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I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 27, 2013 FS MEETING
   (distributed electronically)

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. President Peters – Farewell remarks
   B. Recognition of Faculty Senate members who have completed their terms, who
      have been re-elected, or who are newly elected – Page 4

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION
   A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/
      Executive Secretary of University Council
   B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VII. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Approve list of candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the
      university Pages 5-8

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
   A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 9-10
   B. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker –
      report
   C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry
      Freedman and Andy Small – no report
   D. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg
      Waas – no report
E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair
   1. Report regarding open access scholarly publishing – Pages 11-17
   2. Resolution concerning shared access to data relevant to academic affairs – Page 18
   3. Proposed motion requesting a senate appearance by appropriate NIU administrators able to present information on the academic characteristics of admitted students – Page 19

C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report

D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson
   1. Report on meeting with president and provost – Pages 20-23
   2. Year End Summary – Page 24
   3. Resolution concerning the shared governance role of Resources, Space and Budgets Committee in setting recommendations for budget priorities – Pages 25-26

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair
   1. Nomination of the Executive Secretary of the University Council for 2013-14
   2. Election of UCPC representatives for 2013-15 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (only COB, COE, CHHS, and CLAS have vacancies to fill this year); votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in
3. Committees of the University 2013-14 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; votes will be counted following the meeting and those elected will be notified – walk-in

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Campus Recreation Center resolution – Pages 27-28

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIII. 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, Graduate Council
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
R. Letter of acceptance of ES/P nomination – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 29-30
S. Meeting Schedule – 2013-14 – Page 31

XIV. ADJOURNMENT
RECOGNITION OF FACULTY SENATORS
April 24, 2013

COMPLETING SERVICE:
*Vicki Collins, Department of Educational Technology, Research and Assessment
*Charles Cappell, Department of Sociology
Ana Calvo-Byrd, Department of Biological Sciences
Brian Chung, School of Theatre and Dance

LEAVING FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCIL:
Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Department of Electrical Engineering

RE-ELECTED:
Brian Mackey, Department of Operations Management and Information Systems
Bill Pitney, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education
Milivoje Kostic, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Therese Arado, College of Law
John Novak, School of Music

NEWLY ELECTED:
Lichuan Liu, Department of Electrical Engineering
Jozef Bujarski, Department of Biological Sciences
Robert Schneider, School of Theatre and Dance

*Eligible for another 3-year term; department has not held election yet.
COMMUNITY STANDARDS & STUDENT CONDUCT ADVISORY BOARD (CSSCAB) – 3-year term

Four at-large faculty members appointed by the president of the Faculty Senate from nominees put forward by any of the degree-granting colleges and University Libraries.

The CSSCAB meets as needed.

To view a complete description and membership list for this committee, visit http://www.niu.edu/u_council/committees/2013-14/CSSCAB.shtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>TO REPLACE</th>
<th>FACULTY SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-large</td>
<td>Marc Falkoff</td>
<td>Jane Rose Njue – HHS, FCNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-large</td>
<td>Christine Kiracofe</td>
<td>Elizabeth Cribbs – LIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-large</td>
<td>Carol Thompson</td>
<td>Amanda Salacinski – KNPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-large</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wilkins</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIBRARIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LAC) – 3-year term

One faculty member from each of the three divisions of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; one faculty member from each of the other degree-granting colleges of the university; one member of the library faculty nominated by the Library Council. Faculty members are appointed by the provost upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate.

The LAC meets the third Friday of the month, 2-3 p.m.

To view a complete description and membership list for this committee, visit http://www.niu.edu/u_council/committees/2013-14/lac.shtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>TO REPLACE</th>
<th>FACULTY SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Susan L’Allier</td>
<td>C. Sheldon Woods – LTCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EET</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Arlene Keddie</td>
<td>Lynn Herrmann – NUHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS – Humanities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS – Social Sciences</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS – Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Doug Bowman</td>
<td>Yanbin Yin – BIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>Vacant – need nominee</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULIB</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT CONDUCT BOARD (SCB) – 3-year term

One faculty member from the College of Law and two faculty members from each of the other degree-granting colleges recommended by the dean of the college and appointed by the Faculty Senate.

The SCB sets its meeting schedule per members’ availability.

To view a complete description and membership list for this committee, visit http://www.niu.edu/u_council/committees/2013-14/SCB.shtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>TO REPLACE</th>
<th>FACULTY SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>Sarah Marsh</td>
<td>Yipeng Liu – OMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EET</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EET</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Hamid Bateni</td>
<td>Hamid Bateni – AHCD - 3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>M.J. Blaschak</td>
<td>Danai Fannin – AHCD - 2-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HHS has identified someone to serve 2 years and someone to serve 3 years in order to restore the staggered term pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Marc Falkoff</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>Vacant – need nominee</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY PRESS BOARD (UPB) – 3-year term

Four faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; six faculty, one from each other college, and one faculty member from the University Libraries. The college councils, the faculty of the College of Law, and the Library Council shall forward at least two names for positions to be filled by the Faculty Senate, which will make recommendations to the president for appointment.

The UPB meets twice each semester; schedule is set per members’ availability.

