

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Dawson, Haliczer, Klapers, Latham, LeFlore, Sunderlin, Tollerud

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Welcome. We have a guest today so we’ll try to get started and get through the first few formal items and then you’ll have our guest speaker.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first thing is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. The first one is under VII. A. and that is the FAC to the IBHE report, Sonya Armstrong’s report. Sonya, you’re here, right? You’re not going to speak or you are? You can, okay? So that’s the first walk-in. The second one is under VIII. F. Now that one looks very similar to the list that is already in your agenda. This is the list of University Council members that are eligible for election as Executive Secretary of the University Council. The difference between the one that is in your folder and the one that is the walk-in is the walk-in has the results of the most recent election. So the people with asterisks at the time the agenda was sent out, we did not know who was going to be elected. Those people have now been elected so they are back on the list. The walk-in list is pretty much the same except there are no asterisks next to it, I believe. I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the two walk-in items.

D. LeFlore: So move.

A. Rosenbaum: Novak; second?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Second.
A. Rosenbaum: Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? The agenda is adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 23, 2013 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the approval of the minutes of the January 3 Faculty Senate Meeting which was distributed. I need a motion to adopt the minutes.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: So move.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

R. Lopez: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any changes, deletions, additions, corrections? They were shorter this time weren’t they? Did you notice that? Very short minutes. I told you that my new year’s resolution was to shorten the minutes so this was the first attempt anyway. I’m glad you like them. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Senators: Aye.

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

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Open Access Publishing and NIU Institutional Repository – Patrick Dawson, Dean, University Libraries

A. Rosenbaum: You may recall that in the fall term we began speaking about the issue of open access publishing and that is something that is being considered at many universities. It’s a timely topic. We have had some developments. Our Academic Affairs Committee is looking into it and they don’t have their report just yet, but there have been some interesting developments at NIU and I have invited Patrick Dawson, dean of the libraries, to tell us a little bit about what’s going on and I thought this was information that might be interesting. This is going on irrespective of what we decide in our committee and based on the results of our committee. Patrick.

P. Dawson: Thank you very much, Alan. I thank you for putting me on the agenda and I want to thank all of you for taking time to listen to me. This setup makes me feel like I’m being interviewed. As I want to bring to your attention a couple of issues that are happening at the same time. One is a question of open access, which I’m sure all of you, if you are reading the
literature that’s going on, you’re aware of. And the other is the issue of institutional repositories. It’s where do we put everything that’s born digital and converted digital rather than housing it in separate silos all across campuses. We need to create a central repository for it where it can be made accessible and preserved.

A couple questions, first is: Why open access in the first place? The mode of scholarly communication, as it exists right now, comes from the last two centuries and it’s very restrictive when it comes to scholarly communication. In the December 3, 2012 Chronicle of Higher Education, there was an article about Jack Andraka. He’s 15 years old and what he did was he created a test for pancreatic cancer that works 168 times faster and is 400 times accurate than the previous existing tests that were there. How did he do this? He did this by finding all the information he needed through open access publications. He didn’t have a subscription to the Journal of the American Medical Association. He didn’t have a subscription to Science. He didn’t have access to a university library. He did this by himself on the internet using open access publications.

To dispel a problem and a myth right now, open access is not doing a Google search. Open access are reputable journals. They are refereed that simply have a different publication format than the standard one. When you look at the publication format the way that it exists now, other than the federal government, academia is the only body I know that creates a product, gives it back, and gives it away and then buys it back. You create the research, you give it away to the publishers for publication, and then the university, itself, has to buy it back through the journals that we subscribe to which is kind of a nonsensical, broken model if you think about it.

For that reason, one of the things that are coming forward is to look more and more at open access publications. The other thing, too, is the cost of journals as they exist now. Granted there are upfront costs in journals, but when you think about it, how many of you guys serve on review boards? How many of you guys serve on journal boards? How many of you do review of articles? Do you get a penny? No, you don’t get paid for this. All of this is your free labor that’s being capitalized on by the publishers who produce the work. So you’re doing all the editing, you’re doing all the reviewing. You’re deciding whether it’s scholarly or not and then they are publishing it and they’re reaping the rewards. It doesn’t make a lot of sense. I wasn’t a business major though so I can’t say. When you think about it, too, when you think of some of the major multi-national publishers, Elsevier Scientific which owns about 98 percent of everything that’s published in the realm of science right now. The amount of money that was made by the chief of Elsevier in one year was, his salary was $10 million. So if one person is making that money, you know that the whole company is making a hell of a lot of money off of the labor of you people.

It’s a system that can’t keep going on and on and on because, when you think about it too, you look at the fact that only about 20 percent of funding for NIU comes from the state of Illinois. The rest of it comes from grants, from contracts and from tuition. Yet, on the other hand, in the library itself, we have had a flat budget since 2001. But at the same time, serials’ inflation every year is anywhere from eight to 24 percent. Every year serial publishers say: Okay, yea, you can have access to our content again, but this year we’re going to charge you 16 percent higher than we did last year. We’re not able to negotiate in that because they pretty much have the monopoly on what we are buying.
Open access is a way to be able to break that cycle. Now, open access is scholarly material. There is the Open Access Scholarly Publicists Association and also the Journals of the Directory of Open Access Journals. All of these, what they do is, they are peer-reviewed journals that are academic in nature. Now it’s going to be up to each department’s P&T committees to decide whether or not they are going to accept something that’s open access. Open access doesn’t mean that you simply put something up on your computer and, if you do a Google search, you’re going to run across it. That is not what we’re talking about when we’re talking about open access publication. We’re talking about refereed scholarly journals that have research component to them. It’s just a different means of publication rather than the one that we’re used to, which is paper. Again in the open access world you guys are going to be doing the reviewing. You guys are going to do the editing. You guys are going to decide what gets to be published or not. It’s the same thing. It works a little differently.

The big thing that works differently in open access publishing though is there is no publisher to absorb the costs, the upfront costs, of producing something. If you say, you write something and you send it off to Sage and they accept it and it goes through the whole process and everything, you really don’t get any money for the journal article that you wrote, but Sage makes money off of it, but they’ve covered everything. Now if you wanted to publish in an open access journal, your upfront costs would be anywhere from $500 to $2000.

