

11-1-2017

FS Transcript 2017-11-01

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Transcript 2017-11-01" (2017). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 55.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/55>

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Arado, Bateni, Beamer, Bishop, Boughton, Buck, Carlson, Chen, Chitwood, Demir, Duffin, Fredericks, Gebo, Glatz, Haji-Sheikh, Hanna, Hathaway, Horn, Jaekel, Johnson, Johnston-Rodriguez, Konen, Krmeneč, May, McHone-Chase, Millhorn, Millis, Montana, Mooney, Moraga, Naples, Nejd, Newman, Novak, Olson (for Chung), Plum, Powell, Riley, Rodgers, Ryu, Saborío, Schatteman, Schraufnagel, Sebastiao (for Chomentowski), Shi, Sirotkin, Slotsve, Surjardi, Thu, Whedbee, Wilson, Zheng

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Azad, Baker, Briscoe, Bujarski, G. Chen, Chomentowski, Chung, Creed, Grund, Hunt, Lampi, Liu, Maddali, Mogren, Patro, Penrod, Rheineck, Scherer, Shibata, Song, Staikidis, Stephen, Than, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Doederlein, Gelman, Falkoff, Klaper, Riley, Thu, Torres, Van Zante

OTHERS ABSENT: Click, Groza, Kortegast,

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Saborío: Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Faculty Senate President **L. Saborío** called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

L. Saborío: First up, we need a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. But I need to amend it, so after we get the motion and the second, I'm going to amend it.

L. Beamer: So moved.

L. Saborío: Okay, we got there. And second, Therese. So the amendment is that we need to remove item V. B. the textbook presentation, because one of the presenters is ill and is not able to present. So that has been postponed until the January meeting, because in December we have Provost McCord coming to talk about Program Prioritization. So we will remove item V. B. All in favor of adopting the agenda as amended, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? And abstains? Okay, perfect.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2017 FS MEETING

L. Saborío: And we need a motion to approve the minutes of the October 4 Faculty Senate meeting. Therese, thank you. And a second? George. All in favor of approving the minutes, say aye.

Members: Aye.

L. Saborío: Any opposed? Any questions? Sorry I forgot to ask if there were questions or comments.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

L. Saborío: I have a number of announcements here. They are not on the agenda, but there are a number of things that I would like to talk with you about.

One, we have started a search for a policy librarian. The president decided that this would be offered to a tenured faculty member. It would be a position for full-time for two years. And then in the third year, the faculty member would be 50 percent policy library and 50 percent faculty, with an MOU between the President's Office and the faculty member's department. The position will be posted on HR sometime next week. If you have any questions, though, you are welcome to ask me. We do have a committee, and we have a faculty rep on the committee. Any questions? It will be posted next week. And if anyone is interested, then please check the HR website for the posting that will give you information on how to apply for the position.

Second, I want to announce that the ex-Illinois State University President Bowman was named Illinois Board of Higher Education Director. I don't know if anybody read that in the newspaper. Paul's not here; I was going to ask him to comment on that decision. So we do have a former president now as the director of the Board of Education.

M. Haji-Sheikh: That's not the one that was charged with assault, is it?

L. Saborío: I don't think so, no. He was on Gov. Rauner's transition team, interesting, right?

And next I was asked to talk about the Faculty Salary Study. We haven't forgotten about it. It's still ongoing. I know that Virginia [Wilcox] is finishing her portion of the study. Kristen Myers is also on sabbatical. So because of those two issues, we've decided to postpone the report until next semester. So we should have that full report ready to go by next semester.

So yesterday I had a video chat with the Council of Illinois University Senates, and one of the items we discussed was [House Bill 4103](#), and I wanted to bring this to your attention. It indicates there are two items to the bill, but actually there are three. The first one deals with a uniform admission process. They want to develop a uniform admission application known as the Common App to be accepted at all public institutions of higher education in Illinois. I see this as being similar to maybe the University of California system where there's one application and you check where you want your application to go.

The second part has to do with an automatic admission. They are proposing that any high school student with a 3.0 cumulative GPA or better on a 4.0 scale shall be guaranteed admission to a public university. So if an applicant is denied admission to one of the Illinois universities, public universities, then the Board would send that application to a similar institution for consideration. Interesting, right?

