident. One thing that is going to be implemented soon is an anonymous sort of text alert system that you are able to text into the DeKalb Police Department and alert them of crimes. This is one of the things that we are looking into to make sure that the student body is able to contact DeKalb police and NIU police about crimes without worrying about implicating themselves in the thing. With the amnesty policy, not only are we working with the DeKalb Police Department, but we’re backed by several other institutions.

Away from policies there are several other opportunities we’ve been looking at to try to further engage the student body. Going off of the Orange Bowl we’ve taken a much more introspective
approach right now. We’re looking at the other teams such as the basketball team, where there seems to be a very low attendance at the games. At our last meeting we formed a committee to try to increase student attendance at these games because, as much as we have success with the football team, our athletics won’t be able to move forward unless we have massive student attendance at all our game events.

That’s one of the things we’re looking into this semester and as far as that, we’re also looking to increase student involvement when it comes to voter turnout. In nine weeks we’ll be having our executive elections and we’re hoping to slow down the steady decrease in voter turnout we’ve had, try to increase it a bit. Get students more actively engaged in the process of governance at the university and just more involved with these issues. With that, that’s all I have right now.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Mike regarding Student Association?

M. Theodore: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Sorry I left you out there.

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

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

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

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – report – Page 10

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, reports from the committees. Our first report is from Brad Cripe, chair of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, and Brad is bringing forward something that has been in the works for quite some time. And we’ve had a lot of difficulty getting adequate data on this and so we are excited that Brad is brining this forward. Brad.

B. Cripe: Thanks, Alan. Perhaps the only additional difficulty that we might have is actually reading the report given the font size that I chose; my attempt at being environmentally friendly. The committee was charged a while back with an analysis of the ratio of faculty to administration here at NIU currently. We were charged with figuring out how that ratio has changed over time and we were also charged with figuring out how that ratio compares with other universities that we are either geographically or somehow or other affiliated with in some way.

What you see before you is data from the U.S. Department of Education through a yearly report that universities are required to file with them. I think it important as you look at this data to rely
less upon the individual categories that you might see and look more at the total columns given
that some universities report their faculty on different line items than other universities do.

If we look at the NIU column in the first table, you’ll see that NIU reported that in total it has
1,180 faculty engaged in instruction, research and public service in some capacity as of
November 1, 2011. At the same time, it’s reported 344 executive, administrative or managerial
positions and 982 positions that it deemed other professional. Now these categories do not have
any definitions associated with them so it’s up to the university to determine where its faculty
and its administration fit here. So that’s why if you go across columns, you’ll see that Miami of
Ohio for example apparently has no faculty engaged in research which we know is not true. So
we have to be careful, again, to look at totals and not to look at individual classification columns.

The last two rows of each table give you the ratio of faculty to total administration, so for every
one executive or professional body on campus, NIU, as of November 1, 2011, had approximately
.88 faculty members. And if you’re looking at strictly what NIU would define as an executive or
administrative or managerial position, one of those, as of November 1, NIU has 3.43 faculty. The
committee computed this for all major Illinois universities and all universities in the MAC to
give you an idea as of November 1 where we sit with respect to our peers.

Then I went back to 2005. I chose a year that was as far back as possible where the data looked
like it was reported the same. In 2004 the data reported differently so I was trying to find a year
that had some validity while also going back as far as I could. What you’ll see if you look at
2005 is that NIU has remained relatively constant in this ratio of faculty to administrators, while
virtually every other university that I looked at, or that the committee looked at, increased its
faculty ratio instead. We were charged with determining the ratio of faculty to administrators. I
think you see that. Depending on how you define administrator, it’s between somewhere
between 1 to .88 to 1 to 3.43 administrators to faculty. Then you see the change there and you
see it across different institutions.