That’s the stick. Here’s the carrot I’m offering. What we want to do in the library is to establish an open access publishing fund and we’ll pay up to $2000 per article for you guys to publish in open access. It has to be, here’s the caveat, it has to meet these criteria. The journals that you publish in have to be members of the Open Access Scholarly Publication Association, the OASPA. And the journals have to be listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals. What we will do in the library, if you send us the publisher’s name and the fact that you’ve been accepted and that it is going to be published and it meets the criteria, we’ll determine whether it meets the criteria. Then we’ll release the money for you to be able to pay to have your journal published. Either we’ll give it to you or we’ll just do a money transfer to the publisher, the open access publisher, to cover it.

Other thing, too, is we make sure that you retain your distribution rights, do not give away your copyright or your distribution rights, hang on to them because we also want you to park that in our institutional repository so that in an institution repository – once you have it parked there and you have your copyright and your distributions rights – you can get scraped by Google Scholar and your citation rate will go through the roof. It’s going to be much higher than it is through either Science Citation Index or Social Sciences Citation Index or Arts and Humanities Citation Index. Now that mechanism isn’t there for your P&T program committees yet to deal with either. All of this it’s going to be a major change in academia that’s being led in publication because of the technology that exists now. That’s what basically I want to bring up with you.

Now as Alan mentioned, there are things that are going on that are pushing open access that are outside of academia. The National Science Foundation has required that data that is generated from any funded, NSF-funded, research has to be made public. We have to have somewhere to park that data so it can be made public. That’s one of the purposes we have in creating an
institutional repository. The data sets have to be put somewhere. Data has to be there because to qualify for NSF funding, and other federal funding agencies are following suit, you have to have your data accessible to the public. They figure if the tax payers pay for your research, tax payers should see what your research garnered.

The other thing is, I never make a habit, I’m not a political junkie, but anything that affects libraries, I follow. Now in the Illinois General Assembly, on the 15th of this month in the senate, Senate Bill 1900 was introduced and the name of the bill is The Higher Ed Open Access Research bill. What this would do is it would create an open access research articles act. Granted, this hasn’t been given to committee yet anywhere in the legislature and there’s no telling if it will get traction or not or go anywhere because it’s going to get huge push back from publishers and it’s going to be an unfunded mandate. So, if it goes anywhere, I’m not sure.

Basically what it says is that anything that is produced, any journal article that is produced in any public-funded institution of higher education in the state of Illinois, has to be open access and it has to be parked in an institutional repository. And they’re asking that the copyright be made a public domain, so you lose copyright so that’s not a good deal. There are a lot of problems with this bill, but the point is that politicians are getting involved in publication and in scholarly communication and that muddles things up a little bit.

What I’m trying to do here and what we are offering for you, the faculty, is a means to be able to continue to do your research and to be published in recognized means, recognized scholarly journals that are open access in nature. We will do this by offering you a carrot to help you do this and it will save us money in the long run because we’re not going to be having to pay, let’s see, I think that we just paid about $17,000 for a subscription to Science. Most journals that are in the heavy sciences run anywhere from $17,000 a year to $28,000 a year. However, if you’re a member of the Institute of American Scientists and pay your dues, you get access. If you’re a university, you pay $17,000. That’s a very huge inequity in the pricing for scholarly communication as well.

I didn’t want to take too much of your time because there is a whole bunch of information behind this, but I just wanted to make this available to you and let you know about it. I had asked Alan if he would be able to advertise this to the teaching faculty and instructors that this is going to be available. If you’re interested in it, my name is Patrick Dawson. I’m in the directory, contact me and we’ll talk about how we can go about making sure that you can meet the criteria for publishing in an open access journal and then we will see about covering your upfront costs.

I’m doing this as a pilot project. What I did was I cut money out of salary savings to be able to cover this but, if it’s successful, what I’m hoping is that the provost will take it over in the Provost’s Office and it will continue along that way. But, to be able to do that, you have to show your success rate first. Please do let your colleagues know that this is available. Please do be aware of the fact that scholarly communication is changing, that it is actually more restrictive now the way its set up than it should be. It’s not the free flow of information, it’s pretty restrictive because of subscriptions and that politicians are getting involved in the publication which affects promotion and tenure as well. All of these things are happening at the same time.
I’m sure you might have questions. I don’t want to take much of your time, so if you do have questions, you can e-mail me or, if it’s just a quick question, I can try to answer you. Yes, please.

**G. Slotsve:** Just two quick things. One: You mentioned $500 to $2000. Was that a submission fee or a publication fee?

**P. Dawson:** It’s the whole thing, submission and publication.

**G. Slotsve:** So you were saying upon publication so that if you submit it…

**P. Dawson:** No, no, no if it’s accepted.

**G. Slotsve:** Upon acceptance. So that we’re still taking the risk then you submit somewhere we pay out of our pocket $500.

**A. Rosenbaum:** There is no submission fee, I don’t think. It’s just if they accept it, there’s a publication fee.

**P. Dawson:** Right.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So you can submit for free.

**G. Slotsve:** You can submit for free. That’s what I wanted to double check.

**P. Dawson:** I’m sorry, I was muddling you up there.

**G. Slotsve:** The second thing: I just wanted to know, this is just in a broad sense of what’s going on here. It’s not that I’m against open access publishing, but this is also, in the long run, doing a cost shift. What this is going to do is put back on the faculty member a financial burden to have your work put out. That if it is accepted, you’re going to be looking at $500 or $2000. It will save the university money but it goes back to the faculty and starts coming out of our pocket again.

**P. Dawson:** Unless the university is willing to cover it.

**G. Slotsve:** Exactly. And so, in the long run, we’ll probably have to look at the university trying to cover fully.

**P. Dawson:** Correct, yep. Yes, sir?

**H. Bateni:** Thank you. I have a couple of questions. The first one is: I heard of these open access journals and I am very much keen to know more about it. Is there any way of assessment of quality of these journals like the impact factor that we have on other journals and would that information be available? That would be my first question. The second question: You mentioned that once we want to submit something to a journal, it’s better to contact the library to see if that journal has a good quality to be supported by the university. Is there any chance that the library
provides a list of all these journals so by the time of submission, we know what journal we should go to? Thanks.

**P. Dawson:** Sure, and for your first question, if you’ll e-mail me I’ll be able to send you what information I can on that.

