I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

J. Novak moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Rozita Lopez, motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 24, 2013 FS MEETING – sent electronically

T. Arado moved to accept the minutes, seconded by G. Slotsve, motion passed. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum shared the following announcements:

- The draft accreditation Self-Study Report for Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is now ready for campus comment. Visit www.niu.edu/hlc to review the document and provide feedback.
• The Operating Staff Council and SPS Council have invited the Faculty Senate to join them in co-sponsoring an educational forum on the pension issue. This event could include State Representative Pritchard and others. J. Kowalski expressed support for the idea and suggested including Steve Cunningham as a resource person. A. Rosenbaum noted that it would be vital that we have a good turnout in order to send a strong message that this is a concern to NIU employees. He also suggested that we could invite Steve Cunningham to speak separately to Faculty Senate, perhaps at the next meeting. A show of hands indicated that Faculty Senate is in favor of co-sponsoring the forum.

• Last year, the idea of a Faculty Club was raised. In order to test the idea, A. Rosenbaum has made arrangements to partner with Ellington’s for a trial-run. The Hunt Room, located in the back of Ellington’s, has been identified as the venue; the menu will run in conjunction with Ellington’s; reservations will be required. The plan is to select one or two dates in October for this trial-run.

• All Faculty Senate faculty members are enrolled in the Faculty Senate Blackboard site. This is an online venue for discussion of various topics of interest to the NIU faculty.

[NOTE: At this point, we skipped to Item V. We will return to Item IV. A. when President Baker arrives.]

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

George Slotsve was nominated to serve as vice president; his nomination was approved with the following vote: 41-yes, 2-no, 1-abstain.

Sarah McHone-Chase was nominated to serve as secretary; her nomination was approved with the following vote: 44-yes, 1-no, 1-abstain.

B. Selection of Faculty Senate liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee. The LAC typically meets from 2 to 3 p.m. on the third Friday of the month, though they meet only two to three times per semester. This person also will be asked to represent the Faculty Senate on the Provost’s Open Access to Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force (no meeting schedule established yet)

Gleb Sirotkin was nominated to serve; his nomination was approved with the following vote: 45-yes, 1-no, 0-abstain.

C. Selection of a second Faculty Senate representative to serve on the Provost’s Open Access to Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force (no meeting schedule established yet)

Winifred Creamer and Rebecca Hunt were nominated; Winifred Creamer was selected with the following vote: 21-Hunt, 23-Creamer, 3-abstain.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS (continued)

A. NIU President Doug Baker –
   Guiding Expectations expressed by Presidential Task Forces – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Introduced Dr. Doug Baker, president of NIU to address the senate.

D. Baker: Brought the senate up to date on his activities since assuming the office on July 1. He identified three overarching objectives:

- The first is student success and the importance of engaged learning and co-curricular experiences with an emphasis on career success. He envisions mobilizing NIU’s alumni base (225,000 strong) to support this effort.
- The second is ethically inspired leadership and that we hold each other responsible and we do the right thing and are open in transparent ways.
- The third emphasis is on community, building community, building community inside the institution, building community in our adjoining neighborhoods and across the state.

The first week in July, I held a task force with 29 external supporters of the university drawn from advisory groups from our colleges by and large. They are people that care about us and they want us to succeed. I wanted to kind of test these ideas with them and so we put them into six groups.

Each working group wrote a draft report which was presented to the Board of Trustees at a special meeting on August 15.

Dr. Baker distributed the reports of the task forces to the senate and discussed them. He emphasized that these represented the expectations for the university of these external stakeholder groups. They will be considered along with internal input as he defines the agenda for the university. The highlights were:

Under ethically inspired leadership, they noted that leadership requires a leader to behave and make decisions in an ethical manner; however, ethically inspired leadership is not merely leading by example. It’s really the culture that we create as a faculty and staff and student body at this institution, what we expect of each other, what are the core values that we have and how do we treat each other. Let’s do the right thing. The concepts and terms used to communicate institutional ethics and the specific values that serve as this foundation should be accessible and easily understood. It’s expected that there will be a certain core set of values. They gave us five: integrity/fairness, respect/trust, innovation, community, and stewardship. Values will be applied to the decision making processes in a transparent manner.

