I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Greetings. Hello everyone can you hear me? All right, let’s begin. We don’t have a huge agenda today so there’s a chance we’ll get out of here before six o’clock, maybe. We’ll give it a shot, right?

Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. The only change is that Steve Cunningham is not here today. I had a conversation with Steve and he doesn’t have anything new to report and I didn’t really think we wanted to hear a rehash, so he will come and speak with us at the first sign of anything going on that we need to know about. So I’m staying in touch with him about that and he will come when he has something to say. I don’t think we wanted to just go over the same material that we’ve already heard about. So the only change in the agenda is the removal of Steve with the NIU pension update. So with that change – we have one walk-in item, the one walk-in item being the pension statement that I e-mailed to you yesterday and so that’s the only – that’s a walk-in item, technically. So I’ll call for a motion to adopt the agenda with the one walk-in item and the change regarding Steve Cunningham.

J. Novak: Motion.

A. Rosenbaum: I need a second.
T. Arado: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so we have a motion and a second. Any comment, additions, changes? All in favor say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposed? Any abstention? All right the agenda is approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2013 FS MEETING

A. Rosenbaum: We need a motion to approve the minutes of the September 4 meeting.

J. Kowalski: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and remember, everyone, the microphones. Okay Jeff made the motion, I need a second.

T. Arado: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Therese is seconding again. You’re going to be our second today for everything. Very good. Any corrections, changes, omissions? Hearing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes say aye.

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? The minutes are approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Just a couple of items, we have a guest with us who we will get to in a moment. One of the items that I want to again remind you about is that we are trying to do a Faculty Club. You saw this in Faculty Matters, those of you who read it. So it will be our first try at doing a Faculty Club lunch. We will be doing this on October 24. I want to remind you that reservations have to be made through Pat. So if you e-mail Pat and tell us, you don’t pay us, you’ll be charged at the luncheon. This will run pretty much the same as the Ellington’s lunches. I don’t know how many of you have tried that, but they have been doing this for a couple of years now on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Ten bucks, you get three courses, it includes drinks, non-alcoholic, of course, and it’s very nice. There’s always a theme. The theme for our October 24 meeting is going to be Italian. So it will be an Italian theme. We will have the Hunt Room in the back, so we’ll have our own room and we will see how that goes. We’ll try to talk a little bit about it at the lunch and see if people have suggestions, how we can improve it, whether they like it, etc. etc. We’ll give that a shot and I hope many of you will join us and encourage your fellow faculty members to give it a shot. So that’s October 24.
Second, as many of you are aware, we will be inaugurating President Baker on November 13. That will be a kind of day of activities and celebration. One of the things that we have is we have an Inauguration Steering Committee and also an Inauguration Committee, two committees that are trying to plan the inauguration. The president has asked that the inauguration not be about him, but rather be a celebration of NIU. He’s also asked that we keep expenses to a minimum and, in fact, almost everything that’s being done that costs money, other than food-related things, will be things that will have other purposes. So they won’t just be for the inauguration, but will also be able to be used for things like recruitment. For example, if banners are made, they will be up for the inauguration and then will be left up for the semester as part of the recruitment drive. The president is really charging us with trying to do this inauguration on as little money as possible and also to not make him the centerpiece of the inauguration. One of the things that’s going to happen is there will be some videos that will be made. What they’d like to do, one of the things they’d like to do, since one of the major focuses of the president’s first term is engaged learning, is they want to do some videos of professors that are really exemplars of the engaged learning process. So if you know of people that are doing great things with undergraduates outside of the classroom, anything special, the committee is interested in highlighting those professors. Feel free to, if you know of somebody or if you, yourself, fit that requirement, to e-mail us, e-mail me or Pat and tell us who it is and what they’re doing and we’ll pass that along to the Inauguration Committee and they will be able to take it from there. I can’t guarantee that they’ll make a video about everybody but they’re certainly going to do some of that and they are collecting names of people who would be good examples of engaged learning. Okay? That has to happen kind of quickly because all of this has to be done before, well before November 13 so all of this is going to happen in a hurry. So if you have someone in mind, get it to us as soon as possible.

Okay next, I don’t know how many people are aware we are engaged in a search now for a chief information officer for the university. So a search firm has been hired. The president is viewing the chief information officer as a critical player at the university going forward. There was a commission report that was commissioned before President Baker took office and the questions were: How could we do our IT and information stuff better than we’re doing it? And the firm that did the evaluation made quite a number of suggestions and so we are now in the process of trying to find somebody. This will more than likely be a vice presidential level cabinet position and we are in the process of doing that.

A. Open Access Week – handout
Drew VandeCreek, Director of Digital Services, University Libraries

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that being said I’m going to turn the floor over to Drew VandeCreek who’s the director of digital services at the University Libraries, who’s going to talk to us about Open Access Week.

D. VandeCreek: Okay, can people hear me through this microphone? I don’t typically speak into a microphone and I also have typically a very quiet voice so if you can’t hear me wave. As some of you may know, Governor Quinn recently signed a bill asking each of the state universities to establish an Open Access to Research Task Force by January 1 and spend the calendar year 2014 thinking of how each institution can best promote open access to publications
produced by their faculty. Each task force is to adopt, before January 1, 2015, a report setting forth its findings and recommendations for implementation. In addition, federal granting agencies such as the National Science Foundation have implemented new policies asking grantees to find ways to share their research data and findings with the public at no charge. There is also further federal legislation pending on the subject of open access to scholarly materials.

This may lead some of you to ask: What is open access? Some of you may have a general idea of it but have questions about it. With this large a context in mind, the University Libraries are sponsoring an Open Access Week October 22-25, actually only four days of the week, but that’s all that we’ve got.

Introductory session: We will give a basic description of what open access publication is, and its several forms and how to get involved in it.

Other sessions will go into issues like copyright, big data, and open access activities that are already going on on-campus. These will feature speakers that are faculty and staff members from NIU libraries as well as people that we have brought in from other institutions. There will also be a representative from the publishing industry.

We will wrap up the events on that Friday with remarks by Illinois State Senator Daniel Biss who is the author of Senate Bill 1900 which is the bill that got signed into law. He is a former member of the faculty of mathematics at the University of Chicago. There will be a reception after his speech.