To view a complete description and membership list for this committee, visit http://www.niu.edu/u_council/committees/2013-14/UPB.shtml

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>TO REPLACE</th>
<th>FACULTY SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Linda O’Neill (for Rose)</td>
<td>Maylan Dunn-Kenney – SEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EET</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Lin Shi</td>
<td>Lin Shi – FCNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>John Austin (for Schmall)</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Heide Fehrenbach</td>
<td>Barbara Posadas – HIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>David Maki</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULIB</td>
<td>Junlin Pan</td>
<td>Robert Ridinger – LIB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on the FAC-IBHE Meeting, April 2, 2013

The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) met on April 2, 2013, at Elgin Community College.

FAC and IBHE Updates
FAC Chair Abbas Aminmansour (UIUC) called the meeting to order and provided the following updates:
- A SB 1900 group is being formed.
- Caucus chairs will be meeting with IBHE Interim Executive Director Harry Berman and the IBHE staff in Springfield this month to move this forward.
- The Illinois Education Research Center’s presentation/discussion of their High School-to-College Success Report will take place at the May FAC meeting in Monmouth.
- Planning is on track for the September FAC meeting in Champaign. There will be a panel discussion about higher education in the future—how we’ll teach, what we’ll teach, and who will be teaching.

IBHE Liaison Ocheng Jany announced that the position search that opened upon Dan Cullen assuming the deputy directorship is now closed and review of applications are underway.

Public Four-Year Caucus Updates
The Public Caucus discussed how faculty productivity is reported at each institution. Caucus members are asked to report back at the May meeting on what information is collected, how frequently, by whom, and who has access to these data.

FAC Meeting
The minutes from the March 15th meeting were approved. The nominations for FAC officers are Abbas Aminmansour (chair), Marie Donovan (vice-chair), and Steve Rock (secretary). Also, nine names for Illinois Articulation Initiative panels (four from Publics, four from Privates, one from Community Colleges) have been submitted; the FAC will consider submitting these (and any others that come forward) after the May meeting.

Next was a discussion of possible items to bring to the Board’s attention at the luncheon. From the Publics: the IBHE Faculty Fellowship, pensions and repercussions in hiring, unfunded mandates, students going out of state, IBHE’s spheres of influence within the legislature, collaboration between four-year institutions and community colleges, standards for IBHE approval of new programs, faculty/administrative balance in hiring, and paperwork expansion. From the Privates: IAI role and connections, possible smoking ban, and quality control for institutions wanting to do business in Illinois. From the Community Colleges: the “6% rule” and its limitations, healthcare implementation, and student readiness for alternate delivery. Additional ideas included recent mandates with teacher education assessments and the interaction of state boards.
FAC members moved to lunch with IBHE staff and members. During this lunch, FAC members raised concerns about pensions as well as a new teacher education assessment (edTPA).

**IBHE Meeting**

The IBHE meeting was called to order by Chair Carrie Hightman. Following several introductions and welcome remarks was an update by Hightman on the higher education budget proposed by the Governor. Next were updates on the Illinois Longitudinal Data System and MAP funding. A dual-degree program that is a partnership between Governor's State University and several Chicago-area community colleges was showcased. Following the action items and consent agenda, Robin Meade from the Illinois Adjunct Association, provided a brief explanation of the impact of healthcare changes on adjunct faculty. At that point, the Board went into executive session and all visitors were excused.

Full meeting minutes are posted to the FAC-IBHE website (once approved) for public viewing. These can be accessed at [http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html](http://www.ibhe-fac.org/Meetings.html). In addition, the audio of the full IBHE meeting is available at [http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/audio/130402.mp3](http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/audio/130402.mp3)

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya L. Armstrong  
Assistant Professor in the Department of Literacy Education  
NIU Representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council
Regarding Open Access Scholarly Publishing:
University Senate Academic Affairs Committee
Report to the Northern Illinois University Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs Committee: T. Arado, A. Azad, S. Fang, B. Mackie, S. Martin, S. McHone-Chase, I. Onyuksel, R. Siegesmund, S. Tonks, C. Cappell, Chair

Last updated Apr. 12, 2013

Recommendations

The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee offers no resolutions on the matter of Open Access publication, but rather submits the following recommendations and information report for circulation.

As the movement for open access publication venues moves forward, departments will need to review their lists of journal outlets used in Promotion and Tenure evaluations taking into account Open Access Journals.

Faculty are encouraged to retain copyright right and copyright decision authority to their published material to ease relinquishing those rights to Open Access journals and repositories, according to their discretion. In the same vein, faculty should be skeptical of mandates forcing them to relinquish copyright rights to either private or public organizations. Copyright control decisions should adhere to the author.

Where quality controls of OA journals are appropriate, faculty should consider publishing in OA outlets.

Faculty need to be aware of the prolific number and varying quality of OA journal outlets and thoroughly research the quality, peer review status, and ranking of OA journals to which they submit their work. It is especially important for tenure-track faculty to establish that their published work will be credited as quality peer-reviewed contributions when published in OA outlets.