**H. Bateni:** Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Brad.

**B. Sagarin:** I appreciate the library getting ahead of this. I think it is a very important issue. I also have two brief questions. The first of which was: For the university to start saving money on this, which you discussed, it would mean dropping subscriptions to the current set of pay journals. I know that, in my field of psychology, there certainly are a number of Elsevier journals, American Psychological Association journals and so on that are very expensive for the university. But it seems that it’s going to be a while before those journals become obsolete.

**P. Dawson:** No, we wouldn’t. This would not be a carte blanche for us to cancel subscriptions to things that are necessary for teaching and research.

**B. Sagarin:** So then it sounds like the library is taking a pretty long-term view on at the point where this might start saving the university money.

**P. Dawson:** Yes, oh yeah. We’re talking about academia, we’re talking about decades.

**B. Sagarin:** And then my second is: Do the criteria that the library has set up – in terms of which journals we would help with the cost for – do those distinguish the kind of true legitimate open access journals from the scam journals that we are starting to see now?

**P. Dawson:** Yes and the scam journals there are plenty of those that are out. Yes, they do and that’s a good point. I’ll put on our library website a list the journals that are recognized in the Directory of Open Access Journals.

**B. Pitney:** I would just like to make a comment. I think it’s important to note that not all open access journals are paid to publish. There are some that do have that fee associated with that and I think those journals intend to be very above board, very professional, very scholarly, with excellent rigor. So I think that is a very important comment to make.

**P. Dawson:** The discipline of mathematics and the discipline of physics have really gotten into that and there is no upfront fee in mathematics and in physics and they’ve been working on open access for a lot longer than any other disciplines have.

**M C. Smith:** I just want to follow up on Bill’s comments because I edited an open access journal, high quality and good deal of rigor. And there are no costs involved through a professional association. We’re moving to a different platform from what we’ve been using in
the past but I’m very interested in the exploring the possibility in publishing a journal through a repository if that would be possible. I’ll follow up with you.

**P. Dawson:** Yeah, please do because we’re – the history undergraduates are launching an undergraduate journal, open access and they are doing it through us and the library using our platform for that. We would be happy to become a publisher.

**M C. Smith:** I’ll talk to you. Thanks.

**T. Arado:** With all of the organizations and groups that are supporting the open access, is anybody working on a commitment to preservation and archiving this material?

**P. Dawson:** Yes, there are various means. The Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, which is close to us, they verify as trustworthy depositories for born digital material. There is something called Portico that is a repository that we belong to. Mostly the journals that charge upfront are going to be your hybrid journals. They are not a hundred percent open access. They are going to be a journal that still is in print but they are moving to open access online as well so they still have the print to support but they are not going to take away the profits from their shareholders either, so that’s why they’re charging upfront. I just lost my train of thought right there. Where was I going with that? Oh, archiving, thank you. There’s Portico, which we belong to and that’s if a hybrid journal should suddenly disappear and one of the sage journals did that. It was a hundred percent online journal and they ceased publication of it. They did not have any of the back issues of it, but it’s in Portico so we do have access to it that way. There’s a Hathi Trust which is done by CIC, Big Ten and the University of California and others and it’s a trusted digital repository. The Seven Sisters have a digital repository. So there is various digital repositories that are available throughout the nation.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Any other questions? This repository that we’re starting here, is that already underway?

**P. Dawson:** Yes, it’s called Huskie Commons. You can get it, its www dot, is it Huskie Commons or common? Its dot lib commons dot edu I think or else do a search on the NIU homepage for Huskie Commons and it will take you right to the URL.

**A. Rosenbaum:** If you send us the actual thing we can get it into the minutes and also on the website.

**P. Dawson:** You will be interested to know that all of the dissertations that have been submitted; all dissertation and theses are submitted digitally now and all of those are reposing in Huskie Commons already. We are in the process of digitizing the old print dissertations and theses so they’re going to be available online as well and quite a few departments are starting, some individuals are starting to submit. Drew VandeCreek is spearheading this for the library, so you can contact Drew on that, too, if you want to deposit anything into the commons.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, no other questions? Thank you very much for coming.
P. Dawson: Thank you very much for your time.

A. Rosenbaum: If we get any more questions, we’ll forward them along.

P. Dawson: Okay, thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: It’s refreshing to hear that the legislature is starting to get involved in this kind of activity isn’t it? We really owe them a lot. All right, I’m delighted. Okay and we are going to be hearing more about this, Charles’ committee is going to have a report for us pretty soon, I think, Charles?

Charles: We’re hoping.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and clearly there are a lot of things going on here so it’s important for us to sort of be aware of what’s going on and we ignore it at our own peril. So I’m glad we’re getting up to speed on some of this and it’s also nice to know that there’s some money being put aside so we can defer some of these costs as well.

Okay, let me give you a quick update on the presidential search. Where we are right now, the deadline for applications was Friday, so that deadline has passed. At the moment, I don’t know if there may be people that have gotten their stuff in before the deadline that haven’t been posted to our website yet, the website that we have that only search committee members can get to, but as of this morning, there were 44 completed applications. So we have quite a nice pool of applications.

The next step is that the search committee will be meeting this Friday. This Friday we will be getting the list of recommendations from the search firm. They apparently go through all of these applications and give us an idea of which ones they feel deserve the most attention. We can go through all of them, ourselves. We don’t have to just be restricted to who they feel is a good candidate, but they will sort of try and give us an idea of who they think would be a good choice for us. We will also be finalizing the interview questions. On March 1, we are going to be meeting to decide on who to bring to the airport interviews and those airport interviews are going to take place on the 7th and 8th of March. And the expectation is that, following the interviews, we will have our short list to present to the Board of Trustees on March 8.

At that point, it’s up to the Board of Trustees how to proceed. I should tell you that there seems to be some sentiment, especially coming from the search firm, that those interviews be conducted in a confidential manner and, therefore, it is not clear that there will be on-campus interviews that are open to anyone who wants to come to them. It is not clear at this point that that will happen and I would say the likelihood is that we will not have open fora as we did when President Peters was hired. Part of this, it seems to me, is a function of the fact that we are a public university subject to the open meetings act. But part of it is due to the fact that people do not want to be identified and, if they come to the campus, their names will become public. And, if you’re a sitting president or perhaps a provost at another university, you might not want your university to know that you were a finalist or that you were an applicant even for presidency at another place. The tendency now seems to be to argue in favor of a more private way of vetting
candidates. So that doesn’t mean that they’re not going to do it, I’m just telling you that I don’t think that’s likely to happen. At any rate, that’s the schedule. Any questions that I can answer about the search committee or the search? Anyone have anything you’d like to know about? Okay, good.