The committee is not bringing forward any resolution, it’s merely providing you with this
information and I open it up to you for any questions that you might have. Just like class.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Nobody has any questions about this? We’ve been waiting for this data
for ten years. Okay one of the things that’s interesting: You all may remember the Raise Equity
Committee that was established by President Peters and some of the data from that is supported
by this. In other words, I think (Charles can correct me or George if I’m misspeaking) but I
believe the ratio that that committee came up with was very similar. I think a one to one ratio of
faculty to administrators. Is that correct? Yes. This is a little bit lower than that, but still the
committee, it’s not very far off.

Anyone have any other thoughts about this. You can digest this and think about it. We don’t
have to necessarily take any action or pass any motions. The committee is not bringing anything
forward but, as you think about this and talk about it, if that’s what you chose to do, and we
decide at some later point that we want to ask other questions or do something else, we have that
option available to us.
Thank you, Brad. We appreciate finally actually seeing this data. It’s apparently very hard data to get for reasons that he’s pointing out that the way you define administrators, the way you define faculty, has a lot to do with what the results of this analysis look like. People are clearly defining faculty and administrators in very different ways. It makes it a little bit difficult to compare across universities or even to know what it means in our own university. For example, we know we have lots of support personnel in this university, how many of those are designated as administrators in a way that we would want them designated, is not 100 percent clear. There may be people in this figure that we shouldn’t be putting in or there may be others that we should put in that we have not. It’s a little complicated.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Charles we have no report?

C. Cappell: No report.

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay Debra, is Debra here? Debra nothing?

D. Zahay-Blatz: No

D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Ibrahim? He was here. Okay I don’t think we have a report anyway.

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Page 11

A. Rosenbaum: Resources, Space and Budgets, Jim?

J. Wilson: Yes, a few items. As you can see on page 11, our meeting from December 7, we did not meet this last January, a couple of weeks ago as January. A summary of our meeting is enclosed. Highlights are: We discussed some of the positive things that were going on with campus safety, details are below. We also discussed the process for building the university budget set forth priorities and we’re starting to process in the next week or two. Dr. Williams did provide us an update on the budget at that time and still going on.

The pension reform is still very uncertain. We have received all our funds for the previous year; nothing so far for this year. No MAP funds have also been forthcoming. One of the pension proposals calls for the university to be more responsible for pension payments. This cause is moot as there is no money, it would mean an internal re-allocation. Those were some of the highlights from that meeting.

Today the RSB Committee did meet with the president and provost about an hour before this meeting. I was not able to attend, but some of the agenda items are as follows: How are the funds generated for the Orange Bowl to be distributed, got some of that earlier today; update on how the $160 million from the True North campaign was or is being spent; status on staffing levels
for Civil Service, SPS and faculty; and after the Blue Ribbon Committee [on Workload Policy] completed its work what changes, if any, have been implemented; what is the current position on enrollment numbers and how are facility upgrades progressing; what is our financial status and what is the outlook; and finally, is there any budget in the works presently being used for the late night ride. Again, I don’t have the upshot of all this and I will be able to present this at our next Faculty Senate meeting. That’s all.

A. Rosenbaum: Now I had heard that the university is kind of bracing for some negative budgetary news. Did they mention any of that? Were they sort of optimistic or pessimistic about the monies going forward?

J. Wilson: We didn’t have a meeting this January so I don’t have the most recent information.

A. Rosenbaum: So they didn’t say anything about it today?

J. Wilson: No, I wasn’t there. I was at class.

A. Rosenbaum: Oh, you weren’t there. Yes, someone in the back? I can’t see who.

G. Sirotkin: I just came from that meeting and I think the projected, they asked to reduce the budget, the state budget by 4.6 percent which drops it under $90 million. That’s what they ask us to prepare.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and did they mention, my understanding of that is that there’s usually a lot of change, that that’s where they start but then there’s negotiation back and forth?

G. Sirotkin: Yes, yes it is just some kind of projectiion and development. It’s not something final.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions since we have someone who was at the meeting? James?

G. Sirotkin: I can update on the old money for 2012 we received from the state and there was one payment for 2013 of $9.3 million.

