FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
Wednesday, April 23, 2014, 3 p.m. 
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Domke, Falkoff, Haliczer, Klaper, D. Long (for Small), Tollerud

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Gebo, Hathaway, Small, Smith, Streb, Thompson, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

President D. Baker and Faculty Senate Vice President G. Slotsve thanked A. Rosenbaum for his five years of service to NIU as president of Faculty Senate and executive secretary of University Council and presented him with a gift on behalf of the Faculty Senate – a photographic piece of various architectural scenes from NIU’s campus.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum noted two walk-in items: a report on the Libraries Advisory Committee and the OARAA Task Force, and a pension reform statement. S. McHone-Chase moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by J. Novak, motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 26, 2014 FS MEETING

T. Arado moved to approve the minutes, seconded by M. Rosenbaum. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Rosenbaum requested a motion to go into executive session for the purposes of hearing the report from the committee evaluating the Executive Secretary and President of the Senate; and the report from the committee to evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor.
J. Wilson: made the motion. T. Arado: was second. The motion passed without dissention or abstention and the senate went into executive session.

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

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

G. Slotsve thanked the committees for the reports and made a motion to leave the executive session, seconded by J. Wilson. The motion passed and the regular meeting resumed.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum introduced Brett Coryell, NIU’s new CIO who had asked for some time to address the senate.

B. Coryell indicated that he wanted to hit two topics pretty quickly. One of them relates to Microsoft Office licensing and another one relates to network changes:

We have a quote from Microsoft for a contract that will give us full campus-wide licensing for all faculty, students and staff for all of the Windows products that we would need for the campus. That deal would result in five copies of Microsoft Office available for everyone’s personal and institutional use. You would be able to install it on tablet devices, both Android and iPad tablets. You would get access to web copies of Office and you would have fully installable local copies as well. Along with that will come other options for no additional price such as the use of SharePoint, the use of Link, which is an instant messaging client, and the ability to migrate out of GroupWise and into Office 365 which would give us 50 gigabyte inboxes instead of two gigabyte inboxes. The conversion of e-mail and calendars out of GroupWise into Office 365 is a non-trivial effort. That can’t happen by the time you get back [in the fall], but we should be compliant with Office licensing by the time you get back and I hope that’s really positive news.

The other topic that I wanted to talk about is the network. And our network here was architected, both wired and wireless, during a time when the internet was a more inviting, open and friendly place. And it is certainly not that right now from an information security standpoint. So right now, if you go back and you have lab equipment or just your personal laptop or desktop machine, all of those machines right now are open and sitting on the free and hostile internet with no barrier between anybody and any country on the planet who wants to scan your machine for vulnerabilities and try to work their way into it. There’s no barrier between them and our campus. The networking people in my group have already found that out.

There’s a design and plan in place right now to implement a perimeter, a border, for the network that will provide various types of protection for us and get us up to the common practices. So we would have a firewall that would protect us. We would look for traffic that’s going to or coming from known hostile sites that distribute Malware and we would detect that traffic and block it. And then we’ll also be doing something about peer-to-peer file sharing. We have hundreds and
hundreds of RIAA and NPAA recording industry and movie industry take-down notices because they’ve detected that we’re illegally pirating movies and songs. We’ll be shutting down a lot of that as well.

Of course, when you go from having nothing to having something for the first time, there can hiccups and I just want faculty to know that I’m very aware of all sorts of issues that are going to be possible. So I know that there are probably people who study peer-to-peer files sharing in the computer science department and I can’t block. I know that, when we put a border up to the network, then the scientists and maybe musicians who rely on high speed, low latency connections may not be able to get that, so we have a separate zone for them that just lets them out onto the internet nice and quick so they can do large file transfers or they can do interactive music concerts. So we’re aware of that. And I’m also aware that fully a third of all machines, if you just go around the planet, a third of all machines have some form of Malware on them. So anybody in this room’s machine might be affected and, without your knowledge, communicating with a hostile site or that hostile site is trying to recruit you to participate in a cyber attack. And you wouldn’t know that ordinarily but, when we detect it and block that, to each individual person’s machine, it will look like you’re cut off from the internet and not able to access the internet. And that will be a disruptive state to be in. So I just want to make everybody aware that we know that that’s going to happen ahead of time.

