FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
Wednesday, February 19, 2014, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Domke, Freeman, Haliczer, Klapier, Streb, Suttenfield, Tollerud  

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Falkoff, Gebo, Small, Smith, Thompson, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s come to order. Welcome to our February meeting.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have one walk-in item. The walk-in item is the list of University Council faculty members that are eligible to be nominated for executive secretary of the University Council and so we’ll get to that when we get to our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, but that is the one walk-in item. I need a motion to accept the agenda with the one walk-in item.

T. Arado: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: And a second.

S. McHone-Chase: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any comments on the agenda? All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone opposed? Any abstention? Okay we have the agenda.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 22, 2014 FS MEETING

A. Rosenbaum: Next item of business is the approval of the minutes of the January 22 meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

R. Lopez: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Second?

W. Pitney: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any corrections, omissions, adjustments? Everyone loved the minutes as always. All right, excellent. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

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

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. “Policies and Guiding Principles for Annual Budget Development and Multi-Year Financial Planning” draft – Pages 4-8 and Presentation – Pages 9-21

Nancy Suttenfield, Interim Chief Financial Officer

A. Rosenbaum: We have some guests today so rather than have them sit through our entire meeting I’m going to introduce our interim chief financial officer, Nancy Suttenfield, who is going to talk to us about the budget making process. And, when she’s done doing that, she and our interim provost, Lisa Freeman, will be available to answer any questions that the faculty senators may have about the budget and the budget making process. Let me turn the floor over to Nancy Suttenfield who is our, as I said, interim CFO.

N. Suttenfield: Thank you, Alan and it’s a pleasure to be here with all of you today and to have the opportunity to talk with you a little bit about some of the discussions that have been taking place between Lisa and me to put together an entirely different kind of budget process that brings much more transparency to resource allocations and the processes for making resource allocations or budget decisions.

I know your packet of materials has a document that Lisa and I together drafted, and you’ve probably had an opportunity to review that. You also have a copy in your packet of the PowerPoint that I’m about to go through. My intention in using the PowerPoint is to hit the high points of the draft principals for annual resource allocation decisions and multi-year financial planning at the 50,000-foot level and do that as quickly as I can and then open the floor up for dialog with you and to hear your feedback, hear your questions, respond if we can to your questions. And Lisa and I together will do that.
I’ll start with the first page which is a quote that we’ve taken directly from the president’s inaugural address that talks about the importance of building transparency into our budget and finance functions, and ultimately to enable us to focus on highest priorities for the campus. What we know is that, without transparency about the financial situation and the way in which we are making decisions about resource allocation, this becomes an unnecessary obstacle to our ability as an institution to address our highest priorities. Everyone really needs to have the full picture about the current situation and also what we’re expecting in the next year or so, so that we can focus the current resources, as well as any new resources that come our way whether those resources are coming from the state or from tuition and fees or other sources such as fundraising, we’re focusing those resources on our highest priorities so that we are effectively and efficiently focusing on our mission critical activities.

So how does great transparency help us focus on our highest priorities? And the answer to that is working together and I like to do a Google search of quotes, so I found a couple here that I thought were very relevant to us. And it doesn’t really matter the sources of the quotes but what I think these two quotes capture here is whether you’re talking about the singular focus of a major retailer that operates nationally and internationally or if you’re talking about the complex economic and social challenges that face a nation, working together is really the secret that amplifies the impact of individual actions. That’s what we’re talking about here at NIU, amplifying the impact of individual actions because we’re creating this more transparent environment where everyone understands the basis for decisions that are being made. Lisa and I working together asked ourselves the question: Well, how might we build the transparency that we’d like to put in place at NIU for the purposes of budgets and financial matters and essentially for all major decisions and then focus our energies on our priorities? And we answered this question by making concrete the essential changes that, when we put them all together, would be transformative. We decided that we would use a set of guiding principles and there were four primary themes that came out of our discussions about guiding principles.

Starting with transparency, we’re talking transparency to the entire campus community using openness and honesty in all that we do at the institution. We’re talking about clarity and, when we talk about clarity, we thought about documenting in these principles practices that are expressed and easily understood or written down so that everybody can remember them or refer to them whenever needed to assure our decisions are, in fact, following the practices that we’ve all decided that we would like to follow.

We’re talking about alignment and alignment means that for those who have always had responsibility and accountability for their programs and activities, whether in the academic side of the house or the administrative side of the house, we’re talking about providing authority over the entire budget. What we’ve had until now has been, yes there have been budget allocations given to cabinet members, deans, departments and so forth, but in many cases not the full budget. There were funds that were held centrally so those that have the responsibility and accountability haven’t necessarily had the full authority. So we’re talking aligning decision making at the level where the responsibility resides.
Then sustainability is also an essential ingredient here. We’ve talked about the importance of having a more sustainable financial model going forward especially in times when we’ve seen state appropriations being reduced and our enrollments have been declining. So the revenue streams coming to us have been going down at the same time that our expenses have been either flat or increasing. That’s not a sustainable model. I apologize I had a bit of sniffles this morning and I took some cold medicine so I’m a little dried out. Starting with alignment, in addition to aligning our authority, our day-to-day budget authority, we’re also talking about alignment that connects us back to the university’s perpetual missions related to research, instruction, public service and so forth and through its vision, values and strategic goals assuring that we’re aligning our resources in ways that help us to accomplish all of those essential guiding principles for a major public university. We’re talking about alignment in a new academic and administrative partnership model wherein the chief academic officer has primary responsibility for setting the strategic goals and priorities related to instructional research and in many cases student activity programs and the chief financial officer is a partner in that model. The chief financial officer advising on financial strategies that will make it possible to fund the strategic priorities and on decision making practices that assure that we are making prudent financial choices that allow us to have a sustainable model for the long term. What’s new in this model? I think most people are aware that the president did reorganize back in the fall designating the chief academic officer as the executive vice president and provost and instead of a vice president for finance, we have a chief financial officer and Lisa and I are serving respectively in those roles on an interim basis.

What are the benefits, jumping to slide 5. The benefits of a partnership, the way we’ve envisioned it, is better informed, more strategic budget decisions and again we’ve realigned the authority such that those that have responsibility over academic programs as well as those that have responsibility over business practices, have the authority that they need to fulfill their responsibilities.

