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I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s come to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. One is Sonya Armstrong’s report on the FAC to the IBHE under XII. A., and the second one is under X.B. We’re going to try and find a representative to the committee to select the presidential engagement professor. That is a committee and we are going to try and find someone to represent us on that committee. I need a motion to accept the agenda with the two walk-in items.

R. Lopez: So move.

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


A. Rosenbaum: Any comments, questions? All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.
A. Rosenbaum: Opposed, abstention? Okay we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 31, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the approval of minutes from the October 31 Faculty Senate meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Second?

M.E. Koren: Koren.

A. Rosenbaum: Any corrections, changes, omissions, additions? All in favor of approving the minutes of the October 31 meeting say aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Okay, so we have the approval of the minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: We have a number of things on the agenda today including two guests who are going to be speaking to us, so I’m not going to take a tremendous amount of time. I want to just point out to you that we still have pension reform in the state. You should be paying close attention to the SUAA reports and messages that you get. Those of you who are members of SUAA, don’t just delete them. It’s not always a trip to the opera or dinner at some restaurant. Those of you who are not members of SUAA, ask yourself why not. It’s very inexpensive and they do terrific work for us. The concern that apparently has been expressed is that pension reform will probably be dealt with at the lame duck session which is January 2 through 9 and what appears to happen at this lame duck session is that things happen very quickly. It’s a way of doing business where they don’t have to take responsibility for it and also apparently it takes much fewer votes to get things through at the lame duck session than at other times and SUAA keeps a close eye on the legislature. We should be paying close attention and be ready to contact our representatives if something comes up that is not in our best interests. So far we have been very successful by keeping a close watch on them and contacting the various representatives. We’ve managed to successfully defeat the constitutional amendment and also other attempts to push through reform to the pension system. Please pay close attention to that. If you are not a member of SUAA, you might want to consider joining. It’s definitely worth the very small annual dues.

Next, I want to give you a very brief update on the search committee to find the successor to John Peters, Presidential Search Advisory Committee, as it’s called. The committee was finally charged at the last Board of Trustees meeting, I’ll cover that under my report on the Board of Trustees. The committee met immediately following the Board of Trustees meetings and began
trying to develop the position profile and job description. So it’s very important that we get a very good profile and job description because that’s what’s used in the advertisements and that’s what is used by the search firm in soliciting applicants for the position. That has to be done first before any ads can even go out. The committee met and spent several hours talking about that. You remember at our last meeting we spoke about that together and it was a good thing that we did that because it enabled us to generate a very good list of things that were important to the faculty in terms of what our next president should be like and what our president should do. That was very helpful, we were able to give that list to the search firm and the search firm is putting together the input from various sources around the university to come up with this description.

We are going to meet again on December 6 and at the December 6 meeting two things will happen. First, the search committee will meet at noon to try and put the criteria into some order in terms of priorities. After the search committee meets for a couple of hours, we will then get together with the Board of Trustees. The full Board of Trustees has asked to meet with the search committee and at that point we will try and hammer out finally what the position description will look like. Again, I should remind you because they keep reminding us, that this is all the prerogative of the Board of Trustees so they can take input from us and advise, but they are not obligated to do so. They, however, seem to be very agreeable to working with the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Even the name of it, it’s called the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. It is advisory to the Board of Trustees. You should also know that when we eventually develop the short list of candidates for the Board of Trustees, it is then out of the hands of the search committee. So we will not be ordering the candidates, we will not be saying this is our first choice, second choice, third choice. We will give them the short list which will have five, plus or minus, candidates on it and then it is in the hands of the Board of Trustees. They have complete control over that but so far they are respecting shared governance and are sort of working with the search committee. I’m confident that that will be a successful collaboration.

Next item, Matt Streb who is our liaison to the Athletic Board has asked to be able to make a brief statement, Matt.

A. Matt Streb, Faculty Athletics Representative

M. Streb: Hi, Matt Streb, faculty athletics rep, and I want to share with you a bit of good news today. Most of you I think, or many of you, are aware of our national ranking in football. We are currently ranked 21st in the BCS standings, but that’s not what I’m here to talk about today. That’s not the thing that I’m most proud about, that’s not the ranking that we’re most proud about. And that is the most recently released, the most recent, graduation rates and our football team is currently, from a graduation rank standpoint, ranked 16th in the country and that is out of slightly more than 100 FBS schools and it’s the highest graduation rate our football team has ever received. It’s 15 points higher than the national average so we’re very proud of that. The rate that we use is the NCAA rate, it’s called the GSR. The GSR is a little different from the federal graduation rate, which most of you are probably familiar with, because it allows us to get credit for transfer students who graduate. If students leave the institution in good academic standing, we don’t get penalized for that as well. So the football team is doing very well on the field and in the classroom. Very briefly, our overall student athletes are doing a wonderful job too. Our overall student athlete graduation rate was also 83 percent. Ten of our sports we’re either at or above the national average and our overall athletic program was three percent above
the national average. I think, overall, we have a lot to be proud of. Our students are getting it done not only in competition but in the classroom as well. Thanks very much for your time.

A. Rosenbaum: Thanks a lot, Matt. And if anybody has been in a coma for the last few days, the team, of course, is going to play for the MAC Championship on Friday night and that will be very exciting and who knows, if they win that we might end up in the Orange Bowl I’ve heard. But, at any rate, we will end up in a good bowl game and so that’s a very exciting thing for us.

B. HLC Self-Study Process – presentation
Doris Macdonald, HLC Accreditation Steering Committee Chair

A. Rosenbaum: Our first guest is Doris Macdonald who wants to speak to us. She asked for time to talk to us about the Higher Learning Commission self study process. Doris.

D. Macdonald: I’m actually going to sit if that’s okay just for the purpose of the microphone, but we’ll let this warm up. Thank you for inviting me. I know it’s a busy schedule, it’s a busy time of year, but we are in the process of preparing for the ten-year reaccreditation by the institution every ten years. The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central states, so some people remember North Central Association better that the HLC, but the HLC self study, we are in the midst. I’m going to give you just a little bit of background, a little bit of update. This is part of what I’ve been doing. Going around campus to as many units, as many colleges and committees and groups as possible to get the word out and you are one of them. And because faculty are an important part of our whole system, it’s very important that I speak to you particularly. I’m going to tell you a little bit about sort of where we are. This is an institutional effort, contextualize the HLC, the present report in terms of ten years ago. Tell you a little bit about the committees, I know there are many people in this room who are on some of these self-study committees, thank you for that, and tell you a little bit about the documents that are going to be provided and a bit about the site team and a team visit is scheduled. The site team will be here from the third to the fifth of March in 2014. That’s a really nice date for us. We were at one point looking at potentially November 2013 which would have been a stressor. We’d do it, but it would be a stressor.

So what is accreditation for? It’s public assurance, it’s evidence of quality, it’s an opportunity for outside examination and consultation and that is, of course, of what the HLC is. They provide an assurance part and they also provide a consultation part. But most importantly for us right now is this third point on the PowerPoint which is, it’s our opportunity for self-study for self-analysis across the board, all functions and facilities in the entire institution. And because it’s an opportunity for self-analysis we are really looking and digging deep into data and the HLC has changed its perspective and changed its criteria recently and its perspective is very much on evidence-based, data-based report as opposed to a more narrative report. I think some people in this room were also involved ten years ago on the report and that was a very lengthy, 300-page, text heavy report. We have some restrictions on length, on content now and we also have restrictions on sort of perspective which is focusing on outcomes, focusing on data, focusing on evidence; not focusing on narrative and process. Ten years ago was our last full review. There were a couple of things that we had to follow up on per the HLC’s recommendation, so in 2007 we filed a follow-up report that was accepted by the HLC. In 2010 we filed a report on off-campus locations, our three satellite locations.
Just this past year we have begun the process of a substantive change request and this is something that people have been talking about across campus. The idea, what is a substantive change request for? We are moving from one tier, HLC identified tier, into another tier for online programming. So the HLC has tier one is institutions that offer five percent or fewer of their programs online. We have submitted a change request because we are moving into the next tier which is five to 25 percent of programs offered online. Five to 25 percent is a very big window, but we are moving beyond five percent. This is part of what we have to do, we’ve begun the beginning paperwork for that and the rest of it will be taken care of during the site visit, but that’s coming down the line. People have been talking about online programs and distributed learning. This is something we are doing in concert with that.

