FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, April 24, 2013, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb, Arado, Azad, Bateni, Bisplinghoff, Cappell, Carpenter, Chandler, Chen, Chung(for Poole), Coles, Collins, Creamer, Crowley (for Ryan), Daniel, Deng, Farrell, Frank, Gilbert (for Gaillard), Gowen (for Briscoe), Gupta, Koren, Kostic, Mackie, Martin, McHone-Chase, Mirman, Naples, Novak, Pitney, Rheineck, Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Siegesmund, Sirotkin, Slotsve, VandeCreek, Wilson


OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Haliczer, Streb, Zanayed

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Can we come to order? Welcome. This is our last Faculty Senate meeting of the year or at least of the academic year.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda and what we would like to do: There are no walk-in items, by the way, but I would like to move item IX. F. up to IX. A. It’s hard to predict how long it will take to discuss some of the items that come before that and I know some of you have, I guess classes, because why else would you leave a Faculty Senate meeting before it’s over. So I’m guessing you have classes to get to so we don’t want to have too few people in the room to vote on the various things that we have to vote on. With the move of item IX. F. to IX. A., I’ll ask for a motion to adopt the agenda.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: I need a second.

T. Arado: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?
Senators: Aye.

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

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 27, 2013 FS MEETING  
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the approval of the minutes of the March 27 meeting. I’ll take a motion to accept the minutes.

W. Pitney: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay Pitney. Second?

J. Wilson: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any corrections, additions, subtractions? Nothing? You all enjoyed the minutes thoroughly and they are perfectly written as always. Thank you very much. All in favor of accepting the minutes as written say aye.

Senators: Aye.


IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. President Peters – Farewell remarks

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I am delighted to introduce John Peters the eleventh president of Northern Illinois University. As you no doubt heard many times over the last couple of months, John has been president since June of 2000. That was before I got here. It was my objective to outlast him. I may still succeed at that. John has seen a lot of change and brought a lot of change to NIU. He has among his many accomplishments increased our amount of private donations and funding many fold over what it had been prior. The ten years before John arrived I think we had total donations of about $37 million and in the 13 years that John has been president that has been raised to about $200 million so it’s quite a substantial increase. We’ve also seen many changes on the campus. He has presided over the additions of Barsema Hall, the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center, the Yordon Center, the soon-to-be Chessick Center, the renovations of Cole Hall, the renovations of Grant Hall, the new dormitories, the renovations of Gilbert Hall and I guess we are starting to renovate Stevens after he wrestled it out with the legislature, is that right. We have the money finally for that. We do, so don’t say anything.

J. Peters: Yes, exactly. Yes, and more too. I even got more added on so we could do a second lecture hall.
A. Rosenbaum: All right so we have quite a number of changes and those are just a few of the contributions that John has made. So it is my great pleasure to introduce John Peters.

J. Peters: Thank you. Thanks for your support. Yeah, I have been riding around recently, taking the new President Baker around, and I just dropped him off at the Convocation Center and I said well when I came that was a corn field. It really was a corn field and we built that beautiful building over there. It’s truly amazing. I just wanted to come by to say farewell to you. I don’t have anything specific in mind but just I wanted to thank you for, how many were here in 2000? Okay that’s a pretty good number, you are outlasting me. That’s the way it should be. Faculty should always outlast presidents. But I do want to thank you for your commitment to NIU and particularly what I have come to appreciate in the NIU professor, which is that sense of engagement where you are intensely interested in your disciplines, whether they be scholarship, artistry, the lab bench, but also your student centeredness. Students are a very important part of that and that makes, I think, for a distinctive character for the land-grant universities and particularly this university and I think we try to live that. I really do appreciate what you do.

I’m also very appreciative of the Faculty Senate. A few of you know this story, but when I was hired in 2000, I had come out of the University of Tennessee and I was provost there and I had done a little bit of work in political science there, but basically my work was at Nebraska and I was, like a lot of you this time of year, fatigued by looking at blue books and rushing to the end. So when I came, I was made president and that’s why I came and I never talked too much about any scholarly or academic commitment that I would make. My contract at that time did not include tenure in my home department which would be political science. I didn’t think much about it but I did think it was kind of peculiar because I had earned tenure at a pretty substantial land-grant and tenure at another substantial land-grant and was heavily involved with the preparation of graduate students in my field and had a mildly mediocre national reputation in my field. But I didn’t think much about it, but the faculty did. Those of you who were around may remember this. You were outraged that your president, who had earned tenure at two land-grants, did not have tenure at NIU, so they petitioned the board. I didn’t quite want to know how that happened, but they gave me tenure which means that I have to give two lectures a year in Matt Streb’s department.

I always remember that. I remember that because I said this is a place that has its values right and, even though it was maybe largely symbolic, it was a big symbolism that it sent that the president was a faculty member and had done the things that faculty members do. I always remember that and when I get to writing about what it’s like to be president, it’s going to be maybe in chapter one about what happens to you when you move from being a faculty-centered person up through to becoming a university president which was never something that was in my thinking. I have a lot of younger people, almost everybody now is younger than me, who asked me how do you be a college president? I want to be a college president. They are starting out here, it’s not something you aspire to be; it’s an outcome of what you do as you develop as a teacher and a scholar and an administrator.

I wanted to say, once more, I haven’t said thank you for that but I do not intend to keep up my tenure duties because I don’t know if I’m useful anymore in the classroom to tell you the truth. I’m not brain dead but I’d have to do a lot of retraining in my discipline. That doesn’t mean I
don’t have a lot to say about higher education. I’m an optimistic person and I’m very optimistic at many levels about the future of American higher education. Of course, my formative career has been at public higher institutions although my undergraduate education was Jesuit trained. But since then everything has been public and I’m committed to the public notion of U.S. higher education and particularly the land-grant institutions. That’s where I was really very pleased that as soon as I came I figured a way to get us into the land-grant system because that’s where we belong for many, many, many years. I’m very optimistic about it and the – I get excited about the explosion of new fields of discovery and I read about it all the time. I can’t always talk to faculty about it, but I read about it and the explosion in the disciplines which fascinate me.

