I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s get started we do not have a huge agenda today so I think we can probably break our previous record. Are you people hammer resistant or what?

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First of all all the first item of business is the adoption of our agenda. There are no walk-in items. That’s very unusual. That must mean that all of our committees and other people are getting their stuff in on time so kudos to them. I need a motion to accept the agenda. Remember you need to say your name when you speak so we get it on the transcript otherwise it’s not easy for us to piece the thing together afterwards. I need a motion to accept the agenda without any walk-in items as written.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Novak. Second?

T. Arado: Arado

A. Rosenbaum: Any discussion of the agenda? All in favor say “aye.”
Senators: Aye.


III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2012 FS MEETING
    (distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the minutes of the September 5 meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

J. Kowalski: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: I need a second.

M C. Smith: Second (silent)

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Cecil Smith. Any corrections, additions, improvements, grammatical changes? Anyone offended by the minutes? Okay all in favor of adopting the minutes as written say “aye.”

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstentions? All right the minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Announcements; I don’t have a tremendous number of announcements. I do want to call your attention to the fact that the president will deliver his State of the University message next Thursday, not this week, but next Thursday. The State of the University message is always interesting. The president lays out the agenda for the upcoming year and brings us up to speed on what’s going on at the university.

We have a couple of things that I want to update you on. One is that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has approved a plus/minus grading system which will go into effect in the fall of 2013. You may recall that we have been having an ongoing pitch battle with UCC over the plus/minus grading system. The senate sent forward a grading system that was similar to the one that was adopted by the Graduate School, which included both an A+ and a C-. APASC and the UCC, well APASC was really the negotiating body, didn’t like either the A+ or the C-. So they actually negotiated with our Academic Affairs Committee. We had a sub-committee that went and worked with APASC and ended up with a compromise that I don’t think our committee was particularly happy with and this compromise does not include the C- and does not include the A+. These will be present in the graduate grading but in the undergraduate grading, you will not have the option of either the C- or the A+. Now many of you who are new to the senate don’t know the full history of this and I’m not going to go through it, but I will say that last spring when it became apparent that this is what APASC was going to send forward to the UCC, I
asked the senate if they wanted me to go to the UCC and fight for the system that we had originally created. Personally, I thought it was not a good idea to not have an A+ and a C- but apparently I am not in the majority on that. The senate decided not to oppose the grading system. So the senate, I guess through their vote, instructed me not to go to the UCC and oppose that grading system and I did not. At its September meeting, the UCC approved APASC’s or accepted APASC’s minutes which basically means that that will become policy, the system without an A+ and without a C- in the fall unless the University Council acts to veto the policy and that will come to the University Council at its next meeting. Faculty Senate members who are also University Council members will have the opportunity, if they so choose, to oppose that plan. I have to say that I am not recommending that we oppose it because my concern is that neither the UCC nor APASC actually wanted the plus/minus system and therefore if the University Council sends it back to them, it’s my belief that they will simply table it and we will not have a plus/minus grading system. So it might be better for us to simply let this pass and then if we are unhappy with it going forward we can then revisit it in the future perhaps. I don’t know how quickly we’ll want to do that, but we’ll be able to perhaps revisit it and then make additional changes. I just want you to be aware of where that stands and the fact that it does not have to be approved by the University Council. The way the wording is, if the University Council does nothing, it becomes policy. If the University Council chooses to veto it, it will take a vote of I think two-thirds and then it could be sent back. As I said, that’s not my recommendation, but others may have different views. Any comments or questions about this plus/minus issue? I know we’ve beaten it to death those of you who have been in the senate for a while probably just want it to go away and I can understand that. Any comments? Okay, so you have been informed that’s what’s happening and UC members will see that at the next meeting.

Another minor piece of business is that, as you know, Sonya Armstrong is our representative to the FAC to the IBHE. We need an alternate for Sonya. If she is unable to attend, we need to have an alternate. At the Executive Committee meeting, Debra Zahay-Blatz volunteered. Is Debra here? No, okay. Debra volunteered to be our alternate and so if anybody else would like to be the alternate we can have a vote, but if nobody else wants to be the alternate we can simply confirm Debra as the alternate. My first question is: Does anyone have interest in being the alternate to the FAC to the IBHE? Would anyone like to hear Sonya speak a little bit about the position and what is involved? Yes, Sonya would you say a few words about what’s involved in this and why someone might or might not want to be the alternate?

S. Armstrong: Sure. So, basically, it entails traveling to a different university or community college once a month for set meetings. Its good food, they feed you. The other benefit I think is really getting a closer look at state legislation that affects us all in higher education. For example, I’m about to give a report where a senator and a representative attended our meeting to talk with us about issues related to higher education. You learn a lot more I think on the state level by attending these meetings.

A. Rosenbaum: And, again the alternate would not be attending with any regularity. The alternate would be attending only when Sonya is unable to go. We have a budget in the University Council Office. We get you a car. We will pay for a hotel the night before in the event that you want to go down the night before because these meetings generally start early in the morning and sometimes they are in Bloomington or Champaign or Danville. So sometimes
there’s a bit of travel involved so we will pay for your expenses, we pay for your meals and so you get a nice NIU Prius to drive down in, so those are some of the perks. Essentially, Sonya seems to be pretty good at attending these meetings so I don’t know how many opportunities you’ll even get to substitute for her. Anyone besides Debra interested, please raise your hand and we can put you in nomination. Okay, I don’t see any hands. I will, myself, nominate Debra Zahay-Blatz as our alternate. I need a second.