Our dean has asked representatives of all of the other state institutions and some private colleges that have asked about it, if they would like to send someone to take part in this, and we know that a number of provosts, deans and other administrators will be coming.

I will now pass out a sheet that has a tentative schedule of what’s going to happen during the Open Access Week. I would note that one thing that we would lack that you would often find in something like a conference catalog or something like that is a more detailed account of what each of these sessions really is about. We don’t have that yet, but I can tell you that, if you want that kind of information, you should go to the main libraries web page. There’s a link featured prominently at the lower left, it says Open Access Week. You can get that there. I can also answer any questions as best I can that anybody might have right now. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions? Do we have any questions for Drew? Drew, I know this is related to open access, it’s not exactly the same thing, but is there anything you want to say about the Huskie Commons?

D. VandeCreek: Right. One of the major links in the chain of what makes up open access publication is something called an institutional repository. This is something whereby an institution like ours has a web space where you can put generally PDF copies of faculty members’ publications up for free use. This is something that will be crawled by something like Google Scholar or something like that. The point is that people can find the work that is in it without having to search one of the scholarly databases and without having to have a
subscription to whatever journal it may be in. We have Huskie Commons in place. We have about 230 or so articles in it. It think there are some people here whom I may have contacted last year about asking if you would care to put an article or two that we had tracked down – we knew that we could get the copyrights to – to put into it. We have a large part of the infrastructure in place here. I think that what Open Access Week is about is much more informational. There are a lot of different ideas about what open access is, and what it isn’t, out there. It’s something that I would guess most of you will have heard mentioned but maybe not have heard talked about in a lot of detail. So we’re going to try to provide some of that background for you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, anyone, any other questions? Okay thank you very much.

B. Resolution on Pensions – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: The next item: I want to speak a little bit about the Resolution on Pensions that was sent out yesterday and talk a little bit about where that came from and what the idea of it is. This came about on Monday at a meeting which I attend called the Council of Illinois University Senates (CIUS). This council consists of the senate presidents or representatives of the senates of all of the public universities. Now it’s a group that’s been meeting for a long time. I think they’ve been meeting for more than ten years, but because there’s such turnover in senate presidents, it’s very difficult for this group to sort of get on a roll. At any rate, we had a pretty good working group on Monday and one of the issues which we raised at that meeting had to do with the pension reform that we are all very concerned about.

And so it quickly became apparent that the representatives at all of the universities have the same, roughly the same, set of common concerns. And the question came about as to whether a joint statement coming from all of the faculty senates at the different state universities might have some influence over the legislators, the governor, or in some way over the pension reform process.

As a starting point the representative from the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, offered the statement that his faculty senate had endorsed, which is the one that has been sent around to you with some minor changes. Clearly they didn’t endorse something that said that the Northern Illinois University Faculty Senate. So there’s some minor changes in that. But at any rate, the group as a whole felt that, if we could get on board with this, not that we have to, but if we could; and that, if all of the senates in the state public university system endorsed it, that that would be probably our best chance of exerting some influence. Not that the legislators are going to immediately say, “oh, thank you for this; we’ll take it right under for consideration.” But it’s something.

We had this, as I said, on Monday and I wanted to get it out on Tuesday because I wanted to give you at least a little bit of a chance to read it and think about it before coming in today. So I didn’t want it to be a walk-in that you just got today in which case you would be sitting there reading it trying to make some sense out of it. It would be nice, I think, if we had more time to process this the way we usually do. However, this process is an ongoing one and, by the time we get this to the people that need to see it, there’s a very good chance that decisions will have already been made. The sentiment among those present was that we needed to do this now. We’re actually in
better shape than most of the senates because many of them didn’t have meetings scheduled for this week. We really have a very quick turnaround or the possibility of a quick turnaround. What I’m doing is putting this out. We don’t have to endorse it.

My reading of it is that this is a document that essentially does not offer a plan but says: These are the things that the faculty feel are important and that should be considerations in any pension reform bill. This is not the same as the plan that was endorsed by the presidents. It essentially, and I think the bullet points really capture it, it essentially addresses most of the issues that I’ve heard that are faculty concerns in one form or another. I’m going to make the motion that we – just so that we can have a discussion – I’ll make the motion that we accept this resolution. I’ll take a second and then we’ll open it up for discussion and, of course, if people don’t want to do this, we don’t have to do it. Okay so I’ve made a motion. Is there a second?

**R. Lopez:** Second, Lopez.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Rosita. Okay so we have a motion and a second. I’ll open up the floor for discussion. Rosemary?

**R. Feurer:** For those of you who don’t know, I’m the one that sent out the objection. I would really like to table this or to amend it. And what I’m hearing from you, Alan, is that it’s an up or down and I have – you know I can agree with most of the bullet points. What I find troubling is that by the mention of the IGPA report (that is essentially the president’s report) and it is a least implicitly supporting that report, which I believe, along with many others, to be seriously unfair.

It’s not a strong enough resolution in rejecting the notion of cost shifting and the underfunding of pensions which in that one bullet point that talks about the 6.2 percent, that’s the heart of our problems and I think as a faculty we have to reject that as a funding basis. The IGPA plan does engage in cost shifting and the other constituents that have been looking this over have basically suggested that cost shifting should be categorically rejected. I don’t see it as being as categorically rejected here. That undermines, cost shifting would undermine, the state responsibility for the pension so that’s one element.

I would think that if this report said at least that the Cullerton plan has some solutions as well, we wouldn’t be seeming to endorse the IGPA report and that’s not there. I would say that the Cullerton bill has much more of those bullet point principles embodying it. It calls for progressive reforms including ultimately a progressive tax as a solution to this and corporate tax base as the solution to this and so I worry about that as part of this.

I would say that we or it’s in the faculty’s best interest to join with other groups that are fighting for those principles of no cost shifting of a progressive solution to this plan and I can talk about that a little bit more if anybody wants to know. But it is, I think, a bad idea to separate ourselves. Most state employees have endorsed the Cullerton plan and this one is the speaker’s plan, basically the IGPA. Or it’s at least being advocated in that respect.

