

**FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT**  
**Wednesday, October 30, 2013, 3 p.m.**  
**Holmes Student Center Sky Room**

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** Arado, Arriola, Azad, Bateni, Chandler, Chen, Clapp, Collins (for Hunt), Creamer, Crowley (for Ryan), Daniel, Deng, Downing, Feurer, Flynn (for Tonks), Gaillard, Henning, Koren, Lenczewski, Long, Looney, Mackie, Martin, McHone-Chase, Moremen, Newman, Novak, Patro, Pitney, Rodgers, A. Rosenbaum, Saborio (for Nissen), Sagarin, Schneider, Siegesmund, Slotsve, Staikidis, Tollerud (for Rheineck), VandeCreek, Wilson

**VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:** Abdel-Motaleb, Bisplinghoff, Briscoe, Bujarski, Cripe, Fang, Farrell, Frank, Fredericks, Giese, Gupta, Hamayatsu (sabbatical), Hunt, Jones, Kapitan, Kolb, Kostic, Kowalski, Lee, Liui, Lopez, Middleton, Millis, Mogren, Mohabbat, Munroe, Naples, Nissen, Onyuksel, Plonczynski, Rheineck, Rollman, M. Rosenbaum, Ryan (sabbatical), Sirotkin, Thu, Tonks (sabbatical), Walker, Ward (for Hamayotsu)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Armstrong, Bryan, Gebo, Haliczer, Klaper, Streb

**OTHERS ABSENT:** Clark, Falkoff, Hathaway, Small, Smith, Thompson, Waas

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, greetings. We'll get started.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

**II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**A. Rosenbaum:** First order of business is the adoption of our agenda. We have three walk-in items. Those walk-in items are the revised disability presentation that Greg Long is going to be doing. The second item on that is the University Benefits Committee report and the third item is our Resources, Space and Budget reports. So I'll take a motion to adopt the agenda with the three walk-in items.

**J. Novak:** So moved.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Second?

**Unidentified:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Opposed, abstention? Okay we have an agenda.

### **III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2013 FS MEETING**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next, the minutes of the October 2 Faculty Senate meeting which we've all been working on diligently. I need a motion to accept the minutes.

**T. Arado:** So moved.

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

**S. McHone-Chase:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any corrections, additions, subtractions, grammatical errors? Seeing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes as written say aye.

**Members:** Aye.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Any opposition? Any abstention? Okay the minutes are approved.

### **IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. NCAA graduation rate report – Matt Streb, Faculty Athletics Liaison**

**A. Rosenbaum:** The first item that we're going to do is I'm going to give the floor over to Matt Streb for a moment. Matt is our representative to the Athletic Board, faculty representative to the Athletic Board, and Matt would like to talk to us a little bit about the NCAA graduation rates and talk a little bit about the performance of our athletes. Matt, make sure you're on the air.

**M. Streb:** Well, thanks, Alan and thanks for letting me spend some time with you this morning. Yeah, my job as the faculty athletics rep is, one of the jobs I have, is to monitor the academic progress of our student athletes and report to the Faculty Senate on that progress. And I'm happy to report today that I have very positive news. I would not want to be the faculty athletics rep at some other institutions, quite frankly, but we're very happy with what we have – with what we've done here at NIU.

Just to give you some background, very quickly. The NCAA has its own graduation rate. It's called the GSR which is the graduate success rate. Frankly, it's a better measure of graduation rate than the federal rate because we get credit, for instance, if we have a transfer student that comes in and actually graduates with our institution. If you look at our GSR for the last cohort, the most recent cohort, our GSR for all sports is 85 percent which is the highest it's been since the NCAA has started tracking the GSR. As important, and something that I'm very proud of, is that we have the – tied for the highest GSR rate in the Mid-American Conference with Miami of Ohio. If you look, four of our sports: women's basketball, women's golf, gymnastics and men's tennis have 100 percent graduation rates. Ten of our sports have graduation rates above the national average for their sport. And several of our sports that fall below the national average,

still have very strong graduation rates. For instance, women's tennis has a graduation rate of 88 percent. The national graduation rate is 92 percent so they're still doing very well. So we're very excited about all of that.

I wanted to point out one thing in particular and that is our football program has been getting a lot of national attention again because of the job that they've been doing on the field. I've always talked about the fact that, while we're very proud of that and that's something that's been great for the university, I'm just as proud of the fact that they're doing it off the field as well. Our football GSR for the last group was 85 percent. That is the highest in the Mid-American Conference by 10 percent. So, not only have we won two straight Mid-American Conference championships, we've appeared in three straight games, we're hoping to make that four this year, we have the highest graduation rate for our football team by 10 percent.

If you look nationally, depending on what poll you're looking at, we're ranked nationally. Probably the most important one right now is the BCS poll which puts us at 17<sup>th</sup> in the country out of about 130 programs. If we were to rank our football programs based on graduation rate, our football program right now would be ranked 12<sup>th</sup> in the country of about 130 programs. Of the top 25 teams in the AP poll right now, we have the third highest graduation rate. So we've been doing a wonderful job not only on the field but also in the classroom.

And just one last thing, with the GSR you can't do an apples to apples comparison with the student body at large, so the NCAA does also look at the FGR, the Federal Graduation Rate. And if you look at NIU's Federal Graduation Rate, you can look at this one of two ways. One would be from the most recent cohort starting in 2006, it's a six-year graduation rate. The other would be to combine the four most recent cohorts. When you do that, either way you do it, NIU's graduation rate is 54 percent. Our student athlete graduation rate using the FGR is 65 percent if you look at the four-year average, okay over four cohorts. So our student athletes are graduating at a higher percentage than our students, in general. And, if you just take the most recent six-year average, so starting in 2006 going through 2012, our FGR, all right the federal graduation rate of our student athletes was 78 percent compared to 54 percent for the university as a whole.

So we're very, very proud of the job that our young men and women are doing in the classroom. Sean Frasier, our athletic director, and I – as excited as we are about these numbers, still think there's room for improvement. But I think it says a lot about the job that our student athletes have been doing, not only representing this institution on the field and getting a lot of national attention for it, but also doing a great job in the classroom. I think that's something we can feel very proud of. So thank you very much for your time this morning.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Good; does anyone have anyone have any questions for Matt? Matt, I have a question.

**M. Streb:** Sure.

**A. Rosenbaum:** What has to happen for us to get it to a BCS bowl now? What are we rooting for?

**M. Streb:** Well you want to definitely root for Fresno State to lose, but really what we need to do is it's one week at a time. If we lose any of our games, that's a discussion that doesn't exist anymore, so we need to take care of business on Saturday. We're at UMass. Our next home game is two weeks from tonight, I believe it is, maybe it's Tuesday night, I can't remember, against Ball State. That will be the biggest game of the year for us. But if we lose, there's no BCS hope. If we continue to win, though, we've still got a little ways to go, there is a chance we could be in a BCS Bowl game. So the biggest thing you want to do is root for us to obviously keep winning and hope that Fresno loses somewhere along the way.

