I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, can we come to order? All right, thank you. Welcome Faculty Senate members and guests to the November 20 meeting.

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

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: Our first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have the agenda as written with one walk-in item. I need a motion.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: I need a second.

Unidentified: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, we have an agenda.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 30, 2013 FS MEETING

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the approval of the minutes for the October 30th Faculty Senate meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.


A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any comments, questions, deletions, corrections, anything? Everyone loved them as is again? Alright, thank you. All in favor of accepting the minutes as written, signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? We have minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I have a few announcements. One is I don’t know how many of you were at the pensions forum that we co-hosted. I know a lot of you voted for us to co-host the event with our Operating Staff Council and Supportive Professional Staff colleagues. Well that was held today from noon to 1:30 in the Sandburg Auditorium in the Holmes Student Center and it was a very exciting and contentious event. How many of you were there? Some of you. Alright, thank you. All right it was very interesting. We had four of our representatives there. Pritchard was there. Demmer was there. Syverson was there and Fortner was there.

And so we had a lot of annuitants that were there as well and we had some pretty interesting questions and accusations and the fur was flying, so to speak, so it was pretty good. We were certainly able to make it clear to them that we were not very happy with them. So I think they took that away from the meeting. Also, though, I think certainly the ones that were there were mostly people who would not – voted with Madigan on those proposals – so they kept trying to point out that we were sort of attacking the wrong people. And we tried to make it clear to them that they should go back to the right people and tell them that they were attacked. They weren’t really attacked, but there were some very pointed questions I thought. Anyone who was there want to make a comment about it? Deborah?

D. Haliczer: It was certainly lively. Alan and Andy and I weren’t saying much of anything though Alan did a wonderful job of moderating. What we wanted to tell you is that it was videotaped and will be posted sometime late tomorrow on the budget and pensions website for those who were not able to attend. So do watch it. You will hear some impassioned comments by faculty and retired faculty and it was lively, lively.

A. Rosenbaum: And we will put a link to that on the Faculty Senate Blackboard website so if you want to watch it. It’s kind of like reality TV so you might enjoy it. Okay so that was good.
The other thing: I know many of you have attended our, we’ve now had two Faculty Club lunches, and by all accounts those seem to be going very well. For the first one we had about 28 people and then we scheduled a second one and the second one we had, I think, 53 people. So either word is getting out or people are getting hungry or something. I don’t know which but it was very nice.

I would really encourage people to spread the word on that and maybe some of you would like to come yourselves, those of you who haven’t been there. We’re going to keep scheduling them and so we will probably schedule one, probably not in December, but after we come back from the break we’ll start scheduling them again and possibly more frequently if we continue to have good turnout. But it was very nice. It gave people an opportunity to really meet faculty members from other parts of the university.

One of the things that I’ve been trying to do – and this is sort of related to that – is to get the faculty more connected to each other, for the faculty to really think of themselves as an entity and not just think of themselves as faculty within departments. And so that was really a nice way to do it. I think a lot of people were sitting with people that they didn’t know, some people that were from other departments, and found that they had things in common, that they might have research interests in common, that they might have come from the same place or have lived in the same places. So it was a really nice event I think.

And so we’re going to schedule those again and I hope people will continue to support the Faculty Club lunches. And eventually maybe we’ll get a permanent sign for that Hunt Room that renames it the Faculty Club. So that would be nice.

Along those lines, we’ve also scheduled an event that you should have gotten an e-mail about yesterday I think. And that is our first – I guess it’s the first, there might have been one that’s outside of my range of memory – but it’s our first faculty holiday social event. This is going to be sponsored by the NIU Foundation and we’re also going to weave into it an appeal for the Faculty Fund. So we’ll be talking about the importance of the Faculty Fund, what the Faculty Fund accomplishes. We’re going to try and have a few students, who have gotten Faculty Fund scholarships, to speak. It’s really going to be a very nice event.

There’s not going to be pressure on people, but we do want people to be aware of the Faculty Fund. Unfortunately, we don’t really get that much participation and what people need to know is that this Faculty Fund enables us to bring really bright students to the university. There are very high standards that are required to be a Faculty Fund recipient. Faculty Fund recipients have to maintain a GPA while they are here and they are able to get up to $9,000 a year. One of the interesting things about it, that people may not know, is that, of that $9,000, we only have to put in $2,000 – $1,000 per semester and the rest of it comes through the university. So we can give a lot of scholarships for not a whole lot of money. So it’s a very important thing and that is also related to this idea of the faculty behaving like a faculty and sort of taking some ownership over the quality of the students and the quality of the university.
I want to encourage you, we sent out that announcement, there was a SurveyMonkey attached to it because we need an idea of how many people to cater for. We’re going to have wine, cheese and hors d’oeuvres. So that will be very nice. But we need to know whether we’re catering for all 1200 faculty or whether we’re catering for the 53 that come to the Faculty Club lunches. I would encourage you, how many have we had replied - 47, so we’ve only gotten 47 people that have said they’re coming. That’s not a whole lot so I want to encourage you to come yourselves, but also to go back to your departments and to try and encourage your colleagues to participate in this event. Hopefully, it will be very nice. It’s the last week of classes; it’s 3 to 5 in the afternoon. We pushed it up a little so people who have children at the Child Development Lab can pick up their kids and still come to the thing a little earlier. So please publicize that to your departments and let’s try and get a great turnout. Also, have them respond to that survey. If they lost the survey or they deleted it, let us know, we’ll send them another one, but we need to get a count so that we know how much wine. We don’t want to run out of wine do we? Anyway, so please I hope that you’ll take advantage of this. It’s going to be a, hopefully, a very nice event and if it isn’t we won’t do it again. Hopefully, you’ll come to it.

Okay, what else – provost search. We now have a search committee. Some of you may be aware of this because you may have been asked to vote for a search committee member or two. We have a search committee for the provost. We have now hired a search firm so that search is now getting underway. Our objective is to hire a provost in time to have them take office at the beginning of the fiscal year; so that would be July 1. So that is moving along.

The president is also going to assemble a search committee for the chief financial officer. We know that some of you are interested in that and we’ll be pushing for faculty representation on that CFO search. We don’t really have to push. The president recognizes the importance of having all of the constituent groups represented on these search committees so that will not be an issue. So we’ll make sure we have faculty on that committee.