We had a question from Ibrahim about the tuition waiver situation. Some of you may have gotten wind of this tuition waiver issue. Yes, nodding. Okay, well it was a little unclear exactly what is going on with tuition waivers so I asked to meet with Brad Bond to try and get some clarification. It’s a rather complex issue. I’m not going to take a ton of time, but I would like to bring you up to speed a little bit on this so that we have a better idea of what’s going on.

First of all, most of what I’m going to say has to do with graduate tuition waivers, but I did want you to know that, according to Brad, we give quite a large number of undergraduate tuition waivers and those are capped legally by the state at three percent of tuition billed. Universities, I heard that Western for example, exceeded that by a little bit and was fined in some way by the state. They are very careful about how many of those tuition waivers we can give.

We give quite a few graduate tuition waivers and, in fact, 55 percent of all graduate tuition is waived at this university. So that’s quite a lot of graduate tuition. It’s starting to get some scrutiny. You may remember last year the legislature was a little bit up in arms because they each had tuition waivers that they could give out to constituents and they lost those tuition waivers. And, when they lost their tuition waivers, they began looking at everyone else’s tuition waivers and so now we’re getting scrutinized. The state government is scrutinizing us and we have actually put together a committee here on campus to look into graduate student stipends and tuition waivers. More about that later, but not much more.

Okay. Brad also tells me that, in the past few years, we’ve seen a very large increase in the number of tuition waivers that are requested and that are given. The amount of tuition waivers that we are giving out has been increasing dramatically. There are two types of tuition waivers that we give out. The first type are called mandatory tuition waivers and I don’t know if those are the only two examples, but those are two examples of what these are. Anyone who is a ward of the state, such as like an orphan or somebody whose parental rights have been terminated – whose parents’ parental rights have been terminated – wards of the state and veterans, we have mandatory tuition waivers. This is an unfunded mandate. We are simply told that we can’t charge them tuition. The state does not reimburse us for their tuition. We give out quite a number of veteran tuition waivers. I don’t know many wards of the state, but we give out quite a number of veteran tuition waivers.

The second group are called discretionary tuition waivers and there are two types: group 1 and group 2. They don’t call them group 1 and group 2. I put them into group 1 and group 2 for ease of talking about them with you. Group 1 are tuition waivers that are most common and they are not being changed at this time. So those tuition waivers are staying the same. No changes have been made. Those tuition waivers include, well athletic is mostly undergraduate I think we maybe have one graduate student that has an athletic tuition waiver. Fellowships, international students, the employee waivers. These also are not being touched at the moment even though you’ve all heard stories about how the legislature is sort of going after those or trying to, but so
far they haven’t. And grad assistantships, if you have a grad assistantship, you get a tuition waiver. That’s not being changed so departments that have graduate assistants, your graduate assistantships are not being changed at this point and they are not affected by some of the new rules that were published by the Graduate School last week.

Group 2 is another matter. Group 2 of the discretionary tuition waivers includes the ones that are up there: the recruitment waiver, minority student waiver, artistic talent waivers, McNair and internship and I don’t know if this is a complete list also. There may be other types of tuition waivers that are in this group. This may not be a complete list, but these are examples of the types of things that are in group 2. These are the ones that are currently being scrutinized and these are the ones that are subject to the changes that are being made.

Here are some of the changes. Recruitment waivers previously we worked by headcount. In other words, we have 140 I believe tuition waivers. Now it’s done by dollar amount and we’re capped at $500,000 a year. Minority student waivers and artistic talent also are capped at $500,000 a year. McNair waivers are capped at $100,000 a year. Internship waivers, which does affect some departments, namely departments that are practical, nursing school, it affects us in psychology, I’m sure if it affects some of the education departments, probably some of the departments in health and human sciences as well.

Internship waivers are being phased out and this is going to be a problem because, when we phase out the tuition waivers, our students are then responsible for paying the tuition and so departments are going to have to think about ways of dealing with this. Because in our department, I can’t speak to everyone’s, but I know in our department, our students will not be happy and we will be less attractive to students if they are paying tuition during their internship year. Our department has been thinking of ways that we can possibly circumvent this problem such as reducing the number of credits that people take when they are on internship and things like that. This is being phased out over three years and that’s something that departments that are affected by it I think are going to have to start thinking about it and worrying about.

Those group 2 waivers, the ones that I just had on that list – and again I will put these slides up on Blackboard if anyone wants to see those names again or see those categories again. Group 2 waivers are now going to be assigned through a central application and vetting process. People will make applications or departments will make applications for them and the tuition waivers will be assigned in that way. There will be two deadlines. One will occur in mid-March and the idea of this mid-March deadline is that many schools, many graduate programs have an April 15 notification of students so they wanted to be able to have this done in time that students, when they are notified of an acceptance, could also be notified that they are getting a tuition waiver. So that is the March deadline.

Not every program accepts their students in time to meet the March deadline and, for programs that do not, there will be a second deadline for applications and that second deadline for applications will most likely be in June. Now the date has not been determined, but that will be forthcoming. This could be problematic because, if the deadline is in June, you might not find out that you’ve gotten that tuition waiver for a couple of weeks or so. I don’t know how long that process will take and so it may really slow down the acceptance of students who are not accepted
based on that first round. This is a work in progress, Brad Bond is aware of this and he’s trying to work out the rough spots in this. If departments are having any problems with this, you should probably make sure that Brad is aware of what the issues are so that he can take those into consideration as they are working through these processes.

That’s the application process. There is also a special subcommittee of the Graduate Council that is looking into both graduate student stipends and also tuition waivers. It’s very likely that there are more changes coming for a number of reasons, both internal and external to the university. Once the legislature, of course, gets its teeth into something like tuition waivers, who knows where it’s going to end. We don’t know what the state is going to do. We don’t know what’s going to happen to employee tuition waivers and we don’t know what this internal committee is going to do either. I think that’s the last slide. That’s all I have. Yes.