One of the things I’ll always remember is I moved from boy my world of 15 years, 12 years, was political science, my graduate students, my sub-discipline and my basic course that I taught as an undergraduate and the rest of the world didn’t really exist. I don’t know if any of you are like that, but I think we all start out that way. But then as I moved up and I had to learn, especially with the dean of arts and sciences, I had to learn about the tribal rights and rituals of all the disciplines. What did it take to build greatness in sciences? What are the peculiarities of performance which I had the arts? How did the humanists approach things? Mathematicians, they’ve got the world figured out by the time they are 27. I just love that. Then I get excited and I’m still excited about that.

That’s the great exciting things about universities and today we have tools that are unimaginable to me. Intellectual tools and processes and of course, on the research side, the ways that we collect data and then the explosion in Internet too and the use of technology and cyber stuff in our research. It’s scary. It’s both rewarding to think about and exciting, but it’s also extremely challenging. I can’t image how I would have to teach my courses now with those tools available because you must use them now because the students demand, they don’t really demand it, that’s the way they learn. It’s part of their learning culture. I’m very, very excited about that.

At the same time I’m very concerned about the future of American higher education. I’m very concerned at several levels. One is the challenge that we have faced in the ten-year – really it’s going on 15 years now – disinvestment in higher education on the part of almost every state. The reasons are rational. I understand them. I think they’re wrong-headed. I think investment in public higher education is the best return on the dollar you could possibly have and yet there are so many other needs that are proximate for policy makers: health, schools, prisons, safety, roads, infrastructure, on and on and on. And it seems as if higher education gets relegated to the bottom of that priority list and why?

Well historically we have another mechanism of raising revenue and that’s tuition. You can’t possible offset a dollar of state general revenue with a dollar of tuition. It doesn’t work. All across the United States we’ve had to raise tuition to the point where it’s getting difficult for a working class middle class family to afford our wonderful experience that everyone should have it they’re ready for it and they want to put the effort out. I’m very concerned at that level.

And then there’s the challenge of technology and the rise of the new competitors for what we do, our enterprise. I’m concerned about that. We have to get on top of it. We have to control it. We’re the ones who created it so we should be the ones that control it. I guess I’m the one who
always believes you can’t stop the growth of technology, you can only begin to kind of control it and ebb it in and use it for good purpose. But it’s really a challenge and with the rise of these massive online courses – which is inevitable it’s happening now – people will figure a way of doing two things with those: monetizing, figuring a way to charge for it; and number two – and here’s the threat – giving credit for it. What is the core of what you do and what we do? What is the core thing you control? You control the awarding of academic credit. You determine what a three-credit hour course in calculus is and you give credit for it in mathematics, in every one of your courses. If that is lost, and I think it’s appropriately placed, then I think it goes at the fundamental role of the traditional faculty member.

And so, here you have, take MOOCs. Stanford University has a free course in calculus and 100,000 people take it and Stanford is only really interested in the one percent who get through it who have a kind of profile that might be attracted to Stanford and a list that they can sell to companies to give access to those brilliant people who took that one percent. But what about the rest of them? I mean, I guess you can say it’s on your resume, but there’s no academic credit for it. Well people now are figuring out, I call them like travel agents, we have curriculum agents out there who are going to go around and bundle these experience and find a way of getting the authority through their states or the federal government, through accrediting agencies to give credit. Now think about that for a moment. That ought to scare the hell out of you because then, where are we? The challenge of that is, let’s get on top of that and figure a way for us to get involved in that because, if we don’t, we’re going to lose it.

And then the other thing is the new competitors. They’re all over the place, the for-profits, the online universities. The Chicagoland area, in my experience now, is one of the most glorified, heavily recruited regions in the country for two things: athletic talent and, even more, academic talent. Every Big Ten university, save two, have permanent recruiters and officers in the Chicago area. All the great privates – and we compete with them, but that’s okay because we have a great product. We’re close, I think we have developed a great campus experience. We’ve developed that spirit of engagement among our faculty. We have good internships and externships. Our students, when they graduate, they get jobs. They stay in Illinois and they really do appreciate what you have done for them and transformed them – for over a hundred years. It’s an amazing story.

I just wanted to stop by and say thank you for what you do. Think ahead to the future, we must get more flexible. We must be more flexible to compete. That means cultural change. The more junior faculty members that we hire are coming out of the best Ph.D. and M.F.A. and whatever terminal degree programs and they’re experiencing it. We’ve got to listen to our young faculty and adopt those new methods, and as always, emphasize excellence in quality.

I spent a lot of time with the new president who is an academic. Comes out of the land-grant tradition, has a business organizational background. I didn’t know him when he got his Ph.D. at Nebraska because I was an administrator and he was a graduate student, but I knew his advisor, world-class advisor who only took the best students and really produced good organizational theorists. I think I was on a couple of his Ph.D. committees, not the current president, but Doug Baker, Douglas Baker is – you’ll find him very faculty oriented and very understanding of the disciplines.
I want to congratulate the search committee. They did a beautiful job. And the trustees. I was only involved to try to sell. I was not involved in the selection at all, but in trying to encourage people to come and to explain the university. They did a nice job, the trustees did a nice job. Tremendous pool of candidates and it was done the right way because in this day and age you cannot do these open searches anymore. You lose 50 percent of the good candidates. We would not have had the pool we had unless…and yet, we had a tremendous, from my observation, again I wasn’t involved, tremendous constituency group involvement in the selection and the proof is in an outstanding candidate. I’m just enjoying – he’s been on campus this week, meeting people and getting down to business and I’ve enjoyed working with him as we transition.

As to me, I look forward to, I’ve been going through my library. The books that I had purchased at Nebraska that I haven’t read and moved to Tennessee and then eight years later, the books I purchased at Nebraska and didn’t read and the books I purchased at Tennessee and did not read, I shipped to DeKalb. Now those books, plus the books that I purchased and was given in DeKalb, are now going back to Tennessee and I’m going to begin to read again. And I’ll begin to write again and to think and to be giving some lectures in political science and I’ll be involved with some national issues and NCAA. And I’ll be watching, with great interest, your progress and my, I’ll always be…of all the experiences I’ve had, I’ve had great experiences every place I’ve been, but I can speak for Barbara and I, NIU has such a special place in our hearts – both because of you and the quality of the people here. I love the students, it’s not easy and it’s not been easy and it shouldn’t be easy and it’s never been easy in the history of NIU. During the pandemic we almost closed the university down over a hundred years ago.

The things that this university has accomplished for this community and the state are truly amazing. I know this is the time of year when you’re fatigued, when you need to get back to grading, but I just couldn’t let the moment pass to say thanks for what you do and keep it up. Thanks. I’ll take any questions if you have them. I’m still working.