Also in 2012 we constituted subcommittees that began gathering evidence and gathering data. We are continuing to do that now and we are drafting the report right now, or drafting chapters of the report. We will continue to do that through the spring of 2013 and the site visit, of course, of 2014. We are focusing, of course, on the criteria that are dictated by the HLC and these criteria are organized into five groups. We’ll look at some of those. One of the things we are really keying on doing is trying to engage the entire campus. So in the subcommittees that are working on gathering data and helping to create this self study report, we have representation from students, from operating staff, from SPS, from faculty, from administration. So we have people across the board participating in the process; and, as we go through the process up until the site visit when there is much to do during the site visit, we are going to continue to try to engage the campus.

Here’s a little look at what the criteria are that HLC is looking for. There are five of them. The first one is mission. This is the primary criteria, not just because it’s the first on their list but because all the other work that we are doing in creating this report is reflecting back on the mission. As you recall, last spring, you were instrumental, those of you who were on senate last spring, will remember that the statement of vision, mission and values came before you and it was approved ultimately by the Board of Trustees and Alan was integral in creating that document. The new statement of vision and mission and values is something that we will be speaking to throughout the report. The key for the HLC is that the mission guides all institutional operations and endeavors.

The second criterion is integrity, ethical and responsible conduct. And this is not just conduct of individuals, but this is also that we present ourselves clearly. That we are transparent in everything from our tuition and fees to the courses that we offer, what the catalog looks like. Okay and integrity, ethical and responsible conduct a major key. There are two criteria that speak directly to the teaching and learning mission of the institution, the primary mission. The first one is the quality resources and support. What do we do to foster our mission? How do we support student success? How do we support the teaching mission? What resources do we have to use in the teaching and how do our faculty on staff, how are they instrumental in this mission? The other teaching and learning one is evaluation and improvement. This is where assessment of the learning and this does not just teaching and learning in the classroom. This is also co-curricular endeavors that are teaching and learning endeavors. But that we are responsible, not only do we assess what we do, do we understand what we do, that we work on improving it and that we reflect on what we’re doing as we are assessing. In the assessment field they call this closing the
assessment loop. It’s doing, knowing what you do well, improving on what you’re not doing well, and being able to talk about what the struggles and the points of pride are as well.

And the fifth criterion is resources, planning, institutional effectiveness that we have sufficient resources and structures and processes. Of course, this is for all state institutions, they struggle but we’re speaking to it. Again, all of this ties back to what is the focus in the mission. What does our mission say we do and how do, for example, our resources help meet that mission, foster that mission, feed that mission. This is the steering committee, each person on this list, the steering committee members, are chairing a subcommittee of ten to 15 people who are working on a specific piece of one of the criteria. So, for example, Bill Goldenberg is responsible for the criterion one mission, and he’s chairing a committee of about ten to 15, I think 12 to 15 people who are out gathering data, speaking to specific items that are iterated in the statements by the HLC, questions we actually have to answer.

Then the other four criteria are so large, each of them so large, that they are broken up. So, for example, Mary Ellen Koren, you’re in the second row, is chairing a subcommittee that is dealing with half of criterion two, while Kristin Meyers is dealing with the other half. All of the subcommittee chairs are faculty members. They represent all of the colleges across campus as well as faculty development and instructional design. In addition, the provost’s office staff are integrally involved in this and that includes the Office of Assessment Services and well as the Office of the Vice Provost and the Office of the Provost, as well as all the support staff in those offices who are very key to this being successful.

When the HLC gets our self-study report, what are they going to look for? Evidence, evidence, evidence of continuous improvement throughout the institution. They’re gonna look for evidence that we have assessment and we plan assessment well for all institutional endeavors. This is not just academic assessment. They’re going to look for how we focus on student learning outcomes. There are specific policies that speak in detail to student learning outcomes, including such things as completion rates, loan default rates, all sorts of things related to learning outcomes. They are going to look throughout on how we reflect back on the institutional mission. That’s a rhetorical piece that has to be written, so that’s about how we’re going to write the document that we’re reflecting on the mission. And they are going to look at strategic planning and priorities especially in time of fiscal unease, they want to know how we’re planning. It doesn’t mean we have to be successful in all our plans but that we are being proactive in planning, strategic planning and setting priorities.

Our timeline here, fall’s almost done, but we are gathering evidence and writing, continuing that through the spring. In August, and this is a really important piece I would like you to think about and also take back to colleagues if you have an opportunity to discuss this. In August, we will be posting the report online for NIU community response. We are really encouraging you to have a look at the report, to give us feedback on the report, I can’t promise all the feedback will wind up in the report, but it’s not only that it’s an important thing that the HLC asks us to do, but if this is really about self-study and self-analysis, as much input and as much participation from the campus community as possible, makes it the best possible report. I’m hoping that the report will up and there will be an online response form as well that will be very easy for you to just input comments. That report will be up and available for four to six weeks at the beginning of the fall.
By the end of the fall semester, we are submitting that report, and it’s an electronic submission with an electronic resource room to the commission and they will come for the visit.

When they come, there’ll be ten to 12 consultant evaluators. They will come from outside the state. We have been asked, this year, it’s a new perspective by the HLC to send a quite short list, but a list of what kind of skill sets would you like some of your evaluators to have or what sort of perspectives would you like evaluators to have? It’s no longer the case that it’s like big state universities get evaluated from other big state universities. There is much more diversity. We may have someone from a small religious college, we may have someone from a Big Ten institution, we may have someone from a mid-sized institution much like ours. But they’ve also said are there certain things you would like to have because the evaluation part is important, but the consultation part is also a very important part of this process.

They will verify that what we said in the report is right. They’ll judge whether we’ve been compliant. The HLC is the mediator between federal regulation and our compliance, federal compliance. All of you, for example, the course activity documentation that was instituted this semester where you posted what you’re doing, how you’re spending your time in your class, and your syllabus. By the way, thank you for doing that. Apparently, as of this morning, it’s about 93 percent of every course on the books has been uploaded and submitted and that’s really excellent participation and it was one of those things that is a late policy, it’s federal compliance, credit hour production and accounting for credit hours. The HLC requires that we do this. Not just for the self-study, but requires that we do this so that we are in continual compliance with federal regulations. I just really appreciate, for those of you who’ve done it and done it willingly and even those of you who haven’t done it willingly, thanks for doing it anyhow. It will be a continuous process. We will be doing this on a regular basis and once you’ve done it once, it sort of becomes much easier. But they’ll judge compliance, that’s just one piece of federal compliance, there’s much, many, many pieces of federal compliance. They’ll consult with us, they’ll recommend, there will be a whole set of meetings, I’m sure they are going want to meet either with the senate or with representatives of the senate. They are plan meetings, there are also spontaneous meeting, we put together a fairly elaborate schedule and typically changes within the first day because the evaluators decide they need to meet with somebody about this or somebody about that, but there will be numerous meetings on campus. There will also be open forums and, for those of you who aren’t involved in any of the plan meetings, please try to participate. Come to an open forum. Send your colleagues to an open forum. Send your students to the student forums. Be a presence. Then the team leaves and they send us a report and a recommendation and we a response to whatever the recommendations are.