The third item has to do with the Higher Education Strategic Centers of Excellence plan. This is the part that has my concern. The Board would do a study of academic programs at each public university. They would determine which academic programs should be prioritized at each campus. And then they would prioritize state funds to strengthen successful and academically superior programs, while eliminating the [inaudible] of weaker academic programs. Red flag, right?

They talk about insuring medical, dental, nursing programs and maintaining science, tech, engineering and mathematics centers of excellence. And then also addresses vertical integration between community colleges and public universities.

So any questions? I'm going to keep an eye on this. This was introduced for the first reading on October 12, and it was referred to the Rules Committee. Is that what you were going to ask. I think that may not ever materialize, but we need to keep an eye on it. And we discussed it during the video conference yesterday.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Do you have a list of sponsors for that?

L. Saborío: No. It's on the General Assembly website. And it is new, so we'll see what happens. Number 1 and number 2, they seem okay, right? Go ahead, Laura.

L. Beamer: I was just going to ask if we can get a copy of this?

L. Saborío: Yes. Okay, I saw another hand over here.

V. Naples: Do we know whether the 3.0 grade point average is consistent for a student to be accepted at all of the Illinois public higher education institutions, or does it vary from school to school.

L. Saborío: No, they were talking about 3.0 to be admitted.

V. Naples: Right, but that's to all. But is that the case at present, that it's got to be 3.0 or above? Or are some accepting lower or have a higher cut-off than 3.0?

L. Saborío: I don't think it's a 3.0 across the board. It depends on the program; it depends on the institution. Of course, the higher-demand programs can insist on a higher GPA.

V. Naples: So this is a relatively significant change in the percentage of students that would be accepted and that would vary from institution to institution.

L. Saborío: And from program to program. Some programs would maybe be forced to accept students with a lower GPA than they normally would.

V. Naples: That's a slippery slope.

L. Saborío: Yeah.

A. Gelman: The common application, are they talking about the actual item called the Common App? Or is this idea about creating one for Illinois public institutions?

L. Saborío: That I don't know. Is there an app already called the Common App?

A. Gelman: It's actually called the Common App, and it has a lot of the better institutions around the country on it. I think there's some Ivy involved in that.

L. Saborío: So we would be competing with that?

A. Gelman: Well, either that or perhaps investigating what it would cost, what it would take to join the actual Common App, because it makes it easier for a student – one application. And we'd put our hands, our access to some of those students who are applying.

L. Saborío: Access.

A. Gelman: Right. So that's the question. If it's called a common application. It can be called that without being that.

L. Saborío: Quote Common App Quote. Right. So this is potentially a good move.

A. Gelman: If it's the actual one, it's the best news ever.

L. Saborío: Go ahead, Michael.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I had heard some of the rattling and some of the people the minority party in the legislature talking about this. I think some of the lack of funding was, at least from what these people were telling me a year ago, they were hoping some of the lesser universities would collapse, and they could make these regional centers. And I'm feeling that's probably related somewhat to that kind of concept that they were running.

L. Saborío: Also there's a real concern with the number of students that we're losing to out-of-state institutions, the out-migration.

S. Klaper: Also I don't know if you all saw what was happening in Wisconsin this week. The Board of Regents there issued a decree to the regional campuses, not Madison, but to the other campuses like Whitewater and all the rest of them, which programs they found to be low-performing and that would be eliminated as of January, or not accepting new students as of January, and then other ones that were at risk, like math and chemistry at the regional campuses, because

they found them to be not necessary. And a lot of teacher education programs at the regional campuses as well, so it's something to keep an eye on, because it seems like some parts of Illinois like to model themselves after what's going on in Wisconsin.

L. Saborío: This is definitely concerning.

V. Naples: Is this in any way related to trying to make it less expensive for students to apply to different universities. Are they going to have an opportunity to fill out this common application and then send it to a variety of universities under an umbrella price, as opposed to doing it independently now in most cases where it's a certain fee for one and then a different fee for the other?