McHone-Chase: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: I guess we don’t need to have any discussion now do we Ferald? Do we have to have discussion? Okay no discussion necessary, all in favor say “aye.”

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstentions? Okay we’ve approved Debra Zahay-Blatz as our alternate to the FAC to the IBHE.

Next item, an issue was brought up at the Steering Committee that involves the fact that we use an awful lot of paper to distribute our agenda. You can see, we send this out to you, aside from the amount of paper that’s used, it takes Pat a fair amount of time, even though she’s not complaining about it, I have to make sure you’re aware of that, no complaints from Pat, but she has to make copies on the copy machine, staple them together, stick them in the envelopes and mail them out. Those who are sort of green-minded seem to feel that we could probably do without this. We are already providing you the minutes in electronic form as you know. We could easily send you the agenda in electronic form as well. The Board of Trustees, for example that always prints up those books on the Board of Trustees meetings, has stopped doing that. They are now using iPads, so if you have your own iPad you can download the agenda and the book onto your iPad. So we could do it the same way. I don’t know how many people have iPads or who want to bring their iPads or computers or whatever. But certainly we have the option of going paperless if the senate is agreeable to that. We’ve discussed this at one time in the past and that’s when we decided to go paperless on the minutes. So, I’m sort of putting this out, what are the feelings? I know a lot of you don’t remember that there’s a senate meeting until you get the thing in the mail, so it’s sort of a visual cue that you need to be here on Wednesday but we could send you an e-mail reminder if that would work. Does anyone have any thoughts about this, about whether we want to go paperless? Charles?

C. Cappell: I think it would help if this room was wireless. I don’t know if there is wireless capability in here.

A. Rosenbaum: It is.

C. Cappell: Then I think it’s a good idea.
A. Rosenbaum: How many people actually have iPads or something that they could bring? Or laptops that they would want to bring. So a fair number of people. We don’t have plug in, that’s one thing, your battery would have to be charged. Yes?

M. Lenczewski: I was the person who brought this up in the Steering Committee. Right now I’m actually looking at the agenda for the minutes. It’s actually really convenient if you bring your laptop with you because then all the attachments are hyperlinked, and you can click on them when we’re discussing something. The room is wireless so you can see everything that is going on. You can get, if there’s any updates, they’re instantaneous in here and one thing we discussed is if you really want paper, we could have it so that you elect to get paper. You would have to do something in order to say I want this mailed to me, but I think that just having it here. The other idea we brought up at the Steering Committee was if we wanted to project, if you didn’t even want to bring anything with you, if we projected the agenda up on a big screen, we could always see, everybody could see what’s going on. That was another suggestion brought up. I really think that this could save a lot of paper and a lot of time.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and we appreciate your passion and your respect for the environment. The one problem with the projection, and we can solve this if the senate so chooses, but they do not give us the projection materials for free. We have to pay about $60 a week for the projector and the screen. Well the screen I guess is not expensive. We could, if the senate so chooses, ask the president to buy us our own projector. I imagine he would do it if we asked for it. We could do that, but again some of the materials that are on there are a little difficult to read when it’s projected on a screen. It’s kind of smaller and that didn’t really work that well at the Board of Trustees meeting, but it’s possible we could figure out how to work that out as well.

M. Lenczewski: Yes, but it is very easy on your computer to see everything and be totally wireless.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other thoughts about this? Yes, George?

G. Slotsve: Projecting it would be an interesting idea and that actually might work for I think hopefully a number of people here especially if we don’t have to spend the $60 every meeting. Second best would be moving where you make it an option, but I do not think we should have just wireless that you bring your own notebook or iPad along those lines to this particular meeting. There are faculty that the university has not bought notebooks for, has not bought iPads for, you’re tied to a desktop computer, so it just isn’t going to work for those individuals. Now rather than sending it out if you want to save on envelopes at least, what you might do is at least have a few copies of it just brought to the meeting that if you want to pick up a hard copy of the agenda, we could just pick it up at the meeting if that’s how you prefer to have the agenda delivered and at least we are saving the envelopes if nothing else.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so if you don’t want to bring your desktop computer here to the meeting, I guess one way we could do that is people could tell us, not necessarily in advance, but just tell us once that you want a copy and we could have that many copies here. Charles?
C. Cappell: One further thought in advocating for the resources is the $60 charge is absurd. This projector should be mounted like a conference room or a smart classroom. There is absolutely no reason not to have permanent facility available to anyone who uses this room. I would advocate the president and the provost, etc. should absorb that cost.

A. Rosenbaum: Can we tell them you said so?

C. Cappell: Why not?

A. Rosenbaum: No, I’m kidding. That would help because I think in the past when we’ve had it here it shines in my eyes when I’m sitting here which is not good, but if it was ceiling mounted, that might be okay. Yes, George?

G. Slotsve: If they did mount one it would not only serve the Faculty Senate but the UC has presentations, I mean it serves the whole body. It seems to make sense.

