FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
Wednesday, March 27, 2013, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Allori, Arado, Azad, Bisplinghoff, Briscoe (sabbatical), Fang, Farrell, Fredericks, Gaillard, Gupta, Hamayotsu, Henning, Jones, Kapitan, Kowalski (on fellowship), Lee (on sabbatical), Lin, Long, Middleton, Mohabbat, Munroe, Onyuksel, Parker, Plonczynski, Poole, Rheineck, Rollman, Ryan, Sirotkin, Thu, Von Ende, Walker, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Haliczer, Klaper, Sunderlin, Tollerud, Zayaned

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: This may be all we’re getting today. Pat tells me that it’s spring break week for the local schools and maybe that’s why we have a little sparse attendance.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order or business is the adoption of our agenda and we have one walk-in item – the walk-in item being my report on Thursday’s Board of Trustees meeting. We need a motion to accept the agenda with the walk-in item.

M C. Smith: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay Cecil.

G. Slotsve: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: George is second. Any discussion of the agenda? All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? Okay we have an agenda.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2013 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next is the approval of the minutes of the February 20 meeting. We need a motion.

C. Cappell: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Charles. I need a second.

C. Nissen: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any corrections, changes, omissions? Something you’d like omitted? Everyone is good with the minutes. Okay, good all in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? Okay we have minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Faculty Fund – Michael Kolb

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the first thing I want to do is turn the floor over to Michael Kolb. Michael would like to talk to us about the Faculty Fund. This is an annual drive. It’s very important and we try to give the Faculty Fund as much publicity as we can. I’ll turn the floor over to Michael. He’s got to leave soon so we’ll start with that and he’ll fill us in on the Faculty Fund drive.

M. Kolb: Hi, good afternoon, Michael Kolb from anthropology. I won’t take up too much of your time but what I would like to do is just make a sales pitch for the Faculty Fund. It’s the annual announcement period where we send out notices to everyone about the Faculty Fund. What I can do is talk a little bit about it. Dan Gebo, who’s our director, he’s also in anthropology, unfortunately could not be here. But I’ll do my best basically to go through what I can.

Just some facts and figures and what it’s about and what you can do, particularly yourselves, or if necessary like I say if you would take this information back to your departments and spread the word. Every faculty member, both current faculty as well as emeritus, will be getting the requisite information about how to contribute to the faculty fund. Next slide please.

Just to give you some background, we were actually able to begin to work with, with the help of the Faculty Senate, work with basically some of the statistics of what the Faculty Fund is about. It is a faculty fund that was geared basically for incoming freshmen. It’s a scholarship program and it’s specifically merit-based. In general, which we’ve gotten from some statistics you can
see, we shoot very high with students with a very high GPA and very quality ACT scores, usually drawing from about five percent of the high school classes of those who are applying to NIU. The average scholarship is about $9,000. This makes it the third largest NIU student scholarship that’s available for incoming students. It’s also renewable for up to four additional years as long as the students maintain an adequate GPA. The history of the fund dates back to ’76 founded by six university professors and it’s actually one of the very first student scholarships offered at NIU. Continuing it, adding to the scholarship, of course is really, really critical hence my being here. Next slide please.

Obviously our goal, like any educational institution, is to try to bring the brightest and the best students here to attend NIU. There are currently 16 students that are funded at that $9,000 a year level. Obviously, however, we would like to be able to support more students. It’s certainly critical to our mission and it’s certainly critical, like we say, to the success of both our students as well as their institution. Whatever you can do, like I say, bring this out, make this available, just mention it in your departmental meetings. There will be something going around, but just a simple $5 payroll deduction equals about $120 or so yearly which, of course, would greatly advance the fund that we have. Next slide.

What people will be getting is a letter which is basically the giving campaign which is kicking off this week which is a letter from Dan with a little bit of history. This will be accompanied by the sign-up form which is the next slide please, which is a specific form.

We’ve worked to get this dedicated specifically for the Faculty Fund so what you have to do is just fill out this form. There is a box that you can click exactly how you want your money to be donated. There is also a payroll deduction form below it. But the main thing, of course, is to either give us a one-time gift if you can or you do a payroll deduction and just click the Faculty Fund and it will go directly. Virtually every dollar that we raise goes to students. There are no overhead charges, there are no expenses that we have, so everything that you guys are able to donate goes strictly to students. That’s basically it. Like I said, I don’t want to take up too much of your time. Most of you maybe are familiar with this but, like I say, we’ve been streamlining it so we can get the donor form set up properly so we can get everyone to sign up. Yes?

G. Slotsve: I just want to ask you, on the payroll deduction, I haven’t closely in the past. Is that before or after tax?

M. Kolb: I believe it’s before.

G. Slotsve: So it’s actually a good deal then.

M. Kolb: It’s a good deal. Absolutely. I believe it’s before.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions? Questions for Michael?