L. Saborío: Right, exactly, that's the point.

V. Naples: So that was one of the points they were trying to make.

L. Saborío: It's easier for the students, much more convenient. Of course, there go your application fees, right? This is just a synopsis, so if you want to read the entire proposal, it's online. If no other questions, let's move on. We'll keep an eye on that for you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Recreation and Wellness [presentation](#)
Alex Van Zante, Facility Operations Graduate Assistant

L. Saborío: Next we have items for Faculty Senate consideration, and we have a guest speaker with us here today. It's Alex Van Zante, facilities operations graduate assistant. And he wants to talk to us about recreation and wellness.

A. Van Zante: Hello everyone. As stated, my name is Alex Van Zante. I'm a facilities operations graduate assistant at the Rec Center here on campus. I'm here today to talk to you guys about our new membership program for faculty and staff members. And I don't think that my clicker is working.

All right, so like I said, we have recently revamped our membership program for faculty and staff members. So as a faculty and staff member, you can enjoy an annual membership to our Rec Center for \$120 per year. That's a pretty competitive price, especially with the facilities around the area here in DeKalb. Also included in that membership is a free locker, towel service, unlimited access to our group fitness classes, which I'll talk more about here in a second, one free personal training, orientation or assessment, and then one free nutrition coaching session. And, if you don't want to commit for a year, you can also do it by semester. You can do multiple semesters at once. If you do decide to go with the full year, you only have to go 15 times to pay off your \$120 based off of our \$8 daily visit price. And also with that, if you are a member at our Rec Center, you can have a dependent, any number of dependents, up to the age of 24, and they can join for just \$60 per year.

Like I said, group fitness classes are included with your membership, so that includes a variety of classes like Yoga, Zumba, spin classes, we have some high intensity interval training as well. So we have a whole number of different classes. A lot of them are geared toward the kind of people who don't typically work out that often, and I know that can be common as you get older. [laughter] Sorry.

So we have stuff beginning as early at 6:30 in the morning, stuff ending even up until 8 p.m. at night. So there's a lot going on during the day. Those are offered Monday through Friday. Friday we only have one class, so it's essentially Monday through Thursday. But those, like I said, are included in your membership.

And another exciting thing about being a staff or faculty member is that you can do payroll deduction to pay for your membership. So you can do it in three different types of pay periods. You can do it just one pay period so that the total sum can be taken out of just one paycheck. Or you can do up to ten pay periods for the year, so every pay period, you would just have \$12 taken out of your paycheck, and that would be essentially over the course of six months since we get paid bi-monthly. So for as little as \$12 per paycheck, you can become an annual member at our Rec Center. Yes, that's with taxes too.

And then also included is that we have satellite locations so we recently merged with the Department of Kinesiology here on campus, so what that entails is that you can work out at our satellite campuses as well. So we have a fitness room in the New Residence Hall. We have a pool at Anderson Hall, and that's pretty attractive because only faculty and staff members can use that pool. And then we also have stuff at Gilbert Hall as well.

And I can field any questions if you have any. If not, you can email me or my supervisor.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

A. Van Zante: We do not.

V. Naples: How does that relate to the FIT Program? And does that also include the weight room in Anderson.

A. Van Zante: Yes, so we, like I said, we recently merged with the Department of Kinesiology, so that does include the FIT Program, they are under our department now. And the weight room in Anderson is included.

V. Naples: Good. One of my favorite places.

E. Fredericks: Could you tell me how often the pool is open, or what days or what time?

A. Van Zante: It's a good question. I don't work there since I, obviously, just work at the Rec Center daily. So I can't give you a definitive answer for that. I know that it's open Monday through Friday for sure, and I believe that it's open during Anderson Hall's normal hours, which are pretty – they go throughout the day quite a bit. If you want to email me, I can get you an answer for that.

E. Fredericks: Okay.

A. Van Zante: All right, that's all I have. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Thank you very much, Alex.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Katy Jaekel, Chair – no report
- B. Academic Affairs Committee – Clanitra Stewart NejdI, Chair – no report
- C. Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession – Laura Beamer, Chair – no report
- D. Rules, Governance and Elections Committee – Keith Millis, Liaison/Spokesperson – no report

L. Saborío: Okay, reports from standing committees. First I want to ask Therese, do you have anything you want to say, Therese, about the Rules, Governance and Elections Committee? I'm kind of putting you on the spot, here. Keith Millis isn't able to attend.