**I. Abdel-Motaleb:** If you go back to the day you were hired here as a president, what do you think you should do you have not done?

**J. Peters:** Oh boy, do I have a list – the bucket list for NIU? I think a lot’s been accomplished and it wasn’t me, it was just these great people and I was able to prod them and block and tackle for them. But there’s so much that has to be done. I have not been able to focus the way I really wanted to on the development of, but the provost has done a good job, on the academic side, some new programs, so that’s one thing. I have a whole list of infrastructure improvements that I would like to have seen. I’m disappointed that we didn’t get general education done. I urge you to get that done. Our general education program lags behind, it’s not flexible enough, but then again, I was an external president. That’s what I was hired to do even though I’m an academic and that’s up to the provost. That’s on my list. I didn’t get enough – we had a lot of good plans, but because of the disinvestment by the state, we weren’t able to get to them as I would like – the infrastructure, some more buildings, but things for faculty or the academic departments. Things like that. Just more of what we’ve done. I walk around campus and I get – well for instance I was talking to a young man yesterday who is an international student and you know we need to recruit more undergraduate international students, that’s what’s happening across the country.
That’s exciting because it makes for a great campus. And I was thinking, you know what we really need? We need a building, a center for international students where international students can come from all cultures and then they have a place where they can feel at home and yet it’s also a place that they can show us about; and our students our Illinois students, about their culture. So the international side I didn’t get done what I wanted to get done. But the deans and all of you have done a good job. I could go on and on. Anything else?

V. Naples: Could you tell us what is the single-most important thing that you learned during your tenure as president that you would like to have known when you first arrived?

J. Peters: Oh wow, about NIU or just in general?

V. Naples: Whatever is your pleasure.

A. Rosenbaum: You learn not to ask questions after he speaks at the Faculty Senate.

J. Peters: No, it’s a good question. First of all, I came pretty well prepared because I had done an awful lot of jobs at universities and a lot of the things that were rough edges on me had been knocked off. Like, I was too aggressive and I was too judgmental because, you know, as a faculty member you’re judgmental. You’re judging all the time. And I learned in administration you can’t be too quick to judge. So I came with that and some things I learned that I’m trying to pass on to people that I’ve mentored, is when you come in and you have a mandate, you’ve got to do things quickly. The longer you wait on things that you know need to be done, you ought to do them even though you know they may be tough and people may complain. Because people will always complain about every decision you make because that’s just the nature of things. There are usually winners and losers in allocative decisions or decisions about programs. That’s one thing. I did a lot that I wanted to do in the beginning, but there are things that I wished I had done right away that I didn’t do. I guess that would be a big part of it.

I can’t say that I wish I didn’t have any more time to give. I mean I gave everything I had all the time. I’ve learned a lot here as a person and I’ve changed as a person. Probably it was 2/14, but I’m going to write about it. I’m writing a book about what it’s like to be a president. And it started because people who know me know I like humor. I think humor takes the rough edges out of tough stuff. But it can’t be a totally humorous book because of what we’ve been through with 2/14 which is obviously when people talk about …. I’m not big on legacies. Legacies are something historians write down the line and probably get wrong sometimes. But when they talk about legacies, it’s going to be difficult to separate me from February 14, whether I like it or not.

But then when they ask me what my legacy is. I can tell you what it is. I fell in love with this place and all of its manifestations and I was always a faculty person but I fell in love with students, our kind of student. The thing I say in my legacy when I shake hands May 11 the last commencement, my name is on something over 72,000 certificates. Now you did it, I didn’t, but I’m taking credit for it. That’s a heck of a legacy. Think of that legacy for you and some of those are doubled up degrees. One person has three degrees, but you know 60,000 over a 13-year period. Those are people who by-and-large are well trained; 80 percent of them stay in Illinois; they have careers most of them I would think; they are better citizens for having come through
here; they are great professionals. Contemplate this, and I try to tell this to legislators, even though we have problems and we get bounced around, don’t always believe what you read in the paper. I’ve learned that. They get it wrong most of the time and they don’t know the real story, but contemplate this country without public universities. Think about that. We are the engine that drives the economy, that drives culture, that drives all that’s good. Even though we infuriate people, because we insist on the freedom of academic freedom in the classroom. We nurture free speech. We put up with ideas that enrage people, but why do we do that? We do it to come to understanding, to understand people in different cultures. I have three grandchildren and they all have southern accents now, and I don’t know if they’re going to do it, but I made sure if they want it, they’ve got NIU educations. I can’t think of a better place to send my grandchildren than this place that lives diversity and where a lot of first generation kids.

As faculty, we value hard work don’t we? That’s the other thing about the younger generation. We meet them half way. We do all we can, we put all this infrastructure, the other half is their commitment and their hard work and boy when you come together like that you produce a great graduate. I don’t know if I’m going to… I’ll try to get it in my book, I don’t know when I’m going to get to it, but Barbara’s book is coming out next week, the first volume on women at Northern which is the early years and they are incredible stories and she is such a beautiful writer. I have a real hard target to hit with that, but I have a lot to say.

**M. Kostic:** You mention basically challenges in the future for education, globalization, those online courses, information age, and it all comes down to the quality really because cutting and pasting is free and cheap and the way for real estate what matters is location, location, location. I believe for education will matter quality, quality, and quality and I think now we need, what is your take on it? What do you think is the best solution to be on top of it what you said in your words? For example, Ford couldn’t sell cars enough here, but he is the best selling manufacturer in the world now because of China. Chinese students probably are not interested in online courses. They would like to come and get the experience in America for many reasons, education being one. How do we maybe become flexible in how to improve the quality because the quality is the quality of your students which are coming and enrolling with you and I think we need to be thinking about increasing the quality in order to survive? What is your comment to it?

**J. Peters:** Well, I can’t disagree with any of that and a lot of it when you talk about the intake of international students and we have to understand that even though we’ve been number one in the world in higher education and even though on some of the test scores our younger people don’t do well, that doesn’t tell the whole story because of what happens to our students when they come to the university and the kind of creativity and innovativeness that come from being at an American university. That sets us apart.