The last item I want to mention before we have some guest speakers is that I’ve mentioned this before, that not by choice but because of the way the position is defined in the constitution. This is my last year as executive secretary and president of the Faculty Senate. The most anyone can serve is five years. I have totally enjoyed serving as the president of the Faculty Senate and the executive secretary. I think that it’s an opportunity to do important things within the university. I’m mentioning this because we need to recruit a new executive secretary and I want you to know that the nominations will be taken at the February 19 Faculty Senate meeting. So that’s seems like a long way off and, in fact, it is. But it’s only two meetings from now. The qualifications are not many. You have to be a member of the University Council. It can’t be your first year of your first term on the University Council, but that’s pretty much all that you need to – that’s pretty much the only requirement. And so we have a limited number of people that are eligible for that. You know whether you’re eligible or not. Please start thinking about it. I am happy to talk to anybody who has interest about what the job involves, what you can expect if you were to take this position; and I’d be delighted to talk to anyone about it. So let’s not wait until the last minute when it’s February 19 and then it’s like, “okay, who we gonna draft.” So very important, let’s start thinking about it and, if people are interested, come and talk to me about it. Any questions about that?
Okay, the next person I want to introduce, Deborah Haliczer has asked for a few moments to talk about the SPS awards so Deborah.

**D. Haliczer:** Thank you for the opportunity to do a commercial. This is a reminder that the deadline for nominating Supportive Professional Staff for the SPC Presidential Award is coming up soon, December 2. It’s the Monday after Thanksgiving weekend. If you have SPS in your areas who need to be recognized for their excellent service to your department and your students, please consider nominating them. If you have questions, ask me and our application nomination packets are available on the NIU website under Supportive Professional Staff Council Awards. Any questions, just ask. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, I shouldn’t drink water during these meetings. One more item, as I think I’ve mentioned before but I’m not certain, the Faculty Senate is entitled to a liaison to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. Now in the past we’ve always had a Faculty Senate member who is on the council and so we didn’t have to pick somebody else. We are in a situation now where we do not have a representative on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. We are entitled to one; we do not have one. If anybody is interested in representing the Faculty Senate on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, you can either raise your hand now and we’ll vote you by acclaim most likely. If more than one of you is interested we’ll get out our clickers and have a vote. If nobody is interested we either won’t have a representative or if you think about it and say you want to do it and think about it later on, then just get in touch with me. Does anybody want this position? The thrill of representing the senate on the Undergraduate Coordinating Council? No. Anne, could you tell us how often that group meets?

**A. Birberick:** Sure, for those of you who don’t know me, I’m Anne Birberick, the vice provost and I’m co-chair of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. It meets on a monthly basis, I believe, I can’t remember if it’s a Monday or a Wednesday, but it usually goes from 2 to 3 and – what does it do? Good question. So what happens is there are a series of undergraduate curriculum committees that meet and all of those committees report or roll up to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. So at the meetings members of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council all sit on these different curricular committees and they give reports and share what’s going on in these different curricular committees that range from the General Education Committee to CUC to the Honors Committee. So there’s a wide range. And then we discuss what’s happening in these committees and we either accept what the committee’s recommendations are or in certain cases and instances, if we disagree with what’s going on in a particular committee, we could refer issues back to the committee and have them look at them and reevaluate them. We’ve done that on occasion.

**A. Rosenbaum:** And let’s not forget their major role which is supporting the Faculty Senate whenever we try to pass some kind of academic policy.

**A. Birberick:** Yeah, we can do that too.

**A. Rosenbaum:** And just to correct, the Undergraduate Coordinating Council meets on the first Thursday of the month, from 1 to 3.
A. Birberick: Oh, first Thursday. I sit on so many committees.

A. Rosenbaum: And we have remaining a December 12 meeting, then February 6, March 6, April 3 and May 1. If anyone’s interested, please raise your hand. You’re interested! Two people are interested. Wow. Okay, Jeff Kowalski and Keith Millis are both interested. Anyone else? Wow, that’s amazing. Do one of you want to yield to the other, otherwise we’ll take a vote.

J. Kowalski: Who else was interested? I’ll yield if the other person really wants to do this.

A. Rosenbaum: How badly do you want to do it, Keith?

K. Millis: I’m fairly neutral. I was on it years ago.

A. Rosenbaum: Oh, an experienced member.

K. Millis: I have teaching on Thursdays so that’s basically my reasoning for raising my hand.

J. Kowalski: Yeah, I’m happy to have you do it if you wish to do it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the gentleman from VPA is yielding. Okay, all in favor of Keith Millis as our representative to the UCC signify by saying aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposed? Good, Keith. Thank you for volunteering. We appreciate it.

A. Birberick: We will get you the material that you need.

A. Rosenbaum: And we will speak to your chair about recognizing your service to the University. Okay, thank you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. NIU Admissions Standards – Presentation
   Eric Weldy, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that’s the last piece of business I have. We have a guest speaker today. I’ll remind you that the senate specifically made a motion last year and passed that motion to invite the vice president for student affairs, or whoever it was that had the information we wanted, to come to us and talk to us about admissions standards at the university; how those admission standards are enforced; and more specifically whether those standards have changed over the last couple of years. Senate members have expressed concern that the admissions standards that are set by the faculty have not been enforced the way we intended that to happen and so we had asked for a presentation of that data. Eric Weldy was, of course, not the vice president for student affairs and enrollment management at that time, so he’s since stepped into this I’ll call it role, so he’s stepped into this mess and whatever we’re going to hear today is not
E. Weldy: Thank you very much Alan. I think this is probably the third or fourth presentation that I’ve given as it relates to enrollment management, where we are, where the recruitment retention. And so I’m very happy to have an opportunity to speak with you today. I understand I have maybe 10 or so minutes in which to present the material.

To start out with, I’m gonna make a request that you ask me back because the information I’m gonna give you today will give you the big picture as it relates to where we are. And I’ll go through from the standpoint of an overview of the things I’ll talk about today, but I want to be able to come back and give even more specific information as it relates per college.