The bullet point I have the most problem with is this idea of tiered systems. I think we as a faculty ought to reject tiered systems and put our voice, if we have a voice at all, is to say we
shouldn’t have defined benefit pension plans for some people and not for all. So that’s the other main bullet point that I see that is problematic there. That 6.2 percent is never going to get us out of this mess. It’s just saying that we have to keep that basic 6.2 percent is what led into that. I am a strong advocate for the “We are One” coalition that is the Cullerton coalition bill. Other faculties are, I would think that the University of Illinois Chicago faculty will not go for this. I would just bet that no matter what was said that they will not because they’re the ones that are really pushing for something that is more progressive.

A. Rosenbaum: I actually believe that this is endorsed by them because this came from the universities coalition which includes the three campuses, UIC, Urbana-Champaign and Springfield.

R. Feurer: But it hasn’t been vetted among the faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, this resolution was approved by the university from that group.

R. Feurer: From the University of Illinois at Chicago?

A. Rosenbaum: I’m saying the university, I forget the full name of it, but it’s the university coalition, it’s the group that is the combination of all three senates from the three main campuses. So I believe that it is actually approved by them.

R. Feurer: And endorsed by them?

A. Rosenbaum: Right, because this is not endorsing the IPGA plan. It is saying that within the IPGA plan there are these points which we feel are supportable. It’s not selecting any particular plan over any other plan. It’s just saying that any solution should respect these principles.

R. Feurer: Well, I have to say that I sent it to a number of organizations that are in the We Are One coalition, and they urged me to tell people that this would be seen as a divisive move by them. Okay that this would be saying that faculty believe that we are rejecting the Cullerton plan and endorsing some version of the IPGA which they are fighting against strenuously. So I have concerns about that. That we ought to at least insert in this that we see elements of this in both plans. Ultimately, as I said, I don’t think that it’s in our interest to basically approve of tiered systems at all. I would really worry about that language on my own grounds. I haven’t talked to anybody about that.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, it doesn’t say accept, it says we must include improvements to the current Tier Two program. So we already have a tiered system.

R. Feurer: But it does say that it could include a hybrid plan. Those hybrid plans are dangerous in respect to setting up one pension for one set of faculty and another for other sets of faculty. So I would just argue about that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes, Brad?
B. Sagarin: [No microphone.] I hear those criticisms and certainly I’m sympathetic to the fact that this a document I do understand that, if we had an indefinite amount of time to debate this, we may be able to modify these bullet points, indicate the precise support that we would give to one plan and things that we would disagree with other plans. It certainly sounds like in this case that time is of the essence and so as I see it we could either support what I see on the whole as a good document, or be silent. My recommendation is that we support this. As I look through the bullet points I see things that, you know, again while imperfect, on the whole are positive. Certainly I think that it would be ideally good for the state to be higher than 6.2 percent. This doesn’t say that they shouldn’t be higher. It just says that’s what we consider the minimum. It talks about reforms to the current Tier Two. I agree that ideally there would not be a tiered system, but the fact is that there is right now a tiered system and so I think their calling for improvement of it is better than being silent on that point and so on. So again, I support the idea of the Faculty Senate adding our voice to the other senates that are supporting this. I’ll leave it there.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Abhijit?

A. Gupta: I’d just like to share my thoughts. Number one: As he said, the tiered system, whether we like it or not, it’s already. And number two: If we have to act on it something urgently so might as well just do something than just table or rejecting. But third: One thing I must admit, I was kind of disturbed to receive the other letter because not only it says anonymous – I mean someone can remain anonymous, I suppose there’s a choice – but to be impersonal just because he’s advocating, Steve Cunningham is advocating the plan to the state and then bring in his personal case, to me that’s very petty because does it mean then president cannot advocate salary increase of faculty because his salary would increase? I mean that really, I think, it’s not only petty I think it even would not serve any purpose at all. So I suggest that kind of letter probably does not do any service to me personally. I think it rather does the other way around. And I think Steve, as far as I know, again I’m not in administration, but he’s trying hard to protect our pension system at the state level. So instead of appreciating that, thinking that okay he can survive without reduced benefit or whether Eddie Williams can survive with reduced benefit, that’s really wrong way to look at this problem.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments?

W. Creamer: I am surprised that, once again, we get something like this with so little time to talk about it. You did say that you attended this meeting on Monday and you got us the paper on Tuesday, so it’s not your fault that it comes so fast. But why do we not have the ability to amend this thing and make it say what we’d like? This idea that we can only support it or do nothing I find very – I find it objectionable. Why can’t we do something to make it say what it ought to say? I have to admit I was influenced by Rosemary’s comments. I don’t think any of us will be very happy to be 85 and getting less than we need to maintain our lovely retirement lifestyles. Whether or not that’s the crux of the matter, why is the choice being put that we can either approve this or do nothing?

A. Rosenbaum: That’s not necessarily the case. I mean we could alter it. I think, though, that could possibly lead to a process to where other schools are not in favor of this and we have
different documents. But if that’s the will of the senate, we can do that. So we would send it along to the Council of Illinois University Senates and then let the chips fall where they may. So they could pass ours around and maybe people would be more willing to endorse that, so we absolutely can do that.

**W. Creamer:** I’d just like to add one other little thing. For example, by mentioning a minimum, this social security 6.2 percent as a minimum, it’s almost better not to mention a number. Once you put a number out there and say, “oh this is our minimum,” people somehow make that a target whereas it should be a floor. It might be better to just say that we want the state to continue making contributions at a level higher than they have been. To me, that would be better than putting what’s the least we’ll go for. I think it would be better for us to amend this.

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

**D. Rodgers:** Just a quick question, comment, is that I think I would feel more comfortable if I had time to bring this to my home department and get the feel for them before voting for my department on this because I think that they’ll probably have some thoughts on how we should vote. I didn’t feel like I had time to do that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Rosemary?