Clarity, that is the next ingredient necessary for transparency and again it’s about communicating budget and other business practices and decisions that are easily remembered and understood and it’s more than just sharing a print out of what the budget looks like or providing access to what the budgets for other departments might look like. These are steps toward transparency but they’re basically rudimentary steps that really don’t get us to where we want to be sharing information that is important to working together. What have we done to start moving in the direction of clarity? Well one of the things that we’ve done so far, Lisa and I worked together back in December and the early part of January to look at all of the activities that had been supported through central budgets and all of the ones that we identified as recurring expenses predictable from one year to the next, such as faculty and staff salaries that were being managed in a central budget. We’ve gone through line by line and we’ve transferred those budgets to the responsible unit. Whether that is in an academic unit or an administrative unit so that there’s full transparency, full clarity to the person that’s managing a budget for the year, they know with some dependability that these are the resources that are available rather than having a partial budget that is inadequate for all of the expenses of a particular unit and having to return to the CFO and asking for additional allocations throughout the year.

What else is new is varied opportunities for discussion and input before decisions are made and this is a good example of this meeting today. The principles and guidelines that we’ve
developed, we’ve developed with the thought that we would like to have a discussion with various campus stakeholder groups to have their input, to hear any questions or concerns there may be, and this is the model that we plan to establish as we create a new budget process where we’re setting priorities and making preliminary resource allocation decision so that we can explain what we’re proposing to do and receive feedback input, questions and so forth. Again in the interest of full understanding and clarity about what we’re doing. We’re also working on reports and probably toward the end of March you’ll be hearing more about some presentations and discussion that will be a follow-up on to the Bold Futures workshops where there will be specific reports that I provide that give you more background on recent financial trends, the current situation, and what the prospects are for future years. Look for that. That will be coming soon.

In the interest of time, I’ll skip over the obvious benefits and move on to the transparency itself. I’ve talked about the importance of dialog. We also have in the back of our minds putting together appropriate training for faculty, staff and others on campus, including students, to enable them to adapt to changes in the processes that we’re creating for an annual budget review and budget formulation process along with other kinds of training that enable people to be more effective and efficient in doing the work that they do because they haven’t really had training on business practices or the underlying policies or even the underlying state rules and regulations that are related to many of the things that we do. That’s an area where we have a lot of opportunities to create meaningful training that will enable people to do their own job more effectively and serve others on campus that are their customers, their clients, whatever business nomenclature you want to use or their colleagues, and we think that that’s very important. The benefits are deeper engagement of the entire campus community. Everybody understands how his or her specific role fits in with the strategic goals and priorities of the institution and how their role contributes to the advancement of the university mission. We hope through better informed campus constituencies, that we’ll be making better decisions on budget and virtually everything else that is a major campus issue.

Finally we get to sustainability and sustainability depends upon both equilibrium and vibrancy of what we do as a university. Equilibrium obviously is about having balanced budgets. That’s always important. But it’s also important that we understand the drivers of all of our revenue and expense. We have a major focus right now on enrollment because enrollment times tuition equals tuition revenue equals a major revenue source for our budget. We have witnessed over the last several years declining enrollment and, even though we’ve had tuition increases that have helped to compensate for declining enrollment, the rate of increase in tuition is not a sustainable model. I think nationally many colleges and universities are seeing that they’ve reached a maximum and they can’t keep going back to tuition and fees and other pricing to keep on an upward growth path especially as appropriations decline. So we really need to understand that underlying driver and what’s going on with the dynamics with students that we hope to attract as well as students that are here that need some help in staying here. The entire cabinet and members of senior leadership and various departments are working very hard on those issues right now.

But we also need to focus on the cost side and the drivers of cost and I call this a relentless focus on driving down costs. We hope to be creating many discussion opportunities as well as projects that will be focused on new ideas for how we do things, taking advantage of pilot projects to try
out new ways of doing things before we commit a lot of resources or go through a major change in management exercise and looking for ways that we can work together to bring down our costs.

We hope to create equilibrium by doing all that we can to boost our revenue as well as reduce our expenses and that will then create more flexibility in how we can allocate or reallocate current resources to achieve our highest priorities. The benefits confidence that we will be focusing on our priorities and we will be doing what’s best for students because that’s why all of us are here and that as we confront difficult decisions whether they’re budget decisions or any other kind of decision that we’re respecting our past, we’re acknowledging present day and that we’re protecting our future by not making decisions today that jeopardize our future.

A couple of last things on page 11: here are some things that you no doubt have heard others talking about from some of these presentations and these are more concrete elements of what we have in mind that are manifestations of the principles that we’ve been working on. We’re talking about creating central resources that will be under the management of the provost for real time funding of strategic initiatives in all of our core mission areas.

I mentioned pilot projects, we’re also talking about demonstration projects where individual units step forward and say they would like to create a new model. For example, in the School of Business, there’s interest in restructuring the pricing for the various programs there as well as restructuring how expenses are charged against different funding sources that are available to the school. And, if that is a successful pilot project, there may be lessons learned there that can be applied in other academic units.

In the cost saving realm we’re talking about partnerships between business officers and the various campus units as well as the central units to identify areas where we know we have not only inefficiency but we have a lot of campus frustration. The best example is there are always people that are looking to understand the status of a purchase or a payment and everything that we do in the purchasing and payables process is now paper-based. So if a piece of paper goes astray, nobody knows where it is, nobody takes responsibility for making certain that the piece of paper reaches its ultimate destination so that the purchase can be made or the vendor can be paid. And we do have capability in software that we’ve purchased for our business systems that that could be a totally electronic process and all of the lost paperwork would go away, people could sign on to an account and check the status and go directly to wherever there appears to be a bottleneck and get a response and get the transaction back on its way or to wherever it needs to go.

Incentives for more prudent end-of-year spending, Lisa had many examples of situations that she was aware of during her years here where at the end of the year there was a mad rush to spend down whatever money there was so that it wouldn’t be lost. And we’re very serious about putting in place for the current year a new way of thinking about balances that appear to be available toward the end of the year by sharing what is left with the individual unit, some percentage going to the unit, some percentage coming back to the university to maintain flexible funds. We haven’t worked out the details on that but stay tuned, that’s a coming attraction.
And repurposing of vacant positions, that is a practice that’s been under way more or less since the president’s arrival last year. There has been, I would call it, a soft freeze on vacancies wherein rather than just replacing positions that become vacant for whatever reason, the dean or the business unit director has to come through the responsible cabinet member. And then there is a discussion with the president, himself, about how critically needed it is to replace a particular position or is there a higher and better use elsewhere for the funding and the position. So this has actually been underway this fiscal or academic year, and this is a practice that we expect will continue indefinitely.