**A. Rosenbaum:** All right, thanks a lot, Matt.

**M. Streb:** Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, a few other items of interest. Some of you may know that we had our first Faculty Club lunch the other day and we had about what 25, 28 people that came to that and it was quite a good lunch. I think we had a really nice time and most of the people that were there were encouraging us to keep doing this so we scheduled another one.

You should have gotten an e-mail on that. The next Faculty Club lunch is November 19. They are all in Ellington's. We have the back room, which is the Hunt Room, which will ultimately be renamed the Faculty Club, I believe. I don't know if they're going to put it on a permanent sign or whether they're gonna put it on like some double-sided tape that they can take down if we don't use it enough. The meal that day will be Asian Twist. It's \$10 and it's a three-course lunch and there's wine available for people that what wine at an extra cost, But that \$10 includes taxes, tips, whatever, so it's a flat rate. You pay for it at Ellington's, you don't have to pay in advance. And basically what you have to do is you have to register because we have to let them know how many people. This is prepared, in case you don't know, by the students in FCNS and so they have to know how many people to prepare for. But you also can't just register on the Ellington's site, you have to register specifically with us. To do that by sending an e-mail to Pat and I think she's going to send out another e-mail. There was a little glitch in the link so some people that thought they registered, if they didn't get a confirmation, they're not registered. There was a little typo in the link or it was broken or something. So, Pat's going send out another one in the next day, tomorrow morning. And so, if you're interested, you have until November 11. Let us know. You don't have to come with a group. We sit family style so, you know, we have big tables, tables of eight to ten, and you just get to sit with other faculty members and we had some – it seemed very pleasant. We had a lot of conversation going on and people were encouraging us to do that. So I encourage you to sort of join us on November 19.

Okay I also want to call your attention to the fact that we have our inauguration of the president on November 13. I mentioned this last time. This will be an opportunity to hear firsthand what the president's plans are. Some of you have been participating in these Bold Futures workshops. How many people have been to the Bold Futures workshops? Good. The idea is – I think the last one will be held tomorrow, and then the president will try and put together whatever feedback he can cull from those workshops and that will be incorporated in his plans that he will unveil to us in his inaugural address. The inauguration will take place in the Sandburg Auditorium November 13 at 3:00 and then there will be a reception in the Chick Evans Field House, I believe.

Following the inauguration there will be, I assume, snacks; but I'm not sure about that so you might want to come to that.

A couple of things that are going on, you have since our last meeting heard about the president making some rearrangement in his administration and those include taking Ray Alden out of the provost position, moving him to the vice president for international programs and international affairs. The president is convinced that one way to deal with our enrollment problem is to increase our number of foreign students and he has made some connections in China and is working to bring a reasonably large number of students from China to NIU for either a semester or a year to sort of increase their sort of liberal arts, art, music, humanities training because apparently this person's feeling is that in China the emphasis is too much on STEM, sort of the opposite of what we have in the United States. So the president is working on that, has moved Ray Alden into that post, has moved Lisa Freeman, as you know, into the temporary or acting provost position, and is beginning a national search. The search committee is not yet been established, but I've been assured that it will have strong representation of the faculty on that provost search committee.

The president is also rearranging the way the finance, facilities and operations side of things has been done. He's broken up a number of the duties that were formerly held by Eddie Williams. He's reassigned a lot of those duties to different positions and is now looking to hire a chief financial officer whose main responsibility will have to do with the budget and budgeting issues as opposed to being in charge of facilities and all the other many things that Eddie Williams was in charge of. We will have a search for a new chief financial officer.

We will have a search for a new provost and as I've said before, some of you know, we are in the midst for a search for a new chief information officer and so that is an ongoing search. We have a search firm. I'm on that search committee along with a number of other people. One of the things that I am interested in getting from faculty is feedback on issues that they feel are important to faculty in the hiring of a new chief information officer. I know I've heard from people, George Slotsve of course is our representative to the CFAC committee, the computer facilities – what does it stand for?

**G. Slotsve:** Computing Facilities Advisory Committee.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Computer Facilities Advisory Committee. And so George has spoken to me at times about concerns that faculty have had about the way computing or IT services have been handled in the past. And so since we do have representation at least in the form of myself on this committee. I would be very much interested in hearing feedback from faculty on what was wrong with the way things are done and what our main concerns are regarding a new chief information officer. And so you can feed that back either by calling me, sending me an e-mail or filtering it through George who understands the CFAC stuff much better than I do. So if you contact either of us and let us know things that you or your constituents are concerned about in the selection of a new chief information officer that would be very helpful to us.

We are also working now to set up a pension discussion with legislators. We are partnering as we voted to do with the Operating Staff Council and with the SPS Council so we are now in the

process of trying to make those arrangements. We have reserved the Sandburg Auditorium for November 20, I believe, at noon, Debra do you know? 12:00 to 1:30, so we reserved the Sandburg Auditorium and tentatively that is the date and time. However, we have not yet gotten commitments from legislators on that, one of the reasons being that we have not yet sent out invitations to legislators and one of the reasons for that is I believe that we need to make sure that the administration is okay with us inviting – you want to say something about that Deb? Okay, so we're okay? Okay so we will most likely – so it's most likely gonna be approved by administration and then we will invite as many legislators as seems reasonable given the area that we're in and that is tentatively scheduled for November 20. So if, in fact, we cannot get them to come on that day, we may have to rearrange things a little bit, but right now that's the plan. What we'll try to do is, what we're inviting them to do is to come and talk to us about their position on pension reform, their feelings about the various pension reform plans, but also to address questions from us. So basically this is going to be the opportunity for university employees to speak up to the legislators and to have your questions answered and to, hopefully, make them aware of how strongly we feel about various issues. Okay so you can circle that on your calendars and we'll let you know if there are any changes in that. Okay. Those are all the announcements that I have. Do you have any questions? Anyone want to know anything or have a question I might be able to answer? No, okay.

## V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

### A. Accessibility Statements and Syllabus Inclusion – Greg Long – [updated report](#) – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** The next item we're going to deal with, we're going to have a presentation by Greg Long. Greg as you know is the chair of our Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities. And we have heard from Greg before; he's on the University Council and Faculty Senate as well. Greg has been doing a little research and wants to talk to us a little bit about the disability statements that we are encouraging people to put on their syllabi. So we've talked about this before, it was in Faculty Matters, and now Greg is going to give us a little update on how well we're doing with it. So, Greg, if you want to grab a microphone. Are you going to show some slides? Okay so I can stay here.