A. Rosenbaum: From this year’s budget?

G. Sirotkin: Yes, from 2013 and all fall MAP money was received.

A. Rosenbaum: Good, okay, thank you. One issue that we need to think about in Resources, Space and Budgets, I think, would be the vehicle to do this. Last year and the year before that we did have raises. There are obviously not any raises in the works this year and so the question becomes how long faculty and staff will go without raises and whether or not we want to sort of make an argument or push for the inclusion of a raise going forward. One of the things that I was told was that, if we expect to have raises next year, that we have to sort of put the process in motion this year so that the president needs to begin setting aside money or the chief financial officer needs to begin setting aside money that will be able to be used for raises for next year. So we might want to think about pushing for that. I know that when we’re hearing all this negative
news and four percent budget cuts, the natural response is to say: Well, I guess there’s not going to be any raises. But I think if we just do that then the chances of getting raises are never going to be high. We might want to talk about whether we want to push a little bit and suggest that the administration consider that if employees have not had any raises this year that next year a raise might be in order. We can perhaps raise that with our Resources, Space and Budgets Committee and they can raise it with the president and the chief financial officer. Anything else? Okay, thank you.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Executive Secretary of University Council and President of Faculty Senate – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 and NIU Bylaws, Article 13.6.3.10 – Pages 12-13

A. Rosenbaum: Next, Therese Arado is our chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight and we have some business to take care of. Therese.

T. Arado: Thank you. We have to select the Committee for the Evaluation of the Executive Secretary of the University Council and President of Faculty Senate. In order to do that, I need to pull names from three different groups of people. I will pull two names from faculty members of the University Council and one alternate. I’ll mix them up as I pull them out. Sean Farrell, Department of History is one. Cecil Smith, Leadership Education – I’m hearing roars of excitement behind me. Those are the two and I’ll pull the alternate from the University Council group. The alternate is Melissa Lenczewski from Geology.

All right I’m going to do the same process from the Faculty Senate members who are not in University Council. Gleb Sirotkin, Department of Mathematics. Timothy Ryan, Department of English. And this is the alternate, Vicki Collins, Department of Education Technology.

This is the student member from University Council, Michael Theodore, Student Association. And then the alternate, Cara Prock. That would be the Committee for Evaluation of Executive Secretary.

2. Selection of a committee for the evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 and NIU Bylaws, Article 13.6.3.10 – Pages 12-13

T. Arado: The other point of business we have is to select an evaluation committee for the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. This one I’m going to draw three names from the senate and one alternate. Okay, we get to double dip today, Melissa Lenczewski, Department of Geology.

A. Rosenbaum: We should probably not use the same person on two committees so why don’t we exclude her.

T. Arado: So can I just keep that one aside?

A. Rosenbaum: I would do that.
T. Arado: Do we have to take a vote on that or anything.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t think we have to take a vote on that.

T. Arado: All right, so our first name, Brad Sagarin from Department of Psychology.

A. Rosenbaum: Brad was a lucky winner last year also.

T. Arado: Abhijit Gupta, Mechanical Engineering. Okay, I’m really pulling out good names, I’ve got Cecil Smith again so I’ll put that one aside. William Pitney, Department of Kinesiology. Those are the three names and this one will be an alternate unless I pull another duplicate. Mary Elaine Koren is the alternate.

A. Rosenbaum: Congratulations to all the lucky winners.

T. Arado: That’s the end of my business.

A. Rosenbaum: Are you done?

T. Arado: That’s all.

A. Rosenbaum: Those of you who were just drawn to be on a committee, Pat will keep you informed, the materials that you want, if there is anything you want like in terms of what was done last year or previous years, if you want something sent out to the faculty or the senate or whatever. Pat is the person to talk to about that and she will help you do whatever it is that you have to do and arrange meetings and whatever it is that you need.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. President Peters’ response to the Raise Equity Committee report and recommendations – Pages 14-16