The other thing is that one of the wonderful things about higher education in the U.S. is that it was differentiated. You have extremely elite schools, MIT, they got a roll admission and they cater to a certain strata. That doesn’t mean that there aren’t any NIU students who will go through engineering or computer science who will turn out to be even better, and why? Well it could be because they may have had a chance to go to MIT but maybe not, but they were, through no fault of their own, the victims of a sub-standard high school education. But the commitment was there and the native intelligence was there, and that puts a burden on a place
like us to take a chance on people like that. That’s what we do best historically. That’s what we do and in the past few years we have put many more dollars, marginal dollars that we could find, into merit scholarships and the profile of freshmen classes dramatically improved in two years. What the good thing about that is, if you have good students in the class, it permeates to other students and it challenges the faculty.

The other thing I’m very proud about is what happened with the Honors Program. That is taking off and it’s honors – not only at the university level but at the department level – and I think in the future we’re going to raise a lot of money. Donors are interested in honors students. Then that gets back to faculty as well. I think when I came we had one chaired professorship and we’ve got a whole bunch of them now. We’ve got to track and retain the best quality faculty. You work at all of that and then you have to have good facilities. You don’t have to have the best facilities, but you have to have reasonable facilities so that you can do your research and that students can study. Nothing ever gets in the way of excellence, should get in the way of excellence and quality. At the same time, we have to understand our role and mission here, historically, the educator of first generation students. That is appreciated by the legislature. I didn’t totally answer your question, but I tried.

A. Rosenbaum: I think we are going exhaust John going through time and even earlier. We have a little presentation so, John, if you would join me at the easel. I want to explain this a little bit. This is something we’re presenting John with from the senate. What we did, and this was done by a whole bunch of people, we had a lot of different people working on this with us. The basis of this is a diploma, an NIU diploma from, as you can see, Northern Illinois State Normal School. This is from 1902 and it’s signed by the first president of NIU. We used that as the basis for this tribute. I’d like to read it to you if I can read it which is not all that easy.

Whereas, John G. Peters has completed 13 years of distinguished service as the 11th president of Northern Illinois University; and

Whereas, he has been an advocate for the faculty and a strong supporter of shared governance at NIU; and

Whereas, he has successfully guided NIU through a period of unprecedented challenges; and

Whereas, he has demonstrated his devotion to and affection for Northern Illinois University; and

Whereas, he has opted for a well-deserved retirement.

It is with great respect and appreciation that the Faculty Senate of Northern Illinois University hereby appoints John G. Peters as an honorary Faculty Senator in perpetuam. Resolved this 24th day of April, 2013.

John, it’s well deserved. We will carry this back to you since some of the senators have not seen it, we’re going to place it in the back there so you can get a look at it as you go out.
J. Peters: [no mic]

A. Rosenbaum: Just remember you’re a non-voting member of the senate.

J. Peters: If I miss how many meetings…

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you can miss quite a few before you are catching up to them.

J. Peters: So beginning in about a year [no mic] Thank you very much.

B. Recognition of Faculty Senate members who have completed their terms, who have been re-elected, or who are newly elected – Page 4

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next item of business is the recognition of faculty senators. We do this every year. We have to recognize those faculty senators who are completing service. We really appreciate the fact that you represent your departments and come to the Faculty Senate. We know that in many departments it’s not the first choice that not everyone is dying to be the faculty senator and so we appreciate that you are willing to take on the burden and to come here and do the job for the many faculty who really don’t pay much attention to faculty governance until something happens that they don’t like. Then all of the sudden they are very concerned and why didn’t we do something about it. But you are the ones that are recognizing the importance of shared governance and the role of shared governance in the university. And so I really appreciate your willingness to come here and to be faculty senators. We are particularly grateful to those faculty senators that are completing service. The first two, Vicki Collins and Charles Cappell, are still eligible for re-election so it’s possible that they will be back with us. Their departments are slackers and they did not have the election yet. Hopefully, both Vicki and Charles will be back but if not, we again appreciate their service. Anna Calvo-Byrd from the Department of Biological Sciences is completing as is Brian Chung from the School of Theatre and Dance. Nice round of applause for them.

Ibraham Abdel-Motaleb has been elected to the University Council so he will remain a faculty senator but not representing his department. He will be here by virtue of his role as a University Council member. We are not losing him, but he is taking on the role of University Council member.

And we have five people that have been re-elected. Those are Brian Mackie, Bill Pitney, Milivoje Kostic, Therese Arado and John Novak. We appreciate the fact that they have completed a term and have signed on for yet another one. Thank you to them.

We also want to note newly-elected representatives: Lichuan Liu of the Department of Electrical Engineering; Jozef Bujarski for the Department of Biological Sciences; and Robert Schneider from the School of Theatre and Dance. And they will be joining us in the fall semester. We are delighted to have them coming on board with us.

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION
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A. Rosenbaum: Next we go into executive session. I need a motion to go into executive session.

I. Abdel-Motaleb: So moved.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed. We are in executive session. George Slotsve, our vice president, will take charge. John Novak is our recording secretary for the executive session and we ask all non-voting members of the Faculty Senate to please exit into the chamber outside.

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve list of candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the university – Pages 5-8

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is the Consent Agenda and what we do with this consent agenda is we are approving a list of candidates who are running unopposed to serve on committees of the university. Any time there is opposition or more than one candidate for one position, you get a ballot and you will have those ballots at your place, but the ones that are unopposed, we approve by the consent agenda. I need a motion to accept the consent agenda.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Second.

Pitney: Second

A. Rosenbaum. There’s no discussion of the consent agenda. All in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Any abstention? Okay the consent agenda is approved.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 9-10

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have reports from our advisory committees. Sonya Armstrong.

S. Armstrong: This report is largely informational with several updates on things I’ve been reporting on for the past few months. I wanted to call your attention just to two things, very quickly. One that the Faculty Advisory Council officers have been named and the three people you see there under FAC meeting have been re-elected. Those are the officers for the FAC. The other thing is that the IBHE meeting minutes have not been published yet, but I will certainly send a link to Blackboard as soon as those are available. The IBHE meeting was again largely informational and really just a lot of updates. I’ll close my report there and take any comments or questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions or comments for Sonya? Sonya, this was the meeting that was attended by the IBHE itself right?

S. Armstrong: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: How are they doing, were they like eating raw meat and things or were they reasonable?

S. Armstrong: Quite reasonable.

A. Rosenbaum: Good to hear. Okay no questions? We’ll move on.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a brief report from the Student Association. James.