M.Kolb: Thank you very much. Again, like I say just spread the word.
A. Rosenbaum: I should also point out that our other councils, the Operating Staff Council and the SPS Council, also really try very hard to do scholarship types of work and I know the SPS Council, and I think Operating Staff as well, provide scholarships and we should try and outdo them since we are the faculty. It’s a very good thing. We complain a lot about wanting to raise the standards at NIU, wanting to attract better students, wanting to attract people from the top ten percent of their high school class and up, wanting to raise ACTs. And, in fact, one of the great ways to do that is through provision of scholarship monies. So this is really a hands-on thing that faculty can do to improve the quality of undergraduate students that we get. So it’s a really good thing and, as Mike pointed out, it’s not something where money is being siphoned off as it is with certain charities. All this money that we do put together does go directly to student scholarships, so it’s a really nice thing for the faculty to be doing. Thank you, Michael, for keeping us aware of this.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, a few announcements. First, I’ll give you an update on the search, the presidential search, which certainly is, I think, of interest. There are people on the senate here who are on the search committee. We are still sworn to secrecy and confidentiality, so there is a limit to what I can tell. Certainly, I can’t tell you anything about specific people, but I can at least bring you up to date on where things are. The search committee met on March 1 and reduced the list of candidates from approximately 50 to 10. We had approximately 50 applications. I say approximately because the number kept changing. The committee only had access to this electronically and so the search firm that we are working with created a website for us. It was a secure website. When you got into the website, there was a list of the candidates, but many of the candidates were also candidates in other searches. So if a candidate took a job at another place, they would suddenly disappear from the list without any notice. As a result of that, we never really knew exactly what the total was. So, for example, you’d look at it one day it would be 48, the next day it might be 47, then it might be 52, so there were some fluctuations in that. If you said 50 you’d be close. So we reduced the list down to 10 candidates that we chose to interview and we did do what are called airport interviews; they were done in the O’Hare/Rosemont area. We did those on March 7 and March 8. The committee interviewed ten people. All of them showed up. We did not have anyone drop-out, which is not that common by the way. We sort of view that as a statement of the value that people placed on this presidency because even the search firm people that were working with us said that we would expect that if we tried to bring in ten people, two or three of those would probably decline to attend the airport interviews. So we expected that we would have a few people that had declined. That didn’t happen. All ten accepted our invitation. So the search people themselves were telling us that this is really a statement of how much value people place on this search and this position and the value of NIU’s reputation in the academic community. So we were very pleased about that.

The search committee worked very hard over those two days. It was quite exhausting. At the end of the day on March 8, the committee selected the four finalists. So we eliminated six of the ten. We did not rank the candidates. There was never a ranking of the candidates. No one on the search committee could tell you which one of those four was the top choice of the search committee. I think that’s fair. I think that, if you look at the four candidates – of course, you can’t but if you could and if you did – what you would find is that you have four great candidates that have different strengths and so they are not identical to each other, but the committee’s feeling, and people on the committee that are here can correct me if they wish, I don’t
recommend it but they could, we would be happy with any one of those four. We handed the Board of Trustees four candidates, any one of which we feel would be an excellent president for Northern Illinois University. We were very happy with the search. We were very happy with the quality of the applicants and we were particularly happy with the four that we selected.

Those were handed over to the Board of Trustees. The next step is that the Board of Trustees met with the candidates. This happened last Friday. The Board of Trustees spent about two hours with each of the candidates. The candidates were brought to the university in disguise and were given a tour. They weren’t really in disguise, that’s for the Northern Star person in the back. They weren’t really in disguise but neither were they announced. They were given tours of the university. They felt it was important, of course, for them to see the university, to see Altgeld Hall, the president’s office, the facilities that we have here and also the DeKalb area in which they would most likely be living. They were given tours. They met with the Board of Trustees, each of them for about two hours.

On Saturday, the candidates each met with ten constituent groups. Ten groups were formed to meet with the candidates. I’ll tell you what the ten were even though I always manage to miss some of these. I’ll do my best. The ten groups were: the faculty and they were represented by presidential teaching and research professors. Not all of them but some of them. The president’s cabinet. The deans accompanied by several chairs. There were some department chairs also mixed in with the deans and also I think some vice provosts mixed in with the deans as well. The community. The Alumni Association. The Foundation. Operating Staff Council and SPS Council. The chairs of the presidential commissions. Students. Each of these groups met with the candidates for a brief meeting, I think it was about a half an hour long, and they met with each of the candidates. Everybody that was involved was sworn to the same confidentiality statement.

Following that meeting, on Tuesday (this took place on Saturday) on Tuesday, each of the constituent groups that I just mentioned, each of those groups that I struggle to remember and finally did with some assistance, met with the Board of Trustees for a debriefing. Also at that time the PSAC, the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, had five representatives who also met with the board and tried to convey to the board what the sentiment within the committee was about each of the candidates. They had essentially asked us to identify what we saw as the strengths and weaknesses of each of the candidates. We tried to do this, not as representatives of ourselves, but in order to capture what we saw as the sentiment within the search committee. We tried to give them a well-rounded notion of what people seemed to think were the strengths and weaknesses of the various candidates.

Also I neglected to mention that the president, John Peters, and Provost Ray Alden, also had individual meetings with each of the candidates and also gave their feedback to the Board of Trustees. This was essentially the process and following the debriefings with each of these groups on Tuesday, the Board of Trustees went into executive session and I assume, although it’s not confirmed, that that was the time when they discussed who they would make an offer to. They will not disclose the name of whoever it is they selected if, in fact, they did select someone and I can’t assure you that they have done that already. I don’t know that. But they will not disclose that name until that person has agreed to take the position and they have a signed
contract. The best guess is that we will probably know in the very near future, either tomorrow or Friday possibly, but probably no later than early next week.