And I’ll stop here but, before I do and turn it over to the floor for questions or comments, I want to invite anybody here that has a question, comment at any time to contact me directly. I’ve put my e-mail information up there. I’ve been getting many, many great suggestions, many good questions that have been helpful to me in my own orientation to the university and have put me on to issues and opportunities that need my personal attention. And I try very hard to respond to anybody that contacts me with a personal reply, sometimes it takes me a little while to get back, but I do very much invite and welcome contact from anybody here or anybody around campus that wants to send forward a question or has an idea or a concern. I will stop here and see what questions the floor may have.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Nancy, could you give us some idea, I know that right now we’re working on the budget for FY15 or is that right?

**N. Suttenfield:** We have not yet started, we’ve been focused primarily on establishing base budgets for the current year so we have a place to start in planning for the next year.

**A. Rosenbaum:** But the next budget year will begin July 1 that would be FY15?

**N. Suttenfield:** That’s correct.

**A. Rosenbaum:** When will the budget for FY15 be developed?

**N. Suttenfield:** All I can say at this point in time Lisa and I plan to have some communications with the deans very soon about what they can expect. We will be working on a budget for the university that goes to the board in June. So between now and June with specific milestones in between to be worked out, we will be developing a budget for next year.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Now could you explain with an example, so let’s say I give an example. Let’s say my unit wants to start a program and we want a faculty member that has expertise in a certain area. So how does that work through the budget process? What are the units that will be proposing budgets? Does it come from the department? Does it come from the deans? How would that work? Let’s track that through the process.

**L. Freeman:** So, in the model that we’re developing now there will be a discretionary funding maintained within the colleges so that an idea for a new program forward and there will be a plan for that program showing that the program will be aligned with the university’s mission. The larger mission in terms of excellence in teaching, learning, engagement, research, creativity,
artistry service, also that this is a program that will help us with our overarching goals in the three pillars in terms of building student career success, thriving communities, financial sustainability in the sense that we will be looking to invest and jump start programs that are being proposed because there’s student demand, because they build on areas of existing strength or they take advantage of great opportunities that reflect the changing world and the changing goals of the university.

So this idea will come forward, there will be some sort of format under which the program would be designed and that will probably be a skeleton template that would be shared with deans. And then modifications would be made within units as appropriate because I’m guessing there are questions you would want to ask about a program in chemistry, that would be different than questions you might want to ask about a program in trombone. Depending on what’s being asked for in terms of the program, is it a new hire, is it a new course buy out, the number of members of and levels of university administration that might be involved in the discussion would be different, and that program would be funded or non-funded through funds that are held for things like jump starting programs with the idea that there’s an understanding of what the goals are for the new program and what the financial investment on an annual and likely tapering basis would be. And when I say tapering basis that doesn’t mean we would hire and fire faculty, but obviously sometimes, when you’re starting up a program, you need more of course preps to set something up and those are things that are not constantly needed at the same level they are needed immediately. If you’re starting up a new research program sometimes temporary faculty or graduate student salaries are something that are needed at a higher level at the beginning than at the end. So this would be sort of part of the type of proposal that would come forward depending on the size, depending on how many units were involved, the number of discussions that would come forward.

In some ways there are things that would look very similar to what program start ups look like now in terms of eventually going through the provost’s office and having to answer some questions for IBHE. But I think that we would all like to see more discretionary funding at the lower level so that everything doesn’t have to come all the way up to the top. We’d like to see the opportunity through things like carry forward funds for even small experiments to be tried by faculty locally to get an idea. If you think you have a new program idea and offering a summer session course or offering one section of something and it’s part of a graduate seminar to sort of gauge interest to sort of get employer feedback. Sometimes you can actually get an idea by doing a very small experiment about whether something is scalable or large and needs to be fine tuned.

I don’t know if I’m addressing your question. If you want to know exactly what the eventual budget process will look like, I can tell you that it will be consistent with the guiding principles but we don’t have all the details worked out and, as those are put in place, we will come back to you and ask for feedback. We will be looking at budget practices at other universities. We will be looking at what makes sense within the framework of an Illinois public institution. And we will be trying to build the best possible process that’s the most responsive to the academic needs of the campus. I can also tell you that, as we do this, we may not always agree. And, as we do this, we may make poor choices that need to be revisited after we try them out and we’re prepared to do that.
A. Rosenbaum: It sort of answers my question but it sounds like what you’re saying is that the decision making is at the college level as opposed to there being some larger discussion about how money is funneled to the colleges or which colleges get how much money. I’m sort of wondering: Is there a transparent process for that where the deans come in and say this is what I need money for and then someone has to make a decision as to whether to give them that money and whether the arguments for department level funding requests go to the deans who then have to put it in their budget and then come to a higher university level discussion of some sort where decisions are made.

L. Freeman: We are moving from a model where pretty much everybody got the same regardless of what was going on, regardless of what was going on in terms of enrollment or demand, regardless of what was going on in terms of growth potential, regardless of what was going on in terms of past history, to a model where we actually try to align the budget with our strategic priorities. One of the things, and you know this Alan, and others of you who were on the presidential search committee are aware that this was very much a discussion of the search committee, is the institution has generated a number of strategic plans, of visions, of benchmarks. And, although there were definitely priorities that were articulated in there that a lot of thought went into, the final phase of operationalizing those plans by aligning them with budget didn’t really occur in a sustainable way. I see Matt Streb in the back and we worked very closely together on Vision 2020 and there were certainly new money put on the table that was able to support some of the investments. The same thing happened in Great Journeys before I came here. But the way that money was dispensed to the colleges is things were held centrally, there was not confidence that the funding would recur. It’s very hard for someone who’s managing a program, whether it’s a research center or a new undergraduate degree or a large scale course transformation initiative or the Office for Student Engagement and Experiential Learning to have a plan going forward, a multi-year plan, if they have no idea if the next fiscal year budget is going to have the money for staff that they’ve already hired, is going to have the money for mailings, is going to have … And so what we are doing now and what we’ve done is we’ve looked at those things, we’ve looked at the success of the programs and we said you’re going to have to pay faculty and staff to run this very successful initiative as long as it exists, so that money is going in your budget.