**G. Long:** First off, I would just like to say “thank you” for the opportunity to come and speak to you and to provide a little bit of context for those of you who don't have a lot of background with regard to disability and education. Students with disabilities, whether K through 12 or even post-secondary have really had only about a 40-year history of access to public education. As a group, there's a fairly short history with them and when you think about it when it relates to college, there are very, very different rules that exist for getting accommodations in the K through 12 system versus the post-secondary systems. So K through 12 they're looking for children, they're providing more comprehensive services, it's really seen as an entitlement program. When we talk about the move into college, getting accommodations really becomes much more of an eligibility issue. Plus the idea that with the changes that exist between the K through 12 and college, a lot of the students don't necessarily know how to advocate for themselves; they may not know how the rules work. I mean, a lot of our students come to the university ill prepared in many things, and students with disabilities are no different in terms of even being able to talk about their disabilities or otherwise seek accommodations.

So for the last seven years I've chaired NIUs Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities and heard a lot of different things from students. One of the things that we've tried to do over the years is advocate for the idea of having a syllabus statement be just a requirement in everyone's, the accessibility statement be in everyone's syllabus, because it serves legislative purposes and accreditation purposes. I mean if you're applying for grants and HLCs coming to look, it's a good thing for us to have it there just for that standpoint. From a student standpoint or a class climate standpoint, it's also important because if that statement is there, then that student has some sense that perhaps this faculty member gets it or has some sensitivity.

You know it's much like the LGBTQ Ally Program. You go through that training, you put something on your door that says, "hey I'm a safe haven, I'm an okay person to talk to." The accessibility statement, as part of one's syllabus, at some level serves that same idea that if you've got that in your syllabus then students are a bit more comfortable. So with that in mind, like I say, I have in my role with the disability commission, advocated for this concept for a number of years.

This past January, Grad Council and UCC passed the syllabus policy to say: Hey, we do have an expectation that every course have a syllabus and one of the components within the syllabus was the idea that there should be what they call an ADA statement or accessibility statement. So we have this expectation that it's there so I thought I would take advantage of this and I have the good fortune of being able to teach a large gen-ed class. It's called Disability and Society. I have a little over 300 students every semester. So this semester I thought it might be helpful to see, so how are we doing with that idea of the accessibility statement? And I will say up front that the data that you have in front of you, the walk-in packet, that's all based on student information. I cannot 100 percent verify everything. On the other hand, because we had so many, you know I've got 320 students. They each gave me the cover sheet and then the sheet of the syllabus that had the statement in it, and so we have a tremendous amount of redundancy. I mean I can't tell you how many copies of certain classes we have and the students were pretty reliable so I suspect that what we got here is reasonable accurate.

So just as a heads up. It seemed like for all of our purposes it would be valuable to at least see where are we at right now. So from a benchmark standpoint, as I've got in the report I gave you, last month received 400 unique syllabi. We actually received far more than that, but in terms of actual unique syllabi representing a specific section of a course, we have 400 syllabi and then we went through, and again, did a basic separating them out into departments and then separating them out into which ones had the statement, which ones did not. Overall from a university standpoint, it was what 77 percent of all syllabi included the accessibility statement. So at many levels, that's not bad. I'm not here to cast any stones at all. I would, however, argue that there's no reason that figure couldn't be 100 percent if communication and expectation were there. Because one of the things we find is there's great variability. While 77 percent of all courses have this, at a departmental level, it's only about half of all departments have every course covered. So within a department it's not at all unusual to have some courses with it, some courses without, even within sections of the same of the course. So when you're talking about some of the larger classes that have multiple sections, some of the sections will include the accessibility statement, some will not. So from my standpoint, if you find one of your courses on

this list, please don't be mad at me. I'm not trying to make anyone upset, but think about it from the standpoint of lets communicate this in a more consistent fashion because it just makes us look bad at one level to, I mean, within the same section or within the same department and not be consistent and as part of the academy just overall in terms of how we want to treat students and the support and all we want to show them.

Putting the statement in the syllabus as a, not just as a recommendation but as a policy on our part, to me, I think would send a much stronger message because it is a really valuable thing and, you know, it's kind of a no-brainer at many levels as I look at it at least. So I just wanted to share this. I teach this course every semester and so as you find this data helpful, I found it as a useful experience for the students because it was an awareness experience where we can talk about it from an advocacy standpoint and does data help with advocacy because you know we have data now. I can say X percentage have this, X percent don't. So I anticipate that this will become a class assignment for the next upcoming semesters so as this body would find it helpful, I'm happy to let you know say we are at 77 percent this semester, where are we, you know, next year at this time.

So I want to let you know that those things are happening and, like I say, my request would be that this body consider a proposal that we, you know, have an expectation that the ADA statement or the accessibility statement, however you want to call it, is actually something that should be in every syllabus. And even in the UCC and Grad Council syllabus policy there are a couple of things that I would even question because they have some exceptions there and some of the exceptions relate to the internships or field work and so forth. Well those also are able to be accommodated if a student has a disability. So there are some things in the overall policy that we might want to talk about, but just as a general sense, I wanted to just throw this out there as a suggestion and ask for you all to consider it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Greg, just to be clear, in reading this chart, let's say you take a department like AHCD, there's a two there. Now that just may mean that only two students handed in the syllabus and they both included the statement.

**G. Long:** Right, although that would mean two – there are two sections of that – so I'm expecting that's from two sections because we have, you know, if you look at some of the other ones down there that have, you know there's a lot of – one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight – yeah.

**A. Rosenbaum:** What I'm saying is that this is not a random selection of courses so in your class if somebody wasn't taking something you couldn't have gotten the syllabus?

**G. Long:** Oh, absolutely right.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right, so if a department has only a one or a two next to it...

**G. Long:** Absolutely.



**A. Rosenbaum:** ...it doesn't mean that they're not doing anything, it may simply mean that you only got one or two syllabi from that department and they might have both had it so they might have 100 percent response, right? So there's no way to really tell from this.

**G. Long:** Exactly, and I'm just like I said, I'm just working on it from the standpoint of yeah we can most certainly, and I can lead the charge if you want to deconstruct some of the data and have some you know like discuss it in terms of what the limitations are, but I'm looking at it from just the overall picture of – so we have 400 syllabi, that's a pretty nice representation. We have 57 different departments represented and, yeah, for some departments its only one syllabi and I'm using what I've got, but just from the standpoint of there's no other body or mechanism on campus right now that's looking at this so I just kind of figured we would use this as a class project and share the results with you. So it's nothing more than that. This is just information sharing and if we as a body choose to do anything to incorporate a policy I'd like that, but from a data standpoint certainly we can have some issues with this.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, does anyone have any questions about this for Greg? Yes?

**E. Arriola:** Actually, I just have a general question. Does NIU currently have an interpretation of accommodations for disabilities that are inclusive of students who may become pregnant who are dealing with those issues or is there a separate policy that deals with the student who is pregnant while being a student?

**G. Long:** I do not know the answer to that one. I know that we certainly deal with things that are temporary disabilities, but I do not know any policy specifically as it relates to pregnancy.

**E. Arriola:** And where would I explore that if?

**G. Long:** I would guess potentially HR. Wouldn't that be it or would it be student affairs?

**E. Arriola:** Probably student affairs? I am curious just because I've had a – I teach at the College of Law and we often do have students who are facing difficulties that are connected to their wanting to be a full-time student and are also approaching child birth and the issues that come up for them, so I was just curious about that. Thank you.