Faculty need to be aware of publishing fees associated with some OA journals and take actions as appropriate to pass those costs onto funding agencies or employers as normal research costs.
Information Report

The movement for open access to scholarly information appears to have its roots in three intersecting phenomena: the long standing commitment to the core value of sharing knowledge held by the scholarly community; the digital revolution; and changes in the publishing industry that have consolidated outlets and raised most costs to printed material. Furthermore, the Open Access (OA) movement has generated contentious factions: publishers, authors (seeking copyright control and royalties (Turow, 2013)), scholars (some committed to the ‘information wants to be free’ meme, and some being exploited and duped by OA outlets), and libraries (generally supportive of OA as a means to reduce operating costs. Each of these institutions have vested interests in the evolving publishing world including OA; these publishing format outcomes could affect the goals and even survival of these institutions, and no uniformly satisfying resolution is likely.

As academic libraries are being burdened with increasing costs of purchasing access to academic journals, a movement led by academics and research libraries has advocated moving more and more scholarly publications to “open access” outlets.

Open Access (OA) is defined as:

"Here is the definition of "open access" from the BOAI: "By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited.'"
(Source: http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/boaifaq.htm#openaccess, retrieved Mar. 20, 2013)

Cornell University Faculty Senate in 2005 voted a resolution advocating that faculty boycott publishing in expensive, restricted access journals, publishing rather in open access journals, negotiating to retain copyright, and depositing published or pre-published papers in open access archives.

OA Models
Different models for OA publication are emerging. Some are peer-reviewed, others use different quality control checks. Some require fees covering publishing costs, others are free. Some are for profit, some are not.

Some journals are not necessarily Open Access in name and in their fee structure, but nevertheless allow non-exclusive distribution rights for preprint versions of articles to be maintained by the authors. The authors may be able to grant these rights irrevocably and in perpetuity to free archives such as arXiv.org (http://arxiv.org/), now based at
Cornell University) before submitting the article and transferring copyright to such journals, making it impossible for the journal to later restrict the free distribution of the content. The services provided by arXiv.org have been in universal use in many areas of physics since the early 1990’s, including astrophysics and high-energy physics, where the coverage of arXiv.org is near absolute, making journal subscriptions (but not the journals themselves) a perhaps superfluous luxury, depending on the subscription cost. More recently, arXiv.org has extended coverage to mathematics, statistics, computer science, quantitative biology, and quantitative finance, with varying degrees of completeness. This model is extremely cost-effective in the fields where it has been adopted, as it has allowed for free distribution of research results while requiring neither mandatory publication fees nor journal subscription fees. This type of model compared to those OA journal outlets with large publication fees have clear advantages for scholars. The details of the arXiv.org non-exclusive distribution licenses are described at http://arxiv.org/help/license. Encouraging the spread of the arXiv.org model to other research areas could be an important factor in forcing costs down while ensuring free distribution.

Another example of this type is eScholarship, maintained by the University of California Library, a site that hosts a repository and currently publishes 53 OA journals that do not require a publication fee:

“eScholarship provides Open-Access scholarly publishing services to the University of California and delivers a dynamic research platform to scholars worldwide. Powered by the California Digital Library.”
(http://www.escholarship.org/publish_journals.html, Accessed Apr. 12, 2013.)

The Public Library of Science (PLoS), a non-profit organization, currently publishes 7 OA journals, primarily in the medical and biological sciences (biology, medicine, genetics, computational biology, pathogens, and neglected tropical diseases; and one more general science journal, PLOS ONE http://www.plos.org/). This site charges authors once the article is published in order to recover operating costs.

The profit model is being used by existing publishers to supplement their journal portfolio and accommodate the OA initiative. An example is Open Sage Publications, which currently charges authors a fee for articles accepted using the peer-review practice of their traditional print journals (http://sgo.sagepub.com/ accessed Apr. 12, 2013)
Issues Regarding Open Access Scholarly Publications

Copyright
The OA movement does not oppose copyright per se; it appears to advocate that copyright be retained by authors or research institutions rather than publishers with the express purpose of voluntarily using the copyright rights to make access free. Refer to the Creative Commons Copyright Licenses offering several forms of licenses used as a foundation for many OA sites (http://creativecommons.org/about, accessed Apr. 12, 2012).

A leader in the OA movement who directs the Harvard Open Access Project writes: “The basic idea of OA is simple: Make research literature available online without price barriers and without most permission barriers.” (Suber, Open Access, OA version, p. 8)

SB1900, recently introduced by Sen. Biss, mandates public universities to develop policies establishing OA repositories; and among other mandates, requires faculty publishing scholarly material related to their university research, when not linked to royalties, to grant “…an irrevocable, worldwide copyright license . . . to the public . . .” (Section 15(b)(5).

Fees
OA journals will often charge authors a fee to publish accepted papers, while submissions are free.
As an illustration, Sage Open, a OA access journal for the social sciences, currently advertises a discounted publication cost of $99; PLOS ONE charges $500 to authors situated in the U.S.

Because OA journals are non-profit and need mechanisms to cover publishing costs, passing these costs to faculty becomes a concern. Faculty can become more aware of these potential costs and incorporate sufficient budget requests in research grants to cover them. The level of institutional support for research could also be expanded to help with publishing costs, just as a portion of scholarly travel is supported.