How can you help? Commit to the process. I know this room is already full of people who are really committed to service on this campus and many of you are also committed to this process because you’ve been participating in the process already. Many of you have also been asked for information, so can you give me some information on this? Do you have a report on that? We appreciate that you are timely and kind when you respond to requests that we have for information or for action. We’d really like you as much as possible to encourage participation when there are events or opportunities to serve. We will try to get the word out. We are working on a sort of a PR kind of plan to keep this in the forefront; to keep this in people’s mind and with that PR we are also hoping to have some, to work at getting more word out about the new statement about vision, mission and value. The new mission and vision statement we hope they’ll
be some more campus publicity about it. Just sort of a get-to-know, make sure you’re familiar with it, and again, spread the word when you can.

If you’d like more information, if you interested in how the policies run or what the criterion look like, you can go to the HLC website. That’s NCAAHLC.org. Have a look, look at the criteria, see what it is we’re writing to. You can also look at our own NIU Web site. On that Web site we have our agendas, our minutes, our meeting schedule, the lists of the steering committees, the lists of who are on the subcommittees and any other information. We have a little countdown clock that’s making me nervous, but it’s good to have it there. We also have an e-mail. If you have questions, if you have requests, if you have comments, and you don’t know how to find me, HLC2014@niu.edu, or if you contact one of the steering committee members, ask one of the steering committee members a question or if you know somebody who is on one of the subcommittees, and you have a question or you have some information that you think is important for us to have, pass that along. Because it is an all-institution endeavor. We are looking for input from as many sources as we can. We are looking for as much solid evidence as we can for institutional effectiveness. Now I’m just going to open it up and see if anybody has any questions for me. I stunned you into silence.

A. Rosenbaum: They are just glad they don’t have to do what you’re doing.

D. Macdonald: Well, it’s actually pretty interesting, I have to tell you and I really appreciate that everybody who’s been helping and been part of this. George, you have a question?

G. Slotsve: It’s not so much, it’s more of a suggestion than a question, but when I filled out the online form for allocation of time to different activities, everything is filled out in percentage terms, so percentage of outside of classroom time. It would have been useful to be able to have someplace where you could report how we’re spending, the percentage of what.

D. Macdonald: Well, there actually is on that form at the very top, there is a little box that has how many in-class hours and how many out-of-class hours and what’s happened is that’s been pre-populated. If it’s just a regular sort of lecture class, it’s been pre-populated. It can be changed though.

G. Slotsve: Okay, because I didn’t realize that was sitting up there. I didn’t see where it was on the form.

D. Macdonald: This is actually a good piece of information for me to take back because as we’re, there have been a lot of comments as we are rolling up for next semester. I believe you can change that. I know it’s pre-populated but I think you can change it.

G. Slotsve: Because it’s just some classes I’ve got I’ll spend 20 or 25 hours outside and it would be useful for you guys to know that there’s a lot of outside work in some classes.

D. Macdonald: Remember that that number is pre-populated based on the university’s definition of a credit hour and we have a credit hour policy that’s recently been approved that says that for so many hours in the classroom, this many hours outside the classroom, and it is basically the
same policy as the federal government has, so that’s how that’s been pre-populated. I will take that comment back though. Thank you.

G. Slotsve: Thank you.

A. Gupta: Hi, this is Abhijit Gupta. I could find that box of other things, my concern is that when I submitted that one, say for any particular course and I realize that maybe one number was not quite correct, but once it’s submitted it cannot be changed and only it can be changed, it can be changed, eventually I did, but have to wait like two weeks until the chairman had access. So I was thinking maybe at least after we save it, maybe wait one more day before it gets final.

D. Macdonald: Or have a review so that a little delay so you can sort of double check? I believe that’s one of the things that the chairs are sort of charged with doing, is checking to see that the numbers are right, but it may not be like you could contact your chair and say please change this or wait the two weeks until it’s been loaded.

A. Gupta: That’s what I need eventually but I was thinking at least give one day or what about two again bring and make sure is it absolutely correct.

D. Macdonald: Okay, I’ll that that comment back as well.

C. Cappell: I’m just curious about what the equation is that you’re using for an hour outside of classroom or inside credit hour. I know it will vary by extensiveness of the course but can we get that information?

D. Macdonald: The equation is the standard equation which is for every 50-hour period in class, so for every one credit hour, 50 minutes in class and 120 minutes outside of class. So a typical three-credit-hour course is 50-plus 50-plus 50 or 75-150 minutes in a week plus six hours outside of class. And that’s stated in the credit hour policy. We have the credit hour policy. I don’t know if it’s online right now. I think it’s a little box, a little info box, but that’s what the policy is. And that’s the federal definition as well.

C. Cappell: One comment. In my department three of us have to confess to measurement error. We were confused with that old time tracking of faculty activity.

D. Macdonald: Yea, the old faculty activity reports.

C. Cappell: I was sitting there pumping in how much time I was spending outside the classroom.

D. Macdonald: No, it’s the amount of time a student is spending.

C. Cappell: I hope you’ve got some measurement error checks.

D. Macdonald: I think that’s what your chair is doing. I didn’t develop this so I am giving you my perspective on the fixes here. There was a question back there?

C. Cappell:
D. Macdonald: No, and these are good.

M. Kostic: ….. after the deadline when we submit it we couldn’t get back to do it better and I was not being able to upload my syllabuses, it would not accept syllabuses until I was _____ to fix it and then there should be a link on that webpage which help and when you click on that help it should give you another webpage with a list of helps if there is more than one. Not to go to e-mails or chairman, I don’t know why we don’t do it for everything on that MyNIU. It’s so easy, straight forward, it’s done everywhere else and we always have issues with that.

D. Macdonald: So, a little help window that would open up?

M. Kostic: Right, where you click and then you get to another page which may have ten items and ten links which are relevant to us and that number of hours my colleague didn’t even notice, it should be circled and then tell something about it. My questions is this, if it was done in a hurry and we did it 93 percent, we didn’t do it as good as we all would like and could be doing it and when I was choosing those from the list, I was choosing them as they go alphabetically and they would appear alphabetically and over there you could not sort them according to the letter or something. Anyhow, those are my comments that could influence quality of what you are presenting.

D. Macdonald: You know, and I can take all these comments back. This was something that needed to be implemented and the people who put together the bolt on to MyNIU, so that would be Jeff Reynolds and Nick Choban, were working day and night and getting it up and running and we know there are glitches to it and I am hoping that some of those will be taken care of, but these are all comments that are helpful to take back. I don’t know where they are in, like what kinds of comments they’ve had and whether they are thinking about these, but these are all things I will take back. I wasn’t part of creating it and I know the first time you put out something like this you are going to be, this is where you get all the bugs out. I think having done it once, I’m hoping that you’re all sort of familiar with the idea of doing it and one of the ways I’ve been looking at it is the stuff what I put in there, is exactly what should be reflected in my syllabus anyhow. This should be information that’s reflected in the syllabus – what the students are going to do and what’s expected of them in the class. I can take those comments back and I will pass them on to the web folks or to the IT folks who developed this. Gupta you had another?

A. Gupta: Just to add like if I recall correctly, it has been a while, that default number of row that comes, for example had exam preparation but not exam, so I was thinking though we can add rows and I like exam, but it is best the main items to be the default and if needed, so then for example, exams should be in one of the default rows as opposed to the exam preparation. But maybe my memory – it’s just a suggestion.

D. Macdonald: I can pass that along. I’d be willing, if you wanted to wanted to e-mail me specifics about, anybody wanted to e-mail me specifics about these, particularly the course activity documentation, because then I have sort of how you’ve encountered the problem and I can make sure I pass it on correctly. But I will pass these on but if you want to e-mail me with that information, I’ll be sure to pass it on because I sort of dropped out of the development of
that after we sort of initially started it and so it’s more helpful if I know exactly what your problem was that you had with it. Any other questions? Any questions about the process, the report? I hope to see everybody on Faculty Senate commenting on it in the fall when it’s up online and telling all your friends to read it. And, of course, it will be a long document. Maybe you’ll just want to read the part you’re interested in like the teaching and learning assessment part, or the mission part. If that’s what you do, that is grand as well. So thank you very much. I’m going to pass this on.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Thank you, Doris and thanks for the work you do in putting this all together for us.