**G. Long:** Sure.

**J. Novak:** I'd like clarification on something. Has there been a change in the protocol in what a student does to be proven to have a disability? What I've been told was that they used to come in and take tests, and now they come in and have an interview. Is this true?

**G. Long:** Well, the best person to ask on that would be say Randall Ward who's the acting director of the Disability Resource Center. But, from my understanding, the level of documentation you provide depends on the type of disability you have. So if you have, if you come in with an amputation or in chair, there's very little documentation that's necessary. If, on the other hand, you're saying I have a learning disability or a mental illness and need accommodations for that, you will, at your own expense, have to, as necessary, pay for the

documentation because, as a Disability Research Center, they don't do evaluations. Now I do know that they've moved to a stronger emphasis on interviews, but I couldn't tell you how that necessarily interfaces with the level of documentation that they require.

**J. Novak:** The other emphasis I've noticed is that students who get accommodations would get, always in the past, time and a half on a test. Now it's double time. It's always double time now. So I'm just noticing a change in the way things are done and it makes me think it's easier to be given accommodations, good or bad.

**G. Long:** Right and that may be true. Certainly one of the – I would invite Faculty Senate to have Randall Ward and/or Melanie Tucker-Thompson to come over who would be overseeing that kind of work and talk to us about how they look at these things because yeah you are right, there are some differences and shall we say some of the eligibility criteria or whether its time and a half versus twice as long and they would be in a much better position to explain why those decisions get made.

**J. Novak:** Okay, thank you.

**G. Long:** Yeah I'm sorry I can't give you more specifics.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Just to also expand a little bit on one of the points that Greg just made, there are places on campus where students can get those evaluations for learning disabilities done for free. So it would be at their own expense if they decided to go to a private clinic outside of the university; but, for example, the Psychological Services Center in the Department of Psychology performs those evaluations at no charge to students so it's not quite as bad as that. Yeah?

**S. Klaper:** Again, Randall Ward would be the right person to ask all these questions to or to invite to speak on this issue, but another thing is there are different offices on campus that will pay for some evaluations. I just learned about Student Support Services will sometimes pay for those evaluations if there's a cost associated, but also DRC will accept, depending on the situation, and it's very fact specific for each student, but will also accept some students' documentation that they had from high school or previous evaluations. It's not like if you had some sort of disability, invisible disability, that's not clear on sight and you've been addressing that issue your entire life, that you have to go and get a whole new barrage of tests done for that. That's not accurate. You can many times rely on previous documentation for that. And, depending on the student's situation and their access to that documentation because sometimes students don't bring it with them or they don't think about it or they think they want to try and handle the situation themselves before seeking assistance or due to a family situation, they might not have immediate access and I know the DRC has been trying to work really hard to work with students to be cooperative and help them as much as possible so that they can be successful here.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, now Greg made a point a moment ago about the syllabus policy. For those who don't remember, we've had this discussion before but the syllabus policy is found in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. And, essentially I think the University Council last semester had to authorize that for purposes of the Higher Learning Commission, but if you read that policy, which you should, it basically requires that you have a syllabus but what goes

into that is sort of left to the discretion of the faculty member although there are suggestions as to what you should put in it both for your own protection and for the protection of students. Greg, a moment ago, mentioned whether we wanted to perhaps require the disability statement. That would be something different. In other words, there is nothing in there, at this point, that is specifically required and so that would be a question that the senate – if the senate felt we wanted to pass a resolution requiring that, that would have to, of course, go to the University Council for approval, but we could do that. So I don't know if Greg is saying he wants to make such a motion, or a motion to send it to a committee for consideration, so can you give me some direction on that?

**G. Long:** Right, well and honestly I would like whatever is going to work. So from the standpoint of whether we talk about it as a resolution that we refer to a committee and we come back to it next month, or whether we talk about it more on the floor right here, or if as a group we don't feel there's value in it. I mean some feedback from that standpoint would be helpful too.

**W. Creamer:** I have not read the long policy but in my department, from my department I would have thought that the disability statement was already required. Would it be possible to do something like have a show of hands of people whose departments already very strongly suggest the disability statement? Is it a department by department thing or does?

**G. Long:** Well, I think it's a communication thing because, when we look at the data, we see that even within departments, in a single department, there are some courses that do and some course that don't. So for me it's a communication not intent. We're just not communicating that this is an expectation. Because I mean in our department same thing, we recommend you do this, but whether you do or don't, it doesn't really matter and ...

**W. Creamer:** That is interesting, but my department is relatively small and I would guess that it's strongly recommended and I don't know anybody who doesn't do it, but that is obviously a person to person thing.

**A. Rosenbaum:** It would seem that I don't know what reason a faculty member would have for not wanting the disability statement, number one. And, number two, we have a boiler plate disability statement so it's not like you have to craft it yourself. So it would seem that there are a couple of ways to do this. One is as faculty senators you could each go back to your departments and have a discussion about can we all agree to put the disability statement on our syllabi and it would seem like if that was made clear and this is where you find the disability statement, I don't know, unless someone could point out to me, why there would be an objection to that. I don't know why that wouldn't sort of get us to full participation in that domain. But we could also – we could pass a policy but then again, if people don't do it, I don't think the policy would have any teeth anyway. It's like we're not going to be able to fire people for not putting the disability statement in. But I don't see why we couldn't handle this as representatives going back to our respective departments and saying unless someone has a good reason, why aren't we all putting this on our syllabi? Any other comments, thoughts about this?

**G. Long:** And I'd say too that I'm fine with that because I mean we can also look at this from a data standpoint because next semester I'll be able to collect the same information and bring it back to the group and, if we see that you know it's gone down, or stayed the same, or whatever, that might then prompt us to take more action. So I will continue to provide data in the upcoming semesters just as a heads up to see how we're doing with this.

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

**C. Downing:** Greg, my understanding is that accommodation is required by law, that's correct?

**G. Long:** That's correct.

**C. Downing:** So an astute student would know that he or she would be given accommodation in any course, is that correct?

**G. Long:** In theory, yes.

**C. Downing:** Potentially. Where I'm thinking, I agree with Alan completely. I don't see reason why we wouldn't put this in our syllabi, it just makes sense, it's obvious. But given that people are or not going to do it, which is an unfortunate reality of our world, if there was a communication at a more top level, at the university level, when you come in this is your right, in other words, focus more there than at the decentralized syllabi level, couldn't we achieve this same result?

**G. Long:** I would say in theory, I would say, and again for me part of this trying to create the culture change that's systemic in nature because in preceding several years I have sent notes to the vice provost's office and the provost office at the beginning of the semester to say you know when you send out that thing to all of us that says here's what's up for the semester, would you put in a reminder about the disability statement and it gets forgotten. So it's, from my standpoint, there's a lot of very reasonable things and this should be a very easy thing to do but how does it get put into the system so that we don't have to have somebody like me pester you about it, because I don't like doing this. But from the standpoint of do I think it's important, do I think it has real value. But I think there's great value to it because really, truly you mention the astute student, and yes a student who understands his or her rights absolutely needs very little guidance from this. But there's a whole lot of them who are not astute. The rules are so different.