Locally, Dean Patrick Dawson of Founder’s Library reports the following facts and initiatives:

- Founder’s Library spends $3 million dollars on acquisitions each year with 80% of that on serial publications.
- Since, 2000, there has been a 600% increase in journal acquisition costs.
- Publishers are using ‘forced bundling’ that bundles popular less expensive journals with more expensive ones.
- N.I.U. has established a ‘repository’ for scholarly works generated by N.I.U. faculty and graduate students for material with released copyrights or open access granted copyrights, Huskie Commons Repository.
- Founders Library has instituted a trial program to support authors publishing in OA journals to cover publishing fees charged to accepted authors, to the extent of one paper per year, up to $2,000 per paper.
Quality
The quality of OA journals is a major concern to faculty, both in terms of finding valid outlets for their own work and being able to use information about the quality of journal outlets in promotion and tenure decisions. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) lists a quality control for inclusion:

“Quality Control: The journal must exercise peer-review or editorial quality control to be included.” (Source: http://www.doaj.org/, Accessed Mar. 20, 2013)

The DOAJ currently reports a large community of journals and articles:
“8775 journals
4491 journals searchable at article level
121 Countries
1045661 articles

News
2013-03-12 DOAJ hits the 1 MILLION mark!
2013-03-08 DOAJ has a new site, with new features
2013-02-13 New advisory board”

While peer-review criterion for material that is to be treated as a scholarly publication is a basic level of validation required by most if not all departments as evidence of quality control; the vaguer standard for inclusion: “...exercise peer-review or editorial quality control [emphasis added]” leaves perhaps some room for journals to be included in this list that would not meet department standards.

The apparent philosophy behind the PLOS ONE OA outlet is to allow post-publication reactions to determine the overall quality and impact of an article, rather than relying on traditional editorial and peer assessments prior to acceptance:

“PLOS ONE will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound [emphasis added]. Judgments about the importance of any particular paper are then made after publication by the readership (who are the most qualified to determine what is of interest to them).”
(PLOS ONE, the most general science journal of 7 PLOS journals,
http://www.plosone.org/static/information;jsessionid=F30658E9E5DBBB6631338CB73F0132C9

The arXiv archive maintained by Cornell University Library functions via expert ‘moderation’ by scholars working in physics, mathematics, and a few other quantified sciences:

“Submissions are reviewed by expert moderators to verify that they are topical and refereeeable scientific contributions that follow accepted standards of
scholarly communication (as exemplified by conventional journal articles).”
This model incorporates distributing both ‘preprint’ versions of papers as well as papers
that qualify for archiving but may not be subsequently published in a traditional peer-
reviewed journal.

Faculty will need to review OA journal outlets in their field and classify them using
standards applied to current publications in their field. Clearly, academic departments
open to the principle of OA journal publication will have increased work in evaluating the
scholarly rigor applied by each OA publisher. We further anticipate that it is and will
become more difficult to substantiate the validity of the review process for these OA
sources than the established, traditional sources.

Unethical and Fraudulent Practices
A recent news report chronicles anecdotal incidents of some of the practices of OA
journal publication sites and pseudo scholarly organizations. Scholars have been duped
into believing they are invited, highlighted, conference speakers when they are in fact
not, believing they have been selected as prestigious editors, into submitting papers,
and duped into publicized affiliations with conferences and OA publications and had
difficulty removing those affiliations even after they have withdrawn (Kolata 2013,
10, 2013).
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Proposed:

Resolution Concerning Shared Access to Data Relevant to Academic Affairs

Whereas the NIU Faculty Senate is a partner in shared governance; and
Whereas the NIU Faculty are the premier custodians of the academic mission and academic integrity of the university; and
Whereas the NIU Faculty are responsible for awarding grades, establishing and monitoring standards; and
Whereas the Academic Affairs Committee request in 2011 for grade distribution information was delayed and thereby ostensibly denied during the deliberations over the Plus/Minus grading system proposal; and
Whereas the absence of such data may have delayed the passage of the grading system change, encouraged the modification of the proposal recommended by the Senate, and exacerbated the sentiments that were largely uninformed by evidence; and
Whereas the implementation of the Plus/Minus grading system warrants comparative analysis, as do other academic affairs policies;

Therefore be it resolved:
That Faculty Senate Standing Subcommittees, the Senate Executive Committee, and the President of the Senate shall be given access to pertinent data relevant to academic affairs, such as the grade distributions, generated at NIU in a form suitable for computer analysis.

That administrative data requests from Senate Committees will be vetted through the Senate Executive Committee and formal requests made to the Provost by the President of Senate.

That the Faculty Senate has the presumptive right to the same data relevant to academic affairs of Northern Illinois University as any administrative authority, and that such access will be denied only when the distribution of such data requested violates Federal and State Privacy Laws.

That the request of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee for grade distributions of NIU students, per their forthcoming formal request via the process described above, be granted.