We will be able to end the Northern Star’s countdown of how many days it has been since we formed the search committee and how many days we have “kept you all in secrecy” regarding the candidates for the search. I would also, again, like to say that I really feel that the Northern Star engaged in really poor journalism by putting that article on the front page. First of all, this board has gone out of its way to include the constituent groups. The Northern Star pointed out that Illinois State University may not be doing it quite the same way, but they failed to mention that Illinois State University had all of the members of their Board of Trustees on the search committee. Ours did not. We had the co-chair Bob Boey and one member, Tony Iosco. The board did not put any pressure as all on this search committee. The board did not have an agenda. The board did not have its own candidate. The board essentially tried to put together as representative a group as it could, including three students, one graduate student and two undergraduate students, and then basically let us do our work. And their only charge to us was to get us the best person that we can to be the next president of Northern Illinois University. I don’t know that a Board of Trustees can do much more than that to have an open and inclusive search.

Secondly, the process that they elected which was to have these constituent groups meet with each of the candidates, that was actually sort of the advice of the search committee but they didn’t quite follow the search committee because the search committee actually advised them to do it themselves. They did not want them to bring in these constituent groups because it exposes too many people and increases the chances that the names of the candidate will be disclosed. So the search committee said this is not what you should do, you should do this yourselves. You had a good search committee; they did their work, now it’s your turn. But the Board of Trustees didn’t want to do that. They wanted to have a slightly more open process. As open a process as they felt was reasonable and so they did the constituent groups and they refer to this as a hybrid. It wasn’t quite open forum the way it was done in the year 2000 when President Peters was hired, but it was not the secretive method that the search firm said was really the best thing to do. It was a compromise and it was a compromise in the interest of really trying to include as many groups in the university as possible.

The Star gave absolutely no credit to them for that and made it sound like this was some kind of CIA operation that was designed to somehow pull a fast one on the university community. This is irresponsible. My feeling about it is that this board did the best job it could to be fair and inclusive and to allow us to pick a very good presidential candidate and they should be given some credit for that as opposed to the nonsense that you saw in the Northern Star article and I feel pretty strongly about this, can you guess?

The fact of the matter is that the way searches are done now is that if you have an open forum on campus you will lose good candidates. There are states that require it to be done in open forum. Those states have a reputation for not attracting very good presidential candidates to their university. This was done in the best interests of Northern Illinois University and I think that should be made clear and so that’s all I have to say about that unless someone has a question or a comment. Yes?
V. Naples: I do have a question. Even though you are not going to reveal names of individuals, would it be possible to give us just some of the feel of the kinds of backgrounds among the last four candidates? Are they academicians? Were they other university presidents or administrators or faculty, from where did they originally come?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I think I can answer that and what I would say is that all four candidates were at least at the provost level. All four candidates are academicians. We do not have a person who comes to us as what they call a non-traditional candidate. There is not one of those in the final four. I would say, and again, folks on the committee who are faculty can either support me on this or can present a different opinion, I believe that this committee pretty much followed the recommendations of the faculty as a whole. When the faculty, you remember at the beginning of this I asked faculty senators to get us information about what the faculty were looking for in a president, I believe that our final four candidates fulfill all of the requirements that the faculty recommended. Is that fair? Milivoje, Rosita, anyone?

M. Kostic: So I see you are very strong about the whole thing. You are right about many things, not on all of them.

A. Rosenbaum: In your opinion.

M. Kostic: In my opinion. It was really all inclusive committee and faculty was allowed to express and do whatever they figure out is right and just. I think it was like half committee faculty?

A. Rosenbaum: It was actually a little bit more than half faculty, I believe. It was a little bit more than half faculty. I think we had like 15 or 16 of the 28 that were faculty.

M. Kostic: It was basically necessary the way you say for running the process for the last four and once we chose last four, our committee was distend basically, we had no say about anything beyond those four we recommended.

A. Rosenbaum: Correct and nor are we supposed to.

M. Kostic: Now, I wouldn’t be so harsh on the Northern Star that its nonsense that their own strong opinion the way our own is and my own is actually those four could be made public and if anyone could not stand the criteria maybe we could debate whether he is good or not good for our presidency at NIU. At some point, you become public at a public university and how many of those groups members were there after the committee finished the job? All those stay-focused groups. How many where there? They were groups but how many?

A. Rosenbaum: How many in each? It varied.

M. Kostic: How many total?

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t know the answer to that. I know some of the groups had as many as ten in them, some had four in them.
M. Kostic: I’m not making any judgment. I’m trying to say I understand Northern Star or maybe a lot of people who would like more transparency and publicity and I don’t agree why that once we make it public people will immediately withdraw. Not really some will stand for the position and even we offer someone job, he might be getting better offer simultaneously someone else, right? It’s the best for the search firm to keep everything confidential but for us, I don’t know and I don’t see it as a big issue but I understand opposite opinions.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know I think your opinion is certainly a valid one. People have said similar things. The search firm who does many of these searches every year, was of the opinion that that does not produce the best candidates so your sense that they wouldn’t withdraw it, you may be right. I don’t know.

M. Kostic: But you say they are all so great. It doesn’t matter if two withdraw. We’ve got two others which are great. I’m just having a little debate. It’s a complex issue. It’s not like black and white.