**C. Downing:** Completely understood but I would then respond, I'm not trying to mess with you, but I would say that the non-astute student wouldn't even get to the end of the syllabus anyhow.

**G. Long:** They'll surprise you.

**C. Downing:** But, if you could pick, what would you want us to do?

**G. Long:** What I would want us to do is to is to A put it within the syllabus and your...

**C. Downing:** No, no, I mean the senate, what you want the senate to do?

**G. Long:** Well, what are we comfortable with? Because can we make just a stronger statement, whether it's a policy or whether it's a resolution? But some sense that we as a body think that the ADA statement, the accessibility statement, has value and that we expect it as a body, that we expect that it should be there. That gets passed to the deans, to the chairs, and so on and so forth, but that that does then become a consistent expectation because right now it's a recommendation, but it's not an expectation because clearly when we look at the data we see such variability that it's not being communicated. So I'm wanting to have some sort of mechanism that formalizes the communication or systemic kind of approach that says, hey yeah by the way, you're going to put your name, your contact, when your class meets, also put the darn accessibility statement there. That's really all I'm asking for.

**C. Downing:** I would agree with that, I have no problem with making the motion. I do agree with Alan that it probably wouldn't have any teeth.

**G. Long:** No I agree, I agree.

**C. Downing:** Would you like a motion?

**G. Long:** Yeah.

**C. Downing:** I would like to put a motion on the floor for the senate to say that we strongly encourage our representatives to go to our colleges and departments and strongly encourage individual faculty members to include at least the boiler plate statement on disability accommodation in their syllabi.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, okay but

**C. Downing:** Oh oh; I knew I'd do something wrong.

**A. Rosenbaum:** No, no, no, but it sounds like what you're saying is the motion is for us to go back to our constituents.

**C. Downing:** Right.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Whereas, I think what you mean is for the senate to come out with a resolution that says we encourage all faculty to include the disability statement in their syllabi.

**C. Downing:** Thank you, yes.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so would that capture the whole thing, Greg?

**G. Long:** Yes.

**A. Rosenbaum:** That we encourage – the Faculty Senate resolves that faculty members are strongly encouraged to include the, what do you call it?

**G. Long:** They either call it the ADA statement or the accessibility statement.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Or both in their syllabi. Is that sufficient, or do we need something else? Yes, Rosemary?

**R. Feurer:** I think the problem is is that it's inadvertent and I guess if I were to think that there's a way of resolving this, it would be to ask the chairs of each department to send out a message at the beginning of each semester. I know that's helped me in the past when I'm revising a syllabus that didn't have it and it's prompted me. So I would hope that we would have something a little bit more specific in there, a recommendation that the chairs of each department at the beginning of each semester until we get 100 percent compliance are advised by the Faculty Senate to send out these reminders.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so we have a motion, now that's not the motion, you're recommending a change to the motion.

**C. Downing:** I accept the amendments. Can I do that?

**A. Rosenbaum:** You do?

**C. Downing:** I do. I think the way she said it was good.

**A. Rosenbaum:** All right so now you want to state that for the record for me?

**C. Downing:** Let's give it a shot. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages chairs of individual departments to, at the beginning of each semester, remind all faculty to include the disability, accessibility, the statement you gave the language, in each of their syllabi.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, I need a second.

**R. Feurer:** And instructors too, that's I think that's one of the main, I see in our courses that they need to send it to instructors.

**A. Rosenbaum:** All right, we'll include instructors in that as well.

**C. Downing:** Faculty and instructors.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We have a motion, we need a second.

**H. Bateni:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Well now that we have a second and a motion, we can have discussion.

**P. Carpenter:** If I understand the motion, the recommendation is that you strongly encourage the chairs to send this out, so if a chair doesn't, you've lost everyone.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So you're sort of not happy with the chair part of it?

**P. Carpenter:** I think if you ask the chairs to do it then if a chair in one department doesn't and that department has 250 courses, that's potentially 250 courses where the reminder is not going out. Also, it seems we have the boiler plate language so why can't we actually circulate that on a regular basis through the Disability Resource Center to all faculty and instructors to insert into their syllabi?

**A. Rosenbaum:** That would be up to the Disability Resources Center.

**G. Long:** And I would say too if we think about this, that you're right, from the standpoint of if a chair inadvertently fails to do this, then his or her faculty aren't going to be aware. But the hope is that this becomes more inculturated and so, even if the chair would forget, it's not like everyone in the department is going to fail to do it. It just perhaps is not going to yield the same inclusion rate that you might if the chair is actually promoting it. So I mean, you're right, the chair has plenty of responsibilities and he or she may forget, but even if they do forget I don't think it's going to cause the whole system to crash.

**P. Carpenter:** Which then begs the question why are we going to do and add this layer in?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Say that again, please.

**P. Carpenter:** To me, it then begs the question why we're actually putting this resolution, motion, this resolution to actually do this step?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so what would you like to – how would you like to change it?

**P. Carpenter:** I would prefer to see this worded in terms of that this becomes an individual faculty and instructor responsibility.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So that's kind of the original language we had before Rosemary added the bit about the chairs.

**P. Carpenter:** Correct.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, well...

**P. Carpenter:** I will declare a vested interest as being a department chair.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, other thoughts about this issue? Yes?

**E. Arriola:** Yeah, the vested interest issue is apparent in the sense that I don't that we have been sued yet, but one way to look at this is the preventive nature of having this kind of reminder to all instructors is that the reason why you want to do this is that, you know, God forbid we would

be sued later on for failure to accommodate a student. That's really one way in which to think about why it is in our best interest to get this message out.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right, and I also like the point that Greg made earlier which is that there's also a message to students that we are concerned about this issue. By putting it in the syllabus we're calling attention to the fact that we are complying with this which might make it easier for students to approach a faculty member. Apparently for many students that's a very difficult thing to do. Greg didn't show it, but he's created some videos which are quite interesting.

**G. Long:** Yeah, if any of you are interested, I seem to be a disability pest for this week and next, because I'll be at University Council next week. But one of the things that we've done and if you look at the Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities, the PCPD, if you look at our website, we've updated it recently with a number of training materials that we have made available through a collaboration of really, truly about 100 people on campus – students, faculty community members, alumni. One is a written tutorial and the other is we got some videos, and then also I have a MOOC, massive open online class, that I created this semester and one of the lessons is specifically devoted to post-secondary education and disability. And the links for those lesson segments, they run about five to ten minutes each, are on the disability commission web page. So if any of you want to see those, they are readily available and next at University Council I'll mention a bit more only because we had at least historically some fairly bad behavior directed towards students with disabilities in terms of failure to accommodate or disclosure in classrooms, a number of things I wish I didn't know about, but that I do feel then an obligation to say well let's address this. So that's what I'll be talking about next week. But the materials for that, like I say, go to the disability commission website and you can see and take a look at anything we've developed. It's not perfect but it represents a log of hard work.