We have had many discussions at least over the past four and a half months that I have been here as it relates to what data is available or is not available or has not been available to whether it’s the academic deans or other departments on campus. And so we’ve had discussions from the standpoint of being very open as it relates to sharing information and data and I think that will need to occur if we’re going to move forward as an institution because I believe if you’re going to make decisions that impact where you plan to be within the next five, 10 years, that you need all the information, all the data before you in order to make a wise decision. And so I just want to stress that. Today I’ll give some big picture, kind of overall as it relates to our student body, and request that you allow me to return to give really more specific information as it relates per college. Next slide please.

Today I’m going to talk about what I call the enrollment funnel. I’ll just say a little bit about the process quickly as it relates to how we generate inquiries from the standpoint of students in bringing applications, getting applications. I’ll talk about admissions standards, where we are with those. I will also give you a profile of our admitted students. I think this information will be very helpful to you. I’ll talk about our top feeder high schools and top feeder community colleges. For those who are not aware, a little less than half of our students that, new students that we admit each year, are transfer students. And a large majority of those students come from community colleges. I’ll share information as it relates to the mean GPA and mean ACT composite score of our new freshmen coming in. And I’ll give you a little bit of history going back about five years with the data and also share some high school class rank as well as GPA and then I’ll talk in regards to retention and graduation rates. Because, when you look at the numbers, that really shows you kind of where we are and we can have a discussion and really we’ll kind of let you decide from the standpoint of where we are and where you think that we need to be, what direction we need to go. Always open to having conversations.

On Monday, Anne Birberick and I hosted a retention summit. We had about 60, a few faculty members, staff members, and students came together to really discuss where we are as an institution and what we need to do. We were, in regards to recruitment of students, we’ve done decently the past couple of years, but not enough to make up the difference. Our biggest struggle is not from the standpoint of recruiting students. Believe it or not, our biggest struggle is
retaining the students that we do have. To kind of give you a big picture, last year we lost about 1,001 students who were in good academic standing that left the institution. Those were not all freshmen going into their sophomore year. We’re talking a good portion of those not only being in that group, but also being juniors and seniors. I think the largest number were seniors. Roughly about 335 and so that kind of tells you that we have quite a battle on our hands from the standpoint of retaining our students. But I’ll go into the rest of the presentation. Next slide please.

I’ll talk about how we generate basically student names, inquiries, as it relates to getting students to apply. Some of you may be familiar with the fact that we purchase names from ACT and other courses. This year I requested that we purchase just over 180,000 student names. In the past we’ve probably purchased about half that amount but I thought it was important for us, at least looking at the fall 2014 cohort, to generate as many applicants as possible. And that’s something that universities across the country do. Some other things that we do is that from the standpoint of hitting the pavement with our admission counselors, going out to the high schools and community colleges. We also acquire a graduation list from community colleges. Students inquire of our university through other means as well. We advertise. We have a marketing campaign each year to reach out to students and parents. There are web inquiries. We host a number of events and a number of the colleges host events in which we invite potential students to come on campus and to see our campus. Just wanted to give you an indication in regards to how we generate names.

In regards to the application process, if we have applications that are sent in and, if applications are incomplete, we follow up with the students through phone calls and other means, and the numbers can be large. Sometime there is certain information within their application that is missing and we do a lot of follow up with them. For applications that are complete and go through the process, some are denied upfront when they don’t meet our minimum requirements for admissions, but also completed applications are sent to the department for review as well.

Certain applications that do not meet full requirements are referred to the CHANCE Program and so there’s a process that the CHANCE Program has where students have to be interviewed and they have to come to campus. We go through the extra process. I’ve been on campuses with similar programs to CHANCE in regards to the process and sometimes it’s a little bit more strenuous as it relates to students being admitted from the standpoint if they don’t meet those minimum requirements, there are certain things that you need to do to make sure you identify the students that have the best chance of being successful when they come on campus. I think I’ll go ahead and skip and go to the next slide please.

Just want to show as it relates to admission requirements. I’ll share with you and I won’t read through everything, but I’ll share some information in regards to freshman admission requirements for the university as well as transfer student admission requirements. As you see here in regards to freshmen, applicants must rank in the upper half of their graduation class or have a GPA of at least 2.75 on a 4.0 scale and they must have a composite ACT score of at least 19, or a critical reading and mathematics SAT score of at least 870. Of those who do not rank in the upper half of their class but who rank in the upper two-thirds or who have a GPA of at least
2.5 on a 4.0 scale must have a minimum composite ACT of 23 or SAT critical reading and mathematics score of 1030. Next slide.

In regards to transfer admission requirements, it’s a little more, not really complicated, but a little bit more lengthy, as it relates to the number of hours that a potential student who would like to transfer to the university, what the requirements are. So a student who has attempted up to and including 12 semester hours will be evaluated as a freshman for admission purposes. And so they must meet the current freshman admission requirements.

Those who attempt more than 12 semester hours but earn fewer than 24 semester hours of transferable credit, must meet current freshman admission requirements, be in good academic standing at the last college that they attended, and they must have a 2.0 GPA on a 4.0 scale from all colleges attended. However, the established competitive GPA for transfers is a 2.5. So, in other words, if a transfer student has a 2.5, they have a better chance of being admitted. Those who have a 2.0 GPA could possibly be put on the wait list, but the chances of them getting in are a little bit slimmer. Next slide.

In regard to Illinois transfer applicants who have completed more than 12 but fewer than 60 transferable hours, they will be held to the competitive 2.50 GPA requirement. The students who meet the competitive GPA will be admitted. Students who do not meet the competitive GPA, as I noted before, who are above a 2.0 will typically be wait-listed and asked to write a personal statement. Next slide.

And this closes out the transfer admission requirements. Those who earn 24 to 59 semester hours or earned 60 or more semester hours of transferable credit will be considered for admission if the student is a good academic standing at the last college attended, has a GPA of at least a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. And students who have 60-plus transferable hours will not be held to the competitive GPA requirement. Next slide.