Respectfully Proposed,

N.I.U. Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee:
T. Arado, A. Azad, S. Fang, B. Mackie, S. Martin, S. McHone-Chase, I. Onyuksel, R. Siegesmund, S. Tonks, C. Cappell, Chair

Last updated Apr. 10, 2013
Proposed Motion Requesting a Senate Appearance by Appropriate NIU Administrators able to Present Information on the Academic Characteristics of Admitted Students

The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee offers the following motion:

We move that the President of the Faculty Senate invite and schedule an appearance by appropriate and knowledgeable N.I.U. Administrators to present detailed distributional data on the academic qualifications of N.I.U. admitted students over the past several years, as well as their matriculation status, and that this presentation be scheduled in the Fall 2014 semester. This information should be presented both in aggregate and in detail by colleges.

Respectfully Proposed,
N.I.U. Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee:
T. Arado, A. Azad, S. Fang, B. Mackie, S. Martin, S. McHone-Chase, I. Onyuksel, R. Siegesmund, S. Tonks, C. Cappell, Chair

Last updated Apr. 12, 2013
President Peters was unable to attend. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham were present to answer the questions the committee had submitted prior to the meeting.

1. Vision2020 - in what ways is Vision2020 linked to budget? How is the plan being impacted by lower admission numbers and the adverse publicity the university has had of late? What is the current status of the plan in terms of meeting the milestones the plan identified?
   a. Provost Alden explained that the funding for Vision 2020 was ‘one-time’ funding. In some cases this was spread over several years, but no base allocations have been made to initiatives identified in Vision 2020.
   b. Steve Cunningham confirmed that about $8M has been allocated and/or spent on initiatives from Vision 2020 and Provost Alden indicated that this included around $4M for technology and facilities improvements, $1M for recruitment initiatives, $1M for research, and $1.5M for academic improvements such as engaged learning, course transformation, and on-line course development.
   c. Some of the funding allocations have only recently been approved and while in some areas spending has moved ahead of schedule in other areas it has not been on schedule. A complicating factor has been the drop in enrollments. Had enrollments held at the 2008 level, it might have meant that this level of ‘one-time’ funding could have been sustained.
   d. Provost Alden was asked if he had any indication as to whether the new President will continue with Vision 2020. He noted, based on his limited interactions, that President Baker believed Vision 2020 had many worthwhile goals and that it was a good plan. He felt it was likely the new President would adopt some facets of Vision 2020 taking a strategic approach linked to base budget funding.
   e. Conversation followed about the need to revisit the milestones and benchmarks for Vision 2020 in light of the changing fiscal (e.g., performance metrics) and higher education landscape and lower enrollments. There is a need to clearly identifying priorities in the plan and develop concrete actions plans tied to budget, something the incoming President has expressed as a priority.

2. Workload - a combination of retirements, inability to fill all vacated positions, and individuals on suspension/leave has seen workloads increase for many employees. Do we have sufficient employees to cover operations?
   a. The Provost stated that on the faculty side, the number of faculty was back to where NIU was a decade when we had an enrollment high. With the projected budget cuts and lower enrollment numbers, this is going to make the next round of cuts very challenging. In some areas there are over capacity issues and other
areas under capacity. The need for a more strategic approach to implementing budget cuts was discussed.

b. Deb Halizcer commented that retirements were trending up again and with comments from both the Provost and Steve Cunningham, an issue previously reported that mid-career leavers was the bulk of the 30% turnover over the past 3 years (60% of people leaving), staffing concerns exist. Typically expect an attrition rate of 3% per year and the current annual rate is 3X the normal rate. The attrition is resulting in impacting diversity in the mid-level ranks. The concern over mid-career leavers was expounded with reference to the budget and pension uncertainty in Illinois and the challenges NIU has in being competitive with salary and benefits. Steve Cunningham noted that that NIU is at a disadvantage in the higher education market. This is further compounded as many other states are reporting a comeback in revenues.

c. The attrition has impacted workloads as it has led to job expansion. This looks like it will be a challenge for a while. It was noted we are living off the “work ethic” of the current employees. Having sufficient staff is a qualified yes – we need to do more with less and in part this is because we have to move forward given all the issues facing the institution.

d. The conversation on workload also addressed the cost of the increasing number of unfunded mandates and compliance requirements being applied by at the Federal and State levels as well as external accreditation agencies. These costs are in terms of increased workload as well as the real cost fiscally in the additional reporting requirements, although the exact fiscal cost is unknown at this time. It is also the case that because of some of these mandates and fewer staff in some areas other work isn’t getting done. With budgets constrained, there is a limited ability to compensate employees for the extra work they take on. Some of the compliance mandates also limit NIU’s ability to be responsive to the changing higher education climate, for example, it has taken 5 months to get approval to move forward on the RFP for the development of entities to work with NIU on on-line initiatives.

e. There were additional comments about the current budget uncertainties as to whether the cut will be at the level proposed by the governor (5%) or whether, as happened last year, the legislature imposes a different % cut. Current planning for the academic units is to prepare for a 2.5% or 4% cut. Steve Cunningham reported that current planning allows for up to a 10% cut from the legislature although clearly this adversely impacts NIU.