For the next series for those types of initiatives to go forward there will be some, hopefully depending on the overall budget situation and in terms of the timeline for building the budget, the state appropriation is very unclear at this point because of issues like the tax increase, the gubernatorial election. We have questions about where our enrollment numbers will be and the tuition dependency of our budget is fairly large. As we get a sense of what’s going on, we will have an idea that there’s an uncommitted pool of funds, not just at the central level, but also colleges will have some of those and departments will have some of those. And that occurs to some degree now but it hasn’t occurred at the scale to allow real consideration of multi-year initiatives at the level that the president thinks it should have happened or could happen going forward. And so, as we look at a central bank of funds or unallocated funds and how colleges would compete for that, we don’t have all the details yet but if I had to guess I would guess that flowing from faculty to departments to deans or faculty from multiple departments to center directors to deans or provost or to vice president for research would be the way that ideas would
get developed and injected into a competitive budget process for new initiatives. But that has not been set in stone. I don’t know if you want to add to that.

**N. Suttenfield:** The only thing that I would add to get to the question when will certain things happen, this is not a transformation that will happen between now and the start of a new fiscal year. For all of these principles and guidelines to become imbedded in the way in which we plan and do budgets, it’s probably going to take us anywhere from 18 to 24 months. That’s likely to be two fiscal years because there are a great many considerations and as I mentioned, it’s important to us that, before we make any major change, we have opportunities like this one here today to hear your thoughts. And, if we’re about to make a major misstep, we’d like help before we make a misstep. We will keep the entire campus posted as we’re moving into new phases about how this will actually be implemented and there will be plenty of opportunities for you to ask us questions and maybe we haven’t thought about the answers yet and I think what Lisa’s tried to do here is give some preliminary thoughts about how this might roll out but we can’t yet say when specific aspects of it will roll out.

**M. Kostic:** This was a nice talk really, very general. Not much of substance, I hate to say, and we are interested in facts. In my department, Mechanical Engineering, I’m professor Kostic from there, we have 580 students where [inaudible] faculty so 50+ students per faculty. At the State of the University, I was surprised to hear president talking in his speech that there is 16,000 students at campus or 50,000 together, 4,000 or 5,000 employees. So there is ten times more employees than faculty so we are a minority here and students success begins at ground zero meaning in the classroom. And I think when times were good, Wall Street was stretching and making bubbles, everybody was happy and services and administrations were going to the extent that it is no longer sustained. And I don’t see how we could be training anymore teaching. They got to talk about the details, the reality and working together in academia is not the same as working in business or government. And we got to be aware of it so, if we share the formal and the training of faculty or instructors or teachers in high school, it was proven it doesn’t bring any measure of success in teaching and learning. What’s important isn’t enthusiastic faculty and instructors and to carry to the students. Basically we need to sit down and reflect a lot just going with the marketing ahead of the maybe groundwork zero is less for publicity and everything else but it’s going to help in my class. We got to sit down and talk about everything and it’s not easy, the times are not good and I don’t know should we unionize? Maybe we should make a union and be more organized. I’m a little joking but there is – I’m 36+ years in teaching and probably in a couple I happily retire but we are talking about reality here and when I came in, the salary was low, the benefits was nice. Now we’re cutting the benefits, salary is basically becoming lower because we don’t keep up with the cost of living then we’ll be losing the quality of instructors and then quality of the students and then sustain the liabilities in there. I could talk more but I think I said what I wanted to say in the brief time.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t suppose there’s an answer to that.

**L. Freeman:** I guess I would just say that the fact that this is general and not detailed does not reflect any desire to withhold information. It is, indeed, a work in progress as we’ve shared with you.
N. Suttenfield: And, as I mentioned, there will be some follow up presentations in late March that provide more specifics about the financial situation. And in terms of addressing needs where we know them to be, I think one really key opportunity that we have which I mentioned on the final slide was that we do have opportunities to repurpose positions as they go vacant. So there may be retirements, there may be resignations, we know that roughly $2.5 million worth of salary turnover takes place every year. There’s an opportunity to rethink how we repurpose faculty and staff positions to areas as Lisa said where we have the highest demand and we have opportunities to build on the strengths that already exist.

G. Slotsve: I guess what I want to clarify because the word demand is being thrown out here and the nature of the decisions that are being made are long-run decisions. So from a faculty viewpoint, if a position is taken from one department or you decide to go on demand base and say this program currently has high demand for the students, how far out are you planning because the titles that you’re making could easily be 30 -35 year hires and you’re trying to forecast a demand for a program, I doubt you’re going to have a decent estimate five years out.

L. Freeman: I am not an economist so when I use the word demand I’m probably using it completely inappropriately. So let me just start out by saying there, and if I gave people the wrong impression by using the word demand inappropriately, I regret that. Universities have a core mission. We know what our mission is or at least we should all be memorizing them off the little cards that we were given for HLC. And we have a mission related to teaching and learning and research and scholarships and excellence and engagement. We have a set of guiding principles for NIU that wants us to create students who are citizens and lifelong learners and that’s inherent to the decision of student career success. And there will always be a faculty that reflects those needs and many of those faculty will never be in a department where an economist might talk about market demand. But that doesn’t mean that they’re not mission critical.

On the other hand, we see in Nancy’s presentation, and I had a lot of input into that presentation, talk about alignment. When we talk about alignment and misalignment, maybe that’s more what I mean when I say demand. If we have seven colleges and every college gets exactly the same amount of money regardless of their enrollment, regardless of the number of applications, regardless of the number of students they’re serving, regardless of the role they play in progressive learning and undergraduate studies, baccalaureate goals, gen ed, then we are not aligning our resources with our mission. And if we have a college that has enrollment growing and we wind up with a faculty to student ratio that’s unacceptable from a pedagogical, unacceptable from an accreditation standpoint and we don’t do something to address that, then we’re not doing our job aligning resources, mission and needs. And so in my mind that example would fit demand but that’s probably not an appropriate use of the word. So I apologize if I misled, but I think we need to recognize where resources that we have need to go to continue to grow the institution and to grow it in a way that’s consistent with the mission and goals and plans that we’ve made together going forward. That’s really the message I was trying to send and I apologize if I used language that created a different impression.