I had a meeting about a week ago with one of our vendors who helps us from the standpoint of looking at the students that are admitted to the university and where we do well as it relates to recruiting and admitting students and where we do not do so well. So I thought it would be good to have an opportunity to share with you at least this past fall our top five feeder high schools and so you can get a look at those. From the standpoint of the students that we recruit, most of our students that we recruit are really within a 25-30-mile radius of DeKalb. But we also do good in DuPage County and in Cook County as well. We don’t do so well in central and southern Illinois and a lot of that has to do with the fact that we haven’t really recruited there. We have improved the past couple of years as it relates to our recruitment of out of state students, in Iowa, Indiana, Wisconsin, but we can do a much better job, once again, because we haven’t really actively recruited those students. Next slide.

I also wanted to show you from the standpoint of our top five feeder community colleges. I’ll be honest with you, even though that a little less than half of the students that we admit each year as a part of the cohort that comes in each fall of new students, our relationship with community colleges is really, how should I say this, we can do a much better job as it relates to our relationship with community colleges. A lot of that has to do with colleges wanting to really
increase or enhance their articulation agreements with us. And so we really have not followed through with a lot of those. And so what President Baker is doing, and a group of us, is really working to build those relationships with our community college colleagues. A wonderful example would be a couple of weeks ago President Baker went to Schaumburg. There was a meeting of community college presidents within the state of Illinois and President Baker was the first president of a four-year public institution to ask for a meeting with the community college presidents. I think that says a lot from the standpoint of, you know, if we’re getting our students from certain feeder schools, then we really need to work hard to make sure that we keep those relationships strong. Next slide please.

Just want to give you an indication of mean GPA and ACT score for regular admits for the fall but also for all freshmen. With the next slides, I’ll give you a little bit more detail. Next slide please.

I wanted to get a chance to show you from the standpoint of the mean NIU ACT score for our new freshmen cohorts versus the national average. What I don’t have up here, what I should have placed up here, was the GPA for our new freshman cohort groups. For example, in 2009, the mean GPA was 3.08 and in 2010 it was 3.07. 2011 it was 3.06. 2012 it was 3.11 and this fall new freshman cohort mean GPA is 3.15. The interesting thing, though, is that the gap between our new freshman ACT score and that of the national ACT score, there was a larger gap ten years ago and that gap has closed within the past ten years. Next slide.

Also I wanted to give you a sense of the class rank of our new freshmen over the past five years. You can tell at least within the past five years, we’re at least increasing from the standpoint of the students who are enrolling who are in the top ten percent of their high school graduating class. Ten years ago, almost 75-76 percent of the students within the new freshman cohort were in the top 50 percent. So we’ve been closing that gap there over the past few years. Next slide.

This is very telling when you look at these numbers from the standpoint of retention. An institution such as ours, our first-year retention rate should be at least 80 percent or higher and over the past ten years our enrollment has dropped by roughly about 5,000 students the past ten years. And so with that, our retention rates have dropped significantly.

I have a theory in regards to why we have such a large percentage drop from 2011 to 2012. My theory is that, in that particular cohort group, we admitted late a number of students in the application process, like in July and August. Usually when you admit students, it doesn’t matter their socio-economic status, it doesn’t matter their race or ethnicity, if you admit students in July and August, those students, the chances of them succeeding in college are very slim. For example, students who apply for financial aid, the students who apply early on, are students who are really on top of things. Those are usually your brightest students. Those are students who usually come from families in which their parents have college degrees and so forth. I think from the standpoint of this particular year, I think there was a push to reach certain numbers and so a number of students were admitted late to push up the numbers and I think that really hurt us in regards to that cohort group. Because, if I look at that number, it doesn’t show it there, but the retention rate from first to second year for our black or African American students for that year
dropped over 13 percentage points. That was very telling for me in regards to the significant drop. Next slide.

I also wanted to along with the retention rates to kind of give you an opportunity to look at our six-year graduation rate patterns for our students. Interesting enough, we are not too far off the national average in regards to graduation rates. In fact, we have been doing fairly well over the past few years, but I don’t think that that will continue at the rate that we’re losing students. Next slide. Questions? Yes.

G. Slotsve: I know when you were invited here or when it was talked about being invited here a year or so back, for when you come back next time one of the questions that I think that was also of interest: When you were talking about the means for the ACTs and different things, some of the faculty were interested in what the distribution looked like. Was it by model? What’s going on with the distributions? We were hoping for a little more than just a mean and wanting to know what’s going on in the details of the distribution.

E. Weldy: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, Abhijit?

A. Gupta: Just curious I guess whether for retention point of view or whether, of course, it would be good to attract the best and brightest and one thing comes in mind. Maybe you already do it, but from what unique programs such as combined engineering and law which may draw a lot of good students. Or there are few full tuition or full rights scholarship but before this scholarship is awarded maybe a bigger pool is invited to come to the university. And maybe, if they come to the university, they might like and stay or just because they came those students may be given half the tuition. It’s still a small pool but you might get a lot of good students not only from local area maybe even possibly even out of state. So I was thinking how you try to recruit?

E. Weldy: Yeah, one of the things that we’re doing – many of you know that we hired Noel Levitz Consultant to come in. Next week they’re giving the presentation. They submitted a report with a list of recommendations and one recommendation they have and its one that I was stating that we needed to do, is when I looked at our scholarships, our merit scholarships, is that we offer a lot of one- and two-year scholarships. And so if I’m a student with a 3.5 or 4.0 in high school and NIU is offering me a two-year scholarship for let’s say $7000 or $8000 a year and this other school is offering me a four-year scholarship with a little bit more money, then I’m going with the other school. And so that has put us at a great disadvantage over the years. And so we will change that.

Another thing that we need to think about doing as well is, for example, if I’m a student and let’s say I have a 3.8-3.9 GPA and I’m here at NIU and there are scholarships available within the department, academic department, and let’s say I apply for a scholarship there and I receive that award, but the department doesn’t know that I’ve also made other requests for scholarship money and so I ended up having money in my pocket as a student more than what I need. And so we’re pretty much, in that particular case, throwing money out the window when we have other
students who are in need financially and who are good students, and which we could distribute that money. We need to figure out a way from the standpoint of do we need to centralize how we distribute our funds, all of our scholarship money. So those are some of the things that I believe Noel Levitz is going to recommend to us. But we can do a better job as it relates to how we distribute our scholarships. We can offer many more scholarships than what we’re offering now. Also from the standpoint of transfer students, we, at the moment, offer like one transfer student scholarship, merit scholarship and so I look to add more transfer scholarships, merit scholarships for transfer students.