**C. Raymond Alden III, Executive Vice President and Provost** – [presentation](#)

**R. Alden:** My icon disappeared.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Would you like an introduction?

**R. Alden:** Please.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Our next speaker is Provost Alden who you all know. I’ll remind you that there are a number of reasons why we wanted to invite Provost Alden to speak with us. Originally we had some questions about standards for admission and we thought the provost might be able to answer and also we wanted to hear a little bit about the provost’s view of distributed learning and where the university needs to go. So it’s my pleasure to introduce Provost Raymond Alden.

**R. Alden:** Before I get started I did want to mention that I usually give an introduction to Doris thanking, not only her, but the hundreds of faculty that are involved in the steering committee. That’s kind of unique. I’ve been through, I shouldn’t say this, but this is my fourth re-accreditation and three institutions. And generally it’s something done by a small staff that is constantly that’s all they do for ten years. I’ve seen the university come together and really make this a viable process and it is particularly critical because we are the first and probably the major institution having to deal with these particular criteria that they were developing still while we were starting to write the self-study and that credit-hour issues did not even come up until after the faculty left in the spring and then they didn’t finalize the template for it until, what, September. I would like to thank all of you for bearing with us on a federally-mandated but very last-minute requirement. It just shows how the university can come together on some of these issues.

I wanted to get everything in the context of the challenges that we all hear in higher education and then talk about some of the future directions and I’d be happy to answer any questions on any of these issues which each would probably take an hour to give a full presentation on, but if you’ve read anything in the Chronicle of Higher Education or even in the New York Times or in one of the we had workshops a few weeks ago with the Education Advisory Board that a number of you were at. Things are changing – changing in higher education, particularly public higher education, dramatically. Not the least of which is the public and political view of higher education no longer being the public good that allowed our country to be what it is in the world as the only remaining super power and having the technological edges and so forth. It’s being
viewed much more as a private good, people ought to pay for their own education because they benefit from it. So, this is a very unfortunate fact of life and it didn’t just happen with the economic crisis in 2008. This public disinvestment, and you could see the same thing on a federal level, it has almost the same sort of characteristic except maybe it was over a 15-year period, but there has been a tremendous downturn in the amount of public support of higher education. And it’s not going to get any better. Right now, 44 states have shortfalls in their budgets. Unfortunately, the little red asterisk at the bottom represents Illinois we’re 43 of those 44, the only one that’s worse is Nevada and I know a little bit about that simply because Nevada is a wild west libertarian state and they have very small public budgets. So even though it’s 45 percent of their budget is in shortfall, it’s of a tiny budget. We are kind of at the bottom of this and at least the National Governors Association says it’s probably not going to get better for a while.

Unfortunately at the same time expectations of the public and political bodies both at the state and federal level have gone up. There have been very aggressive goals for attainment both in terms for the Race For The Top as well as the Illinois public agenda which both pretty much say that by 2025 either we need 20 million more Americans with post-secondary education on the federal level, or 60 percent of our population between 24 and 34 to have some sort of post-secondary certificate or degree associated with their education.

Another challenge, which is demographic as well as expectations, is access. Our demographics are changing. We are having a more diverse population. Our Hispanic population in particular is growing in the high school systems and we have a lot more non-traditional students, working adults seeking higher education. We have a lot of first generation college goers in this population. Of course, our university has always served that as a major component of our demographics. But we also have the expectations and the learning styles associated with the millennial generation, which is kind of a whole talk in itself, that we have to be aware of in dealing with respect to access and attainment. And affordability, ironically even as the public and the politicians see higher education as a private good versus a public good, there is also cries for more controls on tuition and so forth. The reason for this, and this is one of the big studies that was done prior to 2008, actually the lines stop in 2008 before the economic crisis, is showing that the bottom line which is the investment from the state, the various state governments in public higher education is not adjusted for inflation. That kind of gold line is actually the CPI so that’s kind of a surrogate for inflation, and yet the blue line is what we have to pay for keeping public higher education going. So there is an obvious gap there and, of course, the top line is what everybody focuses on and that’s the increase in tuition. Now it’s a statistic of small numbers because it started out our tuitions as state public institutions back 20 years ago, or now 25 years ago, were relatively low. It was large percentages of small numbers. But this is what everybody is concerned about. People look at this and panic out or they look at something like this which shows a number of things that people are concerned with. Whether it’s the price of a vehicle, the cost of electricity, the cost of prescription drugs, and then the top three lines are public two-year, the community colleges, private universities and public universities. And so people say public universities are out of control. Again, its statistics of smaller numbers, ironically, this very study that produced these kinds of graphs pointed out that in public higher education, 92 percent of the increase has been to offset the disinvestment by the state and federal government. So it is a lot of this gets out in the public, this is what the National Governance Association looks at all the time and, obviously, since 2008 it’s gotten even worse.
Another A in addition to those there are As is accountability. This has been another irony. The more they disinvest in higher education, the more they expect out of public higher education. Performance funding, our state has come to this game relatively late. Now I believe there are 45 states that have performance funding and some iteration. This past year, we have crossed a boundary in that at least several of the states have made a hundred percent of their budget decisions based on performance funding which are all outcomes based not how many students do you enroll, but how many students do you graduate or how many students do you have going on in satisfactory progression to graduation. Unfortunately, now they’re talking about financial aid. MAP funding at the state level; PELL funding and even veterans’ benefits. Now they’re starting to talk about being performance funding based. How well are the students going through satisfactory academic progress. The SAPs you’ll probably hear a lot more about towards a six-year graduation rate and so this is of concern as well because it means that more and more accountability, not only for the students themselves to keep eligible, but institutional records are going to be determining whether a institution is even eligible for Title IV funding in the future. So this is a challenge for us.

Report cards: More and more our national organizations are pushing to have public report cards for every institution. College Choice is one of them. Another one is Complete College America. The Degree Profile. And these are all focused on outcomes, cost efficiency, time to degree, demographics, whether there’s gaps between the underrepresented minorities or the generation college goers and the traditional students, and actually looking at whether institutions have a good record, don’t have a good record, and advertising it to potential students and their families.

Another competitive pressure that has been really something that has changed very dramatically is technology. There have been entire groups of books written on the disruption of technology to higher education. Obviously, we all know about the for-profit, online institutions, we’re a hot bed for that particular type of institution. Any given time I go down to the IBHE meetings, there’s over 300 programs in the pipe line for approval, 90 percent are for these for-profits trying to come into the Chicagoland area. I put in little parenthesis there and partnering universities. A lot of desperate universities are now partnering with some of these for-profits, such as Straighter Line which used to be called a $99 a month university. It’s basically a group of courses, gen-ed courses that have been offered through this group which is affiliated with Wiley textbooks to accept them as gen-ed courses for a public higher education credential degree or for transfer. Community colleges have also gotten into this business of trying to use technology to leverage their position offering relatively cheap two-year programs for their institutions. University of Illinois Springfield has gotten into this in a big way. Programming with other online institutions as well as community colleges around the country, including in California, to offer degrees in various liberal arts and sciences that are somewhere between the price of a community college and the price of a university. You have a tremendous push by a number of organizations out there to offer free or an open course where you have Gates Foundation, Lumina Foundation, Hewlett Foundation and so forth all offering big dollars to develop courses. Entire states are putting their courses online. You probably all have heard about Harvard and MIT using the EDX to put their courses online free for the taking. Carnegie Melon has a very interesting program called Open Learning Initiative where they actually use cognitive and learning specialists to develop courseware for the top 25 enrolled course across the country to allow the software to do
the Socratic questioning of students and measure learning before they go on to the next topic. There is a lot out there. It can be seen as a resource as well as a potential competition.