**A. Rosenbaum:** But my point again being that some of those videos show how difficult it is for students to approach a faculty member regarding this.

**G. Long:** Oh I see, yes. Within the project, what we did as well as not just having me talk, we interviewed 15 students who had disabilities. And so as the lessons are structured. I will bring up a topic, say a few things about it, but then virtually every segment across all ten lessons, we'll have guest speakers who will then come in and give their particular perspective on how they've been treated, what they've experienced, so on and so forth. It's not just me as a professor haranguing people, but allowing the guest speakers who have disabilities to share their unique perspectives and I think that's one of the values of what we created because you really need to hear it from them far more than you need to hear it from me.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, now we still have this remaining issue of whether we want to work through the chairs or whether we want to make a statement to the faculty. So we have two different opinions on this. Does anyone else want to weigh in on that decision?

**C. Downing:** Just a question for Paul, if the chairs didn't send it, who would send it? Would it be us sending it to our colleges? Senate members? Where would the communication come from if it didn't come from the chairs in your opinion?



**P. Carpenter:** I think that would be as part of the policy statement in the APPM.

**C. Downing:** So faculty would just be expected to go read the APPM? So a passive communication to them rather than active?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, there's nothing that prevents us from sending the motion to the chairs and asking them to publicize it within their departments. There's nothing that stops us from doing that as well, so we could also put it in Faculty Matters which has a huge readership here at the university. So there are a number of ways we could publicize it. I mean the chairs are not going to read the APPM either so at some point it has to be sent to them. So I would say that that's not – publicizing it would be the same in either case. Personally, since you asked, my opinion would be that that we not bring the chairs into it because it feels to much like not trusting the faculty to do the right thing and sort of having the chairs having to sort of tell them what to do. Whereas, I think a simple statement to the faculty is all that's required and as we said before, faculty I think will do it if someone brings it to their attention. So we passed the motion, it goes in the APPM, we put it in Faculty Matters, you bring it to your constituents, we send copies to the chairs and we're good. I don't know that that part about the chairs needs to be in the motion. I would recommend taking that out. Yes?

**B. Pitney:** So far I'm hearing no dissention about the issue. It sounds like we would all agree that putting such a statement in the syllabus isn't a problem at all. In fact if we believe it's truly important to help change our culture and really put our money where our mouth is in terms of being a student-centered institution, why not require it in a syllabus? So why not make this part of the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual that each faculty be required to put that boiler plate statement in their syllabus? Is there a potential here to pull the motion, make a different motion, or take that approach?

**A. Rosenbaum:** The maker of the motion can withdraw the motion or can alter it.

**C. Downing:** I'd be happy to alter it. I'm unaware that we could require. If we could require, I would certainly want to alter the motion to include that if this body agreed with that.

**Unidentified:** Alan, could you speak to the process in terms of what we would need to do to get it to that point.

**A. Rosenbaum:** The process would be we would have to approve a specific motion that would then go up to the University Council. If the University Council approved it, it would go into the APPM. So we would be changing the language of the APPM and the University Council can do that. It would be a relatively simple process. I don't believe there would be any opposition to it at the University Council level either. So the only issue is, I don't know if some would characterize this as a – some kind of a restriction on academic freedom, if you're requiring? I guess somebody could then protest it or oppose it, but assuming that nobody did that, it would go into the APPM and that would be it. And I have no problem with us passing it and seeing what happens on the way up.

**C. Downing:** I think it's a stronger motion if we use that language and so I thank the speaker for the suggestion.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so you're gonna change the motion?

**C. Downing:** Correct.

**A. Rosenbaum:** This is okay, right, Ferald? We're okay so far?

**F. Bryan:** It's messy but okay?

**C. Downing:** How many times have I changed it?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Messy but okay. It's okay it's like a crossword puzzle. Okay so the new motion would be that the, how would we put this, that the faculty are required to include the ADA disability statement in all syllabi.

**C. Downing:** Yeah, it's pretty succinct.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Does that capture it?

**C. Downing:** That does.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Is everyone okay with that wording?

**R. Schneider:** I would much prefer a disability statement rather than the boiler plate disability statement.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay.

**R. Schneider:** I object to the syntax of the boiler plate statement.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, okay, we'll do that – a disability statement. All right. That's fine.

**H. Bateni:** I have a question. When we ask require, what would be a consequence of not including this?

**A. Rosenbaum:** You know, I guess it would be to say there are loads of things that are required that don't specify what the consequences are, so I would guess that, at some point, if a faculty member was refusing to do it, somebody could file a grievance against them or something. A student, once we have a student grievance policy, perhaps could file a grievance against.

**H. Bateni:** I personally think that – first I wanted to say that I really appreciate Greg coming in today. I think it increases our own awareness of this and it emphasizes the importance of this, but I am also at the same time worried that, if you require that, we're going to add to the problem in the future not decrease the problem. I don't really think that there would be any resistance from

faculty members as long as they know, I think they would be willing, at least I feel that everybody would be willing to include that. So it's kind of like just like attending the Faculty Club lunch that the last minute reminder could bring like 10 more people. I think that this is that sort of thing. Just a reminder to faculty members who have not included that would be enough for them to include that statement in their syllabi.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so your concern is that by including it and saying that it's required, it could create problems for faculty who fail to include it?

**H. Bateni:** Well, by requiring that, if someone is not well informed then it can open a quite new discussion that a student file a grievance and the faculty file a grievance themselves in return saying that were not aware of this, so I think it's going to involve different levels of people when it is called required. But when it is called a strongly suggested, it would be a totally different. That's my feeling, I may be wrong.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, it's your opinion. Other comments?

**G. Long:** Would it be easier to say that faculty are expected to instead of you are required to? Is that easier language?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Doesn't it already say that? It already has slightly softer language than required.

**G. Long:** I personally as a long time faculty member don't really see the issue of saying it's required would present a problem to me or you know – I'm thinking again kind of like Bill was saying. This is an opportunity to make a statement that we're doing the right thing. Legislatively, it covers our rear end, from an accreditation standpoint that's important from that standpoint as well. From the class climate and student comfort, it's an important thing and it's a no-brainer, it's a plug-and-play. I think that having it be required would not present a particular barrier for most people.