A. Rosenbaum: Other questions for Eric? Eric, one question that I think that has come up in the past, there was some concern that, you know, despite the standards that have been set, there are cases that are admitted by advising deans or by the various colleges where students have one of the credentials but not the other one. And what I’m sort of wondering: Is there a directive to the advising deans about the permissibility of doing that? Are they basically saying, “Yeah you can do whatever you want.” Or are they told, “Look, the faculty has set this standard and you must adhere to that”?

E. Weldy: That’s a very good question. I’ll share a situation that often happens. There’s a lot of pressure that’s put on our advising deans. A lot of pressure when it comes to making decisions. We have parents who do a lot of, how should I say, they go to bat for their son or daughter. They contact the president’s office and there are a lot of things that are stirred up in order to get their son or daughter admitted. And many times I do believe that there’s maybe some added pressure put on some of our advisors as it relates to making decisions. There are some students that I will admit have been admitted and I thought there was absolutely no way that that student was going to be admitted. And so this tells me we really need to take a look at from the standpoint of, you know, if we have certain policies in place, they’re no good if we don’t follow through and enact them; plain and simple. And so we need to figure out a way to make sure that across-the-board we’re consistent and so that you can have one program or one college that’s following the rules and guidelines, and then you can have another that, you know, for whatever reason, may not be. But I think that we can be a lot more consistent with that. Yes.

A. Gupta: Another thing: I thought NIU offers a lot of service which may not be known even to NIU employees I mean whose son, grandson, daughter. For example, there is this beautiful program I think called Summer Saturday Promise Scholar, people coming to NIU they can improve their math skills. But I found out even NIU employees don’t know, so they tell on people from outside and this would tremendously help in the retention also because if math is one of the things that students cannot cope up and leave, so a lot of things if that can be told up front before they join NIU you might get better and also better prepared students.

E. Weldy: Yeah, one of the major decisions that President Baker made was to, in regards to our marketing and communications as an institution, not just admissions, but athletics and all the academic areas, is to have everything fall under the umbrella of the university marketing and communications department, formerly our university relations area. When I interviewed several months ago, one of the things that I had a conversation with Kathy Buettner who is VP for Marketing and Communications. I said the first thing that I’m going to do when I’m on campus is we’re going to sit down and we’re going to figure out how we can work together. And so any
information that you need from the Admissions Office that will help us as it relates to how we communicate with parents and students, how we market the university, I said, you know, everything is open to you. So any data information that you need as it relates to the – I talked about the names that we purchased from students. There is a lot of demographic information. I said I will share all of that with you because, in order for us to attract students, in order for us to market students in a way that will get us the application pool that we want, the quality application pool that we want, we’re going to have to do this. And so, when the president made the decision that the marketing communications across campus was there will be a reporting line to Kathy Buettner’s office, I was excited, because that means that, for example, if I have a brochure from all the different colleges, also from admissions and I lay that information all down on the table, I bet you that there would be little consistency as it relates to the information that is shared. When we speak or communicate any information that we send out as a university, it has to be consistent information. We have to really gain an understanding of who we are as an institution and be able to communicate that to perspective students. I think that’s one of the keys from the standpoint of attracting the kind of students that we would like to see here.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, are there any questions? Okay in that case we’ll thank Eric for the good presentation and for the information and I think we don’t always get the information we want but this is the exception.

E. Weldy: It’s a good start.

A. Rosenbaum: We got most of what we’d asked for, George’s request notwithstanding, and we’d love to have you back when you want to present that additional information.

E. Weldy: I would like to be back. Like I said I presented a couple of times through the Board of Trustees. They have requested some information and so I trust that I will be back a number of times over the years, but I’m excited to be here and just the opportunity to take on the challenge.

A. Rosenbaum: Great, thanks very much.

A. Rosenbaum: One quick item, I neglected to mention before, but the provost’s search. So I am co-chairing the provost search with President Baker. Just as we did with the presidential search, I am interested in hearing from the faculty regarding what we’re looking for in a provost. So those of you who have thoughts about this, I’m going to open a thread, a discussion thread, on the Blackboard website. So you can enter your thoughts there or e-mail them to me or call me, but we’re going to get rolling with this kind of quickly so I’d like you to think about it and perhaps solicit comments from your fellow faculty members. But we’re going to have to decide what are the strengths, what are the things we’re looking for in a provost, what are we trying to avoid, and I would like to hear the faculty’s opinions about this. So please give me some comments on that and ask your colleagues to do the same. It worked out very well with the presidential search. I think we were able to represent pretty much everything that the faculty had asked for in the job description and so I would really like to do the same thing here. I think this is a critically important position for faculty. I think you’d all agree with that, so this is the time for us to sort of speak our minds about what we’re looking for and so that we can really search for somebody that meets the requirements that we have. Okay?
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a bunch of reports today so we’ll get going with those. First one is from Sonya Armstrong who’s reporting to us on the FAC to the IBHE. Sonya.

S. Armstrong: Hello. We met on Friday at McMurray College. I really just have three kind of general updates for you but I’m happy to provide additional details if you’re interested.

First and foremost, the public universities caucus spent almost the entire time talking about the issue of pension reform. It was also exciting as I hear the session today was. One sentiment that was raised through this discussion was that really as faculty we ought to be putting together a document that many endorse and many endorse the same document rather than multiple different versions. So the public universities caucus is currently putting together kind of a general statement and once that’s been vetted and wordsmithed I’m sure, I’ll bring that back for consideration here.

Second, we had guests from the ISBE and also from the IBHE who presented on the upcoming PARCC assessments. This is, I’m not sure how familiar you are with the PARCC assessments, this will be the suite of assessments that will determine college and career readiness in the very, very near future. As soon as I get the PowerPoint and also the written report of that presentation, I’ll be happy to share that on the Blackboard site if that’s acceptable. [Website provided below.]

http://www.isbe.state.il.us/assessment/parcc.htm?col3=open#CollapsiblePanel3

Then finally, we did get a brief update on the IBHE executive director’s search. It is going, as a matter of fact, they are having airport interviews I believe next week. And then the first week of December the short list will be coming in to Springfield for interviews. We do have an FAC member on that search committee, by the way, who will be joining in the interviews. I think that’s all unless someone has questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Sonya? Okay, thank you Sonya. We’ll look forward to that document when they get it together and see how close that comes to the document that we approved.