A. Rosenbaum: Fine, thank you. Any other comments? Rosita?

R. Lopez: Having been part of the committee I’ve got to tell you it’s one of the best committees I’ve ever been on. It was difficult, as my good friend here is saying, and yeah there were lots of good people, but I’ve got to tell you, I walked out of there that last day after we were sequestered without seeing sunshine for two and a half days and I got to tell you I felt really good about the people that we, as a committee – including the students, that were very, very strong, and really were very active and involved. I thought of it as one of the best processes I’ve seen and I’m glad I was part of it. It was a lot of work, but I’m glad I was part of it. I think we got the best for NIU thus far, but I agree with what he’s saying. It all depends who’s thinking about this or who’s looking at it from a different perspective. For me, it was seamless, it was excellent, and I feel real good that any of those chosen to be at least seriously brought on campus are just excellent choices. That’s my walk-away and I’ve been here for 17-plus years and I got to tell you, we are in a good place.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, good, thank you. Any other questions or if anyone has any comments? Again, I can appreciate that people want to know who the candidates are and I can appreciate that the Northern Star wants to know who the candidates are, so I think that is certainly not unexpected that people would want to know. But I think the decision to do it the way they did it was based on what the best advice was regarding how to get the person for this job. When you pay a search firm to help you, it pays to pay some attention and take advantage of their expertise in the field. I can’t fault the board for following the advice and for doing what they were told is the best way to get the best person for this position. That’s my update. Any other thoughts, comments or questions? Other than that, we’ll all sit and wait until the Board of Trustees announces the final result.

A. Rosenbaum: Next, at our next meeting, which by the way is our last meeting of the year, I have invited President Peters to come and he is going to do a farewell address to the senate. We have a lot of business at that meeting and so I had hoped he would be able to come to this
meeting, but he’s working on the appropriations for NIU in Chicago with the rest of the cabinet. He was unable to come to this meeting and so he will come to our last meeting and he will give us his farewell address. We also, in honor of it being the last meeting and the last meeting with President Peters, we’ve increased the quality of the refreshments a little bit. So you can look forward to I think a plate of cheese and a plate of vegetables in addition to the cookies. We did not drop the cookies to save money. At the next meeting we’ll have cheese, crackers.

M. Kostic: Cheese without wine, right?

A. Rosenbaum: No wine. Unfortunately, I’m afraid to see what would happen if you had wine before the meeting.

M. Kostic: It would go to my head.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so tell your friends on the senate that couldn’t come to this meeting to make sure they are here, if for nothing else, then to at least pay tribute to John Peters stepping down as president and to have some better than usual refreshments. Okay, so that will be at our next meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: The next item that I want to just present to you, as you know, we’re undergoing the HLC accreditation process. You’ve heard a lot about this. I’m not going into detail about it, but there are a number of things that we’ve had to do in response to the HLC requirements. One of them is, we have to sort of pay attention to what we are putting into our syllabi. We have new policies regarding the syllabus. I’ve put these up here so you can get a look at them. We will post them on the Faculty Senate website [Blackboard site] but you should be aware the reason this was done is in response to the requirements of the Higher Learning Commission and in order to keep us in compliance with HLC so we don’t have accreditation issues. Do we have all of it up there? We’re going through it, okay. Yes, George?

G. Slotsve: This will be available on the Faculty Senate website right?

A. Rosenbaum: We’ll post in on the Faculty Senate website [Blackboard site].

G. Slotsve: And it’s also more generally available for other people within the university?

A. Rosenbaum: You know this is one of the reasons we started putting out Faculty Matters because there really isn’t a great way for faculty to become aware of this. So as soon as the new president is named, I will do an issue of Faculty Matters and we’ll put this in there to help make the faculty as a whole aware of the requirements for syllabi.

G. Slotsve: Can we pass this on to the department chair at this stage?

A. Rosenbaum: I believe you can. Is anyone here on the committee that did this? I believe this is a done deal. This is not something that requires approval of the University Council. Is someone here that knows about this? No. Pat, do you remember who it was that….?
M. Kostic: This is not closed session, right? So this is public document as _____ as advice or recommendation or so it could be distributed, I guess, for what it is not, for more than that.

A. Rosenbaum: I would say that it could be distributed as this is going to be the policy.

M. Kostic: Which is what we discussed in the senate.

A. Rosenbaum: Right and this is going to, I believe, appear in the APPM. So it’s been given to the APPM committee and it takes a while sometimes for the APPM committee to get things into the APPM but that’s where it’s going to be. But again, I will make faculty aware of it via Faculty Matters so then everyone will know that this is something they need to pay attention to in their syllabi. There’s really nothing on this – I looked through it – there’s really nothing on this that you shouldn’t want to have in your syllabus to start off with. Most of this stuff is protection of faculty so you need to have all this stuff in, otherwise you can be accused of capricious grading or not having an academic misconduct policy, not having a policy on accommodations or whatever. So these are all things which really should be in the syllabus anyway so there’s not anything in here that I would think that we would be concerned about as a violation of academic freedom or anything like that. Okay. I don’t have a lot that I can tell you about this, but if anyone has any questions I’m willing to look into it for you. Okay, yes? Cecil?

M C. Smith: My cursory glance at that document suggests that this suggested syllabus is a single document. I’m not sure that that notion is relevant today given the use of social media, course management systems like Blackboard. You’ll have this information that is distributed within a Blackboard site or whatever. It’s not necessarily in a single document. I would suggest that to the extent that this document reflects that a syllabus is a single coherent document that may not be accurate.