f. The university is actively involved in conversations to shape the outcome on pensions and health benefits. These include dialog on cost shifting. The university (and other state universities) believe some cost shifting is needed and they are prepared to take on some of the benefit costs but in return we need to see stability in general revenue and not see that cut in addition to having to take on the cost shifting as that in effect would have a double hit on the budget.

g. Issue of performance metrics being implemented by the state. Focus is on degree completion rather than enrollment numbers although enrollments and
retention are precursors to graduation so are critical elements (improving yield
was also stressed by the Provost as key to increasing enrollments). Other
metrics also focus on nuances to who completes degrees with greater weight
placed on certain completers (e.g., Pell recipients, STEM degrees). There are also
metrics related to research productivity. It was noted that the metrics are not
based on benchmarking against an institution’s own improvement but on
absolute numbers. You can improve but still not get performance based funding.
System does not advantage NIU but institutions like U of I as they can open up
wait lists which NIU doesn’t have. Right now as performance based funding
represents 0.5% of appropriations the impact is limited. It is further limited by
the decreasing nature of more cuts which means less to lose. In examining rates,
do not count transfer students or students who leave but then return.

3. It has been stated many times that investing in NIU's employees is critical to the
university’s success and future. There is concern that with fewer employees doing more
work and with no raises in sight and the prospect of increased costs for benefits and
reduced benefits on retirement this is having and adverse impact on morale and isn't
consistent with the messaging regarding investing in NIU’s employees. Are there plans
in place/under discussion to address these concerns?
   a. Steve Cunningham stated no problems with meeting payroll despite fiscal
      challenges.
   b. As part of this conversation the issue of enrollments came up again. The
      shortfall in enrollments has created challenges and even if enrollments start to
      rebound it will take time to compensate for the lower numbers recently. This is
      also compounded by the inability to raise tuition as we are at the price point.
   c. The enrollment issues are also being compounded as more students leaving due
to their inability to cover the costs of their education.
   d. Discussion ensued about the need to visit operational procedures and
governance processes to make them more efficient and responsive. It was
stated the university is working on greater use of electronic records and tracking
systems and ways to reduce the number of steps to complete actions. It was
suggested that through university council we look at reducing the number of
committees and meetings and the number of people involved, but preserving
governance. This will require looking at constitution and bylaws that, as Provost
Alden noted, can in places be complex, contradictory, and vague.
   e. Compensation is a priority for the President. Salary increases are one of the
priority items presented every year to the IBHE. Steve Cunningham stated this
year was the first time in several years there had been no increment. The
increments the past few years have been through reallocation of funds rather
than new monies. Steve stated the university will be looking to see if there is a
possibility to have an increment for 2014.
   f. Conversations with the state over pensions and benefits is also seeking to
mitigate impact on pay by raising losses due to increased costs for health and
pensions and inflation. Until the pension and benefits is resolved it is difficult to
see how we will see increments. The current state deficit means that even with
an increase of state revenues the deficit isn’t going to be resolved anytime soon which means budgets aren’t likely to rebound. Politically it looks like the picture will get worse.

g. Despite the budget challenges, NIU is one of the few that have avoided furloughs and layoffs and this is a core institutional value to uphold. So while there have been challenges with salary, no one has lost their position.

h. With all the changes and challenges it is implicit that we need a new funding model for the allocation of funds across the university. Need to find new revenue streams.

i. At what point will level of state funding and what we need to do to get it reach the point where it costs more to secure those funds than the funds we get?

4. Place-holders - a number of key positions are occupied by individuals who are 'place-holders' with replacement hires being placed on hold until the appointment of the new President. What impact is this having on operations and making key decisions in those areas? With the challenges facing the university can we afford to use 'stop-gap' solutions? What plans are in place to ensure continuity of operations.

a. It was stated that there are no placeholders since the negative implications of doing that are profound. The unique and unprecedented confluence of budget concerns, the changing nature of higher education, lower enrollments, pensions, benefits, and attrition mean NIU cannot put anything on hold. It was stated that the university is committed to moving forward.

b. The legal issues are being resolved and a number of new compliance procedures are being out in place.

c. Looking to create efficiencies through data warehouses, increased data transparency, and examining trends over time.

d. If the new application trend holds, the enrollment pipeline will start to refill and the revenue was help alleviate some of the budget concerns.

5. Budget Statement - the committee requests a formal written response to its statement on budget priorities. How has/is the statement being used? Has it/will it be sent to the BOT?

a. The list of priorities to IBHE is constrained – it is limited to about 5 items. This list includes the recurring priorities of addressing employee compensation and deferred maintenance. As such, this does include some of the recommendations identified by the committee, but as the list is limited it is unlikely all the items will be included. The list is then acted on by the legislature who may or may not take into consideration the priorities identified by the university to the IBHE.

b. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham were not in a position to address whether the committee’s recommendations had been passed on to the BOT. They did note that the new President may take the committee’s recommendations into consideration as he works with the BOT on the budget for the next fiscal year.

c. Provost Alden and Steve Cunningham noted in their parting comments that despite the challenges they were optimistic about the future and NIU’s ability to meet the challenges.
Resource Space and Budget Committee
Year End Summary 2012-2013

The Committee appreciated the updates it received on matters related to resources, space and budget and the opportunity to share this information with the wider university community. The information helped inform the committee on the resource, space and budget issues facing the university and on how the university was meeting the challenges it faces. The committee acknowledges and appreciated actions that led to some changes based on its recommendations.