A. Rosenbaum: And I don’t know why they haven’t done that. Do you know why they’ve not put an overhead projector in here?

R. Garden: Money.

A. Rosenbaum: Money, really that’s the only reason?

R. Garden: As far as I know.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I can talk to the president about it and see if he’s willing to instruct them to put a projector in here. Yes?

J. Novak: I would think either with having the small screens in front of us or having a large screen behind you, it would definitely change the dynamics of the meeting as it stands. I think that everyone looking at their electronics and moving their mouse around or having something above you all the time, it will work and it will say money, but I just think it will be a new dynamic that will take a while to adjust to.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you would think it would affect the meetings in a negative way?


A. Rosenbaum: Possibly. Okay, Melissa?

M. Lenczewski: I was just saying that’s where we are going electronically. Our classes are all now wireless.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay any other, yes?
**B. Pitney:** I think given the restrictions on students and the number of copies that they can print on campus, I think it’s incumbent upon us to start to reduce the amount of paper we’re using so I would certainly be in favor of this idea.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any other thoughts? It sounds like we have a lot of positive but also a couple of concerns. Any other? Okay why don’t we do this, why don’t we just take a quick vote as to whether we would like to go paperless and then we will begin working out some of the details so that we make sure that the people who want paper are getting it. I will ask the president about having an overhead projector installed. Do people want to vote out loud or do we want to use the clickers? We’ll use the clickers. Remember, don’t touch your clicker, we haven’t had a vote yet, so some of the new people need to know this. Don’t play with the buttons. If you touch the clicker before we’re ready to vote, it gets all screwed up. So essentially, this is how the voting works. We will tell you what the numbers mean. We only usually use numbers 1, 2 and 3. When we call the vote, don’t press the buttons beforehand, when we call the vote, press the button that corresponds to your vote. You will be able to change it, it will show you what your vote is if you say you wanted to press 1 but somehow you pressed 2, when you see the 2 and say oh I wanted to press 1, you can change it back until we close the vote. When we close the vote then you can’t change it. So, we’ll call the question, we’ll tell you what each of the numbers means, you press the number, make sure it’s right. When we close the vote, we’ll have an instant vote. The vote we’re going to take is whether or not in principle you would like us to go paperless on the agenda, the minutes are already paperless. So the question is: Do we go paperless on the agenda and again, we hear what’s being said about some people may not be able to bring laptops or iPads, so we will have to have the ability to provide agendas for some people. We will be happy to do that, but we will at least be saving some paper. You’ll also have to remember to come to the meetings without finding the agenda in your mailboxes so keep that in mind. If you are in favor of going paperless press 1, not yet. If you are opposed to going paperless, press 2. If want to abstain press 3. Even though if you don’t vote it’s the same as abstaining and keep in mind also, that you are not voting in terms of what we are going to do for the rest of our existence. If it doesn’t work, we can always go back. So we can revisit this. This is not a change in the constitution or irrevocable policy. Are we ready Pat? 1 if you want to go paperless, 2 if you don’t; and either 3 or nothing if you want to abstain. Vote now. I assume you’ve had enough time. Does anyone still need more time? Voting is closed. Pat, what do we got?

**P. Erickson:** Thirty people voted yes; six people voted no and no one abstained.

1 – YES – 30

2 – NO – 6

3 – ABSTAIN – 0

**A. Rosenbaum:** So by a vote of 30-6 we will do what we can to go paperless and, let me put it this way, if you want paper, send Pat an e-mail and so she will keep a list of the people that we have to provide paper to. Okay so just remember that. If you want an agenda either mailed to you or sitting here at the meeting, either way, tell Pat. We will also try to send out an e-mail reminder about the meeting given that you won’t have the agenda in your mailboxes. Okay, good, thank you.
Two small items, one I think I might have mentioned this, but I don’t know if I did for sure, all university employees have been designated as mandated reporters of child abuse. You will be hearing from HR shortly. They’re trying to work out the details. They have changed the plan. The original plan was that all faculty and anyone else getting a check from the university was going to have to go to the DCFS Web site and complete the mandated reporter training. Apparently, the Web site can’t handle the volume – too many universities, too many employees. HR is developing a modified version of that. As soon as they have that in place, you will be hearing about the need to do this. My understanding is that it is a one-time deal. You will do it once and that’s it. There will be a paper on file with your employer that says that you are aware of your mandated reporter status and you’re all set. New employees will be doing this as part of their orientation. So this should be coming through in a couple of weeks. It’s, I think, a relatively good idea. I think anything we can do to stop or reduce child abuse is a good thing. If this had been in place at Penn State, perhaps some good would have come of it. Anyway, you should be aware of that and the importance of it and the fact that it is coming soon. Yes?

A. Levin: What if people have already done this training?

A. Rosenbaum: I believe if you have already done this training you have a certificate or something and there will be an opportunity to provide that to Human Resources. So they are not I think asking everyone to do it a second time if they have already done it. But, again, HR will let us know the details. Deb’s not here today is she? Deb can you give us something on this? You’re probably better equipped to handle that question than I was.