J. Zanayed: Good afternoon everybody. The Interfraternal Council has their yearly tradition of the tugs going on right now. It’s a tug-of-war match for those of you who don’t know. Just want to let you all know that if a student comes with duct tape wrapped around their arm it’s not a social experiment or anything.

A. Rosenbaum: It means they’ve had most of the skin ripped off during the tugs competition.

J. Zanayed: Right. But it would be nice to see some of the faculty there if you want to get out. It’s a great tradition at NIU that has been going on for a very, very long time. An update, we reported our elections last time. The president-elect, Jack Berry, is getting together his cabinet. He is at the end of his hiring process right now and we’re beginning to transition it. We’ll start early next month. I spoke to you last month about a recreation center to try and garner support for that. Since then, we have submitted a resolution that is on the agenda tonight in new business for support from this body to support a new or improved recreation center. Sandy Carlisle and I – she’s the director of recreation services – we put together the resolution with help from Mr. Rosenbaum as well. I was unaware that the faculty need their own locker room in a new
recreation center for many reasons, but Sandy also agreed in the fact that it would be very irresponsible for us and irresponsible of the university to have faculty share locker rooms with students. It just puts everybody in an uncomfortable area. That is included in the resolution that we put forth today and I hope we can vote on it and show faculty support. There’s been a resolution that came out of the Student Association Senate as well and a referendum by the students that we’re in high majority that the recreation center being a priority of the university’s list. Thank you. We will be addressing that later. Is there any questions?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, you done?

J. Zanayed: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for James? We’ll be talking a little bit about that later on.

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

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair

1. Nomination of the Executive Secretary of the University Council for 2013-14

A. Rosenbaum: The next item we moved item F up front. So this is our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Therese, I’ll turn it over to you.

T. Arado: Okay, we have three items that we have to take care of today. The first order of business is to nominate the Executive Secretary of the University Council. The Faculty Senate bylaw, Article 2.1.3 calls for this to be accomplished by secret ballot. Our clickers are going to be out secret ballot. Don’t push anything on them yet, please. Don’t push anything until we actually say the polling is open. Alan Rosenbaum is the only nominee who’s been put forward for the 2013-14 election. When the polling opens, if you vote a 1, that would be a yes to vote for our nominee. And if you vote a 2, that would be a no vote. So, as soon as Pat tells me we can go ahead. Okay, you can go ahead and vote. One is yes for Alan Rosenbaum and vote 2 is a no vote and you should just press the number and let it do its thing. Don’t worry about it not…

1 – YES – 34
2 – NO – 0
3 – ABSTAIN - 0

2. Election of UCPC representatives for 2013-15 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (only COB, COE, CHHS, and CLAS have vacancies to fill this year); votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

T. Arado: Our second one requires helpers. This is to elect representatives to University Council Personnel Committee. These are two-year terms. In order to be eligible, candidates must be a member of University Council. Four academic colleges currently have vacancies and are voting today: College of Business; College of Education; College of Health and Human Sciences; and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. We have to hand out the ballots based on your college. I’m going to start with the College of Business because it’s on the top of my stack. If you are a member of the College of Business, could you raise your hand to get a ballot. Anyone else from business that needs it? Once you have your ballot, you can vote on this ballot and then leave it at your place and it will be picked up at the end of the meeting. Our next group is for Liberal Arts and Sciences. If you are a voting member of Liberal Arts and Sciences, raise your hand please. Everyone from Liberal Arts and Sciences got one? College of Health and Human Sciences.

A. Rosenbaum: If I could just make a comment to you. By the way, for those people who have not had any dealings with the University Council Personnel Committee to UCPC, this is one of the most important committees on the campus so you really want to select members for that very carefully. This is the committee that, if there is a question about a tenure vote, this is the committee that hears that. This is the committee that hears grievances. It’s a very important committee. Be real careful with that. It’s not just a throw-away item and it’s very important that we have a good UCPC. They protect faculty interest.

M. Kostic: That should be true for all committees.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

T. Arado: Our last college is the College of Education. If you are a voting member from College of Education. All right, so when you vote on those you can leave them at your spot and they will be picked up at the end of the meeting.

3. Committees of the University 2013-14 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; votes will be counted following the meeting and those elected will be notified – walk-in

T. Arado: The last item is to elect faculty members to serve on a number of committees at the university. These are situations where more than one candidate has been nominated to serve on a particular committee. This is the ballot packet that was at your seats when you came in. Only if you are a voting member, please complete each page of this packet – it has different committees
throughout it – and leave the packet at your place and it will again be collected at the end of the meeting and the votes will be tallied. So if you are a voting member, please take a look at the committees of the university ballot and then mark your votes for each page on here. Those are all of our elections for this last meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, Therese. And don’t forget, don’t take them out with you. Make sure you do leave them by your place along with your clicker.

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappend, Chair

1. Report regarding open access scholarly publishing – Pages 11-17

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next we have our Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee but we don’t have a report from them. Academic Affairs, Charles Cappell, in what could be his last presentation as chair if he doesn’t get re-elected by his Department of Sociology. Charles.

C. Cappell: The Academic Affairs Committee has three items for senate consideration. The first is an informational report on the open access [publishing] question. The committee did not decide to make any recommendation resolutions taking an action. We want to basically draw your attention to this issue. There are several recommendations that each of you can take back to your department in good faith and recognition that this is a growing trend and that faculty across the country will be coping with a change in the publication venues, it’s worth considering.

Under the best of circumstances, the open access form, one of the forms, could greatly enhance academic scholarship and the rights of faculty. They will gain access to the publication venues; they will have more journals in which to publish work; there will be more diffused quality in regulation; they will retain some copyright control so that they can grant open access, but will not relinquish copyright under various forms.

Under the worst forms of this, faculty could be forced to relinquish copyright rights in unequivocal terms; maybe charged excessive amounts to publish work that has been accepted for publication. Careful monitoring of the form that the journal is using – and I think for our purposes the ultimate objective is to maintain the quality of published work for our own outlets as well as in promotion and tenure cases – needs to be monitored. Probably all department PT procedures will have to be at least examined to see to what extent open access outlets are, or are not, accommodated. I encourage you to distribute this report to your faculty and bring it to their attention and members of the committee can answer any questions you might have.