Strategic focus on academic and research programs, #1 jobs. They like this idea of student career success. They’re concerned about our students getting jobs and being ready for jobs, so they thought we should elevate student career success by increasing collaboration across departments and disciplines. I thought it was interesting that this group of stakeholders said that
multidisciplinarity was critical for the world of work at this time and building corporate partnerships, incorporating internships in the departmental responsibilities and aligning faculty and program accountability with an aspirational goal for student career success. So basically, they said we need to work collaboratively across areas and get students ready for this complex world of work that is changing so rapidly.

Curriculum. They wanted us to really think about the regional market and what the job opportunities are there. And so they were clamoring for us to be more market relevant, not to be a vocational school but look and see where society is going and what, as an academic institution, do we need to do to prepare our students for that world.

Research. We will be nimble in our research capabilities and they focused a lot on applied research. This might be one where we’d want to go back and talk to them about the overlaps of basic research and applied research and how the two fit together and how that helps us move forward. NIU will build on its unique opportunity to be a leader in some but not all fields. So they’re essentially asking us to think about where we can be really good and competitive in some of our research activities and focus on those areas.

Responsible financial management. It is expected that the leadership will develop and execute plans that ensure NIU’s financial stability in light of the changing funding realities. We have a downward slope on our support from the state, we have raised tuition to a point where we probably can’t raise it much more, and we’ve had declining enrollments for the past decade. That’s not a recipe for financial stability. We’ve got to turn that around and so I think they’re right in this regard. We provide a great education here. I have no doubt about that. As I meet with faculty and staff, the things that we do in and out of the classroom are top notch. I’m really impressed, but we’ve got to convince the market of that, and we have some challenges. We have challenges on both ends of the continuum. We have community colleges that are less expensive and we have students wanting to go to Tier I research schools in and out of state. And we need to show that we have the best undergraduate experience, and graduate experience in various fields, to attract those students.

An effective, transparent budgeting process will be implemented. We need to put our money into our priority areas, and I’m working on trying to clarify the budget and budget processes. I don’t think we have as clear a system as we need. Are we overstaffed or understaffed in certain areas and do we need to reallocate resources? Some areas are bursting and some areas not so much and are we allocating our resources appropriately? We should revisit the question of enrollment targets, and I think they are responding to the 2020 report that suggested we needed to go to 30,000 students and since that’s been written, we’ve dropped enrollment, not gone up in enrollment. So they’re saying, “Get your enrollment plan together, figure the kinds of students that you want and how you want to shape your student body and move it in an academically and fiscally appropriate direction.” So we need to do that academic and enrollment planning together and we are working on that. Consider options for differential fees and actually we already do that in certain programs. Professional programs often times will have a higher tuition rate, so we need to think: When can we do that? When does it make sense or not?
They also noted we need to address the safety issues and there’s a whole gestalt of things we need to do around that, real and perceptual issues around safety. We did hire a new police chief last week. I think you’re going to really enjoy working with him. But policing is not the only piece of safety, obviously. It’s expected that NIU will be student centered, aligning resources more effectively with the students at the core, extending advising processes to work with students before, during, and after attendance.

Build upon our existing minority/diversity programs to achieve a healthy diversity among our student body, supported by strong diversity among our faculty and staff and broadened to include all the dimensions of diversity.

Alumni support must be earned, not expected. Mentoring and internships kept coming up over and over and using our huge alumni base to facilitate that, tell the stories of our successful alums, and we have a long list of very successful alums who are great role models, and use this unique moment in time with a new president, a new mayor, etc, to really move the institution forward, which segues into robust community partnerships, engage with local communities, try and jointly build the reputation of the local area. It’s a vibrant university, it’s a vibrant community, it’s a cool place to live and work and learn for everyone. Continue the relationship building with community leaders, create centers for economic development and possibly develop a local advisory board to help us think more about those relationships in DeKalb and Sycamore and all the way into Chicagoland.