The big news stories of this year were the mooks. You can’t have seen a newspaper or a magazine of a web-based magazine without having come across this. These are now being offered by most of the flagships as being open, online learning for hundreds of student, hundreds of thousands of students, free for the taking. The footnote on this is they are not free. They do have business models and I put at the bottom something that just showed up yesterday, an article on how many different, there’s like 12 different models of how these mooks make money for their institutions and so we could talk about that all day. I don’t think we are going to get into this in a big way, although we should be aware of it, and we should be learning from it. These particular types of offerings do provide some insight into how scale up courses that are offered online without sacrificing quality.

I guess a fifth A if you will is analytics. This is another hot button issue in higher education simply because it’s been something that the private sector has been using for some time. You can’t have ordered anything on Amazon or even done a Google search without becoming very quickly aware that everything you do is being tracked and your future purchases and your future searches are being shaped by data analytics of what your interests are and what your background is and so forth. This is basically the way; at least inside higher education has defined what big data analytics are. It is tracking students, their behaviors, both in class and out of class and out of class, and predicting success; helping faculty to determine how best to interact with them and so forth. I wanted to kind of go through some of the big things that many universities are adopting now to give you kind of a background. Many of these that we are doing already, some of them we are doing more coordinated; some we’re doing less than other institutions, but we ought to be aware they’re out there. Information at the institutional level is predicting academic success as recruitment, helping to recruit students who have the best chance of succeeding based on what previous students in the institution have done with those kinds of profiles. Predicting academic demand. Some of our colleges already have Just In Time deliverer of certain large courses so that we can make sure they are full. Some universities do this to a perfection in determining which course will be full at any given time. Tracking course success. This is going to be critical if you have to become accountable for this for performance funding. And early intervention. We are actually, in the College of Business and College of Liberal Arts Sciences, piloting software to look at students who are showing risk behavior, whether they are not coming to class, whether they have financial or social or other sorts of issues, and trying to intervene before they get into trouble. Reporting information, like I say, this is just becoming a full-time occupation in some of the administrative offices just reporting to all of these new demands. The trustees want to know how many things we have to report every year and I’m sure as soon as they get the report, they will report it to the campus, and it’s huge.

We also have some of this software that allows faculty to see how their students are doing both in class and out of class and figuring out which topics are causing the most problems and it’s sort of using what’s going on in the academic arena to help focus on issues that may be problematic. And then finally, information for students. Some universities have done this in a really big way making sure that all the program expectations and progress guidance is there so students don’t get off track. Course selection, some have even gone kind of to the Netflix four star or five star system type of thing saying if a student’s trying to get into the wrong class because they haven’t
had a prerequisite, they should know that in advance and, if they go into it, they should be given guidance of how to make it through if they have to. And some universities have really done this in a big way.

Major selection change of majors guidance, again this is something that has been done in a number of institutions. So what does this mean for us? First of all, as you all know, Chicagoland is kind of a hot bed for our competitors. As I say, most of the for-profits want to get into this region. We’re a hot-bed of community colleges. We probably have more community colleges here per square mile than almost anywhere in the country. But it’s also an opportunity for engagement and for partnerships; and we have done that quite well. I think we are gonna have to focus on that as one of our real strengths and really even build on that even further. I think there’s a lot to be said about our culture and tradition as a public university that’s a research university, that also values education, both at the undergraduate and graduate level. This is something, believe it or not, that has been relatively rare among research universities. Often times, undergraduates are considered just kind of a necessary inconvenience and research active faculty don’t really interact with them that much. I think this is a strength we need to build on in cooperation with some of the engagement opportunities as a way to build our brand.

So I think going forward there’s kind of a dual focus issue. We serve two different populations if you will. We have the long standing off-campus population which, as I have said, has only grown in the past. So I think there’s an opportunity to offer high quality distributed learning programs for these non-traditional working adult students who are looking for high quality programs either in graduate professional programs or in degree completion programs.

But we also have to be concerned about our on-campus population. Why would a student come to NIU and pay perhaps more than they would at an institution that has a cheap online degree? We need to really define this and build on our strengths so that it’s clear in everybody’s mind, all the students, their parents and so forth, and even in the political sector, what the value is of having a public research university that’s dedicated to engaged learning of its students.

So what are the components and requisites for our value added? I think none of these should be too much of a surprise. I think we need to make sure that everything we do, both financially and academically and in the support areas, should be based on the vision and goals of the university and we should have a robust data set to keep track of how well we’re doing so that we can improve where we need to improve and grow where we need to grow. Engaged learning is going to be a critical issue in our future. I think that’s our strength and engaged learning here means research with students, service learning with students, study abroad with students. Anything that provides the opportunity for students to demonstrate the baccalaureate goals, those kinds of higher learning competencies and skills that are beyond the discipline.

We’ve been talking a lot about transformed course, I characterize these as high-tech, high-touch engagement opportunities. Basically, there’s eight or ten different models for doing this. There’s no one size fits all, but they all have a lot in common, use technology where it can be best used to transmit content and have the faculty focus time on problem based learning or what I’m calling contextual fluency. What does it all mean? You have the content. What does it all mean in the discipline? What does it all mean in the career path the student is interested in? I think this
is we have a number of courses now being transformed. We’ll go through this each year and I’m encouraging everybody to consider this as something we want to look at in the future.

More holistic advising: More universities are looking at advising more than just what courses to take next semester. It’s looking at advising from day one as being: What are the career opportunities for any given path? And when students changes their path, where can they still end up in a productive degree? It’s coupled with the student success programs that we’ve built out of the last strategic planning, the great journey strategic plan. I think more and more we’re going to be wanting to look at student learning outcomes for not only continuous program improvement, which we’ve all done quite well, we have an assessment program that I think most universities of our size would envy, but I do think in the long run we want to go towards providing students with some sort of credentialing for some of these, not only student learning outcomes in the discipline, but some of these higher order skills, the baccalaureate goals; creative thinking, critical thinking, the ability to work well with others and global perspectives and so forth. I think that’s a value added that besides just a transcript or a degree, a student walks away with some sort of e-portfolio demonstrating that they’ve acquired something at NIU that they couldn’t have gotten elsewhere.

A lot of universities are looking more at their alumni association to be a source of helping to look at alums as a set of life-long learners. Getting them back into credentialing, to some sort of certificate, or advanced degree program or helping to advise how to look at constituencies that they are affiliated with on the outside. So I think this is something we need to focus a lot. It’s becoming more than just a development effort to keep track of your alums. It’s trying to figure out how we can use them as professionals to help, not only in their professional development, but of their peers and of people in their constituencies.

On the university scale we need to obviously do a lot more strategic planning. I would assume a new president would come in and look at some of the goals we have and say, considering all of these opportunities and challenges we have, how do we do this in the most efficient way we can to achieve these goals? Obviously, I am a firm believer in strategic budgeting and investment planning, but we also have to look at operational efficiency and sustainability. We need to make sure that this critical mass, this entity that we have here is healthy in the long run and can survive these challenges that we are looking at.

Performance metrics: Obviously we have to generate them for the externalities, the accountability, but I think we need to also do it for our own efficiency. So I’m a firm believer that we don’t just base things on data but data in the context of what does it mean within the mission of a given unit and so that we can also use that to help shape our branding and our marketing and our recruitment efforts. Obviously, we have had a good success at having a lot of good things go on across the university. We want to be able to encourage that, and focus it, and share it with each other, and be able to facilitate to make sure that when we can adapt and innovate that people understand what’s going on in a unit so it doesn’t just become something that one unit is doing and others aren’t benefiting from. Obviously, reward and regard. We need to recognize that in accomplishing all of these mission areas. Faculty and staff had a diversity of roles and we want to make sure that everybody gets recognized in their workload, in their other aspects of reward and regard. Even in days when we don’t have a lot of budget we can at least recognize people for what they are accomplishing.
I put this up because I go to a lot of national meetings and this has been put up at the last several meetings as a cautionary thing that is change or die. I think I would like to put it in the context, I think we’re well placed to adapt to the future because of our culture, because of our location, because of our partnerships. And so I think we’re well suited for the new future and I would hope that we would be able to take advantage of it. So, having said that, I’d be happy to go into any of these in more depth or any other issues you want to talk about, but I don’t want to monopolize your whole meeting, so however long Alan wants to let it go on.