D. Haliczer: Thank you. We appreciate everyone doing this. This is a new state law. We are working on getting the information to the Web site. Lots of you already are mandated reporters and you know who you are. You will be able to provide us with your, all we need to get back from everybody is a certification, a statement that you recognize that you’re a mandated reporter. Alan is a poster child. Alan went ahead and did the entire training. You can, if you choose, do the entire training if you are in a background where this is something that would be appropriate for you. For most people you just need to read the essential materials about what constitutes child abuse, when you should make a report, and how you should make a report. But we are working on all the details and coordinating with DCFS and we should have that very soon. So it’s a one-time thing, we are going get all 8,500 or so employees, that’s everybody, student workers and everyone, to do this form and to inform you about the procedure and then we’ll just do every new employee who gets hired.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so in other words, they don’t actually have to do the training, they just have to do the form that says they are aware that they are a mandated reporter?

D. Haliczer: The state law only requires that we acknowledge that we are mandated reporters. If you’re like me, I like to know a little bit, have a little training on what exactly I have to do and what this means, and so the training will be the essential information. If you want to do the whole hour to hour-and-a-half online training, its excellent training.

A. Rosenbaum: Yea, it’s actually not bad at all.
D. Haliczer: No, I did it too and I have my certificate, but all we need is for everybody to understand the basics and what to do.

A. Rosenbaum: What did you get on the exam by the way?

D. Haliczer: Perfect score on the pre- and post-test. Duh, I’ve been a mandated reporter for 35 years.

A. Rosenbaum: Such a show-off.

D. Haliczer: I am a show-off and most of you too.

A. Rosenbaum: I think I missed one question.

D. Haliczer: You missed a question?

A. Rosenbaum: Well it was a trick question I thought.

D. Haliczer: There are some trick questions, but I used to supervise this in a previous life so I know the answers. Cool. But thank you all for doing it. You’ll hear from us soon. And, unfortunately, because of some timing issues with communication with cabinet and DCFS, we had hoped to get this out before ethics training, looks like they are going to overlap so you are all the ambassadors. This is not ethics training this is something additional, okay.

A. Rosenbaum: It sounds like it’s been overly simplified in case people don’t want to do the training you don’t have to do the training. You just acknowledge you’re a mandated reporter. One question I have Deb: Those of us who are mandated reporters sort of have a slightly better idea, if I hadn’t missed that question I would have said we have a better idea, but if somebody has no familiarity of the mandated reporter training and even if they’ve done the thing, they still have questions about what’s reportable, do we have someone who they can talk to?

D. Haliczer: It is likely that I am the person who is going be designated in Human Resources as your advisor on if you have questions what to do. Obviously we are all directed to call the Department of Children and Family Services if we have a question, but for basic internal questions I’ll be the consultant on that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so essentially if somebody sees something or knows of something and is not certain, they can call you and you will advise them on whether or not they need to make a report or not.

D. Haliczer: Yea, the law, we have to assure everyone that if you see or suspect or know of, there is no one who can restrict you from calling the hot line at the State of Illinois. It’s your obligation now by law. No one will tell you not to do it.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you.
**D. Haliczer:** Okay, thank you so much.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, last item that I have has to do with our Blackboard Web site which hopefully those of you who are new to the senate have discovered and those of you who have been in the senate a while look at once in a while. At any rate, the policy that we’ve had on the Blackboard community has been is that only senators can get into it and I have denied many requests since we started the Blackboard from people who are not senators who wanted to have access to the Blackboard community. The reason I have done this is because I wanted to have it be a place where senators could discuss issues without concern that it’s leaking into the outside community, administration, Northern Star or whatever. We have had a reasonable request from Sonya to be given access to the Blackboard. My initial thought was to deny the request but then we thought about it and it seemed like she might have good reason to have access given that she’s representing our issues to the IBHE. We discussed this in Executive Committee and the Executive Committee felt that Sonya had good grounds for being given access to the Blackboard Web site.

In doing that, the committee also raised a couple of issues which are that the assumption has always been, although I don’t think it’s stated anywhere, that the conversations that go on on the Blackboard are confidential. So if we have a chat or if we open up a discussion thread, the intention was that senators would not violate the confidentiality of that. On the other hand, things that we post on Blackboard are there for you to sometimes download them and distribute them to your departments. Given that we had really never mentioned this business about confidentiality, I agreed that we would but a confidentiality statement on the Blackboard community and that confidentiality statement that we’re working on will say something like the materials are not confidential unless it specifies on the material that it’s confidential, but any discussion that’s going on on Blackboard should be kept confidential and we’re asking you all to respect that so that the Blackboard discussions, if there are any, and again we haven’t had a lot of them. The intention was that we would or the expectation was but it doesn’t seem to be developing in that way, but in case it ever does, we want to maintain the confidentiality of that.

We also decided that we couldn’t simply make an exception for Sonya without also having a procedure for considering the requests of others and a number of people have made such requests. And so what the Executive Committee decided was that if anybody who is not a senator wants access to the Blackboard community, then they would have to write a letter to the Executive Committee explaining why they ought to have access and how that would benefit either the senate or the faculty as a whole. And so we will then consider those in Executive Committee and not burden the senate with them in general. So the Executive Committee felt that they would handle that as an internal affair. We don’t have to do that if the senators as a whole feel that they would like to consider whatever applications we get, we can do that, but this is the way the Executive Committee voted on it. If anyone has any concerns about that or would like to suggest that the senate as a whole should rule on these, please say so. Yes?