A. Rosenbaum: I think this is a very hot button topic though for faculty and that gets at why the process becomes so important because there are many different views of what is critical to the mission. And when people hear about reallocation of funds to the more, I forget the term that you
used, popular programs, there is always concern that there is a process there that enables faculty
to have some input into what those mission critical programs are. And so that gets to how are
these decisions made? Are they made by a committee, are they made by the CFO, are they made
by our Resources, Space and Budget Committee or with the input of our committee? So when
people talk about realigning resources, that does get the attention of faculty. And there is great
concern that there be transparency in that process and that faculty sort of understand and are
included in those decision making processes.

L. Freeman: Well, one of the things that I like very much about NIU, that Nancy likes about
NIU, and I suspect most people here like because you’re sitting in Faculty Senate, is that we
have a very robust shared government system. And we have a Resource, Space and Budget
Committee that reports to the University Council. We have an Academic Planning Council that
does program reviews and helps programs look at what they’re doing well and not as well and
helps them look at opportunities for improvement which are opportunities for investment. And
we’re not contemplating anything that would do anything but strengthen the role of those
committees in a process. If we had everything worked out today to the point where we could
show you a process, a timeline, an application sheet, a detailed description of the role of a faculty
member, a department, a college, the APC, the RSB, the Faculty Senate and the UC, we would
do it. But we’re not there, we’re using guiding principles to inform a process that will honor our
shared governance system and involve the appropriate components in a campus-wide dialog. Does that mean that everybody will always get what they want? No, but that doesn’t happen
now. We have a strong history of shared governance on this campus, respect for dialog around
what’s in the best interest of the students and our overall broad mission of a university involving
teaching, research, scholarship, creativity, engagement and I would suspect those things to
continue.

A. Rosenbaum: And it wasn’t a critical comment. I think that one of the problems we have is
that the administration has not always shared the same view of shared governance as the faculty
has. So the previous administration had a very different view of shared governance than perhaps
and hopefully the currently administration does. I think it’s important for us to sort of have that
sense from the new administration that this is, in fact, the way things will be done and that a
shared governance process and the input of faculty will be continued and will be increased and
enlarged. So I think that’s an important thing for us to know.

M.B. Henning: I am wondering if you can provide [microphone not on] we interviewed
excellent candidates for two positions that we thought we were going to be hiring for this and
now there’s just a lot of confusion about what’s happening with that search process because our
committees made the recommendations weeks ago and we had these good candidates and we’re
fearful that they’re going to take jobs somewhere else. It doesn’t look good for NIU to have these
people just kind of hanging out there. Even our candidates that we deemed not qualified, we
can’t contact them out of courtesy and politeness to tell them we’re not giving them the job and
we’re just very confused about what’s this new process involving that’s holding up our hires?

L. Freeman: I am actually going to speak very specifically to four hires in the College of
Education because your two are among them. And those were hires that had gotten to a certain
point in the process before the president asked the cabinet, including the provost which filters
down to the deans, to justify hiring of vacancies. And so those search processes were going on
and in process and actually not on the radar of vacancies that needed to be justified until they got
to the final stage. So there are four positions that fell into that category. I think there was not a
shared assumption about whether they would move forward exclusive of the vacancy control
process because of when they were started versus be brought into it. And so they are, I just
received last night close to midnight, the justification data necessary to take those hires to the
president and they will be going to the president. We have our processes that don’t always move
quickly and you don’t need me to tell you that. We all experience that. There are the usual or
perhaps more than the usual backups in some of those processes. But the actual cases you’re
talking about are ones that I’m very familiar with because they are unique in terms of where they
fell in the life cycle and we recognize the risk to losing important hires and we’re trying to move
them through as quickly as possible.

M. B. Henning: It sounds like there’s going to be a new process. There’s going to be a new in
the future a whole new layer added on top of the HR.

L. Freeman: So, I don’t actually think that the new layer will exist forever in its present form.
But, as of I want to say sometime in November but I could be wrong, but sometime in the fall, to
send a message about strategic priorities and aligning resources with our mission and to show
that it’s not just business as usual, the president asked all of the cabinet departments so that
included academic affairs, the provost and the colleges but it also included student affairs,
administration, finance, athletics to justify new hires so that questions could be asked about
somebody left, I’m filling the exact same position. The conversation is why is it the exact same
position? Is there turnover because the position is offered at the wrong salary? Is there an
opportunity for synergy that would make this a joint hire better? Should there be a discussion
that would be had? In some cases we’ve asked colleges and other divisions to talk together about
sharing a position of a cross marketing and college communications office. Or sometimes the
president has asked what’s going on in this program? Do we need to make extra hires because
we have too many students who aren’t being served if the enrollment and program has dropped?
Do we need an additional office support specialist in that department or can they be shared in
two departments? So it’s the type of questions that he wants us to start thinking about. And they
are questions that we should be thinking about as we invest our precious resources and ongoing
personnel commitments.

But is it sustainable to have an extra layer on top of HR that has to go up all the way to the
president in perpetuity? I think the answer to that is obviously not. But it’s a step to let us make
the best resource decisions now. And it comes with a price and we’re working hard to make a
better process but I hope that answers your question. The philosophy will stay there, but the
process, as in all of our processes, we hope will be streamlined so that its more user friendly,
more trackable and so in fact we don’t have four positions that exist on paper in one part of the
university that the other parts of the university don’t know about so the special needs can’t be
considered.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other questions? No other questions. Well thank you very much. We
appreciate your coming and we encourage continued transparency.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, just a couple of quick announcements. One, we have the next Faculty Club lunch coming up on I think it’s March 5 is that it Pat? March 4. And when do people have to make their reservations? This coming Monday. So we have our next Faculty Club lunch on March 4, reservations have to be in Monday. You can make those reservations by e-mailing Pat. We have really been pleased with the turnout at the Faculty Club lunches and I think the people who have been there have enjoyed them. If you haven’t been there, you should give it a try. This semester we have some of them on Tuesdays and Thursdays and some of them on Wednesdays to accommodate different schedules. This next one is at Ellington’s. Do you happen to remember what the theme is? No. Well you can get that online. Italian. Okay, great so if you would try to spread the word among faculty. You don’t have to have someone with you. You don’t have to come as a group, although you can. We are generally sitting at large tables and the whole idea is to intermingle with other faculty members, get to know people in other departments, get to talk about things that you have in common, research things, Millie will be there to talk about unionizing the faculty.