A. Rosenbaum: I would say that they are just saying that somehow this material has to be communicated to students.

M C. Smith: So, it’s a matter of what is a syllabus? What’s the definition of a syllabus? If it’s a single document, then I don’t believe that that is an accurate reflection of the current state of affairs for most faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I guess all I would say is that I can’t answer the question. I can just say that my understanding of it is that you are supposed to have some type of a syllabus and that syllabus, whatever form you’ve put it in, should contain this information. And, as long as students are given this information, then you’re in compliance. So whether that’s an online thing or a paper document or whether it occurs in a bunch of different places, as long as you can demonstrate that the students were given this information, you’re okay. That would be my guess as to what they are going to do with this. Again, this doesn’t seem to me to be a policy that if someone doesn’t follow it, that you’re going to get into some kind of trouble, but it’s recommended. As I said, we need to make it clear to HLC that we have addressed these issues. That’s all I have unless anyone has any questions. Any questions?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 3-4

A. Rosenbaum: Next, we have reports from our advisory committee. Sonya, we have the FAC to the IBHE report.

S. Armstrong: You have the report. One thing I want to call attention to is that on Tuesday, this coming Tuesday, the FAC-to-IBHE meeting is actually a joint meeting with the IBHE. If there are any particular issues, questions, topics that you want me to raise with the FAC that we can discuss with the IBHE staff, this is a good time to let me know. Any particular pet topics anybody wants me to bring up? Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m assuming they can contact you if they come up with something or if they want to send you an e-mail instead of raising it on the senate floor?

S. Armstrong: Please, please e-mail me. We did have some visitors and you can read about the visitors’ comments. One that I do want to call attention to is Senator Biss’ Senate Bill 1900 which I believe now has been referred to the higher ed committee. We actually heard a little bit about this last time in the open access journals. I think it’s probably a good idea for us to be watching that one. The other visitors: Harry Berman did give us a bit of an update on the items important to the FAC and I do have some information on some of those so if you have specific questions on anything in the bullets there, I’m happy to address those. That concludes my report.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Sonya?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the Student Association, James?

J. Zanayed: Good afternoon. Thank you for having me today. Today is the second and final day of voting for our executive board. We are happy to report that just yesterday we already exceeded last year’s voter turnout. After today, we’re looking to have it doubled from participation next year. I’m happy to report too by tonight we’ll have a new president. With new leadership brings new style and ideas. As you all know, every year we have a new president, but President LeFlore will transfer all the initiatives to the new president and myself as we continue through summer working towards a grievance policy for students, a medical amnesty policy, adequate student representation on advisory committees, and we continue to look into options to improve the recreation center on campus.

We’ve been working closely with the director of the rec, Sandi Carlisle. The recreation center is something that I’d like to expand on today. Every day the students see a rec center riddled with broken machines, a long wait time, just general over-crowding. Not to the fault of the rec staff.
They have done wonders with what they’ve been given. With that in mind, the Student Association would like to challenge the members of this body to go see what it’s like on the weekdays from 4 to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday. I think you’ll find, you’ll be surprised with what you see. If you can find a locker when you get in there that’s not rusted or broken, you’ll be able to stand in line for a half hour to use a treadmill. While you’re waiting, you may notice the leaking ceiling throughout the building. There are many things that are wrong with our rec center, including its size. We understand that this body may not have the authority to make such change, but we know this constituency holds the most power within the university and, in this matter, our fight is your fight. Quality student life on this campus leads to more enrollment. More enrollment leads to more tuition money and more tuition may lead to raises for all of you. Our counter universities in this state have upgraded their rec centers. Illinois State University, University of Illinois Champaign, University Illinois Chicago have all made state-of-the art recreation centers. If we would like to compete with them in enrollment, we must follow. We’re looking for your support as we move into the summer months and into the next year and as we try to get to on the schedule of the new president to look into a new recreation center. Thank you very much.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for James?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 5-9

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is the BOT subcommittee reports. The Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Andy is not here and I don’t thing Kerry is either. You can read that report.

D. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 10-13

A. Rosenbaum: Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee. Although I am on that committee and was at the meeting, I did not do this report. This was done by Greg Waas. Greg is not here but he managed to give you the entire agenda so it’s a very long report. I’m not going to go into it detail because a number of the items in this were also covered at the Board of Trustees meeting and so what happens is: At the subcommittee meetings, the subcommittee approves these but they then have to be brought to the full board. So, as I’ve told you in the past, many times the Board of Trustees meeting is very repetitive with respect to the subcommittee meetings. Everything that comes to the board has pretty much been also presented at the subcommittees.

The one thing that I would point out here that I don’t get to in the Board of Trustees report. I didn’t cover everything in the Board of Trustees report because then you’d have another list similar to the one we have here on pages 10, 11 and 12. One of the things on this that I didn’t cover is the Huskie Stadium sound system and LED ribbon project which people were very excited about that. And so the board approved that particular project and apparently a ribbon board, I’m not sure, I think it’s those thin boards that go around the whole stadium. Is that right? Does anyone know what a ribbon board is? Is that what that is? I think that’s what it is and
it enables you to put up like advertising that you keep changing, in other words, instead of a permanent sign you can sell advertising and people pay for this to sort of go around. It becomes sort of a revenue source as well and so I thought people would be interested in that. They are improving Huskie Stadium so that’s kind of exciting. Any questions about the FFO Committee?