**M C. Smith:** Are Faculty Senate meetings open meetings?

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have treated the Faculty Senate meetings as open meeting. I don’t think they are technically open meetings. If we wanted to, we would not have to follow the Open
Meetings Act, because we are not a policy making body. That’s my understanding, so we don’t have to do that, but we have done that. We’ve treated as an open meeting. We invite people to come, the Northern Star covers us, so for all intents and purposes, we behave as an open meeting but we’re not required to do so.

M C. Smith: So, if we’re acting as an open meeting, then that suggests to me that our Blackboard community site should also be open in the interest of transparency.

A. Rosenbaum: But we are not required to be an open meeting.

M C. Smith: I understand we’re not required to do so, but as you said we’re acting as open meeting and…

A. Rosenbaum: Well, one of the problems with that is we have gotten burned a few times on things that we have discussed in the senate that found their way into the Northern Star and then created some problems, so it makes us sometimes a little gun shy about discussing certain issues on the floor of the senate and that really shouldn’t be the case. We should be able to discuss issues that are of import to the faculty without fear that anything we say might end up on the newspaper. So for that reason we have closed the Blackboard community to outside individuals. Debra?

D. Zahay-Blatz: I also think the Blackboard site has documents that are under discussion and under review and it’s a good place for us to talk about those things off-line so I’m not sure it should be public.

A. Rosenbaum: Yea, I would oppose making it public. I think we would in a large part lose the purpose of it if we did that but, Cecil do you want to again argue that we …

M C. Smith: I’m just in favor of transparency.

A. Rosenbaum: I can put it to a vote if you ask for that.

M C. Smith: I’m not sensing a lot of love here. It’s my own opinion.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, fair enough. Any other opinions on this or comments? If we don’t have any other comments, though, we’ll follow that policy of considering applications on a case by case basis and will not burden the senate with making those decisions unless the senate would like us to do otherwise. Okay? Yes, Jeff?

J. Kowalski: In the case of Sonya, the reason why the exception might be made is essentially that she is the NIU representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council that makes good sense, but it’s really the position of the person involved that should be the criteria and I think not the person.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, exactly.
J. Kowalski: I hope that would be the applicable principle used.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s the only reason she’s been given it by virtue of her position. Any other comments?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 3-4
   The Three-Year Bachelor’s Degree, AASCU (also posted to FS Blackboard)
   MAP 101 (also posted to FS Blackboard)

A. Rosenbaum: We have reports, the first one coincidentally from Sonya who will update us on the FAC to the IBHE. Sonya.

S. Armstrong: So we met September 21 at Moraine Valley Community College. I’m trying out a new format here so you have to tell me if you like this better where its topic basic based and I’m using my best journalistic principles to put the most important information at the top. First, some news, the IBHE staff is growing. They’ve recently hired three who are all new assistant directors of academic affairs and right this minute they are actually doing interviews to replace the deputy director, Bob Blakenburger. We’re told that we should have a new deputy director in place by the end of this month, early November at the very latest. Staffing is going well.

The second item is actually the three-year bachelor’s degree. I did get a document posted on Blackboard in case you want to know more about this. I’m bringing it kind of as an information item only. It was posed to us at the meeting with some urgency, however, what you’ll note is that when we had guests, Senator Ed Maloney and also Representative Bob Pritchard, when we had them come in and discuss this, they had no knowledge of a three-year degree, they did not feel like it was something that we should be worried about, but given the urgency with which this was posed to us, I thought I’d bring it back just so it’s on our radar that this is a possibility. That document will actually explain the various models for a three-year bachelor’s degree in case you’re interested.

The last thing and this is something I think I reported on last spring, the IBHE is considering and is now moving forward with, a Faculty Fellows Program. This is kind of a cool idea, I think, in that faculty can actually take sabbatical time to work on special projects with the IBHE. So this would be you know on a case by case basis, the university would have to absorb costs and such, but as soon as I get information about this I can bring this back in case any senators want to apply for this for a sabbatical.

The remainder of the meeting was really spent with Ed Maloney and Bob Pritchard kind of putting items on our agenda; kind of suggesting to us avenues to take in our discussions. As always MAP funding was number one. Performance-based funding came up again and the way
that it came up was really more just kind of an information item. I’m told that at the next meeting we’re going to have kind of performance-based funding 101 because it came back that a lot of us don’t really understand the principles of performance-based funding, so I’ll be able to update you on that next time. And then finally, the issue of public and media relations continues to come up and both Pritchard and Maloney gave us a lot of suggestions as to how we can better communicate with the press.

The last thing I point your attention to is on the second page, those of us in the public caucus met to determine what topics we wanted to address this year and you can look at the list. It’s probably all the usual suspects; pensions, performance based funding, program elimination, and so on. If there are other topics that you want us to address in the public caucus, if you want to send those to me then I’ll be happy to take those back, but currently this is our list of topics for discussion this year. I think that concludes my report.