M. Kostic: [off mic]

A. Rosenbaum: All right, okay, so anyway, there is that. There’s no news on the searches. Many of you have seen the candidates for the CIO position. They were on campus over the last two weeks. There were very strong candidates I think at least we had strong candidates. Some of them were strong candidates, stronger than others. The other things that we have going on are the provost search, of course, and the search for the permanent CFO. And those are still in the application process so we don’t know what those lists look like. And we’ll keep you posted on those as we go along. Anyone have any questions about anything that I’ve mentioned or that I haven’t mentioned? Okay.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. The Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award – Page 22

A. Rosenbaum: Next item is the Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award. We did not get any nominations. So you will recall last time we discussed this and the instruction was to send nominations to me and nobody did. So this year we are not giving out a Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Moving on to our reports, we have no report from Sonya Armstrong on the FAC to the IBHE.

B. Student Association – report
A. Rosenbaum: Next up is our Student Association report and we have Dillon Domke with us to do the Student Association report.

D. Domke: From our side over at the S.A., we have our elections coming up in about a month here and we’re going to be having information meetings February 24 and 25 which is this upcoming Monday and Tuesday. We’d like to urge all of you as faculty members that if you have bright, outstanding students that you think would be good in a leadership position in the university, if you could urge them to possibly come by these informational sessions so that we can cultivate student leaders and further that student career success that President Baker’s been talking about.

Also the S.A. is going to be working with Dr. Baker to get the faculty and student input on the campus master plan. We’re going to be hosting an open house in the art gallery downstairs in the student center the first two weeks after we come back from spring break and we’ll allow everyone – faculty, students, staff - to take a look at all the layouts and drawings and blueprints that the architects that President Baker brought in and presented to us and then also be able to give your own feedback about some of the things that you think might be pertinent to the university.

Also already today we’ve talked in this meeting about shared governance. The Student Association had a strong victory in that department this past week with the cancelation of the Circus Spectacular that was first brought up to us by actually Dr. Mitch Irwin from the Anthropology Department and the [Student] Senate this past Sunday passed a resolution urging the university to cancel it. And then two days later it was canceled. Now it was stated because of weather but I do have a source that confirms that the resolution that we passed did have a part to play in it.

One last thing, this Thursday at 7 p.m., I believe, is we have a home basketball game. I do believe it is Faculty/[Staff] Appreciation Day and Red Riot has been asking everyone to wear red if you are going to the game. Are there any questions?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you, Dillon. So those of you who were going to the circus now have a free night to do something else.

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair; Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison – report – Pages 23-24

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have Deborah Haliczer with the University Benefits Committee report.

D. Haliczer: Okay, I have given you in your packet the copy of a summary of what the activities are in the University Benefits Committee. What I want to talk about is that a lot of people have been expressing concerns about the impact of the pension law changes and how that’s going to affect your decision making about retirement. And lots of people have talked to me and to my staff at HR. And we are still waiting from SURS for an interpretation by their legal counsel of what this is going to mean.
That being said, lots of you have been looking at your calculations on the SURT S estimator, all of us that I know have, and we will soon be announcing SURT S campus visits on April 23 and 24. And when the mailing goes out to the campus, you’ll be able to get online, sign up for appointments on campus. Don’t wait for that. You know those are going to go quickly so get on right away and do that if you’re within four years of retiring. If not, you can call the SURT S office and make an appointment at our NIU Naperville site and see the counselor there as many people have. There will be a presentation on April 24 from 10 a.m. until 12 noon for employees here on campus and we will be recording and streaming that for those who are not able to be here that day. And it will be available for you to look at if you’re not able to come. So we’re doing all we can to try and get the information out insofar as we’re able to. We’re also depending on and waiting for SURT S’ interpretation and legal counsel is busily studying and that makes people frustrated and anxious and we’re doing the best we can. We’re not allowed to get that mailing out to campus until SURT S tells us it’s the day that we can release the communication so I’m giving lots of verbal warnings to people about those dates coming up. So be watching your email. It will no doubt be a Steve Cunningham e-mail so don’t delete it, read it because it’s coming up very soon. If there are any questions, please feel free to ask me. Take care.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Jeff.

J. Kowalski: Yes, I did speak with Deb about this personally and my own case may not be that for everyone because not everyone will have the same circumstances, the same years of service, the same program in which they’re enrolled or any of a number of factors that would affect their own situation. But in my case I’m fairly near to my retirement full payout and, after consulting with a SURT S retirement counselor and being in the money purchase group, I found out I could be very adversely affected, my pension payout stood to lose a dramatic amount of money based on that particular consultation. So people may want to also consider if they’re concerned just to having a consultation with a SURT S retirement counselor. And as I say, it’s not universal, it’s not going to apply to everyone in the same way but just to bring it to people’s attention.

A. Rosenbaum: It does, though, apply to people who have been here a long time. So if you’ve been here more than let’s say 25 years I think, maybe even less than that, 20 years. Whoever’s in the money purchase group, this is all due to the change in the percentage rate that they apply to the money purchase option. It’s not due to the Pension Reform Bill. Regardless of what happens with the Pension Reform Act, there’s still going to be this decrease in the percentage that’s applied to the money purchase formula. Anybody who is going to be near retirement age and who will have their advantage by using the money purchase option really needs to talk to their advisors to find out what the impact is. Abhijit?

A. Gupta: I think, again I may be wrong and I also talked to her. There are two issues, one the calculation of change your money purchase formula which took place before. But I think with the latest pension law change and how the interest will be computed I’ve heard that’s part of that too. So there is a difference between what would have taken place for money purchase if there was no pension law change. That’s my understanding and it can be significant as Jeff mentioned. What I would request, like presentation by Dr. Cunningham, there are things that are black and white. Like how much would be the increment as opposed to COLA. How many will be skipped,
etc., etc. But what probably is not so clear is what is the effect of money purchase formula in terms of does it affect the money after the pension law is in effect or includes everything somebody contributed so there are I think that needs to be clarified. That would be my request because I read the presentation and that was the topic.

A. Rosenbaum: And we are doing our best to get to the bottom of this but I think the safest thing, as Deborah said, is to make an appointment and talk to SURS representative and they will tell you specifically in your case what the impact is of retiring before or after June 1. So people should really be aware of that. Any other questions?

D. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – no report

A. Rosenbaum: Next, we don’t have a report from the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee but George do you have any comments about the candidates that we have for the CIO position, CFAC opinions or anything like that?