**M. Theodore:** First of all, I would like to thank you for addressing the competitive pressures aspect. I can’t tell you, over the last two years, how many students I’ve seen come here for a semester and then immediately go to a community college right immediately due to financial pressures and everything related to that. So that’s going to be one of the most important thing we address soon enough. The question I have is in the term of advising and information students which you addressed briefly and what immediate steps are going to be taken to start integrating online advising and online pre-requisites because we, I mean right around this time all the time and near towards the end of the year, we hear this problem from students is, “I took a class and it turns out that class wasn’t helpful for me at all or it wasn’t necessary to take,” or “I took a class, it turns I didn’t have the pre-requisites,” and all these problems with their online system.

**R. Alden:** Well, first of all we do have the four-year degree paths online for every major. Those are to give guidance as to what kinds of course to be taking. Obviously, every college has advisors. These individuals are there to help you decide how to go along a career path. We also have a central Office of Student Academic Success which has a number of student success specialists which will be using some of this software which I said was being piloted in two of the colleges, to help students determine if they decide to change majors, what major would be most amendable to get into without losing time. So I would, until we get everything online and seamless, I would say first of all students need to talk to their advisors routinely. They need to, if they decide to change majors, go to the Office of Student Academic Success and ask the question, “If I come from this major and go to another major maybe in another college,” and you couldn’t get that help from the advisors in a college, perhaps they could say, “Okay, well looking over what you’ve taken and looking over what the models predict are the best ones, this one you could go into immediately and not have lost any time. This one you may have to take a few extra classes, but here are the classes you need to take.”

So this is something that we are trying to make more seamless, have a more holistic look at things, but we do have expertise in every college. The advisors, in some colleges, they have an entire advising center of advisors. And others they have faculty advisors who are expert in knowing what courses to take in a given field. So I think one of the unfortunate aspects of the student information system and MyNIU is that students often feel because they can register for courses themselves, they’re on their own to register for themselves. They need to have some guidance because time is money; excess courses aren’t to anybody’s advantage. So I think it’s always something we need to keep reminding students of is everyone has advising centers that they can go to. We’re trying to find something that is going to identify people going off track before they get too far off track and proactively kind of active intervention. Go after them and say we see you’re not coming to class, or we see you haven’t taken the appropriate number of
courses in your major for where you are in this academic year, perhaps you need to talk to someone about it. So it’s a work in progress but it’s something we’re working on.

**M. Theodore:** Thank you.

**R. Alden:** Yes.

**A. Gupta:** Sorry this will be my last comment, but just a request. I was wondering the presentation by you and Doris can it be made available on the Blackboard for Faculty Senate?

**R. Alden:** I’d be happy to send it. I can send it to Alan and I assume he can post it or Pat.

**D. Macdonald:** And I’ll just add that the HLC PowerPoint is available on the HLC Web site, on the NIU HLC Web site.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We will post the provost’s slides when he sends them to us on the Blackboard Web site. Anyone have any other questions?

**R. Alden:** Well you originally said there was something else that you wanted me to answer and I don’t remember what it was now.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think the question that had been raised originally had to do with sort of the problem of trying to maintain the university’s financial situation via tuition, while at the same time maintaining academic standards. I think faculty have expressed over time some concern that the academic standards not be lowered in order fill the positions that are necessary to fill in order to support the university.

**R. Alden:** Well, even though enrollment management does not report to my office at the current time, I do know two things about. First of all, we have stopped directors admit. So the directors of admissions do not unilaterally admit students who do not meet our standards, the admissions standards. The colleges can, and do, look at the records of students and make some of those decisions, so it’s the advising deans that are really making those decisions. That’s something that’s only, basically I implemented a couple of years ago. That’s, at least it’s in the academic unit the decisions are being made.

The other thing, and we had a discussion in Dean’s Council this morning. The best place we can effect change on enrollment is not going out and have everybody do recruitment, it’s in yield. Our yield of students who’ve already been admitted but have not enrolled or who have enrolled. Our yield is quite low compared to our sister institutions. I think university-wide it may be 28 percent. That’s low hanging fruit. If we can students on to campus or communicating with their home departments early on, I think that’s been proven to be the most effective way to build enrollment. It builds enrollment on students who have already been admitted and, quite frankly, I think it could be used, if we just came up to – close to what our sister institutions like ISU and UIC have as their yield rates, we’d probably have a waiting list again. So this is a way for colleges to shape their enrollment without having to feel like they have to go out and beat the bushes in the high schools or in the community colleges. It’s just sealing the deal, and quite frankly the Stamat Study that was done a couple years ago amongst top students in this region.
It’s not the prestige of the university they are looking for. It’s whether they can have an academic home and work with their faculty, and get a meaningful career path going early on. That’s what they’re looking for. So if those kinds of conversations and that kind of interaction can be done from the time they’re admitted until the time they make their final decision, that’s where we can have really some impact at the academic side of the enrollment process.

A. Rosenbaum: One more question.

R. Alden: Yes.

M. Kostic: I think we wanted to discuss with the provost the newest online learning. The last time we talked about it and we were debating and then we heard that provost is all for it and I would add before provost commented that the most important thing in real estate is location, location, location and there are many other business particular in education is quality and quality and quality and we need to have a positive tense, so our quality must be improving if we are to do anything of value and those online information age, quantity doesn’t fit anybody. It’s a cut and paste, easily and means nothing, then they get the better students and better students will drive everything better. If we are only to increase enrollment by inviting anyone to come, they come and they don’t know what they are _____ here.

R. Alden: Right. We had a task force on distributed learning that met for almost two years and one of the critical things we wanted to emphasize coming out of that, or the group wanted to emphasize because they reported to me the recommendations to my office even though I participated in a lot of the discussions, is that we want to make sure that we don’t just consider online just someplace to post our lecture notes and then give an exam at the end. This is something that really requires a lot of focus on quality. Quite frankly, the reason that the_____ and the Ivy League institutions are jumping into this is they realize that it’s the future and they realize that it can be done with quality.

Now we don’t want to go only online. I think we have a lot to offer on campus here and that’s the value added we need to reaffirm and focus on and quantify in many ways. But we do have a huge population in Chicagoland that are geographically bound. These are working professionals, they are people with family obligations that are only able to take one course at a time. And so I think that looking at online even though anybody can offer any course online if it’s all right with the chair and the department to do that, we want to look at more programs. What are the programs that someone who is geographically bound. We need an advanced degree let’s say to go on from being in a middle level management to a upper level management position either in public or private sector or school districts or wherever the person may be located. Those are the kind that are most amenable to online. They perform better online.

A lot of the students that we see as traditional students, perform better with high-touch, high-tech combination, hybrid courses, faculty interacting with them both in and outside the classroom. Because I am in favor of online, it doesn’t mean one size fits all. It means that certain populations and certain academic programs can serve better online. But we also need to look at how we can serve as well as we can those students who come on campus and show what that valued added is. It is a complex matter. The competition out there is fierce.
What I see as a positive sign is that the for-profits who got in early and did a lot of the cherry-picking online, they’re starting to lose enrollment. Kaplan has almost gone down the tubes. University of Phoenix went from 500,000 two years ago down to 300,000 students. So it is, that is a positive sign. But it means the publics and the non-for-profit privates are getting quality and edging them out. We need to be at least having a portion of our population served there.

Another aspect of online, which is counter intuitive, regional name appeal, is huge in the online world. If you know the institution and you are able to emote with the institution, even though you never set foot on the campus, you often have a competitive edge to maybe even a more prestigious university coming from across the country. And that’s been shown over and over again. I think having a foothold and a lot of partners in the Chicagoland area, a lot of constituencies, a lot of alums, we can make the difference here for those populations who never come to campus.