A. Rosenbaum: Very good. Questions or comments for Sonya? Yes?

A. Levin: I would like to draw everyone’s attention to I think its slide 14 in the MAP PowerPoint, and if you don’t have it here, when you leave here. It’s a breakdown of how many weeks a year a student would have to work full-time to afford college these days. And according to that chart, it’s 36 weeks a year. I adjusted it for Illinois minimum wage which is as you know a dollar more than federal, and it would be 32 weeks a year. So this means that a student would have to work full-time for 32 weeks to afford college before paying for any living expenses and I think that’s a critical issue for all faculty to be aware of because it’s going to affect everything about how we approach students. So I just wanted to draw attention to that.

A. Rosenbaum: Other comments, and remember Sonya is also asking how we feel about this new format, which I think by the way is great. It really makes it a much more readable report, but that’s just my opinion. Any comments or questions? Sonya one point that I was concerned about is they keep making this point that performance-based funding the money is insignificant at this point and I think that’s a way of sort of getting us to sort of go along with anything they want but that’s going to increase and so we have to make sure that the criteria that are in place, the metrics are favorable to our University or we’re going to find ourselves in some trouble.

S. Armstrong: I think it was at that point where we determined that we really didn’t have a good understanding, many of us, and so just like the MAP 101 presentation was given, we’re going to do, like I said, someone is in charge of a performance-based funding 101 for us all and I’ll be able to bring that back.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, good. No other questions.

B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 5-6

A. Rosenbaum: The Student Association report, Austin is not here but Mike Theodore is and Mike will give us the Student Association report.
M. Theodore: Thank you, Alan. My name is Mike Theodore I’m with the Student Association and I’m chairman of the University Services Oversight Committee. So we do deal with a lot of the issues that directly affect students that come out of the university and Austin, who was unable to make it today, wanted me to address some of the concerns that we’ve been having recently and sort of relay what you’ll be hearing from the student body a lot this year and the following semester.

First of all, I want to bring up a few of the ways the Student Association is working towards making this a more student-centered university and we are taking various steps because we are hearing many issues now that the senate is in session, we’re hearing a lot of issues from students coming to us. First of all, and I’m sure it’s rather predictable this is going to be coming up this semester, which is the printing issue. Many students are starting to suddenly notice that there’s a quota on printing. You go in, you slide the card, you get the balance. And we made efforts to try to make sure students knew beforehand, but now they are starting to notice it and this is an issue that’s going to be brought up the ladder and will most likely be heard in this room a lot because many students are starting to wonder what they are paying for especially when the past years whenever printing has been brought up, they’re told you’re already paying for that in your technology fee. It was brought up before the amount of years it’s going to take for students to pay off debt and the one thing you’ve got to think about and I say this to many of the faculty in this room who relay back to other faculty members is that there are still many of you professors at the university, many instructors, who are requiring students to print out a large amount of materials for class. That’s starting to cause some adverse effects because the one reason that we are dealing with the printing quota was the fact that much of the stuff would start being shipped on to Blackboard and that’s a process that still hasn’t been dealt with fully and efficiently yet and that’s one thing that’s going to be talked about much in the next few months.

Secondly, and you’ve heard Austin talk about it before, is the grievance policy. Last year we presented to the University Affairs Committee of the University Council and it’s sort of gone around for review to many individuals as a first draft of what exactly a student grievance policy would look like. We do have an actual, instead of just being talked about, we do have a hard copy, something to look at, something to debate. So this issue will be coming forward in Faculty Senate, in University Council as an actual issue as opposed to just talking about it because now there is an actual draft of that.

Now away from all the more student-centered stuff, one of the things Austin definitely wanted me to focus on and it’s been talked about recently, and especially with the Clery Act which just came out is campus safety. This is an issue that is affecting the student body a lot. And it’s not only affecting the student body, it’s affecting the university, it’s affecting our press, it’s affecting our enrollment, it’s affecting how our students are acting on-campus and off-campus. And while flipping through the Clery Act I was noticing a lot of references to campus safety issues and our campus safety is looking better than, it’s looking good, we do have a very safe campus. But what we forget a lot of times is that it is just not on-campus issues. It’s that we do have an off-campus crime issue and that’s one thing we definitely want to pressure the university, is to start taking responsibility for the crime that’s occurring off campus. This is something that’s affecting our student body. This isn’t just an issue that’s just left for the City of DeKalb because it’s the students who live in these areas that are going through a lot of these crime issues and we’re
hearing it over and over and over again, and it’s not just some ______ I mean you’re often hard
to find a student who lives off-campus that hasn’t seen violent crimes being committed near
them. I’m talking to students now who are hearing gun shots constantly around where they are
living and this is not just a DeKalb issue, this is something that NIU touches because we are a
part of this community. This is something that we’ll be bringing this up a lot at Faculty Senate.
We will be bringing this to University Council. We will bringing it up to students across campus,
faculty and staff because it is not just an issue that affects students that live around campus. The
crime that is occurring in the City of DeKalb is something that directly affects NIU and we’ll be
bringing it up a lot. That’s mainly all I have outside of the written report.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any comments or questions for Mike? Mike, just a quick question, does
the Student Association have some idea of what they would be asking the university, the faculty
to do about the safety problem or is it just that you want it recognized and something done about
it? Or are they saying the university isn’t doing enough, the university needs to do this instead of
that, do you have some ideas?