I’m starting to communicate with all of the IT people across campus. My group and the 200 or more other IT people who don’t work in the central ITS group, will be prepared with desktop support, distributed IT, the Help Desk, network engineers. And we may just even recruit other IT people to be around and to be available as we deploy this zone-by-zone or building-by-building across campus. We’ll be there to try to assure that, if you detect it, you’re unable to get to the internet for any reason, then we’ll scan your machine for Malware, we’ll reconfigure your network address and just work with you personally until you’re back up and running again so you aren’t waiting days or weeks to have somebody come by and just respond to your service outage.

G. Slotsve asked Coryell to address the Heartbleed virus.

B. Coryell replied that Heartbleed is a security vulnerability that has affected large numbers of machines on the internet: What you should do is change all of your passwords, and as you’re taking a moment to think about passwords, I would ask, if you can, and it’s a bit of a stretch, please use a different password to every site. For many people that’s impractical without a password manager. So I would just say at least have three passwords. Have one for NIU, have one for any of your financial life, and have one for your fun sites. Because at least that way you begin to compartmentalize any of the damage that can be done if anybody guesses or steals your passwords. You don’t want your NIU passwords stolen and then they’ve got access to your retirement account and your Chase bank account.

H. Bateni suggested that many faculty members would be interested in having the administrative password to their computer.
B. Coryell noted that this is a very common request across universities all over the country. But, there are reasons to not want people to have the administrative password. Ninety-two percent of all cyber attacks can be prevented by simply not giving somebody the administrative password. A machine where you don’t have administrative rights is immune to 92 percent of the attacks that have come out in the last either 12 or 18 months.

A. Rosenbaum thanked Coryell for his presentation, and introduced T. Tollerus, NIU’s outgoing Faculty and SPS Personnel Adviser who has also asked for time on today’s agenda.

T. Tollerud thanked the Faculty Senate: It’s been an honor to serve as Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor for the past two years. I was hoping to make a third year of it, but retirement has come in the way. In a perfect world it would be great if we didn’t need an advisor. But we’re not in a perfect world and it’s been a wonderful learning experience to work across campus and to serve you in many capacities, be it retirement, tenure, whatever conflict, just listening sometimes. And please spread the word that this is a wonderful opportunity to get a person who is not in your own department to be able to sit down and talk with you as well as to guide you in what your rights and responsibilities are as a faculty member here. So again I really am honored that you put me in this position and thank you for that opportunity.

A. Rosenbaum thanked Toni on behalf of the faculty and SPS employees and wished her good luck in her retirement. He also added that we are delighted to have someone very qualified nominated to serve next year.

He also thanked a number of others: Pat Erickson who has been a great administrative assistant. She’s been with me for four years and she has made this job a thousand times easier. So I appreciate everything that she’s done for me and with me, and I’m delighted that she’s going to be serving our next executive secretary. It makes me feel much more comfortable that the boat will stay afloat. And I also want to thank Ferald Bryan our parliamentarian for all your help over the years. And also I thank George Slotsve who has been our vice president for pretty much the whole time I’ve been ESP. I really appreciate George’s counsel and his help over the years as well. And also, thank you to all of the chairs, people on the Executive Committee and people on the Steering Committee. I know there’s some of you here as well. Again, this is certainly not a one-person job and there are a lot of people that make it possible and I thank you all for your good work.

I want to remind you that our final candidate for the provost position is Marek Dollar. He will be on campus this coming Monday and Tuesday. And there are open forums for faculty, for staff and community members, and also for students. If you go to them, you’ll get a feedback form. We’re organizing all that feedback for the president.

A. Recognition of faculty members who have completed their terms – Page 4

A. Rosenbaum recognized the faculty senators who are completing their service: Jane Rheineck, Mayra Daniel, Lynette Chandler, Lichuan Liu, Sherry Fang, Winifred Creamer, Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Ibrahim Onyukel, Christopher Nissen, Mark Frank, Eric Jones, Sien Deng, Leonard Clapp and Art Ward. Gary Chen is moving to the University Council. Jozef
Bujarski has been re-elected. Newly-elected members are: Lee Covington Rush, Eui-kyung Shin, Greg Conderman, Reinaldo Moraga, Mitch Irwin, Jimmie Manning, Minmei Hou, Robert Reichle, Ismael Montana, Joseph Stephen, Valia Allori and Kheang Un.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Libraries Advisory Committee, Gleb Sirotkin, FS liaison – report – walk-in

B. Open Access Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force, Gleb Sirotkin, Winifred Creamer, and Rebecca Hunt, FS liaisons – report – walk-in

C. Pension Statement – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum introduced Marc Falkoff, a faculty member in NIU’s College of Law. Marc and Elvia Arriola volunteered to contact the attorneys who are pressing the lawsuits against the state government with respect to the pension reform bill. Marc will present the purpose of the draft statement.