**G. Chen:** I am not sure right now we are still in discussion or going for the direction of the motion but right here my opinion is totally different from the notion of why we want to have the entire NIU syllabi to include this statement – all the syllabi and all the faculty members, including instructors, to all have this all the syllabi. I think individually, it's just a copy paste, I know, it's a notion for creating the culture, I appreciate a lot of this, but since this is a part of, from my understanding of the statement, it's part of the responsibility or the bylaws to protect those students who have disability that we have the obligation of responsibility to accommodate for their needs. We have a student orientation, no matter students are coming as a freshman student or coming as a transfer student, we have the orientation and each student as semester passes also be advised by their advisors, academic advising, why not, the complication can be taken from that channel instead of every single instructor and faculty members on every single syllabi to have the repeated same identical or similar message on the syllabi. I'm not against this good spirit of act, but I'm an engineer, my thinking may be a little bit mechanical or robotic, but I know doing the coding you want to have repeat coding, that does make too much logical sense to me as an engineer and we can certainly do this not over burdening one central office, DRC, but through the other channels as I have mentioned, orientation, offices including the

departmental academic advisors with the help of department chairs, so everyone, including student, will be well informed if that student is having that situation so that his or her privacy of having this disability may not be okay I see this syllabi, I know you are talking about me. I know it can be the message received by, for example, if Gary is having a disability, my tech will be different. Okay this is me. In the class we have 50 students, it's only me. This statement is for me. I would say that we may be able to think a little bit outside of the box, but that is just my personal opinion. I can go with the majority.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, thank you. We had one more comment in the back. Go ahead. Let's make these the last two comments before we do something because we have other items and we can also, we don't have to decide this today, this is not an urgent item, we can hold it over until next meeting, but let's have two last comments now.

**L. Chandler:** And, Greg, you probably have the same experiences as I do, but I do want to mention that there are faculty at NIU who tell students who have disabilities there's no such thing as learning disabilities, I will not give you any accommodations and that's one reason to have that statement in there. And students who do have disabilities and that statement's not there, it's scary for them to approach the faculty because: one, it's not there and what does that mean if it's not there, but then if they get told well there's no such thing and you're just lying. I've had students who just say it's not worth doing this because the professor will give me a bad grade anyway if I advocate for myself. I think having a little more expectation that this will be part of your syllabus and it will be part of your practice to actually offer those accommodations is important.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, last comment.

**M.E. Koren:** This will be very brief. I want to thank Greg very much for his presentation and I just want to say that in the nursing program we do require all the faculty to have the disability statement or accessibility statement in their syllabus and I think we've got real good compliance and we have not gotten any negative feedback.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so we have a motion on the table which I believe is that we are going to recommend changing the statement in the APPM to require faculty to have the disability statement in their syllabi. That's the motion, we have a second on that I think, right? Was that seconded? Does anyone remember? Give me another second.

**H. Bateni:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Hamid, you'll second that? Okay, good. So that is seconded. So this is what we can do, we can vote on this motion. If people feel comfortable with this, we can wordsmith it a little bit keeping the flavor of it intact, and we can pass this motion and take it on up to the University Council. If people would like this but they're still not comfortable with the language, we can vote this down, think about it until next month, and then bring it up perhaps in more well developed form at the next meeting. So we don't have to think about this as an all or nothing vote right now. If people are comfortable with that relatively straight forward statement and the idea of requiring it and putting that statement in the APPM, then we vote yes. If people are

uncomfortable or feeling like we still need to do a little bit more talking about this, then let's vote it down and we'll pick it up again. Not vote it down to kill it, but vote it down and then work on it for the next meeting. Okay? Does everyone have clickers? I don't have a clicker. That's okay, we'll see how close the vote is.

**G. Long:** If you're the tie breaker.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so we're voting on the motion to require faculty to place the ADA statement in their syllabi. This is going to be a revision of the APPM and it will go to the University Council if we approve it. One for yes, two for no, three for abstain. Are we ready, Pat? Okay, vote. One yes that will pass the motion, two no, three abstain. Anyone need more time or are we okay? Let's close it. The motion has carried. So we will wordsmith that and bring it to the University Council at our next meeting. Okay, great, thank you.

1 – YES – 27

2 – NO – 9

3 – ABSTAIN – 1

## **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

## **VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – [report](#) – Pages 8-9

**A. Rosenbaum:** All right, moving along, our next item, we have reports from our advisory committees, first up is Sonya Armstrong, FAC to the IBHE, Sonya.

**S. Armstrong:** Hi, I'll be brief. We met a couple weeks ago at Chicago State University. I think the big news that's kind of all the buzz with the FAC is that we've discovered that this is the fiftieth anniversary of the FAC so we'll be celebrating that in December in Springfield with members of the Illinois Board of Higher Ed and the staff from IBHE. If you look at the report, there are some updates on some important topics. One item I would direct your attention to is that we have been discussing in the larger Faculty Advisory Council and also specifically in the public universities caucus what topics to try to address this year. There are a lot of important topics, we're trying to prioritize, trying to determine what topics we can actually have an impact on and I will ask if you have any input, if any of you have any opinions, please pass them forward to me. That's all.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any questions for Sonya? I will remind you that we are still looking for an alternate so if you've had a mind change and you would love to be the alternate, let me know. If there are no other questions, we'll move on.

B. Student Association –  
Rebecca Clark, Director of Governmental and Academic Affairs – no report

**A. Rosenbaum:** Student Association, Rebecca Clark had to go to class, she was going to cut, but changed her mind at the last minute so she's not here.

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczzer, Chair and  
Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison  
– [report](#) – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next up, University Benefits Committee, Deborah Haliczzer and Therese Arado actually. Deborah, are you gonna...?

**D. Haliczzer:** Sure, happy. Therese is a wonderful representative on the committee and so is George. Okay you have the written report of the University Benefits Committee. I want to give you a little detail about the first item and that's the dependent audit because this is something that's going to affect all of us if we are insuring dependents come January. The annuitants are just in the middle of that now. What we're gonna be asked to do is to produce required documentation that we should be, and are eligible, to insure our dependents. The benefits committee very appropriately asked HR to provide detailed explanations of what sort of documentation is going to be required. For instance, we're told anecdotally that some of the annuitants were asked to provide tax documentation to prove that people are their tax eligible dependents. So we're going to look at what the annuitants have had to do and give more detailed explanation to our members and our employees here so that you're not sending information you shouldn't be sending. We'll be working on that. Thank you benefits committee. The Faculty Senate resolution on pensions was something that we discussed at our meeting and the benefits committee didn't just discuss it, we supported this resolution and I just got the final vote in on my e-mail that the Benefits Committee has voted to support this meeting with the legislators coming to campus to talk about pensions. It's being discussed now by the president. The administration is busily working to approve it so it is highly likely that that meeting will be supported by the administration.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any questions for Deborah? Okay, very good. Thank you.

D. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – [report](#) – Pages 10-11

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next, we have the report from the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee, George.

**G. Slotsve:** You can read most of this yourself. I just want to highlight a couple of things. One is, last spring ITS underwent an assessment review. The final report has been made. I believe it's being delivered to the Board of Trustees committee on November 7. After it's been presented to the Board of Trustees, the report itself will be publically available. When I find out where it's going to be posted, I will let Pat know and, hopefully, we can put a link on to the senate website if you want to take a look at the report.