M. Theodore: Well, from my perspective, from Austin’s perspective, and from the perspective
of many people in the Student Association is, first of all, before it gets to any specific ways to
address crime, is we have to get past this perception-versus-reality issue. It’s been talked about
so many times and I’ve talked to so many people within NIU, within the administration about the
crime issue and they keep saying: It’s not a crime issue we’re dealing with, it’s a perception
issue. From the students that are around here, this is not a perception issue, this is a reality when
you are dealing with major crimes around the area where students are living every single night.
That’s defiantly the first step we have to get behind that this is not a perception issue, this is a
reality. Once we get past that step and once we start looking into this issue as a reality and not
something we can just push away, there’s a large amount of things that can be done and they’ve
already been looked into. We’ve been talking a lot with the safety cabinet as well as with NIU
police about options. But when I talk with many people above them, it’s all about perception and
that’s a problem. This is reality. In many ways when we hear a lot of talk about what’s going to
be done about crime, we don’t really take it very seriously when it’s just being talked about as
this is a perception issue. When it’s a reality issue then we can start taking this seriously. That’s
the first step.

And secondly, last year we saw when homecoming came around which we all know is a big time
where we see a lot of stuff happening in the area, last year the campus starting getting a lot more
involved in the area where there is usually crime. We have walk-around programs just making
sure nobody is doing anything dangerous outside. That is something that I know is being taken
into account again this year, so that’s the first step. Besides that, I don’t have any, because I’ve
heard so many different opinions and Student Association we haven’t exactly gotten together and
relayed exactly what we want done, so I don’t really feel comfortable talking specifically about
specific things, but definitely starting to take it seriously is the first step.

A. Rosenbaum: But, again, the idea that you’re sort of suggesting is that the administration is
seeing this merely as a perception and that would imply that they are not doing anything, when in
fact it appears that they are deploying a lot of university security into those areas, some of the
higher level administrators are working very closely with the police, so their actions, they are
taking actions they are not just saying you’re imagining this. So it would seem that perhaps their concerned that the impression in the outside world that NIU is not a safe place is not fair but that doesn’t mean that they are not concerned about things that are going on in the community because it sounds like, to a great extent, they are working to keep things under control in the areas that you are talking about.

**M. Theodore:** And this is really what confused me and bothers me in many respects is that the university is taking steps but at the same time is saying that it is a perception issue. So it’s sort of a very odd balance. So the question is: If you’re saying it’s a perception issue and you’re taking steps, are you taking steps to appear as if you are taking steps, or are you taking steps because there is a crime issue. So there is this really uncomfortable balance that I think is occurring and I think we all need to get on the same page here and that it is a real issue around the area.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, yes, comments?

**G. Chen:** My name is Gary Chen from Industrial Systems Engineering. What I am going to comment on the following I have no evidence or confirmation. It is just based on a conversation with my student as a faculty member. One day he and I drove to a hospital for a project. On the road we chatted and he told me that based on his experience as a student, “Dr. Chen, how come that NIU is not checking the criminal backgrounds or the background of the CHANCE students that much?” I have no idea or have no clue how to do that, but from what he’s telling me, that from what he has known and I have no confirmation, that some of those CHANCE students, I understand the spirit of helping students who have disadvantage, I have no question at all about that, but from what he told me that some of those CHANCE students they use the money that they got as a support from NIU to buy some stuff they should not do and some of them, they even had the drug dealer background and bring in their Chicago area friends who have a drug dealing background come into the NIU community. But I have no evidence, no confirmation whatsoever, but this is what I heard based upon my conversation as a faculty member with my graduate student.

**A. Rosenbaum:** NIU doesn’t do background checks I think on any of our students so that’s not a university policy. Sonya, did you want to comment?

**S. Armstrong:** I am not a senator but I have to say something here. If there is no evidence, I would really urge folks to not perpetuate those types of stereotypes. Very little that was actually passed on just then was accurate. Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Any other comments? George?

**G. Slotsve:** The other thing I think we should be careful of is we’re throwing the word CHANCE students around here and I don’t think that this is something that we could sit there and say: Oh this is just all a problem with CHANCE students. This is something that if we are going to talk about the issue, it’s broad student body you want to be talking, don’t start isolating students and saying its coming from one particular area of our student body, etc.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Thank you.
**B. Pitney:** I just wanted to thank Sonya for articulating her comment in response to the previous comment to hers. I thought that was very well put and very appropriate and I felt the same way, she just articulated it much better than I ever could have, so thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes?

**M. Theodore:** I just wanted to comment further and I do agree with the point made that it is something to address as an entire student body and not isolated. But at the same time, and I’m not saying this as sort of a super defending the student body and saying we’re all perfect, no. But we do take responsibility when students are committing crimes through the code of ethics and I’ve seen that a lot personally myself. But the big issue that we’re seeing off-campus is not just something dealing with the student body. What we look at a lot is we deal with non-student to non-student relation. We look at non-student to student relations that often cause a lot of these crimes to be committed and what I’ve heard from many people, and I’m not saying this is the general add to this being said, but a lot of saying: Okay if it’s a non-student committing a crime to a student off-campus that’s not really university concern. But that is a concern, because it is hurting the safety of our students directly in the area of where they are living around campus and that is something that NIU needs to address because we need to protect the student body even if it’s protecting the students from non-students off-campus. That is where we are seeing a lot of the crime being committed and that’s why a lot of these crimes aren’t coming up in the Clery Act report and so we’re seeing not a lot of accurate statistics because we’re seeing issues relating to non-students to students and that is one of the most major concern we’re dealing with.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, the Clery Act does report on crimes in areas adjacent to the campus. It’s not just restricted to the campus proper.