G. Slotsve: CFAC, we haven’t met since the candidates have come through. My feeling is it’s probably going to come down to two candidates at least from the interaction they had with CFAC Committee and what we saw in their presentations. They were strong, very different styles. One of them I think is going to be more centralized and take a very different view of centralized computing and that will be where they were emphasizing to centralizing computing operations, have less distributing computing. Another candidate was actually a high school teacher and I think would be very easy to work with. So they were both very strong candidates for different reasons. It will be interesting to see who is hired.

A. Rosenbaum: And just so we’re clear, they didn’t come here as high school teachers. They had been high school teachers in a previous career.

G. Slotsve: No, no. They’ve had high school teaching experience at universities and different things.

A. Rosenbaum: Way back.

G. Slotsve: They were just very different candidates. One candidate had that background that was basically just below what a CIO of a university right now but had a very strong education background. So I think they understood what our mission was and would deal with faculty very well. The other candidate came more where they’ve been in the political, had more of a political life and dealt with the world that way. Just very different candidates with skill sets that would be useful.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, good.

E. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – no report

F. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report
G. BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee –
Deborah Haliczer and Rosita Lopez – no report

H. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee –
Deborah Haliczer and Alan Rosenbaum – no report

I. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – no report

J. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report

C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report

D. Rules and Governance – Robert Schneider, Chair – no report

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


A. Rosenbaum: No BOT reports. Next up we have Resources, Space and Budgets, Jim.

J. Wilson: We have quite a lot in here. We’ve been a little busy. But starting from page 25 up to page 33 you’ll see a series of reports from our meeting with the president and provost and kind of an addendum or appendix, if you will, on enrollment initiatives that was supplied to us when we asked. We did not get a chance to discuss that with the president and the provost. And that follows up with our most recent meeting on February 7, our committee meeting, a report on that.

2. Committee meeting report – February 7, 2014 – Page 32

J. Wilson: And that follows up with our most recent meeting

3. Proposed Statement of Budget Priorities – Pages 33-35

J. Wilson: With that, I’m going to go ahead and move to page 33 which is what we’ve come up with using a lot of material that I just moved over very quickly there. We came up with a Statement of Budget Priorities. Last year’s statement that we created was based on a desire to move a step ahead of just being passive recipients of information passed down to us on high and then just reporting it to everyone. And this statement is based more or less on extensive conversations we’ve had with the president, the provost and Nancy Suttenfield and Mr.
Cunningham. With that, the preamble is a reflection of our meetings with that, discusses that. And we’ve divided up the statement into three parts: the resources, space, budget and what we envision our role as part of the new budget process.

Resources: We prioritize budget allocation in order to safeguard the academic mission of course is at the top but we also identified as priorities a coherent policy of course articulations and to explore the potential of competency based education. And we move on in priorities to looking into innovative teaching models such as online education, hybrid teaching models, flipped classrooms and flexible scheduling. We know, and we’re well aware that enrollment is critical to NIU’s long term sustainability and we believe that resources need to be supplied for effective marketing and human resources considerations that we need to focus on as well. Some of this deals with dual partner hires and some other items.

I’ll go ahead and move onto the space and this is on shared and collaborative use to foster cohesion within and among programs.

And moving on budget we are very concerned. A high priority is compensation, recruitment and retention of potential students and students we have. Looking at the foundation fund how it’s integrated into the budget. Looking at fee options for students whether that should be optional, like a cafeteria plan pick and choose what they would like.

And moving lastly to our role in the new budget process, our highest priority is being engaged in the process of budget hearings. Understanding and having a role in the metrics and benchmarks in these budget hearings and that we should have an active role in that and that we have an ongoing consultative process with our own constituents and our own representatives and how we can articulate that to the president, provost and chief financial officer. And so with that I’ll leave it.

A. Rosenbaum: Now if I’m not mistaken you would like the senate to give its approval to this priority statement so that can go forward to University Council and ultimately to the chief financial officer.

J. Wilson: Yes. I would like to make the motion that the senate approve this statement of priorities.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a motion.

W. Pitney: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Bill Pitney second; okay, discussion. Any discussion of these priorities? Part of that discussion if you feel we need more time to look at this and think about it. We could certainly think about that. I don’t know exactly what the time table is but our committee has done a very good job of this so they’ve put a lot of work into it and I think they’ve done an excellent job.

M.B. Henning: Which pages exactly are we approving?
A. Rosenbaum: Would people like a few moments to just look at this?

Unidentified: A few more minutes.

A. Rosenbaum: A few more minutes okay, we can do that.

A. Rosenbaum: We’re getting close to the time when faculty senators put their heads on the desk and start drooling so has anybody come up with a comment or question for either Jim or Paul was here also, Paul’s still here. So we have both of our chairs of the Resources, Space and Budget Committee here. Any thoughts on this? Yes ME?

ME Koren: I really appreciate the work that has gone into this and I think, in order to make a really intelligent decision, I personally would rather take the time to read it more closely rather than voting on it today but that’s just my opinion.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, what we need to know is what the deadlines are so when does this need to – do we have a sense of when this needs to be to the administration? Because we have to go first to the University Council so the University Council is next Wednesday and then not again for another month so that would take us to the April University Council meeting.

M. Kostic: She said the budget will take about 18 months to…

A. Rosenbaum: No it will take 18 months to get the new procedures in place. It won’t take 18 months to get the new budget.

P. Carpenter: My best guess for this, based upon what happened last year, is that if this is considered at all, will be part of what gets presented then to the Board of Trustees which is in June, correct?

A. Rosenbaum: Well June is when they approve the budget, yes?

P. Carpenter: So it’s going to have to be into that system before that point in time.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, that’s the final approval. They might need a lead on that if they’re going to take it into consideration.

P. Carpenter: This time last year we approved at this meeting so it could move to University Council for the next meeting and then it went out I believe to the President.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so is it your judgment then that we should try to approve this today so that it can go to council next week?

P. Carpenter: Based upon what happened last year, yes.

A. Rosenbaum: So, why don’t we do this, I appreciate your comment ME, we can approve it and then we can also have people contact either Paul or Jim and pass comments along to them
and we’ll have to trust their judgment and the judgment of the committee as to what to do with those comments. Does that seem reasonable?