**R. Feurer:** I just wanted to say that I’m sorry if I offended anybody by bringing that letter in. It was a constituent letter, though, that somebody sent to me urging me to inform the Faculty Senate because that person felt that their voice had not been heard and that they were hearing Steve Cunningham on the radio saying that this had been vetted among the faculty. So that’s the origins of the letter that it really felt that the voice of the faculty hadn’t been heard and yet Northern Illinois University was out there speaking for us. I felt that, if our voice had been heard, that more of us would probably aim for a more equitable. That proposal, that IGPA proposal, 80 percent of the cost savings comes from reducing inflation for retiree’s benefits. I’m unalterably opposed to that and everybody I talk to whom I inform about that, feel the same way. If you feel that’s okay, the Cullerton proposal asks for a progressive corporate tax to pay for this. That is really equitable because corporations in Illinois have been getting off of that. I would just advocate that. That this is more of a logical solution long term and in the immediate, that Cullerton proposal is much more progressive. If you think that you know that IGPA is more progressive, I see more of these bullet points, at least not disagreeing with that principle. Enough. I’d just like to have a stronger voice disagreeing with those principles because we do start out the statement saying that the principles that are laid out there, you should know the principles are the 80 percent of this cost savings according to the scholars at UIC, say it’s going to come out of our future retirement benefits.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Was that letter signed by the way? I don’t recall that it was signed.

**R. Feurer:** No, it was not but…

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, when one wants one’s voice to be heard, one can usually sign their name to it.
R. Feurer: I can vouch for it, but I can say the person was also a very reputable scholar in this university but was still fearful.

A. Rosenbaum: Fair enough but again I have not been posting unsigned letters. We get a few of them. We don’t get a ton of them.

R. Feurer: I understand.

A. Rosenbaum: Some of them are pretty far out. That one was not necessarily far out but it was unsigned. Any other comments? Yes?

E. Arriola: I just want to speak in support of the idea of taking a little time to reexamine this and maybe have a little bit more discussion. I myself feel like I would not feel comfortable voting on behalf of this for my own department. If there is time at all to do that, where we could maybe work out some friendly amendments, then I would support taking it to a vote. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Friendly amendment now or friendly amendment at some time at our next meeting?

E. Arriola: I don’t know and that is something that maybe needs to be considered as to whether or not it can wait a month.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, it can wait three months. That doesn’t mean that it will have an impact. We don’t know when they’re gonna act.

E. Arriola: Well, I heard earlier that there seemed to be an issue that time is of the essence.

A. Rosenbaum: It was the belief the group that this is happening rather immediately and so the sooner a statement is given, the more likely it is that it will be incorporated into the discussion. So our next meeting is the November meeting so we could certainly wait until that.

J. Novak: Our next meeting is October 31.

A. Rosenbaum: The end of October, it’s the very end right? So it’s very close to the end. Its fine, I mean if that’s the sentiment of the senate, then that’s what we’ll do. I’m not trying to railroad this through. This is not my bill or my resolution. Well I made the resolution, but I didn’t write it. I thought that it addressed a lot of the issues that people have been raising. I thought it was relatively non-controversial in terms of the things it supports, but we can certainly either, if someone would like to suggest modifications or if we want to wait until the next meeting. Certainly the point is that you need to talk to your departments, then we can make some modifications, but then we couldn’t vote on it until the next meeting anyway.

E. Arriola: And I am wondering then if maybe an ad hoc committee could be formed. Let me speak personally from at least what I’ve seen within the College of Law. Just in the past year, three individuals took early retirement and each of them seemed to be coming, well a couple of
them simply said that to me, that it was some ways the culture of fear that has been created around this issue and that many people are uncomfortable with not knowing enough and in some ways not getting enough information that makes one feel secure about our futures. I think because of that, rather than feeding into the fear that sometimes it’s worth taking a little extra time just to make sure that we get it right. I appreciate the it’s better to speak up than not speak up at all, but sometimes it’s worth taking that little extra time and this is an important issue for many of us.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Okay so –

M. Rosenbaum: Can I say one thing?

A. Rosenbaum: Sure.

M. Rosenbaum: As I was reading this I really saw this as a broad-based action plan. But if we need to do something today, if we just looked at the first paragraphs, it’s the bullets points that seem to be the main contention points. Those three first paragraphs are really well – they’re broad-based. We’re just saying that, look, we need fair equitable – equitable reforms are needed, something has to be done. If we were to do anything today, I would actually move to amend this and just keep the first three paragraphs. Because I think the first three paragraphs really hit home about fairness, we want something to be done. If we had to do something today, I would move to just at least approve the first three paragraphs and amend everything else. So at least we’re saying as a Faculty Senate we want something done. I don’t know if that’s possible because it seems like the fourth paragraph, that’s where the problems come in with the bullets. And if we had to do anything today I think the first three paragraphs are so broad but it really hits home. There’s a problem, we know that we’re facing the reality, we want reforms guided by certain agreed upon principles, fairness and we end it right there. Is that possible?

A. Rosenbaum: It would be possible but as the maker of the motion I do not want to accept your friendly amendment.

M. Rosenbaum: Oh, okay.

A. Rosenbaum: What that means is and I’ll tell you why. I think the first three paragraphs are fine but I think we have to be much more specific about what we’re asking. So my feeling is that we can reject this, we can fail to endorse it. I’ve made a motion. The motion has been seconded, we’ve had some discussion, We can continue the discussion if people want, but we will have a vote on that motion. If the senate does not want to endorse this, we will turn down that and then I will open the floor for an additional motion and that could include sending it to a committee. It could include some other amendments to it, but it will be open to the floor to make that motion. I respectfully will not accept your friendly amendment. Any other comments on this?

R. Feurer: Could you state that process again you just said about how things would work here?

A. Rosenbaum: I said I’ve made a motion, the motion’s been seconded, we’ve had discussion, we’ll take a vote. If the senate rejects it, then the floor will be open and people can make
additional motions to either send it to a committee, to not do anything, to make other amendments to it.

**R. Feurer:** Is it possible to have a motion to table, by Robert’s rules of orders?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, it is possible to have a motion to table. Is that correct? What is the process?

**F. Bryan:** The motion to table would not allow any debate. If you had a motion to table or lay on the table and it got seconded, then we’d have to vote on that right away. That’s a majority vote.

**R. Feurer:** I will motion to table.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We need a second.

**E. Arriola:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have a motion and a second to table. We will use the clickers. Pat, let us know when we’re ready. All voting members, voting members only, please get a clicker. We’ll wait while you do that. Now, just to be clear Ferald, what will a motion to table mean? Let’s say we table this, what will that mean?

**F. Bryan:** It means we can take it off the table at a future point that we desire.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so that would mean this same motion would have to be taken off or…

**F. Bryan:** The complication with a table motion means that there has to be a motion to remove it from the table at some future time. It could be five minutes from now if this fails. If not, it could be at this body’s discretion.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so now what’s the difference between a motion to table and a motion to postpone?