K. Millis: I'm here.

L. Saborío: Oh, you're here.

K. Millis: I missed the last meeting, but I have nothing.

Unidentified: But he is here.

K. Millis: I am here.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Keith, for that report.

- E. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Sarah McHone-Chase, Liaison/Spokesperson – report

L. Saborío: So we'll go to Resources, Space and Budget Committee. Sarah, you have a report.

S. McHone-Chase: Our October 6 meeting, we had the president and provost visit. And we had an option to ask them some questions. They affirmed that the RSB chair will be included in relevant Executive Budget Committee meetings (EBC).

We talked about how we're going to build the provisional budget in February for the next fiscal year, but we also talked about how the next fiscal year is a mystery at this point.

We talked about how the quarterly budget that we're now required to do is not popular and resented among people who have to make budgets. And we explained why it's unpopular and resented, and I think that those concerns were heard. I think that one of the major reasons that faculty and other people who make budgets feel that way is because a quarterly budget doesn't really make sense on an academic calendar, and also because faculty and others were not consulted before the quarterly budget was implemented. And so I don't know that that's necessarily going to change, but if anyone has any ideas about how to advise the administration on changing the quarterly budget – and I don't know that we can necessarily – the RSB would welcome those ideas and take them to the administration.

L. Saborío: I think they are willing to listen.

S. McHone-Chase: I think they will listen. I don't know that we can – I mean this was implemented by the Board of Trustees, so I don't know that the administration can necessarily change it either. But I think that the BOT was also kind of surprised that we didn't have a quarterly budget and also that we didn't necessarily want one. Let me finish the report, and I'll be happy to take questions.

John Heckmann talked about our deferred maintenance. Our budget is based on the two percent of plant replacement value so our goal would be two percent, but right now we're actually operating on a .5 percent. So that gives us a shortfall of \$16 million.

We also talked about improving graduate stipends and that being a priority of budget development. But it's not going to be something that we do in the short term. It's going to take a little bit longer to do that.

We talked about charging out-of-state students the domestic tuition, which is something that we've already done, so that's been done since that last meeting.

This meeting that we have coming up this Friday, we're going to talk about the \$11 million budget reduction. We're going to talk about reserves and cash on hand. And also our chair, Jim Wilson, is going to be on sabbatical this spring, and we're going to need to talk about who will be the chair in his absence.

I think that's about it. Does anyone have any questions?

K. Thu: Thanks for the report. I just want to repeat what I said in the University Council and maybe, Jim, you might want to add something. The quarterly budgeting comes from the Board. They come from the business corporate world, and that's natural for them. And we don't fit that mold as a university. It actually wouldn't be that bad for units like mine if we didn't have to go and get permission to move the money from one quarter to the next. So in some instances, we don't even know what money is going to come in in a quarter. So we have indirect from grants that comes in. We don't get that money until that money is spent. And there's no way for us to know which

quarter it's going to come in. So then I have to go back to the college office and say, "can I get permission to move money from quarter 2 to quarter 3?" It doesn't allow units the flexibility. I did talk to Lisa [Freeman] and Chris [McCord] about this, and I think you're right, I think they're very receptive to doing something. And one conceptual approach is to move this above the unit level, not have every single unit having to do quarterly reporting. If there could be some sort of an aggregate in a college, for example, that would help a lot. But it's wasting time. It's wasting money. And it's very frustrating for chairs and, particularly, for office managers.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I was present at the Board meeting when much of this was discussed. They did not say all the way down to the local unit at the meeting. They just wanted the quarterly report. They didn't define anything. When you get the corporate leader level, they don't generally define the details below the people they're talking to. So what they wanted to have was a quarterly report. This is what our administration decided to do as a quarterly report for the Board. This is how they decide to handle this issue. So the question is, and you're right asking the president and the VP level, to figure this out. They have the [inaudible] from the Board to do the quarterly reports. I don't know if you were at some of those, but I saw there at a lot of those, pretty long meetings, and I think it's important that we reiterate that these issues are issues on the local level. And I think we can fix them. I don't think the Board is saying specifically. I can't imagine anybody at that level micro-managing a department.