R. Feurer: requested a list of the names of task force members and Dr. Baker agreed to provide it. She also asked if these task force reports would be vetted throughout the university.

D. Baker: Yes, absolutely. I’m going to try a couple things to get us started on that. One is to go back and do a pilot with one of the 2020 teams that worked on that report. I want to honor that because a lot of good work went into it. There are a lot of good ideas but then we need to operationalize it, think about these issues and move us forward. So on September 5, I’m going to hold a workshop for the 2020 team on Faculty Work, Excellence, and Rewards, and see if that’s a useful way to get into the dialog around these issues. And then if it is, we’ll work it out with the other groups.

I’m also holding a workshop with the presidential professors to prototype the same kind of rollout with them. These are the presidential professors of the university, and I’d like to get their feedback on: Does this make sense or not? What do we need to change, etc.? Then we need to figure out how to come back with this group and do a similar kind of dialog.

I’m going to hold a student leadership workshop as well with student leaders from various groups around the university to get their feedback. That’s going to be catalytic in everything that we do.

Then I’m going to sit down and take all that feedback and figure out what have we heard, where are we going, what do we need to change. And then I’d like to roll it out more broadly across the whole university with faculty, staff and students. And I’m going to have to sit down in early- to mid-September and kind of figure out: How do you roll out to 20,000 students and 6,000 faculty
and staff, this kind of dialog process? If you have magical thoughts on that, I’m very willing to listen.

I’d also like to reach out to some of our alumni affinity groups and engage them in another stage more broadly than just those first 29 people. That’s probably not enough. Then the first week or so in November, I’d like to take the results of the first 20 weeks of my presidency and put all that together in a package. And then on November 13 is the inauguration and there I’d like to say, “Here’s what we’ve done. Here’s what we’ve been working on collectively and here’s where we want to go.” So that’s kind of the timeline and here’s what we’ve got so far. So this is a work in progress and these are the steps.

**M. Rosenbaum:** I would love to see more talk about professional development. We raise money for student scholarships, but there’s not ever a pool of funds for faculty to go back to school to take some refresher courses. There’s never money for us to actually take a three-day class on big data to refresh our skills. And, in fact, I’m putting together a proposal for my department to reconfigure some things. Where’s this money going to come from? And professional development for faculty is critical. And I don’t mean a conference, but I mean a real maybe going back for additional master’s degree, additional coursework, and there just isn’t a pool of money available for this.

**D. Baker:** I think that’s really insightful. That’s a great point. Now, we historically have done that with sabbaticals, right, but that’s a seven-year gap.

**M. Rosenbaum:** Well, just to give you an idea, because we’re down so many faculty in my college, I really can’t take a sabbatical without hurting my department.

**D. Baker:** Acknowledged the importance of this issue.

**M. Rosenbaum:** We’ve lost really good faculty members in the past two years. We’ve lost at least four young assistant professors due to several issues. So I can’t take a sabbatical. And, even though sabbatical is typically a time to rejuvenate, that’s what, once every seven years, and that’s not even guaranteed. I think we need to focus in on: How do you take faculty and make them better? I would just like to see more discussion of professional development for faculty to refresh their skills without having to go on sabbaticals.

**D. Baker:** You know, and organizations may be helpful too. This guy on the Chicago Exchange would love to have faculty down there for weeks or months or summers or kind of a mini internship for faculty. They would love that, if we wanted to do it, if relevant to your interests. Yeah, I think there are big resources out there that are untapped for us right now, so great feedback.

**J. Kowalski:** I’ll speak from the point of view of someone who has focused on the arts and humanities through my professional career. And I’ll speak from the point of view also of someone who, as a parent and as a person who went through our higher education system, recognizes that one of the reasons I did so was that I wanted to find a satisfying and financially rewarding career. And I couple those together because I think they are both important to the
extent that people are able to realize that when they get a job and find some way to both make money, survive but also find meaning and value in their lives. And from a humanistic point of view and from the perspective of the arts and the humanities, when we read about or see catch phrases about reorienting, revising, and taking a look at just programs based on bottom line issues, I get a little nervous about the role of the arts and humanities in the coming university age. So what would you say to those people who have not only invested their time, energy and careers in that, but also genuinely feel that that is a vital part of a university education and that not everything can be reduced to just a monetary value.