**F. Bryan:** Realistically, the motion to postpone is usually to a specific time, if you wanted to postpone it to the next meeting, next month.

**R. Feurer:** Could that be done now? A motion to postpone? Or is it…

**F. Bryan:** Let me ask you this. Did you mean to completely kill this or just to postpone it to a future time?

**R. Feurer:** That’s what I meant, postpone.

**F. Bryan:** Then, if you wish to clarify that motion, you can do that. A motion to postpone usually incorporates when that date would be or just a time.
R. Feurer: Okay, I would make a motion to postpone then to replace the motion to table with the motion that we come back and we can do any number of things including set up a small committee to examine this and have alternatives, but that’s really the intention of what my table was.

A. Rosenbaum: So your motion is changed to postpone?

R. Feurer: Replace it with a motion to postpone.

F. Bryan: And does the seconder agree?

E. Arriola: Yes, the second agrees.

A. Rosenbaum: You’ll agree with that. Now is the motion to postpone debatable or is that something that we have to take a vote on?

F. Bryan: I did double-check this. The motion to postpone is debatable on the merits. That’s what Roberts says. I’ll leave that to the discretion of the chair.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, it’s debatable. So I would like to make a comment about that. I would like us not to postpone it. I would like if people do not want to do this to vote it down and then somebody can make a motion to send it to a committee or whatever else we want to do with it. So I would vote that we not postpone. But if you really don’t want to do this, vote no when we have the vote on it and then we can entertain other options. That’s my piece. Anyone else have a comment on that since I opened it for debate?

Okay, so we’re voting on a motion to postpone. On your clickers 1 would be a yes vote which means we would postpone until the next meeting; 2 would be a no vote and that would kill the motion to postpone and we would move to a vote on the motion, the original motion. 1, you’re voting to postpone; 2 you’re voting to not postpone. Okay, vote. I’ll give you a few more moments. Has everyone voted? Everyone good? All right we’ll close the voting. Pat?

1 – YES – POSTPONE – 15  
2 – NO – DEFEAT MOTION TO POSTPONE – 20  
3 – ABSTAIN – 0

A. Rosenbaum: The motion to postpone is defeated. I think I’d like to close the discussion on the original motion and call it to a vote. We’re now voting on the original motion which is this resolution. I would be a yes vote, which would support the resolution. If it carries, this would go back to the Council of Illinois University Senates as an approved resolution. And, if you vote no that would be 2; 2 is no. That would kill this resolution and then it would be open to the floor as to what we do next. Okay, so I supports the resolution, 2 says no to the resolution. Everyone clear? Are we ready, Pat? All right, I’m opening the voting. 1, you’re supporting the resolution; 2 you’re defeating the resolution. Okay anyone need more time? Raise your hand if you need more time. Okay, we’ll close the voting. Pat?
A. Rosenbaum: The motion is defeated. Okay, I’ll open the floor if anyone would like to make an additional motion. Otherwise, we’ll move on to the next item of business. Yes?

E. Arriola: I would like to move to adopt the suggested modification of only having the resolution that has the first three paragraphs.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we need a second. Mark, you seconding it?

M. Rosenbaum: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Jeff, discussion?

J. Kowalski: Having read the first three paragraphs, I feel that they’re fundamentally boiler plate, that they don’t really provide any sort of firm guidance one way or the other and that they will be given short shrift and dismissed fairly quickly by someone who read them so I am not in favor of that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Anyone else? Yes.

R. Schneider: It seems factious to talk about certain understandings and commitments without saying what they are.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, anyone else? Okay, we’ll call the vote. We’re voting on the motion which is to adopt the first three paragraphs of the resolution that we just defeated. 1, you support that, in other words, you would be saying, “Yes, we want to endorse the first three paragraphs.” 2 is a no vote. 1 yes; 2 no; 3 abstain. Are we ready, Pat? Okay, 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain. Anyone need more time? Okay, we’ll close the vote. Pat?

1 – YES – PASS THE MOTION – 7
2 – NO – DEFEAT THE MOTION – 32
3 – ABSTAIN – 2

A. Rosenbaum: It is defeated. We’re in a defeat-the-motion mood today, aren’t we? We’ve defeated everything except for the minutes and the agenda. Okay, the floor is open any other suggestions? Winifred?

W. Creamer: I would like to move that the resolution be considered by a small ad hoc committee to present modifications no later than our next meeting and preferably in the interim.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay I think we can possibly do that without necessarily voting on it.
F. Bryan: If you’re going to create a special task force, you need the motion. If you just want to refer it to a committee, you can do that.

A. Rosenbaum: So we can refer it to one of our committees but you’re asking for an ad hoc committee. So you’re asking for a special group which we would then have to figure out the composition and all that.

W. Creamer: I am perfectly willing for it to go to a regular committee if there’s a regular committee that would be willing to deal with it. Which one am I on? I forget what I’m on.

A. Rosenbaum: Which committee would you like to send this to?

W. Creamer: Well, since I’m on Academic Affairs, how about Academic Affairs? I don’t know how the other people on that sub-committee feel about it.

S. McHone-Chase: I don’t thinks it is appropriate for Academic Affairs.

W. Creamer: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Where would you like to see it? Where do you think it should go?

W. Creamer: Any suggestions?

R. Schneider: Economic Status of the Profession?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Economic Status? We can take a vote on whether to send that to Economic Status. Yes?

R. Moremen: Can I make a friendly amendment to that such that the college and individual departments can provide feedback to this committee so that their feedback can be incorporated to whatever revisions they propose?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I don’t know that we have a motion yet, so is the motion to send this to Economic Status? Is that what we’re thinking of? Okay, and so we need that motion. Would you like to make the motion, Winifred?

W. Creamer: Sure, I move that the consideration of this resolution for modifications be referred to the Economic Status of the Profession Subcommittee.

A. Rosenbaum: And do we have a second? Anyone want to second that?

J. Novak: I’ll second that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, now what was the friendly amendment?
R. Moremen: That there be some mechanism for that committee to hear feedback from the departments and the colleges that are represented in the senate with a deadline. In other words, if they’re going to come up with a proposal by the next senate meeting then, at some point between now and then, they would be willing to accept feedback from the individual units.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so just so I’m clear, this assignment to Economic Status is that they take this under consideration, make recommendations, get those to the departments, get the feedback from the departments, and have that done by the next meeting. Is that what we’re saying?