B. Student Association – Rebecca Clark – report

A. Rosenbaum: Okay next Student Association. We have Rebecca Clark who seems to be the only student that turned out today.

R. Clark: Good afternoon I have a few things to report. Next week’s football game is really what we’re mainly focused on right now. We really want a good turn out and it is a lot of things. It is senior night so the seniors will be able to go on the field. We’re still waiting to hear from
Athletics for that. The “It Can Wait” campaign, the don’t text and drive, we hope to get a lot of students to commit to not texting while driving. And it is also Greek night and the blackout game as well. So wear black if you’re planning on attending.

Recently in the Student Association we formed working groups. Basically what it is is we’re just making committees so we can divide and conquer and reach out to further than just the university but hopefully get DeKalb involved with our students as well.

We scheduled a Meet-the-Police-Chief Night. If any of you are interested it’s December 2 from 5 to 7 in the Huskie Den. Basically it’s just going to be so the students can meet Chief Phillips. They haven’t really had much interaction with him yet so we want to be able to meet everybody in a casual setting.

And then on the senate side, we will be getting a new speaker for next semester and elections will be held this week, Sunday, so that will be three hours long. Recently, we reported at University Council, but our president Jack Berry did attend the trip to Springfield with President Baker a few weeks ago to talk about the funding and we’ve also started doing budget presentations by organizations, student organizations. I do professional and academic and we’ll have the budgets presented to the organizations back in April. With that I yield to questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Rebecca? Questions in the back, yes, Winifred?

W. Creamer: What was the date of that Meet-the-Police-Chief event again for students?

R. Clark: It’s December 2 from 5 to 7 in the Huskie Den.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s Meet-the-Police-Chief?

R. Clark: Yes.

R. Rosenbaum: Okay, if there are no other questions we’ll move on to our Board of Trustees Reports.

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair; Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison – no report

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

E. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – report – Page 3

A. Rosenbaum: The first report comes to us from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel, Dan Gebo.
D. Gebo: This group met and, although there’s a lot of information items, there’s only two important points I think that faculty are probably interested in. Ray Alden as provost organized and paid for a summit on diversity. So there’s a lot of information on diversity on campus. In my report, I gave just the last year of 2012 some of the results in terms of percentages. They gave more data at the meeting and the bottom line is nothing’s changed in the last decade. So we’re pretty much where we had always been. There’s a movement to try to move from a compliance model to be proactive, but I’d have to tell you that we haven’t made much progress, unfortunately, in this area. So that’s the information on that.

The other thing was exactly what we heard from Eric Weldy today. There’s a lot of information about enrollment and this dominated the meeting in terms of information content. As you expect, you can ask – the first question is: Why do students leave NIU? And the answer is: We don’t know. Things like finances and academics and homesickness and campus perception are some of the leading themes. The student representative on the board argued there’s no wow factor at NIU, so this is an issue for this individual. Probably the most important number I thought came out of the discussion was 35 percent of students that leave NIU are in good academic standing and they can afford NIU. So it’s not about money, it’s not about grades, it’s about something else, whatever that would be. So in terms of the key items, those were the big discussion items. There was a very, I would argue, minor action item where they approved a task force to look at open access to research articles. So in terms of action items it was minimal but there was a fair amount of information mostly about enrollment and also about diversity. That’s my report. Any questions?

A. Rosenbaum: It would seem it would be easy enough to contact students who are leaving the university and say: Why’d you leave the university? So do they not have that type of data? I mean, are they not answering these questions? Are we not asking them?

D. Gebo: I think you had the right person here. I should point out that Eric Weldy is now, how should I put it, he’s charged with coming up with a tactical plan to recruitment strategies. So I think, at this point with this new individual, that question may be tackled and we may find out. They’ve had surveys; they’ve done various types of other issues. One of the data, I didn’t bore everybody with all the data, but like he was trying to point out, they know exactly what percentage comes from all the community colleges. They know what percentage comes from high school. They’ve got all the grade information. And so they’re just trying to sort out basically what the problem is. It’s not just the safety issues, okay. So there are other issues that are involved in terms of why students are leaving. So that’s the simple explanation but it’s not the correct explanation.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so maybe we will start asking some of these students why they are leaving and then we’ll have better information.

D. Gebo: Well, exactly right. And you can see why, not only with the president, but with everybody else, the key mantra right now is enrollment, right, and retention of enrollments because of the financial issues with the state and the university. So ultimately this is going to the top in terms of what can we do about it, is what it boils down to. I don’t know.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any other questions for Dan? Yes?

W. Creamer: It seems to me that the university is working with the data they have. The problem – I don’t know if this is what your group, anything your group talked about – but students can walk away and there’s no exit questionnaire so the kind of information that we’d all like to have, why are they going, they don’t have to tell us and there’s no place that we find it. So the university knows what year they were, that they were in good standing, how many semesters they’ve been here. So I’m not really sure how the university can make strides in this without collecting more data. You know it’s like tracking down alumni, it’s not that easy. Was there any discussion with your group?

D. Gebo: Well, some of the information like grade point average they, of course, have. So a lot of this information they may not look up. But my point is: It’s present and they can get a hold of it. There’s more anecdotal evidence. There are no massive surveys if that’s what you’re asking about. There’s no systematic way of collecting data for whatever the reasons would be and I think that’s basically what Eric is being charged with. He’s going to have to come up with a plan to basically try to tackle this, hopefully find out what the reason is and then see what we can do about it. I think he gave you some of his ideas about scholarship increases for transfer students that come from community colleges, things like that. So I think it’s a multi-prong problem; it’s a series of problems for the university but we’re hearing basic information is all I can tell you at this point.

W. Creamer: Thanks.

A. Rosenbaum: Other questions? Okay thank you, Dan.

FBOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 4

A. Rosenbaum: Next report is from the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee. Most of the action items are pretty much self explanatory and also pretty much disinteresting. The informational items were a little more interesting, I thought, not so much because of what we learned but the fact that we were actually getting some of this information.