A. Rosenbaum: The last item on our agenda is President Peters’ response to the Raise Equity Committee report and recommendations. Just a very short piece of history, you’ll remember that this committee was put together by the president to really address the question raised by the Faculty Senate and this had to do with the way raises were done and whether they were done in an equitable fashion and whether there were certain divisions in the university, administrators, finance, facilities and operations that might be getting better raises than the faculty or other groups. So that committee did its business over the course of two years, it was a very long arduous process. George Slotsve was on that, Charles Cappell was on that committee, Rosemary Feurer was on that committee, it was quite an ordeal. At any rate, last year they finally were able to produce the report and the recommendations; and again, the recommendations were not universally supported, but it was the set of recommendations that the committee was able to agree on. We have put those in your folder. So you can see the recommendation of that committee and those are on page 16.
Then we kept after, or I did, kept after President Peters to give us a response to the recommendations that were made by the committee. You have the large part of his response is on pages 14 and 15 and you can see I just received this on January 14.

I have since that point had some negotiations with President Peters and he has agreed to the main recommendation that was made by that committee, namely, number 4 which was that the president provide a research assistant to the Faculty Senate for the purposes of developing standardized reports, collecting data, etc. etc. President Peters has now agreed to provide the University Council, the executive secretary is the way he put it, with a graduate student that will give us 20 hours and that time can be used at the discretion of the executive secretary. But what I have talked to people on the Steering Committee [Executive Committee] about and what I would propose to do, is to make that research assistant available to the chairs of the committees. As you know, many of our committees have to do a great deal of leg work. They have to look up material, they have to do research. Some of the committees are doing calculations or statistics. This will now be a person that can serve the chairs of the committees in the senate and in the University Council to do some of that work.

I am appreciative to President Peters for respecting the recommendations of the committee and for providing us with this graduate assistant that we had requested in our recommendations. I think that is a positive development. We also know, and President Peters alludes to that, that the university is now required to make a great deal more information available to public databases. The IBHE, for example, gets a great deal of data that is of interest or would have been of interest to our Raise Equity Committee. A lot more data regarding raises and salaries is available online. Unfortunately, when the committee did its work, that was not available online and a new database had to be created and we could not get the working papers in electronic form. But now it’s possible that a lot more of that is available. That is the president’s response and I’ll open the floor to any questions or comments about the President’s response. No questions? Okay. Yes, George?

**G. Slotsve:** I just wanted to, I’ll just ask you, to thank President Peters for at least making the RA available. I know with a number of the people that have chaired different committees on the Faculty Senate, hopefully this does pull some work off of them. It’s just been, as Alan was saying, a lot of leg work and hopefully this makes a difference to people serving on the committees and trying to get things done is a more timely fashion. Please thank President Peters for doing that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I have and I will again. This will be very nice. We’ve not had a research person, a graduate assistant, in recent memory. I think there might have been one many years ago because we had a desk for this person in the University Council office. So at some point they might have had this position. I think, right Pat? But we have not had that person for quite some time and this will, I think, again enable the committees to do things that they might not have been able to or at least not been able to do very easily in the past. Charles?

**C. Cappell:** These recommendations were pretty mild. As we formulated them on the senate side, we formulated them in a way that would get the approval of the bigger ad hoc advisory committee. We do appreciate the research assistant. This was a big request so that we could develop our more informative, evidence-based set of data that we use in these deliberations.
However, there were some other recommendations that were discussed at the Faculty Senate that were pulled off of this formal recommendation that went to the fuller committee and they largely pertained to the quality of data management here at NIU. That the difficulty that we encountered in getting a set of information was attributed to the lack of technical capability, differential databases, etc. That was a deeper problem that we felt the administration was not really able to respond to the evidence and information needs of the faculty at this university. We ran into a similar problem in my Academic Affairs Committee when we requested grade distributions so that we could analyze the current basis of grade distributions as we deliberated changing to a plus/minus system and we encountered a difficulty there. So while I am appreciative of the fact that some progress was made, there are still issues that I think as a faculty member the administration needs to address.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments?

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Any comments or questions from the floor? Any issues that people want to raise for Faculty Senate consideration?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Graduate Council
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

??? –

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, all in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we’ll see you next month. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.