R. Moremen: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Do you accept that friendly amendment? Yes, and how about the seconder?

J. Novak: I was the seconder. I don’t see that being possible, I really don’t.

A. Rosenbaum: So you don’t want to second that?

J. Novak: No.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so we no longer have a second for that motion.

V. Naples: If it’s allowed to have a substitute second, I’d be happy to do that.

A. Rosenbaum: All right you can second that. Okay, but I think John’s point is still a good one – that we’re expecting an awful lot from this committee in a very short time. If we don’t care about that, we can approve that motion. Who is the Economic Status…?

H. Bateni: [no microphone] Would that be an optional thing for the subcommittee to do?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, typically, we don’t tell the subcommittee how to do it so that’s unusual I would say.

H. Bateni: So, would it be possible for the subcommittee to request the feedback but if some colleges fail to provide the feedback then they move on?

A. Rosenbaum: Absolutely. So you can request the feedback but if you don’t get it then …I still think it’s a tall order. Milivoje?

M. Kostic: Due to time constraints, maybe this should go to colleges and departments and say, “If you have any comments, forward to the committee which will be …”

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you all have copies of it and you’re all from different departments so you can certainly distribute it to your departments and have them send comments to Economic Status. Okay? Okay, so how would we want to do this? We want to send to George? Okay.
W. Creamer: So who does feedback go to?

A. Rosenbaum: George Slotsve. Or you could send them to Pat and Pat can send them to George Slotsve, either way, whatever’s easiest.

R. Lopez: Do we have this online?

A. Rosenbaum: You were emailed it yesterday. Okay, so we have a motion, the motion is to send this to Economic Status with the advise that they solicit comments from the departments and, although not necessarily part of the motion, it sounded like the agreement is that each of the senators will take this back to their departments and will have their various department members forward comments to George Slotsve who’s the head of Economic Status. Does that capture the motion? Yes and we have the motion and it’s seconded. Any other comments on this? Yes?

Unidentified: Is there a timeframe?

A. Rosenbaum: As soon as possible I would think. As quickly as they can. Yes?

Unidentified: When is the next committee meeting?

A. Rosenbaum: Of Economic Status? I don’t know the answer to that. I suspect that there may not be one scheduled. George is not here? We’ll get this to George and he’ll get that out to the committee.

H. Bateni: I don’t think there is any meeting scheduled at this point.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so there’s nothing scheduled but something will be scheduled pretty quickly I would guess. Okay. So that’s the motion and the second. Let’s take care of the business of voting for this. Once again with the clickers, a vote of 1 is yes which will send this to Economic Status with the provisions that have just been incorporated. A vote of 2 is no which will defeat the motion and 3 would be an abstention. 1 yes; 2 no; 3 abstention. Ready, vote. Okay, anyone need more time? Okay, close the voting.

1 – YES – PASS THE MOTION – 37
2 – NO – DEFEAT THE MOTION – 6
3 – ABSTAIN – 1

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the motion passes. This is going to Economic Status and, hopefully, we’ll have something by our next meeting.

C. Selection of alternate to FAC to IBHE representative
The Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE meets monthly on Fridays at various university locations across the state. Travel reimbursement is provided. The alternate would attend meetings only if NIU’s representative, Sonya Armstrong, is unable to attend.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next item is we need an alternate to the FAC to IBHE. You know Sonya Armstrong is our FAC to IBHE rep. She’s actually on sabbatical next semester but she is intending to attend the meetings. However, if there are meetings which she cannot attend, we typically have a back up, an alternate, for those meetings. The FAC meets on Fridays, Sonya? Is it a specific Friday of the month?

S. Armstrong: It tends to fall the third Friday of the month but that’s not every single month.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and this usually involves some travel because they’re held at various points in the state. What we provide is transportation and hotel and meals if that’s necessary. The meetings are on Friday morning. If you need to get down to Carbondale or to some other distant location, you really have to leave on Thursday night. And so we provide you with an NIU vehicle and we pay for your hotel and your meals. So that’s the deal. We need somebody who is free on Fridays or can be made free on Fridays and sometimes is willing to get away on Thursday night. Sonya, do you know where the next couple of meetings are going to be? Are they close?

S. Armstrong: Actually I think we’re in and around the Chicago area until March, so very close. Could I also make a comment? I don’t have plans to miss a meeting in the near future. However, alternates are always welcome so if you’d like to attend with me and be a part of the conversation, they’re always welcome.

A. Rosenbaum: And looking at the schedule that Pat just gave me, it looks like there aren’t too many that are that far away. There’s one in Springfield. I don’t know where Logan is. I suspect it’s not Utah. College of Dupage, Wabunsee, Roosevelt, and then at NIU in June, we’re hosting. Depending on where Logan is, they’re mostly pretty close, I guess. Is anyone interested in this position? You don’t have to say so now, you can send us an email and we will let you know if anyone else was interested. It doesn’t have to be a senator, it can be someone else, so if you know someone in your department that wants to do it, then they would be okay as well. Okay. No senators are interested. You’re probably all worn out from all that voting.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 4
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A. Rosenbaum: Okay, moving along we have report coincidentally from Sonya on the latest FAC to IBHE meeting. Sonya.

S. Armstrong: I’ll be very brief. The last meeting was at UIUC. As you can see, most of the day was actually spent in a symposium. We had a great panel of speakers come in, you can see there. You can actually follow that link and find some of the presentations as well. But a great panel of
speakers talking about how higher education will be accessed and delivered within the next five years. Very interesting information. I urge you to follow that and look at some of those presentations.

The two important points that I think I’d make surrounding this meeting: One is that the Faculty Fellowship Program that I mentioned early last year is actually now in place. The first call for applications has actually closed. It’s kind of a bummer because it closed after most of us had to put in for sabbatical. So we’re actually looking into the fall now for folks who would be interested. Essentially this position is one where a faculty member, it doesn’t have to be a senator by the way, would go and do work or research with the IBHE and actually learn more about that group and bring a faculty voice to that group as well. So it’s a very interesting possibility. So that is up, you can see the link for the applications. I believe the next round of applications is coming up in March, but I can verify that at the next meeting.