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 14

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll move on to the BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee. Rosita.

R. Lopez: We met on February 28 and basically we received a presentation by Christian Spears, deputy director of athletics, on the NIU NCAA athletic compliance system and basically really went through a lot of in depth looking at areas of compliance such as eligibility, violations and waivers. It was a very good report, well done and well received. This is a very short report, but we also had a reading of proposed changes to the Board of Trustees’ travel and expense reimbursement policy. Basically, after that, most people felt that we needed transparency including an annual report. There was a first reading of the update of Board of Trustees bylaws as they relate to functions of the executive committee and so basically addressing the composition, powers, duties, responsibilities and limitations of the executive committee. Finally, there was a FY2012 financial audit presented as well as a, and this includes a 98th General Assembly report and substantive budget provided as well. That’s the end of my report.

A. Rosenbaum: Questions for Rosita?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Moving on, the Board of Trustees met on March 21. That was this past Thursday. The board had an extensive meeting. They had two executive sessions on Thursday. They started off with an executive session to discuss personnel matters that included some of the negotiated contracts with Civil Service employee group unions. They reconvened about an hour and 20 minutes later. The first item, I don’t know, some of you may or may not be aware of this, but people from the community or even from the university can request time to speak in front of the Board of Trustees. They did have a request, they don’t always, but they did have a request this time from a gentleman from the community. His name is Paul Sauser. He is a landlord and apparently owns something like 500 units which are generally rented out to students. His concern had to do with the university’s plan to require sophomores to reside on campus in on-campus housing. This is seen as something of a threat to the landlords in DeKalb who are concerned that the number of students that will be available to rent their spaces will be decreased. His concern was that, if that happens, then landlords will have financial concerns; they will not be able to maintain their buildings; their buildings will end up getting boarded up; students coming to the area to look at the university will see all these boarded up buildings and will decide that this is not a good place to be. So it is therefore, in his opinion, in the best interest of the university to not require sophomores to live on campus.
As a point of curiosity, he also mentioned that he was a student at NIU and that he moved off of campus in his sophomore year and then moved back on campus in his junior year because his grades were decreasing and his grades improved as a result of moving back into the dormitories. So, to give credit where it is due, Mr. Sauser gave both sides of the argument. He didn’t come in and just try to prevent the one side of it, but I think the board might have been more moved by his statement that his grades went up when he moved back on campus than they were by the concern that boarded-up buildings will prevent students from coming to NIU. That was the first issue.

You can read the report so I’m not going to go into all the detail. A couple of the highlights in terms of what was approved were the fee recommendations and again, the fees that are set, President Peters always charges the committees with trying to keep fees increases to a minimum and he generally asks them to keep increases under three percent. This year, the board approved an increase of 2.77 percent in fees for students who pay health insurance and 4.16 for those who opt out to the health insurance. For the most part, I think the average is very close to three percent. Apparently, about half of our students opt out of the health insurance. In order to opt out, you have to have some evidence that you have health insurance coverage under your parents or some other way.

Next the approval of the FY2014 room and board rates. These have gone up, largely the board rates. The board rates had not been increased, I think, for several years. The cost of food has gone up necessitating the increase in the board rates. The room rates have also gone up an average of 1.9 percent. There are apparently different room rates for the different dormitories on campus. Some of them have gone up more than others have. I think the new dormitory had already seen an increase so they did not see the same increase in board rates that we see at some of the older dormitories.

The board approved the distributed learning fees. As you know, there is now a push for distributed learning. It’s a very hot topic. We have heard a lot about it. In fact, in the presidential search, many of the presidential candidates commented on distributive learning and the importance of that in the economic health of the university. This is a pretty hot topic. The board approved fees for distributed learning, tuition fees, they also approved and renewed – well they renewed and increased – the College of Law excellence fee of $120 per hour. Again, one of the law students spoke in favor of this increase, so these are not fees that are being inflicted on students. They are being agreed to by the students in order to improve the quality of the education that they get. They are partners in this decision-making process.

Of import to faculty and SPC, the board approved all requested sabbatical leaves. All the recommended leaves were approved by the board. Again, it is not every university that is approving sabbatical leaves. This is something that legislators are constantly viewing as a perk that faculty don’t need. President Peters is fond of defending this by referring to it as what it is, which is a professional development fee, a professional development leave, excuse me. The provost has shown the board a great deal of evidence regarding the productivity of faculty following sabbatical leaves. We have been fortunate in the fact that our board has seen the value in these and has continued to support sabbatical leaves such that there was not one that was turned down. Those were all approved.
The last thing I'll point out, and this is just a point of interest, the board authorized the awarding of two honorary degrees. One is being awarded to her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn of Thailand and this is the first time that NIU has given an honorary degree to a member of the royal family. We are also presenting, or the law school, in fact, is presenting an honorary degree to the former governor of Illinois, James R. Thompson. Those are the two honorary degrees.