G. Slotsve: Just a quick question. In terms on transcripts, will you distinguish what’s on-campus versus online course work as far as the credits that are produced?

R. Alden: No. As far as transcripts go, no. Now I say in the future, I would like to have e-portfolio and credentialing of those students that do come on campus and do get heavily engaged in learning experiences in faculty both in and out of the classroom to have some credential in the competencies they require because of those kinds of things. That’s kind of beyond the transcript. That’s kind of something that is added to the transcript, but, in terms of whether you get a grade in an online course or an off-campus course or an on-campus course, those are all the same. They may have different semesters. That’s another thing that these geographically bound working adults tend to want to take one course at a time but want to take it in a more compressed year-round format rather than just the traditional two semesters. So that’s one of the challenges, but it’s also one of the opportunities because if you look at some of those courses, faculty don’t have to teach them quite as often. They have a lot more time off.

G. Slotsve: Well, I would think that this is something that the market will also evaluate because, as I’ve understood it at least with hearsay evidence, is that there are some businesses that do value the online degree to the same extent they would something that’s taken on campus where there’s direct contact with the student.

R. Alden: Right and I think

G. Slotsve: That’s why I’m asking whether, this may evolve, but the market will probably speak on this and it’s something to keep an eye on.

R. Alden: And I believe that what happens is that is the quality of the program. I think that’s why the for-profits are starting to go down a bit. It’s why certain campuses that have tried to have a campus degree, an online light, have kind of rethought that and have, I mean look at Global U of I. It kind of came and went because it was not – the quality wasn’t there. I’m not saying we need to just get online to get online, we need to have high quality online programming if we are going to go in that direction and they should be equal to course-by-course evaluation. Again, we need to also quantify how an on-campus experience adds to that basic experience. And again, it’s two really different populations.
G. Slotsve: No, granted, but then I would just suggest at this stage because it’s at the earliest stages of the planning in a sense, that you think of keeping records to see what are success rates for what’s on-campus versus online, at least internally, so we can find out if there is a difference and know if there is a quality difference going on.

R. Alden: And those universities have done side-by-side studies of online, face-to-face and hybrid. Different sections offered in different venues tend to find out as long as the quality is there that the online and face-to-face tend to be fairly comparable, but the hybrids are much better in terms of student retention and information retention than either of the other two venues. I’m not saying online just to go online, I’m saying hybrid is probably the best way to transform the course.

G. Slotsve: By hybrid you mean a combination of online and in class?

R. Alden: Well, instead of assigning students a text book, having them use some of this courseware, some of it’s free, some of it’s offered by the text book companies, to do the content mastery outside of the classroom and have the faculty focus on what does it all mean and then look at that. A lot of the feedback from those kind of software packages says here’s where eight percent of your students are having problems with this concept. Let’s focus on this or how do you make sense of this content and this content? How does it all fit together? Problem based learning basically.

A. Rosenbaum: I think we are sort of running out of time so thank you, Ray. I appreciate your coming to talk with us.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, moving along with the agenda, the next item we have a number of reports, I think they are mostly in here so I don’t know that we have to spend a tremendous amount of time on those since we are sort of pushing the limits here. Sonya, do you have a report?

S. Armstrong: I do. I’ll stick to the important points to make this go quickly. Lots of IBHE updates there that I hope you’ll read because they potentially affect all of us, especially with the changes in staffing. Also, we have a legislator visit. Alan Phillips, the IBHE deputy director of planning and budget. He actually gave us a very lengthy PowerPoint, 72 pages I think, that paralleled what Provost Alden just gave to us. So if you’d like more information on that, I just got that in my mailbox today and I can get that to Alan to post to the Blackboard site. It’s very detailed. The last thing is that the public caucus is taking on the task of, probably impossible task of, looking at the value of higher education in general and trying to find ways to communicate
with the public about kind of dispelling the misconceptions about the value of higher education especially with regard to the increasing costs. If any of you have any sources that you would like me to take back with me, we are actually writing a white paper which we hope to turn into editorials to send to newspapers and also to alumni groups and those kinds of entities. If you have any sources that you’d like me to include, please let me know. I’ll entertain questions too.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Sonya? We’ll put that on the Blackboard as soon as we get it.

B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a very brief report from Student Association. I assume that Mike is going to give us the report since I don’t see Delonte or Austin.

M. Theodore: Yep, they both apologize for not being here. Things have been moving very quickly lately. As you know, Speaker Quick is going to be graduating at the end of the semester so there’s been a lot that’s been happening with wrapping that up. I will keep it brief. There are just some things to know about. If you are interested, the new speaker elections will be this Sunday so you will be able to know who will be succeeding Austin.

I would also like to thank all the faculty members that attended the memorial this past week for Steven Agee. It was very moving to remember a great student and it’s very good that faculty members, students, staff and the DeKalb community were able to come together to remember him, so I thank everyone for that.

Relating to that, we have been assisting the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management with their bystander intervention program and their training. The important thing here is to reduce the bystander affect and encourage students and everyone at the university to be more educated about what to do in the case of an incident. The reason I’m telling you this is that I heard today that they do need more facilitators for next semester. This program has been moving very quickly. It’s been doing a lot of great work in educating students and it does need faculty facilitators to educate. The training session for that is going to be January 9. If you want more information I can, well you can either contact the director of Health Enhancement or I have the business card for the student who is assisting with that if you want that information. I would definitely urge everyone to look into this. It’s a great way to help for a more safe campus.

Also, stuff to keep an eye out for and to tell your students that you know about: We have put in money for busses to Detroit for the football game and there’s a few slots left so if you know students who really want to go, let them know. Also, we will be looking for, in the S.A. office if you know anyone, we are looking for a new IT specialist. Our current one is graduating. We got him based on a recommendation and he turned out to be very great in updating our Web site and keeping us moving. So we are looking for someone else. So if you know someone who is very web savvy, we’re looking for them. We need someone really quickly. We need to make sure we can keep our Web site up to date in this next semester. So that’s it in the briefest of form and with that I yield.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Mike?
C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – report – Pages 3-4

A. Rosenbaum: Next is the BOT report from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel. Neither Kerry or Andy are here today so we have a written report only.

D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report – Pages 5-6

A. Rosenbaum: Next is the BOT Finance and Facilities and Operations report which you have. I’m going to call your attention to only one thing because it relates to what the provost was talking about and that is the last bullet point on my report which gets at this online learning and sort of the mechanisms by which NIU is going to try and get into this. Apparently, in consideration of the fact that it requires a great deal of technology and scaffolding, one of the ways to do this quickly is to partner with companies that have already begun doing this. This item, this last bullet point that I was just referring to, refers to putting out RFPs for these companies that have experience with online education to be able to propose collaborations with us. So if you wanted to do an online course and you did not have the expertise or we did not have the technology necessary, an RFP could be put out and we could partner with another company. And so this involved the mechanisms by which the board is going to approve those RFPs. The provost’s intention is to sort of have a lot of these types of RFPs going out at various times and so the Board of Trustees has to develop a mechanism for approving those without having to wait for the next Board of Trustees meeting. So that’s what that’s all about and it also gets at the idea that those of us who really have no clue as to how to do an online course, and I’m talking about myself and perhaps some other faculty that have never done this, I don’t think the idea is that you’re just supposed to figure it out yourself, but that there will be some support provided by the university either in the form of a company to partner with or some type of instruction provided in house. We will not all have to do this and those of us who choose to do this, will get some support from the provosts office so that’s an important thing to keep in mind as well. So that’s really the highlights, there wasn’t much going on in the FFO committee meeting. Any questions?