J. Wilson: The information that we were given when we started these meetings was that all cost centers had to show some kind of positive balance going forward from one quarter to the next. But I've also since talked to Provost McCord that, yes, maybe we can handle this at a different scale instead of at this sort of microscopic scale, and at some aggregate level. So I think that's pretty much what they are thinking now, is to try to bring this up at a different scale than where it's done now.

L. Saborío: Right, that's what I got at the meeting too.

A. Gelman: I think since this purports to be data-driven decision making, I think if they take a look even halfway through the year at the number of exceptions, similar to the sort of permission-asking and granting that Kendall is talking about, if they look at the sheer number of exceptions that had to be entertained, multiplied by the number of hours it takes to generate one request, receive the grant, the delay in acting, I think it will be crystal clear that it's actually a time-suck as opposed to increasing efficiency.

L. Saborío: Anyone else? Comments? Questions?

C. Plum: Just wondering, given the complexities that this policy offers and is posing for departments, department chairs, office managers, if maybe there's a timeframe in thinking about revising this or reconsidering what's going on?

L. Saborío: Do you know, Jim?

J. Wilson: I can ask that question this Friday. I'll write it down.

C. Pluim: That would be very helpful, because as we're thinking about budgeting for the next fiscal year and the various areas, it would be helpful.

J. Wilson: I'll write it down.

C. Pluim: Thank you, I appreciate it.

S. Schraufnagel: I would just add my voice to – it needs to be done, gotten rid of, and gotten rid of quickly. Right now it is causing faculty and grad students to not get reimbursed for travel. And we're running into the risk of, you know, they're going to be paying interest on credit card debt now, because this has frozen our budgets and is creating a real mess.

L. Saborío: Okay, those are all great comments. Anybody else?

Unidentified: Does anybody support quarterly budgeting? [laughter]

M. Haji-Sheikh: Well, at the top level I don't see that's a problem, but at the micro-level.

A. Krmeneč: I think what we need to remember in the Faculty Senate is that the academic division is just one of the divisions. Based on a few things that we know of expenditure problems in the past, they're generally not in the academic division. So let's be careful with this, that we're not prompting a change that's going to return us to an era where other divisions are less responsible to their budgets than they should be.

L. Saborío: Yes.

S. McHone-Chase: One thing I wanted to note is that the quarterly budget process was initially implemented to be like a budget check process. It wasn't implemented to punish anyone. I don't believe that it has been implemented to be particularly onerous. I don't think that the BOT – and I'm not trying to insult the BOT either – I don't think that they understood exactly how we operate, how our calendar operates. So I think they would be a little surprised to find out how much of burden this is. I agree that I think they were trying to help us be more responsible.

L. Saborío. Okay, any other comments? These are all really good comments.

C. Pluim: So I super appreciate that you made that comment, and I recognize the willingness to help us and wanting to help us. But I think there begs the question, why weren't we asked.

S. McHone-Chase: And I agree with that as well.

C. Pluim: So all I'm saying is that it's shocking to me that this is a surprise that this is a concern for us.

L. Saborío: I think we heard that from Kendall too, right? Why weren't we asked? Okay, and that concludes your report, right?

S. McHone-Chase: And that concludes my report.

L. Saborío: No more questions, comments? All right.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – [report](#) – Pages 3-4

L. Saborío: So, reports from advisory committees, the FAC to IBHE. Paul Stoddard, from what I understand, he's no longer able to attend, but I could be wrong. Paul, are you here? He's not here, but he did give us a report, which is on pages 3 and 4 of your agenda packet if you are interested in knowing what happened at the FAC to IBHE, the report is available.

B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – no report
Barbara Andree, Cathy Doederlein, Alex Gelman,
Mark Riley, Linda Saborío, Kendall Thu

L. Saborío: And Item B., do we have anything to report, Kendall, the UAC to the Board of Trustees? We meet next week I think.

K. Thu: Yes.

L. Saborío: Yes, so we haven't had a meeting yet.

K. Thu: [inaudible]

L. Saborío: No, I can't think of anything either.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. United Faculty Alliance update

L. Saborío: So comments and questions from the floor. From what I understand, I know we have Virginia here, but another member of UFA was going to be here today to talk about contract negotiations, Fred Markowitz, but I don't see him. Well we do have Virginia, and I do have a question.