And then the last thing I would say is something that Alan already mentioned and that is that NIU is hosting the FAC IBHE meeting in June. And that’s going to be on June 20. I know that folks will probably be gone by that point but I would hope that we could have some participation at that meeting and I’ll keep you posted on details as we get closer. I can entertain any questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Sonya?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up Rebecca Clark who is representing the Student Association.

R. Clark: Good afternoon everyone. I have a really brief announcement Actually, I am the representative for the IBHE Student Advisory Board and we’re actually hosting a meeting January 25, 2014. Everybody is welcome to come and we hope that it’s a really good turnout as well. Recently we have newly-elected senators and Sunday we started our 45th session of the Student Senate. The last senate meeting they discussed the president’s goals and where he wants to go with student career success and just catching everybody up on the workshops and everything. We hope to have the senators out and reaching out to the student body as soon as they can. Homecoming week is next – is October 13 and the week prior to that, so it starts the 9th. So basically our goal is just to get students who would not normally be engaged, engaged. This is not an event where you find people going out to do things for themselves, so we’re trying to get as many students as we can engaged. I’m actually meeting with DeKalb and NIU officials to think up ideas for the John Street College Park area. They want to build economically out there and see how we can take that area and bring it closer the community and university together. And also currently right now the directors are meeting with local non-for-profit organizations throughout DeKalb and they want to get the not-for-profits working with the students and the service groups of that. And I yield for questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Rebecca? Thank you, Rebecca.

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair – report – Page 5-6
A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a new report. This has been added to our agenda and that is a report from our University Benefits Committee. Deborah Haliczer is the chair of that committee and Deborah will give us a report.

D. Haliczer: Well, thank you for the opportunity to talk at Faculty Senate about an issue which is of burning concern to all of us who work here at the university. You have the written report which is a summary of what we’ve been talking about and I can say from the years that I have been on this committee, pensions are the number one issue that we always talk about and are the most frustrating of all of the issues that we address since there’s often so little we can do about it. So I really applaud your efforts to discuss and to get your voice out there. I’ve been reading the letter that you had here and there are so many excellent points that are being made there and I cannot disagree with most of what’s being said there.

The faculty is well represented and I’m really grateful that we have addressed faculty representation on the committee. Last year we were down one faculty slot but this year you’re represented by George Slotsve, Therese Arrado, Brian May from English, Sonya has been a past member. Some of the other people on the committee are retired faculty members so our annuitants’ representative is a retired faculty member. Jim Lockard, who’s the head of the NIU Annuitants Association and one of our two representatives to the SURS Members’ Advisory Committee, usually comes and always sends information. So he serves as a very independent voice on the benefits committee since he can express reservations about official proposals by the university and he is in frequent dialog with other retiree groups around the state.

The dialog has been busy. Any support you give to proposals, suggestions that you make are welcome. Our next meeting is October 24, and it would be really advantageous if the committee and the Economic Status of the Profession is able to get some information to us to help in what we say. We do advise the president and University Council. You have a copy of my annual report. What’s really depressing to me sometimes is that I’ve been talking about the impact of our pension programs on recruitment and retention of faculty and the impact on academic programs since I was the chair the first time in 1996. That’s depressing. I’ll refer myself for counseling, I guess. We’re going to be looking at the Affordable Care Act, as well, because we sent out a communication to all employees, as we’re obligated to do by law, and there’s huge confusion around the country. What was gratifying is how many started calling yesterday and emailing the state yesterday about some of the insurance exchanges so that was encouraging. Any questions you can always direct them to me any time.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Deb?

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

E. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next is the report on the BOT meeting. This was the September 19 BOT meeting. You’ve got the written report in front of you. The highlights I think have to do with – well the highlights and the low lights – the board approved the FY2014 budget which they have to do otherwise nobody gets paid. Of interest is the fact that this budget was $58,000 lower and that was due to the piece of our budget that comes out of the performance-based funding initiative. And so the IBHE elected to go with a metric that is not favorable to NIU but rather is much more favorable to the flagship UIUC. Part of that might have been the fact that the president of UIUC was put on that board. NIU is very unhappy with the way this was done. Basically, originally the intent was that universities would be judged against their own performance and not against other universities. The IBHE apparently felt that that was way too complicated for them to handle and so they went with a metric that disadvantages us. The main thing to keep in mind is that this only affected a half of one percent of our budget this year. However, that will most likely increase and, if those metrics are not changed in some way, we will continue to be negatively impacted. And we are essentially being negatively impacted because of our mission which is to serve underserved populations and first generation college students. Apparently the IBHE’s feeling is that serving those populations should disadvantage you in the performance-based funding domain. I don’t know, Sonya, do you have any thoughts about what they were thinking when they did this? No, okay.

R. Feurer: Alan, could you explain, I’m not following how that mechanism works. Can you explain a little bit?

A. Rosenbaum: You know, I don’t understand it entirely, but I know that when they were thinking about what to use as metrics for performance-based funding, they were using things like the number of people that you graduate. And that’s disadvantageous to schools that take a large number of students that may not have an easy time getting through either for financial reasons or academic reasons. So it discourages schools from taking anything but better students. I really don’t know everything in that metric well enough to tell you what it is. I don’t know, Sonya, do you have a better idea of that?

S. Armstrong: I don’t. Your sense is also my sense, but I don’t know the details of the metric. However, I do have some information that I could share that I think attempts to break it down a little bit. I can send that to you?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, you can send it to us and we can post it. [Illinois Higher Education performance Funding Model]
There was also some matter of it having to do with enrollment. So, if you can increase your enrollments relatively easily, it’s to your advantage. So UIUC can increase their enrollment simply by just accepting more students. They have a much easier time maintaining enrollments than we do. But that’s just again a non-definitive sense of what that’s about.

But in any case, that’s why the budget is lower by $58,000 when, in fact, the government funded it at a level basis. The FY2015 budget guidelines were approved, and again we’ve asked for our increases that we always ask for. Very often these are then dismissed at the IBHE level or, if not at the IBHE level, then at higher levels. So we rarely get the increases that we’re asking for. In fact, as you know, we’ll be lucky to maintain level funding. They also approved the FY2015 appropriated capital budget. This is the budget that deals with building improvements and physical plant improvements and new buildings. The number one item on our list is the Computer Science Health Informatics and Technology Center. That’s become the new number one. The old number one was the Stevens Building renovation which was apparently on our list for something like 13 or 14 years.