D. Baker: Well, first I’d agree with you. The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) is probably the top organization in the country with folks like us thinking about liberal education. And they’ve come up with the LEAP standards; Liberal Education America’s Promise is what LEAP stands for. They are good minds thinking about: How do you educate the whole person? How do they know themselves? How do they know their role in society? How do they know their role as a citizen? Are they able to critically think? Are they culturally competent? Are they able to communicate? Do they have numerical and symbolic reasoning skills? And how do we get them there? And they’ve been working on that with the presumption that, in fact, that’s what society needs. And to ground truth that, they went out and asked employers all over the county. And, low and behold, they said the same thing. So they want students who are ready for life as well as work and you can’t have technical skills without the foundation under it. It kind of reified what we’re doing in universities. You’ve got to have the strong liberal base to build all the other stuff on.

If you have thoughts about what I said today after you read this in more depth, e-mail me at ddbaker@niu.edu. I will be back as we go through this process and get more of your feedback if that’s okay with you. Thanks for having me.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you, Doug. That was excellent and we’re ready to join with you and help you craft a viable plan for the university.

D. Baker: Thanks, I appreciate it.

[NOTE: At this point, we skipped to Item VI. We will return later to Item IV.B.]

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Faculty Senate Standing Committees – Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 3, approve the 2013-14 membership rosters – Pages 4-6

B. University Council Steering Committee – Per NIU Bylaws, Article 2.1.1, approve the faculty members of the 2013-14 UC-Steering Committee – Page 7

A. Rosenbaum: For those of you again who have not been here before, for the consent agenda, we take a motion and a second but we don’t discuss it. So if there is something on the consent agenda that you don’t want, you have to make a motion to remove it from the consent agenda.
These are just the standing committees; you’ve all been assigned to committees and this just approves the committees both for the Faculty Senate and for the University Council.

**R. Lopez:** made the motion. **T. Arado:** was second.

The consent agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

**VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

Due to a lack of time, given the number of items on the agenda, the reports were not given orally, but rather were distributed to the senate with the agenda. Senate members were asked to read the reports and then ask any questions they might have had at the meeting. No questions were asked.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I should tell you that at the August 29 special meeting, the BOT passed a concealed carry policy. I’ve gotten a copy of the latest version of that and will be posting it. And we’re probably going to put it in the next issue of Faculty Matters which will come out soon. Suffice it to say that we are a weapons-free campus and so students, faculty, staff and visitors are not permitted to bring weapons onto the campus. One of the things you should know is that we have public roadways that go through campus and the public roadways are not university property. So Normal Road, Lucinda and Annie Glidden are not university property and are not covered under our exemption. Remember it’s a state law. This is not something that NIU came up with. The administration worked very hard to secure the exemption for the campus.

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report
   - May 17, 2013 – Pages 8-9
   - June 14, 2013 – Pages 10-11

B. Student Association – Rebecca Clark, Director of Governmental and Academic Affairs – report

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay just one quick report and that is our Student Association. They didn’t file a written report so we have Rebecca Clark who is just going to do a very, very brief report on the Student Association for us.

**R. Clark:** I am the new director of governmental and academic affairs. I’m just going to give a quick sum up of what we’ve done this summer. This summer we actually revamped the bus systems. Also we’ve been reaching out to the student body better to figure out how we can utilize each student organization and have them reach out to people as opposed to just the Student Association. There are only ten of us as directors. We can’t reach every student, so we’re working on utilizing each student organization to reach better to all the students.