W. Creamer: You didn’t mention the waivers associated with teaching assistantships.

A. Rosenbaum: Those are grad assistants.

W. Creamer: Those are considered grad assistants? Well, one of the points that affects a few departments, including my own, is the fact that each graduate assistantship will be associated with one waiver and, until now, it has been possible for departments to divide assistantships and yet each student has been able to get a full waiver. So for departments like anthropology where we had eight assistantships assigned and we left one for a head TA at 20 hours and we gave all the rest as ten, but gave a total of 15 assistantships, which means that starting a year from now, we will not be able to do that. For departments that have divided assistantships into increments smaller than 20 hours.

A. Rosenbaum: Are you sure about that? Have you been told that by Brad?

W. Creamer: We just had our TA meeting and we had to cut the number of offers. No, it doesn’t apply for the next year, but we’re admitting students now who we could offer ten hours to in the coming fall but my understanding, we were given this as not an option. That starting in the fall of 2014 we will not be permitted or we have to give out incremental waivers.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, now I haven’t heard that.

W. Creamer: We are acting on that.

A. Rosenbaum: That doesn’t mean it’s not right, it just means that was not one of the things that Brad told me or that I knew to ask him. What he seemed to indicate is that graduate assistants – he didn’t say full-time, he said graduate assistantships – carry tuition waiver. Maybe we need to clarify this particular item with him. It may be a misunderstanding or it may be that it’s accurate and I was not told that. That’s certainly something we should clarify. Yes?

J. Novak: Yes, I’m really surprised that there’s been a large increase in the number of tuition waivers considering every year there’s a budget cut. Where does this money come from and is it totally unrelated or can anybody explain this to me?
**A. Rosenbaum:** My understanding of it is that there is no money exchange, that we’re one of the few universities that does tuition waiver simply by writing off the tuition. It is not a situation where money is sent to departments and money is then sent back to the university. The university simply writes it off. What I’ve been told – and I don’t know this from my own looking into it just from discussing it with different people and with Brad – is that this is a little unusual. At most universities there is sort of an exchange of funds. It’s internal, the same way if you have your office painted we have to send some money to some internal group. But we haven’t done that. It may be that we are coming to the end of that line because, according to Brad, this is also been something that’s been done on the undergraduate level where department chairs can simply give out tuition waivers without having to explain themselves as long as we are under the caps or under the dollar amounts whatever. So it may be that this is just the first volley in what are going to be continuing changes in the way we do tuition waivers, in the numbers of tuition waivers. I can’t say no to that. It sounds like change is afoot. It could possibly, and probably will, get worse than it is right now. I don’t have expertise in all of this. I’ve basically shown you everything that I know about tuition waivers and that just from talking to Brad Bond and trying to get this clarified because I was unclear about it. It seemed like a number of other faculty members were not clear of exactly what’s going on. I thought that perhaps there were more of us that didn’t know what this issue was. This is what I know. Any other questions even though this is what I told you is what I know? Okay.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – Page 4

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, next item, items for Faculty Senate Consideration. We have the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy award. You remember last time we solicited nomination letters. We received none. So we are apparently not giving out a Bob Lane award this year, which is not unusual, we’ve done this in the past. We’ve had years where we have not given out a Bob Lane ward, but that’s the situation. No Bob Lane award.

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next item, reports from our advisory committees. Sonya has given us a report. I don’t know if you want to make any comments, Sonya. I don’t want to push you if you don’t.

**S. Armstrong:** I just want to call attention to the IBHE updates because things are changing, staffing changes. I think those are important for all of us to stay aware of. I’ll have more from the March meeting.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any questions on the report for Sonya?
B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report

A. Rosenbaum: Next, Student Association report. Delonte, are you going to give the report?

D. LeFlore: Good afternoon everyone. A couple of things I wanted to talk about was issues with our bus system. As we all are experiencing from our own areas, that we are experiencing some serious budget constraints. Right now we are looking at the bus system and looking at the mission of the bus and who it is there to serve. Because right now, we’re serving not just the students, but we’re also serving the DeKalb community with our bus system. So we’re trying to reevaluate our purpose for the bus system. Is it strictly for the students to get back and forth from their apartments to the campus or go to Wal-Mart or Schnucks or those types of areas? We’re in the process of working that out and trying to – how do I want to say that – put it within our own budget because, due to the enrollment, our amount of money that we can allocate to busses is continually going down.

Today we met with President Peters and Dr. Williams about student fees as it relates to bond revenue fees and things are looking good with that. Also, we attended the IBHE luncheon with the Student Advisory Committee where we talked about some of the issues or ways to get students involved in the SAC committee from different institutions. And we also talked about ways that we are going to continue to advocate for additional higher education funding as a whole.

Something that I’m most proud of is that elections are coming up this March and I can’t wait to turn over my hat. I yield if there are no questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Delonte? Thank you, Delonte. Wait question, Ibrahim?

I. Abdel-Motaleb: Do you charge the residents of the community money for the bus or is it free?

D. LeFlore: Yes, we do. We do charge them, I don’t know off the top of my head the amount. I think it’s between either 50 cents or $1 for the cost for them. But again, it’s not enough to continue to operate within the community because we don’t get enough ridership from a lot of the DeKalb community as we get for students.

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

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

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

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report

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

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

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

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

1. Report – Pages 5-7

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, anyone else? Moving along, next we have a report from our Resources Space and Budgets Committee. And Jim Wilson is here and I believe Paul is here also. Paul is in the back, so both Paul Carpenter and Jim Wilson. Jim, are you going to give us the report?

J. Wilson: We have two components here in the agenda. One is outlining about eight or so questions we put forth to the president and the provost on a meeting that we held on January 23 and I believe most of those are pretty evident what happened. Some highlights: Point number 3 on page 5 discusses the turnover over the last three years. Thirty percent of the work force has left and approximately 60 percent due to mid-career moves and the remainder was due to retirement. That is point 3. a.

Point 3. c: We discussed some of this in the executive meeting, about that number, if you look at, it might be a little puzzling to some of us, that salary increments have averaged about eight and a half percent between 2011 and 2012. We’re getting clarification on that. That’s an average. Perhaps there is a better way to express that number, maybe a median value of a range would be helpful about that or does it consider the effective raise because, if you recall, part of that raise was negated with a two percent increase in state income tax. We had a two and half percent, I think, in the beginning of 2011 so that’s not clear either.