So the board received a report from WTC Consulting and this was a report on our IT services. This report was commissioned before President Baker took office and that report is available. It hasn’t been posted yet because the Board of Trustees hasn’t fully accepted it yet but many people are familiar with that. I think, George, you’ve seen the report from the WTC as well? Yeah, do you have any comment on it? No? Okay. And so that was interesting.

The second thing was a presentation by Steve Cunningham where he talked about how the budget is done, how the budgeting process is done. And what was very interesting about that was that the Board of Trustees, the members of the trustees, commented that this is the first time they’d heard any of that information. And that sort of was an interesting comment in of itself but it sort of spoke to a change in the transparency with which this administration is approaching things as compared to prior administrations. So it was very nice, the presentation itself was okay, but it was very nice to hear that some of this information which should have been readily
available in the past, but never was, is now being make available to both the Board of Trustees and to the university personnel as well. So that was, I think, a notable change in the way the administration is working compared to the previous one, so that was good.

And then there were some – you know the students have been advocating for better recreational facilities. They’ve made pretty strong arguments for that. There are issues about how much money might be available and how much money it will take but, at any rate, there was a presentation that sort of summarized all of the recreational facilities that are available at NIU and that was an interesting report as well.

And then there was also a presentation on the Affordable Care Act and, apparently, this is something that could be of some problem for the university. There is a formula for how many of your employees are allowed to apply for insurance through the Affordable Care Act. If you’re not providing that insurance for a certain percentage, then you are fined some ridiculous amount for every employee and I think that amount’s like $2,000. So it was very important to hear that the university is monitoring this and making sure that we are in compliance because I don’t have to tell you that, with over 4,000 employees, a fine of $2,000 per employee is gonna hurt quite a bit so they’re on top of that. It was interesting to hear about that as well. Any questions about the FFO report or yes?

S. McHone-Chase: I’m not sure if I understand. Are you saying that the board didn’t understand how the budget was built before?

A. Rosenbaum: Right. They were not aware of the steps or the process that went on. That’s correct. That they were essentially brought into the process on the side of approving expenditures but not sort of being fully informed about how this budget is done every year. So it was very informative for them. That’s at least what the comment was from the board members.

S. McHone-Chase: Okay, thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: So it’s not that surprising. I mean, I think the Board of Trustees can’t be like tuning in on every nuts-and-bolts kind of issue with the budget. They have to be working with the big picture items. But the fact that it had never been presented to them, that this is what we do, this is how we do it, was a bit of a surprise. Other questions?

G. BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Rosita Lopez – report – Pages 5-6

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up we have Deborah Haliczer who is gonna report on Legislation and External Affairs.

D. Haliczer: Thank you. I am reporting for Rosita Lopez who wrote our report which is in your packet. What was interesting in talking or hearing your report on legislation and external affairs is how prominent the whole issue of pensions is. No surprise there. Kathy Buettner and Steve Cunningham were reporting on activity and we are all on alert to see what, if anything, our legislators are going to do and it could happen soon or it could happen down the road a piece. So
we don’t know but we’re kept on pins and needles about that.

One of the issues that the board expressed great concern about – and I was pleased for this – was the impact of the government fiscal shutdown on faculty and student research. They heard a report about the impact on our Antarctica project and how that harmed some of our students, our graduate students who were scheduled to do research. And so again one of things that was gratifying to both Rosita and me was they are concerned about research and saw that as a really significant and negative impact on our academic programs. So they’re paying attention. Thank you. Questions?

A. Rosenbaum: Questions for Deborah? Okay, point of information, I don’t know if we ever mentioned this, but you’re all familiar, I hope, with the University Advisory Committees to the Board of Trustees. So all of the people that are presenting these reports are members of the UAC. And so the members of the UAC are Deborah and Dan Gebo, myself, Greg Waas who’s going to give us the next report, and Rosita Lopez and also Andy Small who’s the President of Operating Staff Council. So UAC members, we split up the various subcommittees and that’s where you’re getting these reports. So Deborah is a member and she’s giving a report on this committee. So each of us is assigned to specific committees and that’s where these reports are coming from in case people were wondering about that.

H. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Alan Rosenbaum – report – Page 7

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next report I have is from, I guess it’s my report, the Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee. This has been nicknamed the CARL committee. It’s an acronym that’s left out some of the letters for convenience, I guess. Anyway, this was a very strange meeting. All I can say is that we heard from Danielle Schultz who is the internal auditor and she reported on the number of audits that they conducted in the past year. She couldn’t tell us anything about them because it was an open meeting and, you know, they are exempt from the open meetings. And so if she had said anything about them then they would have no longer been exempt. And so we learned nothing other than they’ve had 18 audits. So there you have it. I hope you enjoyed that report. I don’t know what else to say about that. I’m sure you don’t have any questions about it because I don’t have any answers anyway.

I. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – report – Pages 8-9

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next up Greg Waas is going to report to us on the newest committee. This is an ad hoc committee. It’s not a standing committee yet and this is the Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology. Greg. You need a mic.

G. Waas: I don’t really have a lot to add to the report that I’ve filed here. As Alan mentioned, this is an ad hoc committee that was established by the Board of Trustees chair, John Butler. And really this first meeting was devoted to providing kind of a broad overview of sponsored research and technology transfer issues. This was led by Provost Lisa Freeman. There was wide ranging discussion on the order of just information gathering as well as lots of brainstorming of kind of
ideas for going forward regarding future meetings. I think the sense is that following this first meeting which was this kind of information gathering, information provision meeting, future meetings will be devoted to a much more in depth, more narrow kind of focus on issues that will be determined by the committee chair. So I’ll take any questions.

A. Rosenbaum: Can you just give us an idea of why the Board of Trustees might have felt the need for a committee such as this?

G. Waas: Well, you know, I think they have discussed this in the past and the decision was that simply the Academic Affairs Committee probably couldn’t accommodate the depth that they wanted to go into and just sort of understand the issues that confront us. I mean, you know, there was a recognition that research and technology transfer sits at the sort of intersection of really all of the core missions of our university, be that the excellent training of students, or the engagement of regional, national, and international community’s, or the creation of new knowledge. I think it’s a good step that they’ve decided to take an interest in this.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you. Any questions for Greg?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next is the report on the special meeting on the Board of Trustees. This was a hastily called meeting. The main objective of this meeting was to do the three things that you see there.