W. Creamer: [Requested a copy of the report.]

C. Cappell: She asked if the report would be available on Blackboard and, yes, the report will probably be in the academic affairs folder or in the information folder.
A. Rosenbaum: Well, it’s in your agenda so you can click on it. There’s a link in the agenda so you can get to it that way. We can certainly put it on Blackboard.

C. Cappell: Any questions?

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Charles? This is an important consideration so we, you know, Charles’ committee has done great work and Charles especially has done a great deal of it himself as well to prepare these reports. And this is an important issue that is not going anywhere. The future is probably going to be online journals, open access publishing and things like that so it’s probably a really good idea to get your departments up to speed on what’s going on with this so departments can start thinking about, in their particular disciplines, what will be the place of open access publications in the tenure and promotion process. To just disregard it and say, no, we don’t count that is probably unfair. There are some very good online open access journals now and people who are publishing those journals the work is peer reviewed. It is given the same scrutiny as print journals. This is not junk and we should pay attention to it. Some fields are better, more advanced, than others in terms of how good their open access journals are. So in the sciences, they are really, from what I’ve heard, very good, probably less so in the some of the social sciences and humanities. But, nevertheless, we can improve the quality of those journals by either not submitting to them or not clicking on them or reading them and gradually improve the quality of open access journals. Thank you for that report, Charles.

2. Resolution concerning shared access to data relevant to academic affairs –

A. Rosenbaum: Next item.

C. Cappell: The second item presented from the Academic Affairs Committee, with its ten members, this resolution is supported by nine aye votes and one member was not voting. I’ll read the resolution. It concerns access to data as part of shared governance.

Whereas the NIU Faculty Senate is a partner in shared governance; and
Whereas the NIU Faculty are the premier custodians of the academic mission and academic integrity of the university; and
Whereas the NIU Faculty are responsible for awarding grades, establishing and monitoring standards; and
Whereas the Academic Affairs Committee request in 2011 for grade distribution information was delayed and thereby ostensibly denied during the deliberations over the Plus/Minus grading system proposal; and
Whereas the absence of such data may have delayed the passage of the grading system change, encouraged the modification of the proposal recommended by the Senate, and exacerbated the sentiments that were largely uninformed by evidence; and
Whereas the implementation of the Plus/Minus grading system warrants comparative analysis, as do other academic affairs policies;

Therefore be it resolved:
That Faculty Senate Standing Subcommittees, the Senate Executive Committee, and the President of the Senate shall be given access to pertinent data relevant to academic affairs, such as the grade distributions, generated at NIU in a form suitable for computer analysis.

That administrative data requests from Senate Committees will be vetted through the Senate Executive Committee and formal requests made to the Provost by the President of Senate.

That the Faculty Senate has the presumptive right to the same data relevant to academic affairs of Northern Illinois University as any administrative authority, and that such access will be denied only when the distribution of such data requested violates Federal and State Privacy Laws.

That the request of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee for grade distributions of NIU students, per their forthcoming formal request via the process described above, be granted.

A. Rosenbaum: Are you making a motion?

C. Cappell: I would make a motion that the senate adopt this resolution.

A. Rosenbaum: And we need a second.

G. Slotsve: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a motion, have a second. Discussion. Everyone is up to speed on what this is about? This is part of our ongoing difficulties in getting data relevant to things like raises. This, of course, is addressing the academic side of things, but getting data has been a challenge and the motion from our Academic Affairs Committee is designed to throw down the challenge to the university and say we want the data.

C. Cappell: I might just elaborate a little bit. We focused this resolution on the business of the Academic Affairs Committee because that’s our primary responsibility and there is going to be a need for that. We’re going to want to see how this new system is changing faculty behavior and student allocations, grades, but I also think this is a precedent. It’s not just a complaint or it’s not just looking historically, its saying we want to establish that if we’re full partners in shared governance, we need the same kind of information that selected silos around the university have to make informed, deliberative policy recommendations. So I see it also as a precedent for other committees. That once this procedure is implemented, that there’s a vetting of requests, they are not made to helter-skelter, they’re reviewed by the Executive Committee and filtered through the provost to the appropriate authorities to provide that data in addition to the fact that the senate has been granted a research assistant through the faculty salary equity proposal request that Alan pursued. We have the capabilities to analyze these data and keep abreast. I see this as not just restricted to academic affairs but to the general shared governance of the Faculty Senate.
A. Rosenbaum: And the only thing I would like to add to this, again, you just read it and just heard it, there is a certain aggressive quality to this which is fine. That is something that the committee is asking. The committee has rejected the idea that we should perhaps put a milder tone to it, so they are sticking to this language. It’s up to the senate to decide whether or not this is what we want to say. Remember, this is mainly going to be dealt with by our new president, not so much our outgoing president. I think Charles has made a case for the idea that we perhaps need to start off with a little bit of the history and to let the president know that we’re serious about this shared governance business, the new president, and so it’s kind of a shot across the bow of sorts and if that’s what we want to do, that’s what we do. Any comments or questions? Do we want go with this motion as is? Do we want to vote on it as is? Does anyone want to recommend a change in the language or any aspect of it?

Unidentified: Vote

A. Rosenbaum: So we will call the vote and I’m assuming the intention is that this resolution will be given to the president.

C. Cappell: We can defer to your judgment as to the appropriate bodies that get it. Certainly the president, the provost, you know better than the committee does.

A. Rosenbaum: Fine. When we open the voting, 1 will be a yes vote, 2 will be a no vote, 3 will be an abstention and this is to, if you vote 1 you are supporting this resolution and this resolution will be taken most likely to the president if not the other individuals in the administrative hierarchy. So are we ready to vote, Pat? Okay we are opening the voting. 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstention. Everyone done? We’ll close the voting. Pat what do we got?

1 – YES – 28
2 – NO – 2
3 – ABSTAIN – 2

A. Rosenbaum: We got 28 1’s [yes] and two no’s. The motion passes and will be passed along to the president.

3. Proposed motion requesting a senate appearance by appropriate NIU administrators able to present detailed distributional data on the academic qualifications of admitted students

A. Rosenbaum: All right, Charles, you have one more item there?

C. Cappell: Yes, academic affairs thanks the senate for supporting their resolution. The third item is a motion following up on President Rosenbaum’s request earlier on that was made through the provost to provide information to Faculty Senate regarding student admissions and matriculation to get some better data on the actual distributions of preparedness, etc. I’ll read the motion and I will so move that we adopt this motion. We move that the president of the Faculty Senate invite and schedule an appearance by appropriate and knowledgeable NIU administrators to present detailed distributional data on the academic qualifications of NIU admitted students
over the past several years as well as their matriculation status and that this presentation be scheduled in the fall 2014 [2013] semester. This information should be presented both in aggregate and in detailed by colleges.