Point 3. E: The president commented that a 4.6 percent cut was under discussion with the state.

And finally here the financial stat, point number 7: What is our financial status and what is the outlook. All the monies have been paid for fiscal year 2012 from the state. However, fiscal 2013 is outstanding. One payment has been received however along with all the fall MAP funds. For this fiscal year, the state still owes $81 million as of that meeting.

2. Proposed Statement of Budget Priorities – Pages 8-9

J. Wilson: The next part deals with crafting a statement of budget priorities. A lot of this comes from previous meetings with the president and the provost kind of fed into this and we’re kind of shaping the language and we have put it up to the Faculty Senate for opinions and takes on it. So if there are any questions or clarifications or things that may be needed.
A. Rosenbaum: Let me add something about this item. A couple of years ago, I think since I’ve become executive secretary, we’ve been pushing to have more of a say, to have more of a role in many of our university committees. So in many of the committees, the tradition has been that the university reports to us and we report back to the senate, but it’s not a two-way street where we are asked for input from the faculty. And so we’ve been pushing to have these committees serve the functions that they are intended to serve which is playing a role in shared governance. Our role in the budgetary process, the shared governance aspect of that, is through our Resources Space and Budget Committee, which as you know is a joint committee of the senate and the University Council. That’s why we have Jim and also Paul. Paul is the chair of the University Council committee; Jim is our liaison or the defacto chair of our portion of this.

For the last couple of years now, we’ve been giving a statement of priorities, budget priorities, and this is our way of saying: These are the things that the faculty thinks should be focused on or protected or emphasized in the upcoming budget. This is our say. Now we don’t harbor any illusions that the university administration is going to say: Okay we’ll do all of this. But we felt that it’s important that we have a voice and that we express ourselves and we tell them where we think money ought to be focused. That’s what this is. This is the report that we are going to put forward to them this year. This is our statement of budget priorities. We should ask whatever questions and raise whatever issues you would like to raise because, when we are done with this, I want to get a vote so we can send this on to the University Council with the approval of the Faculty Senate. Then at University Council we will get the approval from the council and then send that, again, on to Eddie Williams and President Peters. This is an important issue. If there are things that are not on here that we want emphasized, now is the time to talk to Jim and Paul about it. They have possibly thought about things and have not put them in here for one reason or another so we can have a back and forth discussion on that. So I want to open the floor. Do we like this the way it is? Do we want to add things? Take out things? The floor is open. Yes, Charles.

C. Cappell: Two points: One an omission that it seems that the climate and quality of NIU is exorbitantly linked to the quality of the students and the preparedness. So I would like to see some statement either in the budget or resources clause that says that efforts and resources and money should be made to maintain and increase the quality of undergraduate education and also students able to take advantage of NIU. I open up that point for consideration, emphasizing academic quality.

A. Rosenbaum: In other words putting aside, that money be allocated to increase in the quality of the student body, is that what you are saying?

C. Cappell: Or resources, money yeah, some effort made to address undergraduate quality. The other point I have is under the budget item, it’s the third bullet point, the illusion to alternative pricing methods that might be targeted to individual programs. When I read that, I thought of the Florida governor’s proposal to have tuition based differentially upon the major that a student declares to reflect market factors and it was intuitively the reverse of what you would think that the tuition for the underperforming disciplines in the market would actually be higher to further detour students from majoring in things like art and humanities and literature and the civilizing
disciplines and they would be incentivized to major in the more market-oriented disciplines. This could be a Trojan horse. Just a comment.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m leaving that comment to Jim to address.

J. Wilson: For the second point, I think the intention there was to have some kind of reflection on the cost of actually educating the student in a department and I think what was in people’s minds when we were discussing this is that it costs a little differently to educate a nursing student or maybe an engineering student, a lawyer or a medical student, the cost of education there. But I can certainly see how you might come up with a Trojan horse analogy there, but I think that was the original intent of that but that wording could probably, could lead somebody into the Florida governor’s mindset pretty quickly.

A. Rosenbaum: Let me, I think I sort of went about this in the wrong way. I think we should have this moved as a motion with a second and then we can have discussion about it and then certain things can be accepted either as friendly amendments or not. I think that would be the procedural way to go. Jim, would you like to move this, make a motion that this be approved by the Faculty Senate and be sent on to the University Council?

J. Wilson: Yes, I’d like to make a motion that this be approved by the Faculty Senate and sent to the University Council.

A. Rosenbaum: Excellent, thank you. We need a second.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Now, Charles are you proposing a change to the motion?

C. Cappell: I would propose a friendly amendment to include a bullet point about resources and budget items to reflect the improvement in academic quality.

A. Rosenbaum: Jim, are you accepting the friendly amendment or not?

J. Wilson: I’ll accept that friendly amendment.

A. Rosenbaum: You don’t have to. I mean you can, but you don’t have to.

J. Wilson: It’s okay.

A. Rosenbaum: You’re okay with that. Okay any other questions, comments, additions, subtractions? Yes, Rosemary.

R. Feurer: I would like to see some kind of statement that expresses the reality of how budgets are constructed and how much power – or lack of power – faculty have in the construction of this budget. So when we say this it sounds, I mean I like the report, don’t get me wrong and I
commend the work that’s been done on it. But I wonder what we’re looking at is the decline of tuition waivers. We’re looking at a budget in which the decision making is given to us by an administrator. I’d like to have a statement about collaboration from faculty on some of these decisions in the statement of priorities. In other words, how can we use our constitutional power, our governance, joint governance, in order to press – and especially under a new president – for more collaborative decision making; because, when we look at the budget cuts that are being threatened here, it seems to me that we always find that there’s an administrative position being allocated and not more support as Charles pointed out for our students’ unprepared status in the university. Charles and I have talked about this for years now. What we really need are more graduate assistants to help us tutor students who come here unprepared for the course work and that sort of thing. I love this, but I just wonder: How can we make a stronger statement that we really need to make this a quality university by giving faculty support?