And then finally with athletics, we’ve been working to try to get all the students to go to a broader variety of the games. Not just the football games, we want them to go to the volleyball games and we actually might be working with a fan bus to get to Purdue as well. The Iowa game turned out pretty well. But we wanted to see if we can get students to go to the Purdue game as well.
We’re trying to get students well aware that the plus/minus system is going through and figuring it out early on in the semester.

C.  BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – report
    May 23, 2013 – Pages 12-14
    August 29, 2013 – walk-in

D.  BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – report
    May 23, 2013 – Pages 15-16
    August 29, 2013 – walk-in

E.  BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee – Rosita Lopez – report
    August 29, 2013 – walk-in

F.  BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Alan Rosenbaum – report – August 29, 2013 – walk-in

G.  BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report
    June 20, 2013 – Page17
    August 15, 2013 – Page 18
    August 29, 2013 – walk-in

IV.  PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS (continued)

B.  Vice Provost, Anne Birberick, and General Education Coordinator, Michael Kolb – Road to Student Academic and Career Success – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Introduced Anne Birberick and Michael Kolb to discuss the general education curriculum and survey. Note the slides from this presentation can be accessed from the link above (“Road”)

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A.  Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, 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 – no report
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Joe Flynn, Chair – report

1. Hearing Panel election –

**A. Rosenbaum:** You just check 20 names. This is for the hearing panel.

2. By-lot election of Faculty Grievance Committee members

**J. Flynn:** The second one is a by-lot election of the Faculty Grievance Committee. So basically all I’m going to do is pull 15 names and I’ll tell everyone what the names are so that they can be recorded into the minutes.

**J. Flynn:** Leanne Vander creek, George Slotsve, Marilyn Looney, David Walker, Eric Jones, Bill Pitney, Robin Moremen, Virginia Naples, Brad Cripe, Charlotte Rollman, Jon Briscoe, Elvira Arriola, Peter Middleton, Gretchen Bisplinghoff, and Abul Azad were chosen.

3. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting

Ballots were distributed by college and will be tallied after the meeting.

4. Selection of one Faculty Senate member to serve on the 2014 BOT Professorship Award Selection Committee. Committee members review approximately 20 applications online and the committee meets 2-3 times (November/December and January/February).

**J. Novak** volunteered and was approved by acclamation.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Policy** on repeating a course – Pages 19-20 – refer to Academic Affairs Committee

**A. Rosenbaum:** As you may know, in this university you can only repeat a course in which you’ve gotten a D or worse. So you cannot repeat a C. This is part of the reason why we have no C minus in the plus/minus grading system. If we were to change the repeat a course policy such that you could repeat anything less than a C, then someone getting a C minus would be able to repeat a course, and we’d be able to put the C minus into the plus/minus grading system. So what I’m moving is that we refer this to the Academic Affairs Committee to consider whether we want to revise our course repeat policy. I’ll take a show of hands. All in favor of taking this to Academic Affairs say aye.

The motion was approved by a show of hands, without dissent or abstention.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Rosenbaum: The last two items are informational items. One is the meeting schedule for 2013-2014 which is on page 21. And the last thing is that Pat has created a tutorial that explains how to get the agendas, the minutes, the transcripts, and all this other stuff now that we are paperless. Copies of the slides are on pages 22 to 42 of your agenda. So thanks a lot to Pat for creating this for us.

A. Meeting schedule, 2013-2014 – Page 21
B. Tutorial – Accessing Faculty Senate Agendas/Minutes/Transcripts and the Faculty Senate Blackboard Community – Pages 22-42
C. Annual Report, Academic Planning Council
D. Annual Report, Affirmative Action & Diversity resources Advisory Committee
E. Annual Report, Athletic Board
F. Annual Report, Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
G. Annual Report, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Annual Report, Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
I. Annual Report, Graduate Council
J. Annual Report, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
K. Annual Report, University Assessment Panel
L. Annual Report, University Council Personnel Committee
M. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
N. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
O. Minutes, Athletic Board
P. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
Q. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
R. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
S. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
T. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
U. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
V. Minutes, General Education Committee
W. Minutes, Honors Committee
X. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
Y. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
Z. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
AA. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
BB. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.