**A. Rosenbaum:** That is a motion?

**C. Cappell:** That’s a motion.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We need a second.

**G. Slotsve:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have a second. Any discussion? This item is fairly simple. It’s just basically getting a notion whether the senate would like to have someone come in and talk to us about admission standards. Unless anyone has a question or a discussion point. I see none. One will be yes, 2 will be no, 3 will be an abstention. If you want this resolution approved, you vote 1. If you want to vote it down, you vote 2 and if you want to abstain, you vote 3. Are we ready, Pat? Let’s go. 1=yes, 2-no, 3-abstention. Okay closing the voting. Let’s see what the vote is.

1 – YES – 31
2 – NO – 0
3 – ABSTAIN - 1

We have an abstention, wow. 31 yes and one abstention. Okay so that motion passes.

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

**A. Rosenbaum:** Moving along, before we move too far along though, I should have thanked you for your vote. I didn’t do that. I appreciate your vote. I don’t know whether it’s a vote of confidence or that nobody else wants to do it, but I appreciate it anyway so I’ll try and be optimistic about it. Thank you for that. Next item of business, we have no report from Debra’s committee right? Do we, John?

**J. Novak:** I have a very short report.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Go ahead. John Novak is presenting the report for Debra Zahay-Blatz.

**J. Novak:** Okay, first thing I want to say is that, although we have about ten people on our committee, every meeting we’ve had only a few people come. I don’t blame anybody, people have schedules, but we’re just hoping that in the future the stars will align better for this committee. We have requested some additional research assistance from the soon-to-be-appointed Faculty Senate grad assistant to help us get salary data at the department level for NIU and compare institutions. We have some preliminary information that’s tantalizing but it’s too early to really report and corroborate. We’re looking forward to getting to see exactly where we stand between departments and with schools in Illinois and with schools across the nation. That’s all.
A. Rosenbaum: Excellent and we’ve been trying to get this data for quite some time. We’re trying to get a sense of where NIU salaries are compared to similar institutions. Any questions for John or John’s committee?

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

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

1. Report on meeting with president and provost – Pages 20-23

A. Rosenbaum: Next, we have Jim Wilson, Resources, Space and Budgets, and we have a number of items here as well. Okay Jim.

J. Wilson: Yes, we have three items from the RSB committee. One is largely informational. It’s a report with our third and last meeting with President Peters and Provost Alden. President Peters was not able to attend, neither was I. But you see quite a lengthy description, summary, of things that were discussed. They can be broken down into about five sections of some questions that were asked about the Vision 2020 and how it was linked to budget, workload concerns, and retirements and some questions regarding investing in NIU’s employees – concern that fewer employees are doing more work with no raises in sight and its impact perhaps on morale. It seems that, at least the way the question was framed, that these morale is not consistent with the messaging regarding in investing in NIU’s employees. The fourth item was: Are there placeholders? A number of key positions are occupied by divisions who are placeholders – its more of a statement – with replacement hires being held on hold until the appointment of a new president. We asked the question of what the impact was and we heard some answers provided there. Lastly, a budget statement. How is the budget framed in terms of the priorities that were set forth, the budget priorities? This was our third and last meeting and the people that did attend with Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham, so these are a list of answers to these five questions have been provided.

2. Year End Summary – Page 24

J. Wilson: Following that, we have a year-end summary which sort of reflects our take on how things went over the course of the year with our meetings and it largely expresses the sort of informational flow of how this over the last year of… The committee feels that it’s taken more of a passive role, that we’re information recipients and we don’t have much say in the shaping of this and this is a point-by-point, four points, listed as summary. We felt that, in this reflection that information was too general, post hoc, and difficult in its nature to gain any kind of insights into the process of shaping the budget. We would like to know more details such as allocations. Does the information, we seem to think the information does not reflect anything really tangible and that, lastly, that there’s really no feedback. In other words, we feel that we’re not being very efficacious, or have much efficacy, or are being effective is probably a better term, and that we would like to place a more active role in the budget process as it relates to our budget priorities.
3. **Resolution** concerning the shared governance role of Resources, Space and Budgets Committee in setting recommendations for budget priorities – Pages 25-26

**J. Wilson:** With that in mind, we have come up with, designed, a resolution. In the spirit of shared governance, I guess I read this.

**A. Rosenbaum:** You can read it or you can move it. Would people like it read or have you read it? Who wants to hear it read? Who’s read it? We don’t need to read it. We have the resolution before us.

**J. Wilson:** Okay, I make a motion that the resolution be adopted.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay we have a motion. I need a second.

**P. Carpenter:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** All right, discussion? The tone of this is that what we have been saying for a while now is that we just don’t want to be told things. We want to, that shared governance is a sort of a bi-directional phenomenon. That we would like to be included in the discussion; we’re not asking for control over the budget; we’re not asking for line item veto rights; we are simply saying we want to be part of the discussion about how funds are allocated. We’ve been doing this in a lot of different areas. The UAC has been trying to get a dialog with the board as opposed to getting reports. This is the next step. We now have the administration meeting with our Resources, Space and Budgets Committee as required by the constitution and the next step is to get them to dialog with said committee. And, in order to do that, the committee has to have the material so this is really stating that that’s where we are going. We want to have more of an input into these processes. Our incoming president speaks about wanting inclusiveness and transparency so this will hopefully be exactly what he’s looking for, an opportunity to take advantage of the skills and the information brought to him by our Resources, Space and Budgets Committee which represents all of the constituents and Northern Illinois University. This is our only committee that is both joint Faculty Senate and University Council. This truly represents the constituents saying this is what we think should be done. This is what we like. This is what we don’t like. You don’t necessarily have to do it but you should listen to us and so this is I think a very strong motion is terms of trying to move this discussion to the next level with the administration. Any comments or questions about this? Seeing none, we have a motion, we have a second. If we want to support this motion we will vote 1. If we want to reject it, we will vote 2 and 3 will be the abstention. So if you want to support this motion, you vote 1. You ready, Pat? We’re open for voting. We’re losing people by the moment as you can see so it’s a good thing we moved everything up a little bit. We’ll close the voting and let’s see what we got.