**J. Wilson:** I am wondering if that could perhaps be included in that – we had a preamble before the three different families of priorities here and that if we could maybe incorporate a statement to that effect, collaboration, a collaborative nature with a goal in mind of the goal, the main goal, of being able to sustain and promote the university’s mission and vision and that the following are objectives to meet that goal. You can tailor some kind of language more direct wording to that effect.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The only thing I would add to that is, Rosemary, is that this is, what we’re doing here is exactly that. This Resources Space and Budgets Committee can be as assertive as they wish in the process and to assert the things you just said if they feel that that’s appropriate. So we have that mechanism, the Resources Space and Budgets Committee is our voice in the budgetary process. We, going back years, have not really exploited that. We’re starting to do that now. They’re starting to pay attention to us now. So we have been making progress in that domain as evidenced by the fact that we didn’t have a statement like this three years ago or four years ago. So now we are able to assert ourselves and we can put things in like we believe there needs to be more money spent on graduate assistantships if that’s what we think the case is. George?

**G. Slotsve:** Under point 1 for resources what it states is fund allocation. Maybe we could clarify that to state something like overall budgetary allocation. I guess what I’m concerned about is funds possibly could be interpreted as within what we already have in a budget, say that goes to the college where we might want to have some input or have considered reallocating the overall budget that less has to go to administrators, more just has to go to the teaching function of the university. It would be a slightly broader statement.

**J. Wilson:** Yes, and we did talk about the pros and cons of allocation, whether it’s universal or across the board or differential across different parts of the university. But I can see what you are saying is that to be a little bit more specific in the language.

**G. Slotsve:** And I guess it’s just hitting the budgetary process at a higher level because I think the way the budget probably works is they get a budget for the university and then they say this percent goes here, this percent goes there, and then it kind of filters down to us. So at the college level you’re now saying I could interpret fund allocation as across departments where I might
want to think in the fund allocation, the original decision that you’ve just got to start allocating more funds, a higher percentage of the budget to the teaching function of the university.

**J. Wilson:** So there should be language to the effect that there is more consideration at the higher levels as to how those funds will be divided down the line.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Paul.

**P. Carpenter:** Going back to Rosemary’s point under the budget piece, the first two bullet points, part of the intent there was to try and get to that exact point in terms of getting more faculty involvement in understanding exactly how the budget is allocated. I think right now no matter how many times we go through the conversation, it seems very difficult to get specifics on exactly what the allocation model is, period. And the intent there with those first points was to try and tap into that and address that. We can certainly make that language clearer and we can certainly boost that language and if anyone has any specific suggestions, I’d be happy to entertain them.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay.

**R. Feurer:** That was the frustrating thing – that it’s easy enough for us to say that we want this, but we need a little bit more transparency. Is that too strong a language to say transparency in the budget? Because that’s the problem here. You can sit in those meetings, as I have, and, unless you know where the budget allocation is, you can’t have decision making. That’s really what I want.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, we would have to be very clear about the transparency issue because the budget is published. This is a published document. So we get a copy of it. What you’re asking for is transparency perhaps in the budgetary process beforehand which is what is going on with the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. Unless we are asking questions that are not being answered or they’re not addressing things that are of import to us, the combination of them addressing the questions raised by our committee plus the fact that the budget is published every year, would seem to be pretty transparent. So I’m not sure, we have to be very clear about what we’re asking and not just sort of taking pot shots at the administration. What more do we want than that? Do we feel that they are ignoring our committee? Do we feel that they are not telling the truth when they publish the budget, I don’t think so. So we have to be pretty specific about what we are asking for here. Yes.

**M. Lenczewski:** I don’t know if this really falls with inside of the committee or not, but one of the things I’d like to see is some mention that we’d like to move towards sustainability, green energy efficiency in some of our buildings. Many times, when you see energy efficiency or moving towards sustainability on campus, it actually is a decrease in funding because, you know, you are saving money on energy, you’re actually more green. So one of the things that I’d like to see is maybe we make that a priority on this campus.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, that seems to be something that is in the Vision 2020 initiative and there is awareness of that but we can certainly, if our committee wants to add that in some way.
J. Wilson: … more specifically under maybe space for example.

A. Rosenbaum: Or resources. Any other points? Now we had a motion and we’ve had a number of things that have been suggested and it sounds like, Jim, you’re sort of saying you’re going to make some modifications in some of the language?

J. Wilson: Yes.

C. Cappell: I’d like to make one more point and that’s a concrete point. It’s debatable, but I’ll introduce it. Since most of the budgetary decisions and resource allocations are probably going to be a zero sum gain, I would like to see a statement somewhere that says: When reallocations or allocations are made, there be an explicit understanding and statement of the consequences to the quality of the programs and divisions that are so affected by such a change so that we get a clear understanding in the budgetary process and the deliberators that when decisions are made, quality is going to be impacted. There should be some attention to that.

A. Rosenbaum: Where would you want that attention to be? How would you want that to be put into practice?

C. Cappell: Well, it could be part of the preamble that just says…

A. Rosenbaum: But where do you want the administration or the financial…

C. Cappell: I don’t know what the process is, so I don’t know where this deliberation should take place or if there should be, you know. This could certainly be part of the mission of this committee through the senate to say: Anytime this is discussed we are going to raise the issue of the quality impact of the decisions.

A. Rosenbaum: Is that not inherent in Resources point 1, which says: Fund allocation needs to be prioritized to safeguard the teaching mission of the university including those programs and services directly related to student learning and welfare? Isn’t that sort of subsumed under that?

C. Cappell: I suppose if you were a great inferential reader, you could infer that, but sometimes an explicit statement that says we are incredibly sensitive to the quality issue here, and we know we’re under duress, but you should pay attention to that. It’s somewhat to the extent of comments that were made in Executive Committee by a certain leader that said the first preamble says something like we’re really grateful that our programs have not been negatively impacted by these things like we haven’t experienced any negative consequences. I think there are parts of the university that have experienced negative consequences in the last three or four years.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s why we took it out. That’s why it was removed. That’s not there anymore because of that very reason.

C. Cappell: Okay, but I am just raising it as a point and it doesn’t have to be accepted that we make a more detailed, explicit reference to quality impacts.
**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Jim, what do you want to do with that?