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – Page 7

A. Rosenbaum: Next, Todd Latham has the report on Legislation, Audit and External Affairs. Todd.

T. Latham: All right, there was a report by the internal auditor and it really was 16 audits, one was canceled or not completed. Out of those sixteen, you can see item areas, but it really focused on operational areas, compliance, financial, information systems, fraud detection and prevention. Kathy Buettner gave a presentation on the recruitment and marketing efforts of the university. Three main points: high population markets, the use of traditional media, and the use of social media to attract and recruit students. The fourth paragraph kind of identifies the cost of those types of initiatives as about $800,000.

And the last paragraph is the legislation piece of the committee in which Lori Clark reported that
the constitution amendment in Illinois did not pass. And a consequence of the election is that representatives, legislative representatives at NIU, will be changing because of that. You can see of those names. Adam Kinzinger, of course, is one and Senator Severson from Rockford will be a new representative as well. Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Any questions for Todd?

---

**F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 8**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Last is the BOT report and as I said earlier, the main focus was a special meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Board will meet again on December 6 for its regularly scheduled meeting. This was a special meeting that was called essentially to charge the search committee and to hire the search firm and that’s essentially what happened. The search committee now contains 28 people. A number of people were added since we last spoke and that was to make sure that every constituency in the university was adequately represented and so people were added. You should be aware that of that 28, we picked up additional faculty members as well. So we started with 12 faculty members, we not have 15 of the 28, so the faculty, proportionately, have gained representation on that search committee. It is a rather large committee though and there are a number of logistical issues in getting that committee together. As you might imagine, trying to get 28 people at the university together at any time is not that easy. That was the main thing, the Board of Trustees hired the Parker Executive search firm which is a very experienced search firm. We’ve worked with them before. I’ve been on search committees where Parker was in charge and they do a really good job and their expertise is in the area of presidential searches. I think we feel that we’ve got a great search firm on board and we’ve got a good search committee that represents the various constituents in the university and so we will now do our best to identify an excellent president to take us forward. Any other questions about the Board of Trustees meeting? Yes, Mili?

**M. Kostic:** The thing about the presidential search advisory committee, you emphasized many, many times, it’s advisory, advisory the board makes the decision. But do we have absolute say in who to recommend to the Board of Trustees? Then it’s not Board of Trustees alone. They cannot recommend or we even don’t have, they could add a recommendation too?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, the Board of Trustees – we don’t have absolute say. In other words, we can recommend candidates that the search committee feels are appropriate/

**M. Kostic:** But we do get to choose one among the five or …

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, the Board of Trustees

**M. Kostic:** Let’s say five.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, they have a number of choices. They could choose one of the five. They could continue the search. They could either continue the search with this particular search committee and say, “Send us some more candidates.” Or they could continue the search going forward and appoint an acting president because on June 30 President Peters will retire. On July 1, if we don’t have a new president in place, we will have to have an acting president in place.
**M. Kostic:** So then in mind you, we do have a say. It’s not like we are just advisory if we are to recommend a selected group. That’s how it works in college, committee recommends and then dean makes the choice, that’s the same procedure.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right, but they are not restricted to hire from within that pool. In other words, if we send them five, they are not restricted, they could hire outside of that without our consent. I don’t think they will do that because they seem to be respecting the shared governance culture at NIU. So my feeling is that we will give them five or more strong candidates that we can get behind and that they will be satisfied with one or more of those candidates. But there are other aspects as well. I mean just because you pick a candidate doesn’t mean you can sign them. So they then have to engage in a negotiation with whoever those candidates are and so it’s possible even if we give them five great candidates and choose one or more of those candidates, there’s no guarantee that those candidates will accept the offer and agree to become the next president in which case we have to go back to the drawing board again. But the Board of Trustees has the final say and they can hire somebody that is not among the five that are given to them by the search committee. We don’t expect that they’ll do that, we hope they won’t do that, but they have the right to do that. Any other questions about that? Yes, Charles?

**C. Cappell:** I read in the Tribune a few days ago a letter from Barsema and the chair of the BOT in response to an editorial about the need and difficulty of finding an NIU president given the current situations here, and the phrase, entrepreneurship, was a key feature in their letter saying we will have no trouble finding people and here among the attributes that we’re looking for, entrepreneurship was mentioned. It seems like our battle is ongoing to some extent.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, entrepreneurship I think refers to what we expect the president to do, not who we expect the president to be, so my expectation is the entrepreneurship involves figuring out ways to generate money for the university. That person who’s doing that, whether it’s an academic person or someone who comes from the academic ranks or someone who doesn’t, is going to have that same task. We’ve got to figure out how to provide the funds that are necessary to keep the university afloat. So I think that’s what they’re referring to. I think that the idea of a business model president is certainly not one that’s held by the faculty, but I have to tell you that there are faculty that do support that and so I think it’s a minority position on the search advisory committee, but it certainly is a position so there will be people on that committee that will advocate for someone who comes from the business world perhaps and I think we would have to be open minded looking at who those people might be. There might be some very respectable candidates that do come from that side. We can’t just disqualify them outright, but certainly the faculty have made it clear that our hope is that we get a president from the academic side. But that president will have to be somewhat entrepreneurial in order to keep the university in stable fiscal state. Any other questions?

**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: We only have one report and that’s from Resources, Space and Budgets. Jim?

J. Wilson: No verbal report.

A. Rosenbaum: No verbal report. Great. Say no more thank you. You have the written report, which is good.

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Selection of Faculty Senate liaison to Libraries Advisory Committee to replace Jeff Kowalski. The LAC meets from 2 to 3 p.m. on the third Friday of the month.

A. Rosenbaum: Last two items. First, Jeff Kowalski has graciously agreed to serve as our liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee but he is going on sabbatical or assignment, fellowship. So he will not be able to do that during the spring semester. We need a volunteer from the senate to serve as a liaison. Jeff, do you want to say anything about that?

J. Kowalski: Yes, it’s actually a relatively light load. They meet essentially about once a month, it’s typically on a Friday afternoon so it usually doesn’t interfere with anybody’s most pressing schedules on the campus and I found it informative and I found it to be personally educational and it was a very compatible group of people. So I think if somebody is willing to do this, it’s important, but it’s not going to overwhelm you with work.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. Anybody interested in volunteering to take this position on? Oh, two people. I can’t see who’s in the back. We have two candidates. We should have let the clickers out.

Unidentified: Toss a coin.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t have a coin. Oh you want to do a show of hands? Well you know the thing is I don’t know if anyone has a real basis for this. Does anyone feel they have a basis for this decision? We don’t really know, so rather than sort of do that, maybe the coin toss is a better idea. Why don’t you flip it. Virginia, call it in the air.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t have a coin. Oh you want to do a show of hands? Well you know the thing is I don’t know if anyone has a real basis for this. Does anyone feel they have a basis for this decision? We don’t really know, so rather than sort of do that, maybe the coin toss is a better idea. Why don’t you flip it. Virginia, call it in the air.

*Both Gleb Sirotkin and Virginia Naples volunteered. There was some discussion and it was decided to flip a coin. Jeff Kowalski flipped the coin; and it was “tails” resulting in Gleb Sirotkin winning the toss.*
B. Presidential Engagement Professorship Selection Committee – one volunteer to serve as Faculty Senate representative on this committee which will meet January 14, 2013.

A. Rosenbaum: The last item and I appreciate you staying late. This has certainly been a long meeting. The last item is that again you know we have the presidential professorships. They are very important to the faculty. We have presidential research and teaching professorships, but we also have the presidential engagement professorship. These professorships are awarded based on the committee recommendation. There is a committee for the presidential engagement professorship and we need a Faculty Senate representative for that. This will meet probably once. It will meet on January 14. If it is unable to conclude its business on January 14, there will be an additional meeting the following week but this is not an in-for-the-long-run kind of voluntary job. Does anybody want to be on the presidential engagement professorship selection committee? Virginia?

V. Naples: I didn’t achieve the other voluntary position.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any comments or questions from the floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: In that case, we’ll adjourn. Have a good holiday, we’ll see you in the new year. Be careful out there.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.