**W. Creamer:** Oh, way more than that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** More than that? And it was number one on our list for 10 years and so that’s finally been funded and now that’s no longer on our list so we now begin the deathwatch for the new Computer Science Health Informatics and Technology Center, followed by the Davis Hall renovation.

We heard an update on the HLC accreditation process. The draft report was posted until yesterday. So if you haven’t read it, read it yesterday.

And lastly Eric Weldy provided an update on our enrollment figures and you can also read those for yourselves. They’re not great. Freshman enrollment was up 6 percent but transfers were down. The ACT and GPA averages for new incoming students remain relatively the same. Eric Weldy will be coming to address the Senate, I believe at our next meeting. No? November 20 because we requested, we did pass a resolution last spring asking that someone come and speak to us about the statistics for our classes over the last couple of years and Eric will be doing that at the November meeting. But the bad news is total undergraduate enrollment was down 4.5 percent. There are problems with transfers which are way down. This is not strictly an NIU problem. There are many schools within the state that are having these problems. Apparently the number of students coming out of high school in Illinois is down. It continues to be on the decline. So the number of students available for attending college has been declining and so we have some problems in that regard. The president has tried to address this as one of our number one priorities. We really need to pick up the enrollment figures. So that was the Board of Trustees meeting. I’ll take any questions that anyone has on the Board of Trustees. No questions, very good.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report
A. Rosenbaum: The next item comes to us as a report from Academic Affairs. Sarah McHone-Chase, Sarah?

S. McHone-Chase: So, we have this resolution from Academic Affairs and basically the dean of the University Libraries needs this resolution because he would like to join COAPI. It’s the Coalition for Open Access Publications Initiative, I believe. And also it’s a response to the Biss Bill that Governor Quinn passed recently that Drew was talking about at the beginning of our meeting today. So that’s what this resolution is in response to and, as it stands now, I think it’s a fairly neutral resolution. It’s not saying that we need to only publish open access; it’s just saying that, as a body, we are in favor of open access and I’ll entertain any questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, would you like to make the motion first?

S. McHone-Chase: I would like to make a motion.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you are moving the resolution of this open access?

S. McHone-Chase: I am.

A. Rosenbaum: We need a second.

G. Long: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, Greg Long has seconded. We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? You’re all discussed out? Had enough? Sure we don’t want to kill another good motion? Okay, no discussion. We’ll take a vote. 1 yes; 2 no; and 3 abstain. Are we ready, Pat? Okay, 1 yes, 2 no, 3 abstain and vote. Anyone need more time, raise your hand. Okay, we’ll close the vote.

1 – YES – APPROVE THE RESOLUTION – 34
2 – NO – DEFEAT THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION – 1
3 – ABSTAIN – 2

A. Rosenbaum: It passes. Very good. So we have endorsed this motion.

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 9-10
A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a report, Jim Wilson, Resources, Space and Budgets.

J. Wilson: Yes, we had our first meeting on the 13th and at that meeting was Steve Cunningham on which he introduced Michael Mann who is becoming the assistant vice president of budgeting and finance while Steve Cunningham, as most of us know, is the acting executive vice president and chief of operations. And they both sat with us and explained their roles. Namely, one of them being that the position previously held by Dr. Williams is now been merged into the existing roles of finance and facilities.

Some parts of the meeting were we discussed some of the president’s, President Baker’s, approaches that we can anticipate. We are mandated to meet with the president three or four times out of the year and currently we have two meetings lined up in October and in December with president.

We also discussed a number of financial items, budgetary items. Alan already discussed one with the carve-out for the performance measurement. We discussed that. The effect of declining enrollments, that translates into $17 million in reduction revenue which is counting for tuition and ancillary services. I guess we have about 5,000, the numbers are down about 5,000 for long-term projections.

Steve Cunningham also expressed that the president has a desire to be a little more aggressive with IBHE for funding to expand. Typically, we offer up three priorities, but we can offer up five priorities for the university. We also talked about capital funding. It does take it was just mentioned, approximately 10 to 15 years after approval to actually have the project happen on average I would say, maybe longer.

Paul Carpenter, the chair, did post some of the information that was given to us by Steve Cunningham on Blackboard, I believe. A number of campus projects were funded. $20 million of internal funds and Build America bonds were used over the summer to shape up the campus and that’s posted, some of the projects that were undertaken and completed during that time last summer.

And then on a lighter note, well the ending note, I won’t say its lighter, $216 million in bond rated debt is what NIU has right now towards new residence halls and athletics improvements. We have been downgraded by Moody’s to A3 but I guess the upbeat note is that the other schools, other Illinois schools, were downgraded to B status junk bonds, so some good news. That’s my report. There’s lots of detail in there, but that’s it for now.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. Any questions for Jim? Questions, comments?

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Joe Flynn, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: We have no unfinished business. Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Anyone have any business to bring before us?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. **Alternate Policy** – Page 11

A. Rosenbaum: The last item I want to call to your attention is on page 11 you have our alternate policy. Essentially it means that as faculty senators if you can’t make a meeting you’re supposed to ask someone in your department to stand in for you. That’s our alternate policy. So if you can’t make a meeting please do that.

B. **Annual Report**, Office of the Ombudsperson

C. **Annual Report**, University Benefits Committee

D. **Minutes**, Academic Planning Council

E. **Minutes**, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

F. **Minutes**, Athletic Board

G. **Minutes**, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee

H. **Minutes**, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education

I. **Minutes**, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

J. **Minutes**, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification

K. **Minutes**, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience

L. **Minutes**, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

M. **Minutes**, General Education Committee

N. **Minutes**, Honors Committee

O. **Minutes**, Operating Staff Council

P. **Minutes**, Supportive Professional Staff Council

Q. **Minutes**, Undergraduate Coordinating Council

R. **Minutes**, University Assessment Panel

S. **Minutes**, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: If there is no other business I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn.

R. Schneider: So moved.


A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

Senators: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: We are adjourned.
Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.