There is a potential mistake in this which I want to call to your attention before anyone sort of goes to press on this. Item 11, where is says the board approved a motion approved by the student trustee. The student trustee did make a motion, it was approved by the board, but I am uncertain as to whether they approved granting naming rights to the Student Association or whether they just approved the idea of the Student Association coming up with a plan. So if there are any students here who know, do you know which it was? No, so erase that one from your copies and I’ll have an update on that by the next meeting. I’ll have an actual correct statement on what they approved. They did approve something with regards to naming rights, but I’m not 100 percent certain what it is and I don’t want this appearing in the newspaper. I’m retracting Item 11. Any questions about the Board of Trustees report?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – [report] – Pages 15-20

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, our reports from our standing committees. First up and I think this is the main item of business that we have today is from our Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Brad Cripe. Brad.

B. Cripe: I apologize for the length of the report. I was told there was an award for the longest report and am hoping that this results in my immediate dismissal as chair of this committee. This has been in the committee for some time and it relies heavily on the work of last year’s committee. So thank you to the members of this committee last year who helped in their own way last year to draft this. This was brought by Dean McCord from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in an issue to clarify expectations of tenure for faculty who are jointly appointed between various departments or between departments and centers. There could arise a difficulty if faculty are jointly appointed between perhaps two departments where one department might vote for tenure and one department might vote against tenure and how that would be resolved. Dean McCord suggested this language that you see before you that was voted on by the committee to help alleviate problems that could develop with dissention between the joint appointed university constituents for lack of a better word. The committee has considered this and the majority vote on the committee was to advance these changes to the university bylaws and the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual that you see before you. I will open it to questions. I don’t know if there is anymore conversation that I need to have. I certainly would be happy to attempt to answer your questions if you have any regarding this.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and the status of this is this requires a bylaw change. Bylaw changes can only be done by the University Council, so the only thing we can do at this point is to agree that
this is a reasonable change and send it on to the University Council. Now, this actually came to the University Council originally and I thought that the Faculty Senate should have a crack at this before it went to the University Council because this really is a faculty issue. This is not an issue that’s of interest to the university, in general. The main issue here was that, and the reason that we followed this up as we did, is because Dean McCord was concerned that faculty would be disadvantaged by the current language. And so his recommendation regarding the new language is motivated by a desire to protect joint-appointed faculty. I think that there was some concern, not concern, but disagreement, as to whether the policy as it stands now is really all that disadvantageous to faculty. And so I think this is one of the problems that the committee had as well in that the language as it is now doesn’t really scream out that this is disadvantageous. But the committee is apparently convinced that we can make it more advantageous by striking out those sections that the committee has struck out. I know this is a lot of material for people to sort of look at and digest. We do not necessarily have to vote on it now. Because it’s a bylaw change and has to go to the University Council, this is not going to get done until the fall anyway. So if people would like to think about this, then we can hold this off and vote on it at our next meeting. Or, if people don’t have problems with it, certainly we can ask Brad any questions we have about it. If we don’t have problems with it, we can approve it. An approval will simply mean that we are sending it on to the University Council with our blessings and then I will represent it to the University Council as something that the faculty are in favor of. And this will more than likely be supported at University Council level especially given that it has the support of at least the dean of arts and sciences, if not other deans. If anybody has any questions for Brad, please ask them. Yes, Rosemary.

R. Feurer: I was chair of the committee last year and I know that faculty then had, at least the members of the faculty committee had, a lot of concerns. So I guess I wonder how many faculty members participated in this decision making and really vetted this?

A. Rosenbaum: We can answer the question, but what were the concerns of the faculty?

R. Feurer: It had to do with the increase in the number of appointments and the way that allocations of, allocations to a department might work.

A. Rosenbaum: What does that mean?

R. Feurer: Well, that the way that the dean represented it and the main concern was that this would change. So if somebody didn’t get tenure, right, under that policy, that department might lose their allocation for that position.

A. Rosenbaum: Brad.

R. Feurer: That was one of the main concerns. There were several others. The main one being that this as you said that this wouldn’t necessarily benefit faculty members.

B. Cripe: What we did as a committee this year was we examined the information that we had from you guys which was substantial. I really appreciate that because it helped us a lot. It kind of hit the ground running with this. Then I gave the committee four options. The first was to vote to
do nothing because that’s certainly an option and, to be honest, that was the option that I voted for. The second option was to advance the proposal that your committee had put out on the April 25, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting which is slightly different than this one. I believe the last part of the bylaws where we voted to strike that out, if I’m not mistaken, that was remaining in yours, I can’t remember exactly. The third was to advance the proposal that Dean McCord had suggested and the forth was to create your own – try to figure out where you want this to go and how you want to get there. And the committee, I think, with the exception of one person, everyone chimed in and the overwhelming majority were for this proposal that you see before you with the idea that the committee felt that the dean had the faculty’s best interest at heart. That was how we moved forward.

A. Rosenbaum: George, go ahead.

G. Slotsve: I was involved with the committee last year and I guess what Rosemary was getting at is an issue I brought up at the meeting and I refer to it more as a property rights issue. This is a question that we just have to make a decision about. I just want everyone to understand what I thought possibly was a change in policy here. Essentially what’s going on: With the joint appointment, the department may have half a position. If the person gets denied, you’d end up saying we don’t want the position, the economics department says no we’re against it; you some memorandum of understanding but somehow everything goes through. Does the department lose that half position? What happens to the half position? Traditionally in a sense it might have been traditionally it was with the department and when you’re redefining these joint appointments, these appointments now seem to lie with the dean and not necessarily be the property of the department. That was kind of the property rights issue and that was the one question. Was there anything going on that was changing the property rights as to how a department would count how many positions that it had.