**M. Theodore:** Yea, I know but just when I read the Clery Act it just doesn’t seem totally accurate of the real issue around campus. And maybe it is just because I live off-campus around where these things are occurring. I know people who are living around these things that are occurring. I’ve known people who are being directly affected by it and so when I’m reading, you know, that things are looking better, when in the past month around the area where a lot of students are living, including myself, we’ve been seeing a lot of issues and issues that we just can’t ignore anymore. Even if these are issues with non-students, this is something that’s affecting us, you know, when we’re having all these issues happening right by us and so that’s why we’re bringing it up. That’s why we’re bringing this to Faculty Senate, to University Council, to everywhere we can because this affects everything.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, again, I’m sure the faculty shares your concerns about the safety of students so if there is something that faculty can do, I’m sure we would be happy to do that. We certainly need to keep students safe. Any other comments or questions for Mike?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report
A. Rosenbaum: Moving on to a lighter issue, the report on the NIU Board of Trustees meeting which I’m sure you are looking forward to. I’m not going to go into it in great detail because you can read it if you are interested in it.

The main issues had to do with the approval of the internal budget. The budget for 2013 was approved. They also put in the budget guidelines for the FY2014 budget and the guidelines for that budget, I think I mentioned this in my report from the finance and facilities, so let me not waste your time with that.

The other thing that was of interest was the president presented an update regarding the progress on the Vision 2020 initiative. You have a link in this report to the PowerPoint that the president presented so you can look at that directly. Among the highlights were improvements in enrollments of first-year students. Remember we talked about this at the last meeting, that our enrollment is composed of a couple of different components. One is the new entering class, another is retention of students that are already in place, and a third is transfer students from community colleges. Our enrollment of new freshman students, first-year students, was good. It reversed a trend of decreasing enrollments for the last couple of years. The quality of the students was higher. So we had an improvement in the number of students coming from the top ten percent and the top 25 percent of their graduating high school classes. We had an improvement in our average ACT. We had a very good enrollment of honor students, I think close to twice as many as last year, with an average ACT score of 29 and an average high school GPA of 3.96 out of 4. So that was good. The number of students retained has continued to not be a good thing and the number of transfer students state-wide has declined and all the universities are feeling that decline and that has been attributed to perhaps the economy but that is not a specific NIU problem but a more general problem. George?

G. Slotsve: Just wanted to comment on a couple of things here I guess, Alan, or at least one. I’m happy to see that among the honors, the ACT, the average score went up. On the other hand, the mean is a summary statistic and it would be useful to maybe see a histogram of these ACT scores. For example, 16-17, 17-18, I can get a mean going up and have a bimodal distribution sitting here and have a higher percentage coming in at the bottom end. This was also reported for honors students. It would be interesting to see this for all students. It’s nice to know what’s going on with the honors students and our best students, but what’s happening overall to our student body? Once again, a mean can mask underlying distributional changing. I would hope we can get some information as what’s going on at the low end of the distribution versus the top end of the distribution and see if we got a bimodal distribution of the students at the university and how that’s evolving.
A. Rosenbaum: We can certainly get that information number one. Number two, I have spoken to Ray Alden about coming in and addressing the senate and he was very amenable to that. He asked that we wait until after the president’s State of the University address. If the senate would like and we can invite Ray to come in and he can address some of these issues with us. Rosemary?

R. Feurer: For those of who are statistically accomplished, I’ll put it in another way. I have been told that the number of students coming in with 16 and 17 ACTs has gone up markedly and that those students are not being sent to the CHANCE Program. There is a formula that’s been developed so that there are more admissions. I’m gravely concerned. I’d like to know if that’s true.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, well we can invite the provost to come in and fill us in on those kinds of issues and address questions that we might have for him and we can do that at our next meeting if you would like. Okay. Any other questions or comments on this Board of Trustees report?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report
B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report
D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report
E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Page 9

A. Rosenbaum: All right, the last item I think we have, I don’t think any reports from any of our chairs. The only one we have Jim Wilson who is our liaison spokesperson to Resources, Space and Budget. Jim, is Jim here? Jim, do have a report that you want to give or do want it just to be in the folder?

J. Wilson: Just in the folder.

A. Rosenbaum: No verbal report, but we do have a report in the agenda.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
A. Rosenbaum: Alright, any comments or questions from the floor, issues that you would like the senate to be addressing? Comments, thoughts? Okay, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate Policy – Page 10
B. Annual Report, University Benefits Committee
C. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
D. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
E. Minutes, Athletic Board
F. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
G. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
H. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
I. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
J. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
K. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
L. Minutes, General Education Committee
M. Minutes, Honors Committee
N. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
O. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
P. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
Q. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
R. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

C. Cappell: Move to adjourn.


Meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.