The Committee wishes to make several observations related to how the committee operates, its remit, and on the information it was provided over the year. Members expressed frustration over not being presented with opportunities to provide timely and informed input on resource, space, and budget issues.

1. Much of the information provided to the committee is as a matter of report. The committee is not provided with information up front and as such isn’t in a position to provide any substantive or real time input into decisions related to resources, space, and budget. The committee needs to receive information that it can use to help shape the budget as opposed to merely reporting on the current fiscal status.

2. Information is not only post-hoc, it tends to be at a level that is too general to offer any real insights or understanding to how the budget is allocated or spent. More detail is needed on how monies are allocated and then used if the committee is to be able to offer substantive and timely recommendations. The committee believes more transparency is needed on what is actually spent and the return (outcomes) of that spending and how that is linked to the university’s mission and its strategic priorities.

3. There is a tendency to present information in a manner that fails to acknowledge, in a tangible way, many of the concerns facing employees related to workload and salaries. The committee appreciates the statement that salaries are a priority, but feels there needs to be a more concrete strategy to address this than each year identifying salaries as a priority to the IBHE.

4. The committee feels there is no effective feedback loop that allows it to determine whether the recommendations it does make are taken into consideration and that it’s work isn’t wasted. The committee needs to be better informed on how its work shapes resource, space, and budget decisions.
Resolution Concerning the Shared Governance Role of the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee in Setting Recommendations for Budget Priorities

Preamble: Bylaw article 2.8 describes an active role for the Resources, Space, and Budget Committee that includes, among other duties, participating with the president and provost to develop long-range plans regarding the allocation and re-allocation of resources; advising the president and provost regarding goals and priorities for the utilization of resources; and offering advice on budgets and space issues. Over the past few years progress has been made in that the president and provost now meet regularly with the Resource, Space & Budget Committee, as required by the Bylaws, however, those meetings primarily involve the administration informing the committee as to what is being done, rather than being the dialogue described by the Bylaws. More progress is needed in order for the committee to perform its functions as described in Article 2.8.

Whereas the University Council is a partner in shared governance; and

Whereas the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee represents the voice of the constituent groups of NIU in the budgeting process and is responsible for offering recommendations for budget priorities; and

Whereas the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee requires timely and detailed fiscal information instead of post-hoc summary reports; and

Whereas the absence of such detailed and timely information adversely impacts the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee’s ability to meet its charge and to be an effective and an active partner in shared governance;

Therefore be it resolved:

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be given budget relevant information early enough in the budgeting process to allow it to help shape budget recommendations and priorities.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be given detailed information on how monies are allocated that is transparent with respect to funding formulas, actual expenditures and the return on that spending; and how such expenditures are linked to the university’s mission, strategic priorities, and future funding.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee be included in the process of shaping action plans that address resource, space and budget issues as they align with identified budget priorities.

That the Resource, Space, and Budget Committee is provided with feedback that allows it to evaluate how its work shapes resource, space, and budget decisions.
That the Resource, Space and Budget Committee be an active partner in shaping the dialog on budget recommendations.

Respectfully Proposed,

Resource, Space, and Budget Committee
April 2013
Resolution #

A RESOLUTION OF THE NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY'S FACULTY SENATE'S POSITION PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Short Title: FACULTY SENATE POSITION ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF RECREATION FACILITIES

Author:

Sponsors:

WHEREAS: In 1983 Northern Illinois University (NIU) built a Student Recreation Center to provide recreational opportunities for the campus community with an expansion occurring in 1995; and

WHEREAS: With the projected enrollment to be 27,500 by the year 2020, the dedicated indoor recreation space would be 4.55 sq. ft. per person; and

WHEREAS: The industry standard of indoor recreation square footage is 10 – 12 sq. ft. per person; and

WHEREAS: In a recent student survey conducted by Campus Recreation, 98% of respondents wanted to expand the cardio areas (combined percentages), 73% of respondents wanted to expand strength training areas (combined percentages), 48% of respondents wanted to add an indoor climbing wall, 38% of respondents want to add an aquatics area, 33% of respondents wanted to add activity courts, and 33% of respondents wanted to add specialty fitness studios; and

WHEREAS: In this survey it was determined that 57% of first year students reported that recreation facilities and programs were an important part of their college decision which refers to the role that Campus Recreation plays in the recruitment of students; and

WHEREAS: In this survey it was determined that 57% of returning students reported that recreation facilities and programs were an important part of staying enrolled at NIU which refers to the role that Campus Recreation plays in the retention of students; and

WHEREAS: In this survey 51% of student respondents reported that the facilities were too crowded which was the most common reason reported for not participating in recreation; and