B. Cripe: And we didn’t look at it that way. We looked at it the fact that, speaking for myself as I voted for this and as I present it to you, the change as I see it, spells out the requirements for tenure in this memorandum of understanding and that it, in my opinion, based upon what I read here – and I can’t speak for the other members of the committee, but it increases transparency. It affords a written procedure for how disagreements will be resolved ultimately to the faculty member’s benefit, to the person who is receiving tenure. That was, I think, the overriding focus of the committee this year was: How will the faculty member that is being tenured or maybe denied tenure, what would be the impact on them? What would be the transparency towards them? What would be the fairest possible option for them? I think we were looking at it overwhelmingly from that perspective and will perhaps defer and we can look into it some more, but I almost wonder to what extent that is a responsibility of the chair, the responsibility of the administration, and I was focused on the faculty. I was focused on making sure that the process was fair to them.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes.

B. Pitney: I was on the committee this year, as well as last year, and I think what we discussed in the committee this year is that the old language that we’re suggesting be struck is that if, resources permitting, the recommending unit can then take on the faculty member full time.
That’s pretty tenuous in many instances for a faculty member. The language that’s being suggested is that the memorandum of understanding, and Brad just eluded to this, stipulate what the dispositions will be in the event that there is a disagreement between units meaning that the letter has to spell out how it’s going to be handled if one unit says to grant tenure or promote and the other one does not. We thought that was more advantageous for the faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes, Steve.

S. Martin: My question is: Does this change or affect in any way joint appointments with institutions that are external to NIU?

B. Cripe: In my opinion about this, this would affect any joint appointment being that it’s in the university bylaws, it would affect any appointment that was made by the university. That these memorandums of understanding exist. These joint appointments would be governed by this bylaw document and it should affect everyone. I haven’t asked that particular, explicit question, but it was my understanding that this document impacts everything.

S. Martin: I guess I was really asking about the changes to the document, changes to those situations.

B. Cripe: The change would require the memorandum of understanding to spell out exactly how disagreements would be resolved and I would think that if a memorandum of understanding exists with a faculty member, that it would have to include that. But I have not specifically asked that question and I don’t even know who I would ask that question to, if I would ask it to the dean or if I would ask to provost or…

A. Rosenbaum: Steve, what do you mean by – do you mean like Fermi Lab or something like that?

S. Martin: Yes.

B. Cripe: I could attempt to answer your questions exactly if you’d like.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions or comments? Let’s try this. Let’s take a vote and see if we approve this recommendation that’s coming to us and if we don’t then we can reconsider it after people have had an opportunity to think a little bit more about it. Let’s start out with seeing if we can get an approval. Does everyone have clickers? I don’t. What we’re voting on now, we’re voting on the recommendation from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities regarding this Article V revision on joint appointments that we’ve just been speaking about. If you want to vote yes, that would mean you are supporting it and, if it carries, we will take it forward to the University Council. If you don’t want that to happen, you would vote no. Button 1 is yes, button 2 is no, button 3 is abstain. Wait until we tell you. Are we ready, Pat? Okay, 1 is yes, if it passes we go to the University Council with it; 2 is no; 3 is abstain. Vote now. Close the vote.

1 – YES – 20
2 – NO – 11
3 – ABSTAIN – 4

A. Rosenbaum: The motion passes. We will send this along to the University Council. Faculty that have issues with this, remember, we didn’t just pass this. We just agreed to send it along to the University Council. If people think about this and talk to other people in the departments and decide that you have problems with it. Those problems can still be raised at the University Council either if you are a University Council member or speak to your University Council member from your college or I would be happy to represent those myself if you bring them to me. If people have issues, there’s still plenty of time, this is not a policy or a law. This has just been approved to send forward to the University Council. Okay, thank you. Thank you, Brad, and your committee as well. I know a lot of work went into this and it’s been a long time coming so I’m glad to finally see us getting it off our plates.

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 – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Election of FAC to IBHE representative – 4-year term
   See excerpt from NIU Bylaws, Article 16 – Page 21
   See letter from Sonya Armstrong – Page 22

A. Rosenbaum: The last item of official business is the election of the FAC to the IBHE. I will turn the floor over to Therese Arado in a moment but just so you know, we only have one person who expressed any interest in this position. We did not get any other letters of self-nomination, so Sonya Armstrong is our only candidate. So Therese, Sarah I’m sorry, Therese is not here.

S. McHone-Chase: So the deadline to receive letters for self-nomination to the position of Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE was March 15. One letter of self-nomination was received. That letter was from Sonya Armstrong and it can be found in the agenda packet I think on page 22. I move that we appoint Sonya Armstrong to a four-year term as NIUs representative to the FAC to IBHE.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we need a second.

M C. Smith: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any discussion? We’ll call for a vote. Actually I think we should do this by acclamation so all in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Any other business for the good of the order as President Peters is fond of saying?

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
R. Letter of acceptance of ES/P nomination – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 23-24

A. Rosenbaum: The last item I will point out to you is that under informational items and also in the packets you have my letter of acceptance of the nomination for executive secretary for the 2013/2014 academic year. I don’t think I have to do anything else with that.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’ll take a motion to adjourn. We’re adjourned. See you next month for our last meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.