**A. Gupta:** I just want to say that this committee did a super job. Of course, I had the privilege to read it before with the Steering Committee. What I would request is to at least putting on the floor and hopefully get approved because otherwise because of the subsequent timelines with the University Council etc. all of this hard work would be for nothing.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, why don’t we do that. We have a motion, we have a second and then feel free to contact either Jim or Paul with any comments that you want to bring to the committee and they can do with that as they will. Okay. So, all in favor of approving this statement of budget priorities say aye. Opposed, Abstention? Okay the statement is…

**Unidentified:** Awww.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Oh, you want to use those. Okay you’re right. Here we go. Pat’s going to set it up. Does everyone have their clickers? One is yes, two is no, three is abstain. One yes, two no, and three is abstain. If you vote one you’re voting to approve the statement that was given to us by our Resources, Space and Budgets Committee. Ready vote. All right, one more second, everyone’s voted, voting is closed. Let’s see the vote.

1 – YES – 33 votes  
2 – NO – 2 votes  
3 – ABSTAIN – 1 vote

**A. Rosenbaum:** See this is why it’s good to have clickers. Okay well good, that settles it. It is approved. And again I do want to echo the comments that have been made. We have a great Resources, Space and Budgets Committee. They have really made a lot of progress over the last couple of years. And again, next year when people are signing up for committees, again we’ll have a new executive secretary doing that, but really seriously consider being on this Resources, Space and Budget Committee and making that a priority and only do that if you really want to work and really want to get involved in this because it’s a time commitment, they meet with the president, they meet with the provost, they meet with the chief financial officer, there’s time involved. But I really would encourage people we need to keep this a very strong committee and we need to keep them in the face of the administration so that our voice continues to be heard. Thank you to both Paul and Jim and everyone else on these committees. Yes, Virginia.

**V. Naples:** Alan, if I could make a comment in support of what you’re saying, this is my first year having been a member of the Resources, Space and Budget Committee and I found it collegial, interesting and the information about the university gave me a brand new perspective on what is going on here. I found it an absolutely fascinating experience and I’m looking forward to doing additional things with it. So I recommend it to anybody if they are interested in what is going on. And at least with the present atmosphere I get the feeling that the Resources, Space and Budget Committee members as well as other members of Faculty Senate, University Council and other people are going to have a stronger voice in improving the direction in which the university is going. So it’s a real breath of fresh air.
A. Rosenbaum: Great.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair

1. Nomination for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – See list of University Council Members eligible for election – Page 36

Letters of acceptance are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Friday, March 14, 2014, and will be included in the March 26 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the April 23 FS meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, next our next committee is Elections and Legislative Oversight and I’m going to turn it over to Steven Tonks.

S. Tonks: Thank you. It is time now to take nominations for the position of executive secretary of University Council and president of the Faculty Senate for next academic year. The list of eligible members is the walk-in item that was at your place. If you’re nominated, we need a letter of acceptance in by noon by Friday, March 14 and then we’ll have an election on April 23. Yes, George. So now we’re accepting nominations.

G. Slotsve: I’d like to nominate Bill Pitney.

S. Tonks: Okay, thank you.

A. Gupta: I’ll second that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have one nomination. Yes.

R. Hunt: I am Rebecca Hunt and I’d like to nominate Sean Farrell.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we need a second. Jeff.

J. Kowalski: I’ll second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Jeff Kowalski is second. We have two nominees.

S. Tonks: Anymore?

H. Bateni: I’d like to nominate Paul Carpenter.

S. Tonks: That’s three.

A. Rosenbaum: Paul Carpenter. We need a second.

J. Wilson: I’ll second.
A. Rosenbaum: Second for Paul. Okay, we have three nominees.

S. Tonks: Anymore? We need a microphone.

K. Millis: I’d like to nominate Brad Sagarin.

A. Rosenbaum: Brad Sagarin, okay. Brad isn’t here today, he is ill but we need a second. I’ll second.

S. Tonks: Okay, All right, that’s four. Anymore? Okay I’d like to close nominations then.

A. Rosenbaum: Nominations are closed. Okay remember nominees you have until March 14 to provide our letter of acceptance and what we have typically done in the letter of acceptance is to also state your case for why you ought to be elected to this position. So just a statement of what your objectives are, what your qualifications are, etc. So we would like those by noon on Friday, March 14.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – 
Position announcement and NIU Bylaws, Article 9 – Pages 37-39

Letters of self-nomination are due in the Office of University Council and Faculty Senate by noon Wednesday, March 19, 2014, and will be included in the March 26 FS agenda packets. Election will take place at the April 23 FS meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have some new business. Unfortunately, and this is related to the comments that Jeff made and some of the issues around the pension reform, but Toni Tollerud who is our faculty and SPS personnel advisor who had one more year to go on her term is instead going to retire and Toni has done a spectacular job. She’s been a great faculty and SPS personnel advisor. We hate to lose her but, as Jeff pointed out, there are really important personal considerations in this such as losing a great deal of money from your retirement benefits. We really respect Toni’s need to make the decision.

However, that does leave us without a faculty and SPS personnel advisor. We put this out in NIU Today. Toni is available to speak to people about what the job involves, so anyone who would like to call Toni, please feel free to do that. Please spread it to your constituent groups. Keep in mind that the executive secretary must be a member of the University Council, but the faculty and SPS personnel advisor doesn’t have to be a member of the council or the senate, so it’s open to anybody, any tenured faculty member in the university. Spread the word, we need letters, either letters of self-nomination or other nomination by Wednesday, March 19. If you have questions about that, again you can talk to Toni. I was faculty and SPS personnel advisor myself many moons ago so you can talk to me as well and there’s also a description, somewhat of a
description, in the bylaws Article 9 even though it’s not the best description and doesn’t really
give you an idea of what’s involved in this job.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Any comments or questions from the floor, Melissa, yep.

M. Lenczewski: This is just a quick reminder that you were all sent a survey. I’m the chair to
evaluate Alan this year. So please make sure you fill out the survey monkey. If you did not
receive it, please contact Pat. She’ll resend it to you. It’s really critical for us to get a sense from
everybody in this room on how Alan’s doing. If you want to just talk to me, feel free to give me
a call, send me an e-mail, just trying to remind everyone to do that. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other comments or questions?

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, Honors Committee
L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’ll take a motion to adjourn.

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.

J. Wilson: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I don’t suppose anyone’s opposed. Thank you and we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.