V. Naples: The one thing that I would just like to say, and I know this comes from., not only myself, but the other members of the Executive Board, is that we would like to thank everyone who was helping to try and implement the United Faculty Alliance being included in the three percent raise across-the-board. And that includes the faculty, the Executive Board, the membership, the other union representatives and executive boards, as well as our administration and the Board of

Trustees, that are seeing a good way for us to move forward as a community, and looking out for the well-being of all of the components of that community. So it's a very big thank you and a lot of appreciation. And you said you had a question?

L. Saborío: I do. So another item that came up yesterday during the video conference with the University of Illinois Senates is the question of promotion and tenure. Is that something that we will be negotiating in our contract, because the representative from Northeastern, I think it was, was saying that they are questioning the value of the tenure system at her university. And so I was urged by other representatives at this council to discuss this with the union.

V. Naples: Yes, tenure and working conditions and promotion arrangements are things that are very much on the minds of the Negotiations Committee. And they are putting together proposals that will be submitted, or some have already been submitted to the administration about some of these issues. To my knowledge, there has not been a response as to whether they agree or disagree, or counter measures sent back to us. But these are things that are in addition, of course, to remunerations, things that are near and dear to the hearts of the faculty. And they are also important to all of the other unions on campus and the other un-unionized employees as well. And they are negotiable. They are appropriate for bargaining issues.

There are a variety of different ways that tenure is, frankly, under assault all across the country. It is not just Illinois. It is not just this university. It is not just Wisconsin. The original purpose of tenure used to be that it was to protect people engaging in academic freedom. If they had a research program that was not considered mainstream or they came up with controversial ideas, they were to be protected by the tenure process. That has not become as strong an issue at present, but now we are looking at maintaining the quality of faculty and faculty opportunities and faculty development, especially as relating to interactions with students and research and working conditions. So these are very much issues on our mind.

L. Saborío: Thank you. George?

G. Slotsve: I just wanted to find out, for planning purposes, there's a three percent raise, what will union dues be?

V. Naples: Well this is an excellent question. The first thing that I would like to assure everyone is that there will be no union dues assessed to any members until a contract is finalized and ratified by the union membership. So it is negotiated with the bargaining team and the administration. And the Executive Board will also become involved and take a look at that. And then once all of those groups have agreed that that is an appropriate contract, then it is sent to the membership, and the membership is the final group that has a yay or nay say on what will happen. Only after the contract is approved by the membership and put into place will union dues be assessed. And the other thing is that we are, of course, going to be looking for a multi-year contract. And that will include raises, not just for one year, but raises for several years into the future during the entire duration of the contract.

G. Slotsve: I still don't know what union dues will be, though.

V. Naples: We had a guarantee when we were in the process of negotiations that it would not be more than 1.5 percent of the total. And so 1.5 percent cap. It will not exceed that. We don't know exactly. It may be below that. We don't know what the total raise will be. But the raises that we're going to hopefully receive in December are before we have any union contract ratified and in place, so there will be nothing taken out of that for union dues.

I do also want to say that every person who is a member of the bargaining unit is included in the raise whether they are a member of the union or not. And sometimes that wasn't entirely clear. There were people that had not yet joined the union and, even though they were members of the bargaining unit, they believed that they would get the raise if they were not union members. That's not the case. The entire bargaining unit either gets the raise or does not, regardless of union membership. But, of course, we want everyone to join the union. We are all stronger when we work together. And that's also in conjunction with the other unions on campus. We've had marvelous cooperation from them as well.

J. Novak: You mentioned, Virginia, a raise in December. I had heard that the raises were going to be in the last check of this month, November. Is that not true any longer?

V. Naples: I'm certainly hoping it is. I've heard variably, last of November or beginning of December, but I'm hoping for as soon as possible.

J. Novak: Okay.

L. Saborío: I also heard that, John, that it was November 16. So the paycheck coming November 30 would have the raise, but if not it would be retroactive on the following paycheck.

M. Haji-Sheikh: I have another issue. I just want to bring up something. I was watching the newspaper coverage over the Holmes situation where they're talking about doing the remodeling in Holmes. Now what I saw was that they're trying to take bond money to pay for the coffee shop in the library. I don't think that's possible, so somebody ought to explain to us whether they can use bond money in an instructional building or not. Because there was a 2008 board meeting that listed all the places they couldn't use bond money, and one of the places was the library.