One is the approval of this ticket agreement with the Illinois High School Association. They will be having their state football championships at NIU. This is transferring all the revenue from the ticket sales to the Illinois High School Association. You might say: Why are we giving them all of the revenue? The answer is because the funds that – any expenses that are incurred as a result of putting this on – are raised by a committee called the DeKalb County Community Foundation. So this is not money that is coming out of the university. Therefore, there is no reason why the profits should go to the university and this supports the Illinois High School Association. We are going to be having these playoffs apparently every other year and we’re going to be alternating with University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. Apparently we’re pleased to be hosting these. At least anyone who doesn’t have to stand on the field for six hours and watch is pleased. So it’s apparently a nice thing for us.

They also approved the appointment of the interim chief financial officer. This is pending the search for the new CFO. We were very fortunate to be able to have recruited Nancy Suttenfeld. I think I mentioned her at our previous meeting. She has really excellent credentials having been the chief financial officer at Wake Forest, at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, she’s worked for the Smithsonian Foundation and also for Case Western Reserve University. So she has very good credentials. She’s retired from those jobs. She’s not interested in this as a permanent position, but was hired to really work with us and hold us over until a new financial officer is appointed. So this is a very good thing and we were lucky to recruit somebody with such excellent credentials.
And the last thing they did was approve the hiring of the executive search firm for the provost search. And it was very important that they do that because we need to get rolling on that and so we have now gotten that approval and we’ve gotten rolling on that so that’s a good thing. Any questions about the special meeting? Okay, good.

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 – report – Pages 11-12

A. Rosenbaum: Now reports from standing committees. We have no reports from our first four committees. We do, however, have a report from Jim Wilson from Resources, Space and Budgets.

J. Wilson: I have just a few items I’ll go over briefly. We met on the eight of November with Steve Cunningham. He was present and I think I have to say that, from the experience last year, we were kind of witnessing a bit of a seat change. There seems to be a lot more willingness to share information and also get our input on what kinds of things we as a committee can contribute to the budgeting process. As we know, the budget landscape is changing and we think we have some traction now on where we can go with what kinds of things we can contribute to and what kinds of conversations we can have.

Currently the – you’ve probably heard about the budget hearings and the focusing of resources along areas of success and perhaps what is hot and that kind of thing. And what comes up from that is what kind of criteria measures are going to be used. And so that is one of the key areas we think that we can have some input on and something we hope to be addressing over the next few months for our budget report or final report for priorities next spring. So we’re thinking about: What kinds of measures should we be using for credit hours, counting heads, programs, certificates and so forth, how many majors? What are the criteria used in measuring I guess productivity where money should be allocated. So we’ll be looking at, you know, how best – what is an equitable solution to allocate resources and at what scale? What unit level are we operating on? So these are things we’ll be addressing.

Some other points that were brought up at our meeting was that keeping enrollment revenue, focusing on that, but there was some concern about graduate student fees and that they may be paying quite a bit or a large proportion of their stipends and so forth on student fees, up to 29 percent, for example. This is on the back end of the report. So there’s a brief discussion about that.
And then finally, there was some discussion, very briefly, about maybe this enters into the wow factor for NIU. I don’t know, but establishing a corridor like some kind of development corridor between the downtown area of DeKalb on the east side of campus. And that this would be a kind of a help to develop more of a sense of place and belonging for students with more student-oriented activities and stores and that kind of thing.

With that, we do meet with the president on the 11th of December. We have yet to meet with our interim chief financial officer, but we hope that will be forthcoming. That’s all I have.

**A. Rosenbaum:** And she’s just now coming on, I think, on a more regular basis. She really hasn’t been here on a regular basis until, I think, Monday so it should make it easier to meet with her. Any questions? Questions for Jim? Okay.

I think, again, you know, you may be getting a sense that there’s a theme here. The theme is that this is a golden opportunity for us to assert our role in the shared governance process. This is a much more – or appears to be a much more – open administration to that. All the indications are that this administration is listening and so we need to really continue to advance on all the fronts that we have made gains on over the last couple of years. George?

**G. Slotsve:** Real quick is you mentioned that there was talk about funding for areas that are real hot or hot?

**J. Wilson:** Well, that came up with our Executive Committee meeting. But, you know, areas of success or what are the trends, what is the demand, I guess, basically.

**G. Slotsve:** It depends upon the type of resources they’re throwing at something like this and how permanent they are because what’s hot today, five years from now maybe not. So, I mean, I think we should probably have some concerns over jumping after “oh wow this seems to be the hot thing,” throw lots of money and then we’ve got misallocated resources five years down the road.

**J. Wilson:** It’s almost when you think about all the different dimensions you could be looking at, it’s almost intractable in a lot of ways but it’s a start.

**A. Rosenbaum:** But it’s. You are absolutely right this is something that we really have to stay on top of and to really assert our opinions about this. And also the other thing is that it’s important that they not think about it as the money for programs has to be only shifted within programs. So it’s perfectly reasonable to say we need more money put into certain programs. That doesn’t mean it has to come out of other programs. It could mean it comes out of other sources, like reducing the number of administrators or reducing some other element of spending. So I think it’s very important for us to keep, you know they understand that, I mean when you make that point they do recognize that it’s important for us to keep that in front of them that it’s not a zero sum game, that if money is going to go to nursing it has to come out of economics but rather, yes, maybe we need to open up the nursing department so they can accept more nurses because they have lots of qualified applicants and maybe we take that money out of the
Convocation Center, you know, not necessarily out of some other academic program. So our resources, space and budget folks are right on top of this and that’s very important and so we are very mindful of that. Okay any other either questions for Jim or 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: Anything from the audience? Okay, let’s review. The wine and cheese social is December 3. Make sure you publicize it and make sure people send in their RSVPs via the SurveyMonkey.

Let’s start thinking about who wants to be executive secretary next year.

And those Faculty Club lunches, so let’s keep frequenting those. Do we have – we don’t have a December meeting do we? This is our last meeting for the term. So it’s our last meeting for the term so I hope you all have a healthy and happy holiday and we’ll see you again in the new year.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

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

J. Wilson: So moved.
A. Rosenbaum: So moved Jim and a second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor.

All: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.