M. Falkoff provided the following presentation: As everyone knows, we’re all going to be affected in one way or another by the pension reform law. But some of our colleagues are about to be put in an impossible position because there is category of university employees who may not want to retire but feel pressed to do so because they want to lock in the benefits that are due to them without a diminishment that will come about because of the new law taking effect. So their quandary is that, if they retire and it turns out that the new law is deemed unconstitutional by the courts, then they’ve retired needlessly and they can’t un-retire. If they look at the law and decide that it is patently unconstitutional and decide to take a chance and not retire and then it turns out that the courts decide that the law is constitutional, then they cannot retroactively retire. So that’s the kind of situation where you would normally ask a court to issue a preliminary injunction to keep the law from taking effect until the courts definitively determine whether the law is constitutional or not. So you simply would be asking the courts to delay the effective date of the law.

As you probably know, there are five lawsuits pending challenging the validity of the law. They’ve all been consolidated in front of one judge and I’ve spoken with some of the lawyers and discussed this particular issue about the preliminary injunction. So what we’re concerned with right here is not with the ridiculousness of the law or anything like that. We’re concerned with a particular issue: people being put to a choice before they have adequate information. And we’ve inquired whether they’re planning on filing for a preliminary injunction and no one wants to say anything definitively because it’s all litigation strategy. But it seems very clear that within the next week or so there should be a motion for a preliminary injunction filed.

Now the question is: Is there anything that we can do to help out those lawsuits and that prospective motion for a preliminary injunction? And there are two things: One thing that we can do is we can gather the names of persons who are going to be put to this untenable choice.
The second thing that we can do is, as a group, issue a statement that could be used by the lawyers to give a little bit of evidence that this law is having a perverse effect and a real effect in that there are identifiable problems. In our case, as in the case with many of the institutions across Illinois, there’s basically going to be a very large brain drain.

So this is, what you have in front of you, a draft statement for your consideration. It’s not meant to be a legal argument. It’s simply meant to be a statement of the sense of this body that this law is going to be putting a number of us in a very difficult position. And it notes that we anticipate losing up to 800 employees at the university.

It identifies the two major reasons why we expect a wave of retirements. I won’t go deeply into them, but one is that there is a kind of grandfather clause that was written into the law that was designed to keep exactly this kind of thing from happening. But, more or less, there was a typographical error and this is not exact, but the idea is that there should have been a reference to something happening on June 30, 2014, but instead the law says it will happen on June 30, 2013. So, if you effectuate the law as written, people stand to lose a year’s worth of benefit accruals. And then, second, there’s the matter of the effective interest rate used in the money-purchase calculation. The basic idea is that, if you retire on May 30, you’re going to lock in a more favorable interest rate on what’s essentially over-payments that you have made into the system. Finally, it notes that, irrespective of our views about the wisdom of the pension law, we’re simply noting that massive retirements are going to be triggered for no rational reason and that it’s our hope that the law won’t take effect as scheduled and the courts will do something about it.

A lengthy discussion regarding the meaning of the mistake and the implications of the pension reform bill followed. M. Kostic suggested a change to a sentence in the last paragraph of the statement from “We hope…” to “We, therefore, are very concerned and hope…”

J. Novak moved the pension statement introduced by M. Falkoff. G. Slotsve seconded. A. Rosenbaum noted that the motion is to endorse the statement with the wording change suggested by M. Kostic. The motion passed by the following vote:

35 – Yes
0 – No
0 – Abstain

The statement will be transmitted to the attorneys for the lawsuits by M. Falkoff and the statement will also be brought to the University Council for its endorsement.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve list of candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the University – Pages 5-6