One other thing I do want to highlight is they've changed the network rates. A number of, in particular, smaller departments had 10 megabyte connections, although a 100 megabyte connection was available, but it was a substantially higher price for those 100 megabyte

connections. They've lowered the price of those connections so, if you're in a smaller department, the department has a 10 megabyte connection, you may want to think of upgrading. Contact ITS, but the price has dropped substantially, so it will make communications much quicker.

Overall, Alan asked me to be his designee on this committee. Prior to this year, I served a three-year term as the LAS rep on the CFAC committee. I just want to highlight a couple of other things that are changing. One is cloud computing is coming. We've argued, in general this probably a good thing, it has been argued though and I just want to highlight, that for some researchers you may have projects where computing security is very important. Cloud computing might be an issue in that case, the security part of it. As part of reducing costs, either the college or the university, more than likely the university as a whole, eventually is gonna go to university-wide software licensing, which means some of the software that you have will probably be available in the cloud and X number of people will be allowed to use that software simultaneously. So you may not have software all sitting on your own portable machines any longer in order to try to reduce costs. It's also been suggested that we may be moved towards university-wide data licensing as well. If you've got a data license, it's often the same rate whether the department owns the data or the university owns the data, but for who can use the data and access the data, it does matter. And then finally, I just want to let you know, each college does have a rep. If you're having issues with ITS or ITS-type issues, please contact your college rep or contact me and I can try to look into the problems that you're having and bring them up at the meetings.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any questions for George? If people have problems with cloud computing or they're not able to do what they want to do, they need to let us know. We cannot tolerate ruining the work of faculty in order to save a few bucks. Hopefully, the university is going to do this in a way that that will not be the case, but we need to stay on top of it. So, if people have trouble with any of this, you need to let us know and we will go to the proper people and make sure that the faculty needs are met. So that's a critical thing. We have to make sure we can do what we do and some departments are much more computer intensive than others. But let us know if there are any problems as we go along with this. That's that.

- E. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – no report
- F. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report
- G. BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Rosita Lopez – no report
- H. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczzer and Alan Rosenbaum – no report
- I. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – no report

J. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

## VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report

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

C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – report

1. Resolution on Pensions

[Original](#) Version – Page 12

[Revised](#) Version – Page 13

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next item is a report from the Economic Status of the Profession, George. It's the item that was held over from last week which is the resolution on pensions that we were working with for the council on Illinois University Senates. George.

**G. Slotsve:** Everyone should have before them, or it was included with the package for this meeting, the proposed resolution on pensions. We heard from approximately, I'd say 12 to 15 people I received e-mails from, that commented on the original version and we went through the transcript from the previous meeting to see what the comments were. We tried to re-write it in a way that, hopefully, reflects some of the concerns that people previously had. As you know, we had basically three weeks to do this, so we've been under a tight schedule. So I really would like to thank the committee for their help on re-writing this. Our final vote on this from the committee was nine in favor of it at least, and one person abstained and, as Deborah's already mentioned, we brought this also before the University Benefits Committee seeking their approval of it or at least their support for the statement. If you have problems with it, let us know. We just got to try to work it out.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay so, George, do you want to move this new resolution on behalf of the committee on the economic status?

**G. Slotsve:** So done.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay do we have as second?

**W. Creamer:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we have the motion, we have a second. Any discussion? No discussion. Personally I'd like to add that I think that the resolution, the revision, is a much improved version of the original. I really think that the committee did a great job of fixing it and it reads better and I think it's a stronger statement so I commend the committee on that. Are we ready to vote? Clickers? One yes means you support the resolution; two no you're opposed to the resolution; three abstain. Are we ready, Pat? One yes, two no, three abstain. This is on the



revised resolution on pensions. Okay, everyone done? All right, Pat. Okay very good, excellent. Good work by the committee.

- 1 – YES – 32
- 2 – NO – 0
- 3 – ABSTAIN - 2

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

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – [report](#) – walk-in

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, next up is the report of Resources, Space and Budget, Jim.

**J. Wilson:** Yes on the 25<sup>th</sup>, last Friday, the committee on Resources, Space and Budget met with the president for the first time along with several members of his cabinet. Some of the highlights, well one thing is our committee’s evaluating what our role might be in shaping the budget We’re continuing to work on that and so one of the first things we asked the president, one of the main questions, was what role he saw the committee playing. So we’ll get to what his suggestion was or what the next step would be in a moment.

The president, first of all, reiterated the focus on student career success and the need to link the budget to these goals. He was also just fresh back from his trip to Springfield and some of the main points he brought up there was that he believes that the pension reform was still yet maybe a year away from actual decision on that and that it would be hung up in courts for another two years and these are maybe one thing that’s a little bit out of our control.

Another issue he brought up was that, and there is a slight slip of the quill that number 2 – B2 – that the state income tax not sales, income tax, that increase is due to come off the books, I believe, in 2014 or so and that will leave a \$5 billion shortfall in revenue. Being an election year, he felt that no representative was going to say that that was not coming off the books at the time of an election. That’s another thing that the university will not have much control over.

But moving forward – to go forward with things at the university he used the phrase, “to control our own destiny” – basically that we’re going to focus on enrollments and Alan already brought up his focus on recruiting from China a number of students. ‘

He also discussed the separation of facilities and finances and he did mention that an interim CFO would be coming on board this week and that announcement has been made, Nancy Suttentfield. And that is who he referred to us to meet with once she came on board and discussing our role and how we might assist her in shaping the budget.

Also we did talk about an interim provost.

There are a number of budget hearings going on within academic affairs. Where are the funds? Are they allocated properly? Are the rewards and incentives, are they appropriate and in place? These are currently underway and there are more details about it in the text here.

Towards the end here, towards number 3 at the very end, he did also discuss how space should be considered a resource and that this might be an opportunity to also generate revenues for the university by event planning and bringing people to the campus to: 1) generate revenues and 2) to also increase our public profile. He also emphasized the cluster hiring that was occurring at Santa Barbara as one means to diversify our budget, diversifying in terms of research. This approach is being taken now with the NGO program and the sustainability degree program. I think that's just about it. That's pretty much it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, thank you. Questions for Jim? Any questions? People are aware of the temporary CFO, the interim CFO. It sounds very much like a real good idea for us. You get someone who is a retired CFO from other universities. The one we hired is apparently extremely reputable, has been at a number of universities including Wake Forest and Chapel Hill, also worked for the Smithsonian. She has a tremendous amount of experience at the university level and we get this expertise on a temporary basis so she can start straightening things out while we hire a new CFO. And I met her and also the other person that we considered and they were tremendous, they were just brilliant. They seemed to really have a wealth of knowledge that will be very helpful to us as we try and right the financial ship of the university. I think it's a great idea that the president had in approaching it in this way.

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:** Okay, that's the last of our business items. Does anyone have any comments, questions or business to bring before the senate? Okay well I'll encourage you to attend the Faculty Club lunch.

## **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:** Okay, Jim.

**G. Long:** Second.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we have a bunch of seconds; all in favor.

**Members:** Aye.

**A. Rosenbaum:** See you at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.