**J. Wilson:** Well, right now I’m thinking about how we could incorporate it. It could be one of the issues. We were discussing this in Executive Committee that maybe the language was maybe a little too nice, not direct enough. Maybe this could be part of an effort to make the language of this piece a little more direct and that we would like some kind of accounting or an impact statement on how decisions and allocation and reallocation of resources, what are the intended impact. It might be a good idea at one time, three years later, not so good, this kind of thing. So if we have some documentation of it maybe. How to put that in here more elegantly, I’m thinking the preamble or maybe in the last statement, maybe not really a bullet point but kind of a follow up, closing remark to the whole piece.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so I guess the issue becomes: What are we going to vote on? Clearly we have a couple of things that we’ve gotten some agreement that there may be some wordsmithing, adding some of the things in some way that have been suggested. I don’t know if the group feels comfortable voting on this document with the idea that our committee will try to incorporate some of the statements that have been made. The only way I can think of doing that is to take a vote and, if we don’t approve it, then the committee will go back and get us a final document and we’ll do that at the next meeting. The only reason we didn’t want to do that in the first place is because time is very short and so since we need to get it to council after it goes from here, if we don’t do it today, I don’t know that we can get it into the hands of the council in time for this to go to the Finance, Facilities and Operations folks for them to take any of it into account. So we have very limited time on this. What I’m going to do is, I don’t want to force this on people, so we’ll put it to a vote. If it passes, we’ll trust our committee to make the changes that seemed reasonable based on the comments that were made. If we vote no, then they’ll take it back and they’ll work on it and we’ll pass it next time and we’ll just let the chips fall where they may. With that I’m going to call for a vote. We’re going to use the little devices. If you want, what is essentially this set of priorities with some of the changes that have been suggested, you would vote yes. If you are not comfortable with voting on this and would prefer to wait until we have a final version, you would vote no. And, of course, as always you can abstain by pressing 3. One will be a yes vote, 2 will be a not yet vote, and 3 will be an abstention vote. Are we ready, Pat? Vote. Close the vote.

1-YES – 28  
2-NO – 6  
3-ABSTAIN – 1

**A. Rosenbaum:** So we agreed this will be essentially the core of our statement that will go to the University Council. Jim and Paul will wordsmith it trying to incorporate some of the sentiment that’s been expressed. We will post the final version of that on the website and I’ll let you know that it’s there so you can at least see what’s been done with it and we’ll try and give you a little bit of time so if you’re really not happy you can let us know and we’ll play with it that way. We have one week until the University Council meeting so this will happen hopefully quickly. All right, excellent, thank you.
[Per the above discussion, the revised Statement of Budget Priorities was posted to the Faculty Senate Blackboard site on February 22 with e-mail notice sent to all faculty senators. It also was presented to University Council at its February 27 meeting.]

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – See list of University Council members eligible for election – Page 10

   See updated list of University Council members eligible for election – walk-in

   Letters of acceptance are due in the University Council office by noon Friday, March 15, 2013, and will be included in the March 27 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the April 24 FS meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Next item is we turn it over to Therese Arado.

T. Arado: We have a couple of items to deal with for elections. The first is a nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of the Faculty Senate. The list of people who are possible for nominating is on the flip side of your walk-in item. This is the one that is a repeat of what’s in the package without the asterisks so everybody on that list is eligible for that position. If somebody is nominated, or when somebody is nominated, hopefully we don’t have a vacuum, the letter of acceptance has to be in the University Council’s office by noon on Friday, March 15. And then an election is going to take place at the April 24th Faculty Senate meeting. So I will open up the floor to any nominations currently for Executive Secretary of the University Council/President of Faculty Senate.

G. Slotsve: I’d like to nominate Alan Rosenbaum.

T. Arado: Do I need to get a second? Or is a nomination a nomination?

A. Rosenbaum: It’s not a vote so I don’t think you do.

T. Arado: Thank you, George. Are there any

I. Abdel-Motaleb: I’d like to second the nomination of Alan.

T. Arado: Okay, two nominations for Alan. Anyone else want to put forward a name for nomination? Okay thank you for that and Pat will take care of what we need to take care of from that point.

2. Nomination for FAC to IBHE representative – 4-year term
   See excerpt from NIU Bylaws, Article 16 – Page 11
Letters of self-nomination are due in the University Council office by noon Friday, March 15, 2013 and will be included in the March 27 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the March 27 FS meeting.

Therese Arado: The second item is an informational item. We need to have a nomination for the FAC to IBHE representative for a four-year term. This is something that I think can be done through a letter of self nomination to the University Council office. It’s not something I need to take nominations on the floor here for. If there is somebody who you think would be good for this position, you could recommend your name to the office as well and they could contact them to see if they would be interested. But otherwise, a letter of self nomination by Friday, noon Friday March 15 to University Council’s office. The election for that position will take place at the next Faculty Senate meeting. I think that’s all I have.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, Therese. And thank you, George and Ibrahim. I appreciate the nomination. I also should tell you that this coming year is my last year of eligibility, so whether I want to or whether you want me to, I cannot continue beyond June of 2014. And so it’s something to begin thinking about because we need to begin thinking about the next executive secretary. This is constitutional. Basically, what the rule is that you must be a member of the University Council, you cannot be elected to the University Council more than two consecutive three year terms. This is the second year of my second term on the University Council, so I will not be eligible next year and we will have to elect a new executive secretary. We should start thinking about that now and this coming year it gives an opportunity for people who are interested to talk to me and find out a little bit about this process and how the job goes. If any of you want to talk to me about that, if you have interest in the position and want to find out more about what it’s like on the inside of it, I would be more than happy to talk to you about it over the next year or whenever. Well that’s assuming that I actually get elected when we vote on it. Okay I don’t want to be presumptuous. Thank you.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: We have no other business. Are there any comments or questions or statement from the floor? Any issues that people are concerned about that they want to bring to our attention? Okay yes, Brad?

B. Sagarin: Thank you for projecting that, the agenda and materials. I think that’s very helpful. Do we need to request to no longer receive a paper copy or will that then be rolled out?

A. Rosenbaum: I think you have to request to receive it, if we don’t hear from you, then this is the last time you’ll get it automatically. If you want a paper copy you have to let us know. Also, that is our new, that belongs to us by the way, belongs to the senate and council and it was paid for by President Peters. We asked for it, we got it. We now have our own, we don’t have to pay
to have our things projected up on the screen here. We’re pleased about that. We thank the president for that.

**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 take a motion to adjourn.  
J. Novak: So moved.  
I. Abdel-Motaleb: Second.  

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.