1 – YES – 26
2 – NO – 0
3 – ABSTAIN – 1
We have overwhelming support for this resolution. So Jim thanks to you and to the Resources, Space and Budget Committee.

**J. Wilson**: Thank you for your support.

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Campus Recreation Center [resolution] – Pages 27-28

**A. Rosenbaum**: We are down, I think, to our last item. Am I correct? Last item of business and this refers to the Campus Recreation Center resolution which is on pages 27 and 28. This is brought forward, actually, by the students. They are asking for a new rec center or at least modifications to the old rec center, something other than what we already have. As far as the faculty are concerned, faculty can use the rec center, as you well know. The students have agreed that we should have a faculty dressing room and shower, locker room and shower. This is a good idea so that students can’t argue about their grades while you are standing naked in the shower with them. It seems like an idea that should have come up a couple of years ago but somehow it never did. But if we, my feeling is, if we are going to support the student rec center, we want a faculty locker room with showers and I know I’ve created some image for you that maybe is not so good, but so that’s what this is about. A number of you can see the resolution and the question is whether the Faculty Senate wants to support this resolution. I’ll make the motion on behalf of the students. I need a second.

**S. McHone-Chase**: Second.

**A. Rosenbaum**: Any discussion? George?

**G. Slotsve**: I’d just like to point out that by faculty I believe we also mean staff?

**A. Rosenbaum**: Staff, yes we do.

**G. Slotsve**: So that it could be retired staff or current staff that would also be using the facilities.

**A. Rosenbaum**: We will make those changes in the resolution, faculty and staff. Yes, Paul?

**P. Carpenter**: Can we also consider adding in there somewhere that we also consider the extent to which this sort of facility could be used by the academic programs as well for particular classes?

**A. Rosenbaum**: Can you give an example of what you’re talking about?

**P. Carpenter**: KNPE, for example, does currently use some of the recreational facilities for its academic programming.
A. Rosenbaum: I don’t have any objection to that but what I’m wondering about is the students pay for it out of their student activities fees, so these are NIU students that would be in those programs.

P. Carpenter: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: So then that would be perfectly reasonable, right?

P. Carpenter: I think so.

A. Rosenbaum: Where would you want that inserted?

P. Carpenter: After whereas.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, we’ll put it after one of the whereases and just so we have the language on this, what exactly are you saying? That academic programs…

P. Carpenter: and classes. That the facility be accessible by those entities as well. It strikes me as strange that we would invest in a facility like this but then limit the access to it. Recreation is important, but there’s a lot of time when the facility, for example Evans Field House, isn’t used by the students but is effectively used by a number of campus constituents. ROTC uses it; KNPE uses it; and I know athletics uses it sometimes in the afternoons as well. So currently there are negotiated agreements to allow those groups the use Evans Field House.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes James?

J. Zanayed: Just for clarification, staff is already included in the language under be it resolved, the Faculty Senate also supports the university and fully connect with comprehensive assessment of student, faculty and staff recreational needs.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, I think he was addressing the idea that it’s not a faculty locker room that we want as a faculty and staff locker room and showers. That was just that piece. James, do you see any problem with that suggestion that we add this to the resolution so the students wouldn’t have any objections to it being used for classes.

J. Zanayed: No.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, I guess I made the resolution so I guess I can accept the friendly amendment. Okay any other additions, comments, concerns? Speak now. Yes?

W. Creamer: There is this survey by campus recreation that expresses a lot of enthusiasm and interest for this expansion but this proposal doesn’t have any context compared to any other desires of the student community. Are we to take it that this campus rec survey indicates that this is, in fact, NIU student’s highest priority? I understand the desire and I see the statistic and I belong to the FIT program which is for faculty and is held over in KNPE not in the rec center in
the crappiest facilities known to man. So I appreciate this, but is this really, this is it, this is the highest priority that students have?

A. Rosenbaum: My understanding of this is that this is the start of a discussion, I don’t know if it’s their highest priority but it is something that they want and I think it’s something that many faculty would agree with would have some advantage, but I don’t think it’s necessarily stating that it’s their highest priority. It’s the beginning, I think, of a discussion about where do we go from here with this facility. James, do you want to comment on that?

J. Zanayed: On the Student Association’s election, there was a referendum question asking whether or not an improved recreation, forgive me I don’t have the exact language, but whether or not an improved recreation center should be an immediate priority for this institution and it was widely voted yes. I’d say about 900 something to about 300 something. We had a very good output for that question.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and I think also one of the issues here has to do with how do our facilities compare with other universities with which we compete for students and from what the information is, the students put together a very compelling slide show where they showed some of the facilities at other universities that students applied to in Illinois and we really lag way behind in terms of the quality of our recreational facilities. So, as a recruitment tool, even addressing issues of student health, I think looking for this to be a wellness center not so much just a recreation center so addressing issues of health and wellness and the recruitment issues. There would seem to be some strong arguments to be made for this type of facility. It’s also the case that any type of facility like this would require either fundraising by a bond or increase in student fees. I think the students are prepared to vote for an increase in student fees to help pay for this but it would not be money that would be coming out of academic affairs or out of the general revenue funds of the university. If they are able to do this, the money will either come through bonding, it will come through increases in student fees, or it will come through donations of benefactors or some combination of those three. Any other questions, changes that you’d like to see in this document? All right we are ready to vote it then. A vote of 1 is yes we will support this resolution for a health and wellness center with a faculty locker room and showers; 2 would be no and 3 would be abstention. All right let’s vote. 1-yes, 2-no, 3-abstention. All right, we’re down to 26. All right, let’s see it, Pat.

1 – YES – 25
2 – NO – 1
3 – ABSTAIN – 0

A. Rosenbaum: Okay now since you’re in such a yes voting mood, let’s vote a raise for the executive…too bad.

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIII. 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, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum  
K. Minutes, General Education Committee  
L. Minutes, Graduate Council  
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 29-30  
S. Meeting Schedule – 2013-14 – Page 31

A. Rosenbaum: I think that concludes our business. I want to call your attention to informational item S. This is the meeting schedule for next year. I hope you’ll take a look at the certificate that we created for President Peters on the way out. I hope you all have a healthy and productive summer and we’ll see you all at the first meeting of next semester. Thank you all for coming.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.