WHEREAS: In this survey when combining facility related issues (too crowded, too spread out, too outdated, lack of quality, and not the right equipment), 79% of respondents indicated that facilities issues hindered their participation; and
WHEREAS: The Faculty Senate supports the university's efforts in assessing the feasibility of proceeding with a renovation and expansion of Campus Recreation’s indoor facility that better addresses the needs of all campus community constituents including students, faculty, and staff; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty Senate supports the concept of including designated faculty and staff locker rooms in a renovated/expanded indoor facility to alleviate inappropriate discussion of grades and coursework with students during times when faculty and staff are showering or changing; and

BE IT RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate also supports the university in fully conducting a comprehensive assessment of student, faculty, and staff recreational needs (both indoor and outdoor) and work with expert consultants to create a long-term and sustainable campus recreation facility plan that meets the current and future needs of all campus community constituents including students, faculty and staff.
March 5, 2013

Letter of acceptance of nomination as
University Council Executive Secretary/
Faculty Senate President

Fellow Senators,

Once again, I am pleased to accept your nomination for a fifth and final term as Executive Secretary. Although asserting the faculty’s role in the shared governance process represents an ongoing job, I am pleased with the progress we have made. Regular meetings of both the Joint Committee on Resources, Space, and Budgets, and the University Advisory Committees with the President and his cabinet have not only been maintained, but, I think, valued by all parties as well. We continue to provide input from the constituent employee groups to the administration and our annual letter of budget priorities has become an established routine. True dialogue has begun to replace informational briefings and, while that remains a work in progress, the key word is progress. I think we have learned that the way to be heard is to speak up rather than wait to be asked.

Last Spring saw the completion of the report of the president’s committee on equity in compensation, or what we have dubbed the “Raise Equity Committee” for which the Senate had actively lobbied. The report did highlight a few issues which have now been called to the attention of the administration. As a result, the president approved a graduate assistant for the University Council. That person will begin working for us in August and will be available to help committee chairs from both the Senate and Council with research, data collection, and other appropriate tasks. This will, hopefully, make life a bit easier for committee chairs and members and facilitate the work of the Senate and Council.

The revised grading system, which expands grading options to include plusses and minuses took effect for graduate classes in the Fall, and has now been approved for undergraduates, as well. The new system should be in place for Fall, 2013 semester grading. Early reports on the graduate version of the grading system seem to be positive and the transition was apparently seamless. During the past year we resurrected the old Faculty Bulletin and replaced it with an updated e-version titled Faculty Matters. This was designed to enable communication to the faculty of the issues being dealt with at Faculty Senate and University Council, as well as new policies and policy changes of interest to the faculty. Thus far, four issues have been published with the goal of two issues per semester. We have also continued and expanded the use of the Faculty Senate Blackboard Community to facilitate communication with and between Faculty Senators. This has become a repository for documents and links to relevant websites that are of interest to the faculty.
The major ongoing task of the Spring has been the presidential search and making sure that faculty interests are well represented in the process. We have an excellent search advisory committee, more than half of which is comprised of faculty members. While it has been important for me to be involved in the search process, I feel the upcoming role of helping to acclimate the new president to our culture of shared governance is equally important. I think having four years of experience as Executive Secretary will be a valuable asset during this momentous transition to a new administration.

Going forward, there are two remaining projects that I hope to complete. The first is the partly finished Faculty Manual. We have been without a faculty manual for more than a decade and, although I identify this as a goal every year, I have not been able to complete it. I am hoping, once again, to be able to do so this year, before leaving office. Secondly, I have had many conversations with our General Counsel, Jerry Blakemore, regarding the need to revise, correct, and update the Constitution and Bylaws. This document has been in disrepair for a very long time, and although we have made piecemeal revisions to specific articles over the past four years, a more general reconsideration is long overdue. Hopefully, we can, at least, begin this arduous process.

Lastly, this year, we will have to prepare for the transition to a new Executive Secretary and I will do my best to help recruit my successor and prepare us for the transition.

As I itemize some of the accomplishments of the past year, know that I realize that this is not my work alone, but rather the work of so many good people on the Senate and Council, members and committee chairs alike and, of course, Pat, without whom I wouldn’t have run for a third term, let alone a fifth. I consider it an honor and privilege to serve as Executive Secretary of the University Council and especially as President of the Faculty Senate. I appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

Alan Rosenbaum, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology
Executive Secretary of the University Council
President of the Faculty Senate

EXECUTIVE: 03/20/13 and 04/17/13
STEERING:
FACULTY SENATE: 03/27/13 and 04/24/13
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL:
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## 2013-2014 MEETING SCHEDULE

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

**FACULTY SENATE**

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS-EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>3 – 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UC-STEERING COMMITTEE**

3 – 4:30 p.m.

Altgeld Hall 225

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 28, 2013</td>
<td>September 11, 2013</td>
<td>September 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2013</td>
<td>October 2, 2013</td>
<td>October 9, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23, 2013</td>
<td>October 30, 2013</td>
<td>November 6, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2014</td>
<td>February 19, 2014</td>
<td>February 26, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2014</td>
<td>March 26, 2014</td>
<td>April 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16, 2014</td>
<td>April 23, 2014</td>
<td>April 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring Break March 9-16, 2014