Unidentified: What do you mean about the library? The library's not [inaudible].

M. Haji-Sheikh: They're going to put a coffee shop in the library.

S. McHone-Chase: Oh, okay.

M. Haji-Sheikh: Yeah, and they're going to use bond money to do that. And the problem I see is that if they find out they can't use bond money, which is usually what they end up doing after they open up their mouths and talk about it, then they're going to turn around and get money from some other location. And are they going to get it from instructional units? Are they going to get it from repair and maintenance? You know, I mean, you know, somebody needs to explain where that money's coming from since they've said in 2008 they couldn't use it on the – when they got the

Build America they were doing 2009-10, they were doing the BAV, the application, there was actually a board meeting, which said those building was not eligible for bond money.

S. McHone-Chase: [inaudible]

M. Haji-Shiekh: Right, because it was built under construction development board money.

L. Saborío: I will ask [inaudible]

K. Thu: Just an informational item, I think all of us have been hearing in the news about the shootings on or near campus, and I wanted to bring to your attention – and Lisa Freeman sent out what was a very carefully worded message this afternoon – I want to bring to your attention the article in the Daily Chronicle today that covered the shooting from last night in University Village and the awful, racially-laden comments that followed that article. And for those of you who have classes where this can be discussed, this is certainly a moment to bring this to the attention of many of our students and have a discussion. Related to that, there is, the mayor of DeKalb, Jerry Smith, has appointed a development task force for the North Annie Glidden road corridor. They've hired an outside consultancy group to help bring community members together to figure out what the needs are in that corridor. The first meeting was held at Westminster Church several weeks ago, and there were about 140 people that showed up. These kinds of issues, the racial tensions in this town that has a history, needs to be a part of that process. The next meeting is tomorrow night at 6:00 at Westminster Church, and I encourage as many of you to attend as possible. And by the way, at the last meeting, a lot of students from NIU showed up.

L. Saborío: Thank you, Kendall. This is something that we need to continue to discuss. It can have a potential impact on enrollment, retention, parents, students and even in our local community [inaudible]

S. McHone-Chase: Starting today and through November 16, the library is having a food drive that will benefit Huskies Food Pantry. What we'll do is, I'm primarily wanting to have a successful food drive, but if you have fines or fees at the library, we will forgive – not all of your fines and fees – but some of your donation will help relieve some of your fines and fees at the library, and I can do that because that's my job. So I would very much like to see. I've tried this in the past, and it hasn't been as successful as I would like it to be. But I would very much like to see a successful food drive at the library. And this will benefit you, the faculty, and it will benefit your students, and it would benefit this food pantry that I would like to see it be a success. Yes?

M. Haji-Sheikh: Sarah, what type of goods do you guys want?

S. McHone-Chase: I would like unexpired canned goods, non-perishable food. The food pantry has a link of what they would like the best. We have put a link to that on the library's home page as well. So like larger items that are more expensive, like peanut butter, would count for more. We're going to count everything from like \$2 to \$10. Things like toilet paper that people don't donate very often will count a little more. Spices, which are expensive, they will count more toward your fines and fees, those sort of things. If you bring in like a big, big jar of peanut butter, that will count more. If you bring like a tiny little can of tuna, that will count a little less. But here's the thing,

please do not bring in expired food, and please bring in non-perishable things, and please bring in food. Thanks you.

Unidentified: [inaudible]

S. McHone-Chase: It starts today and runs through November 16. Thank you.

L. Saborío: Any other questions? I think we're going to get out of here early. Sorry, I don't know what happened here. The textbook presentation was canceled is what it was. We could stay and talk, but I imagine that people are going to start running out the door.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- C. [Minutes](#), Baccalaureate Council
- D. [Minutes](#), Board of Trustees
- E. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- F. [Minutes](#), Comm. on the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- G. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council
- I. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council Curriculum Committee
- J. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- L. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- N. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- O. [Minutes](#), Univ. Comm. on Advanced and Nonteaching Educator License Programs
- P. [Minutes](#), University Committee on Initial Educator Licensure

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

L. Saborío: Can I have a motion to adjourn? George. And a second – we got three seconds, pick which ever one you want. We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 a.m.