S. McHone-Chase moved to accept the candidates, seconded by W. Pitney. The consent agenda was approved.
VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 7

B. Student Association – report

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair; Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison - report – Pages 8-9

D. Haliczer complimented M. Falkoff and his colleagues on an excellent statement and for a very brilliant discussion of some very technical issues. She noted that members have the committee written report and she called attention to two benefit meetings. The one today from 5 to 7 p.m. is for retirees or people about to retire. A representative from SURS and the State University Annuitants Association will be there in the Sandburg Auditorium from 5 until 7 p.m. today. Tomorrow is the meeting for current employees. It is anticipated that the Sandburg Auditorium will be full with over flow in the Regency Room. The meeting also will be streamed for viewing on computers or on the NIU television station.

D. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – report

G. Slotsve reported that at the last CFAC, B. Coryell led the discussion about communication between ITS and Central IT versus the rest of the university. Coryell is developing a plan so that he can collect information and find out what it is faculty members need. Part of that is going to be through CFAC, but also a distributed computing around the university. He is putting together groups that he’s calling Tech Talk where he’ll try to get together with different technical groups within departments and within different colleges so that ITS knows what they want to be doing and they know what ITS wants to be doing so they can get together and work. There have been a lot of communication problems over the years when dealing with ITS. Slotsve thinks [Coryell] is trying to collect the information and set up a structure to collect that information. Slotsve also reported that Coryell wants Central IT driven by the functional needs of the university rather than the technical needs of ITS. That’s a big change. Slotsve has been on that committee for four years and he takes this as a good signal. Hopefully, IT will become more responsive to the end user and what we actually need.

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 – report – Pages 10-11

A. Rosenbaum reported on the March 27, 2014 BOT meeting: The BOT approved the president’s request to use $4.5 million of local funds to demolish the Douglas residence hall complex. This is part of the informal master plan which was constructed for us. The idea is to make Lucinda a main street for the university. And Lucinda, if extended through what is now the Douglas residence hall, will provide a straight road clear through to the west campus and the Convocation Center. The Douglas residence hall apparently has lots of asbestos which makes it particularly expensive to demolish. This is going to happen rather quickly.

Also the president is trying to get much more detailed drawings and proposals for the campus master plan. The purpose is to have something concrete to show to potential donors who might want to support one or another component of the master plan. They’re working hard now to support the piece of it that involves the little electric busses that are going to run up and down the campus in front of the Holmes Student Center and will, hopefully, make it easier for people to get around on campus. So that too could be happening rather quickly. The busses have been designed; it’s just a matter of getting the funding in place.

IX. 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 – report – Pages 12-14

J. Wilson reported that currently there are budget hearings taking place from April 16 through April 30. Subsequent to those hearings, the RSB Committee will meet with the Academic Planning Council on May 5 to review the list and be asked to comment on alignment of the requested positions with mission, pillars and the priority statement that we set forth a couple months ago.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair

   1. Nomination of the Executive Secretary of the University Council for 2014-15
S. Tonks reported that the first item is to nominate the executive secretary of the University Council and president of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 2.1.3 calls for a secret ballot so clickers will be used. We have one nominee, William Pitney.

Bill Pitney was nominated by the following vote:

29 – Yes
0 – No
5 – Abstain

Bill Pitney’s name will be brought forward at the University Council for election.

2. Election of the Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Advisor for a 2-year term

Paul Stoddard – Pages 16-17

S. Tonks identified the next item, to elect the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor to a two-year term. The same clicker voting procedure will be used. We have one nominee, Paul Stoddard.

Paul Stoddard was elected by the following vote:

32 – Yes
0 – No
3 - Abstain

3. Election of UCPC representatives for 2014-16 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (COB, COE, CEET, CLAS, and CVPA have vacancies to fill this year); votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

4. Committees of the University 2014-15 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; votes will be counted following the meeting and those elected will be notified – walk-in

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
S. Klaper: Dave Long wanted to announce that the Holmes Student Center will be open 24 hours a day for study period for finals. He hopes faculty will share this information with students.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, Computing Facilities Advisory Committee
K. Minutes, General Education Committee
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

A. Rosenbaum: called attention to the Faculty Senate meeting schedule for 2014-15.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

G. Slotsve moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by J. Wilson and S. McHone-Chase, motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.