
J. Schaffer represented W. Baker; D. Lonergan represented D. Jones.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was in attendance.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Bauman, Brown, Burgess, Caldwell, Carter, Caughron, Creamer, Ghrayed, Heinze, Hubbard, Kang, Kay, Larson, McSpadden, Miller, Miranda, Montague, Payvar, Pierce, Popovich, Ridnour, Song, Spear, Wagner

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Willis: I’d like to call the meeting to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda? It’s been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor?

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2001 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 5-30)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the December 5 meeting, which appear at great length in your packet? It’s been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes of the December 5 meeting. Are there any corrections or changes to the minutes? All those in favor?

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
President Willis: Okay, let me move on then to President’s Announcements and I will be brief.

First I would like to let you know that Jenine Povlsen who was the SPS President has left NIU. Her replacement, at least in the interim, the now acting president of the SPS, is Bev Espe, who is over here. I’d like to welcome her, and I’m sure she’s overwhelmed, so any assistance and advice and help that you could give her I’m sure would be welcomed. Welcome, Bev.

The only other thing I can tell you is that as of last Thursday, which was the last time I talked with President Peters, there was no more solid news on the budget then we had when he talked to us in December. So I presume once we actually know – once he actually knows things – that he will let me know, and I will let you know, but right now it’s all fuzzy.

All right, that’s all I have in the way of announcements.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

President Willis: I have a couple of things under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. These are things which we always do at our January meeting - assuming we have one – which are selection of committees to evaluate me and also to evaluate the Faculty Personnel Advisor. I will turn it over to Gretchen at this point.

A. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of Executive Secretary of UC/President of FS – see Faculty Senate Bylaws June 1999, Article 7 (Page 31)

B. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws June 1999, Article 7 (Page 31).

G. Bisplinghoff: Basically, we’re going to go through the procedure of drawing names for the evaluation of the President and as was said of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. So I have the lucky names in front of me and I will draw. First I need two of the Senate, correct? This is for the evaluation of the President. Jody Newman-Ryan and Richard Greene. Two names from Council.

D. Mathesius: You have to pick an alternate too.

G. Bisplinghoff: Ah, okay. [Draws her own name]. All the lucky folks. I want you to know I would be a millionaire if I were to go buy a lottery ticket today. This happened last year and I was on the committee the year before that. There should be a term limit on these committees and I am going to suggest that to the President right now. Some people have abysmal luck when we pull names. Now, I will draw two names from Council. Unbelievable. Patricia Henry and Sherilyn Spear. And I need an alternate from UC?

D. Mathesius: Yes.

G. Bisplinghoff: I should learn to read somebody else’s name. Diane Musial.
D. Mathesius: And then one student and one alternate.

G. Bisplinghoff: One student and one student alternate so I need two from here. All right. I have R. J. Gravel and Douglas Stalker.

Now, the names for the Faculty Personnel Advisor evaluation committee. Should I just dump the two together? And I need three plus an alternate. William Baker, Ping Woo, Robert Zerwekh. Those are the three names for evaluation of Faculty Personnel Advisor and one alternate – Betty Kay.

President Willis: Maybe you could read those off again or give them to me and I’ll read them off?

So, for evaluation of the Executive Secretary: Faculty Senate, Jody Newman-Ryan and Richard Greene. The alternate is Gretchen Bisplinghoff. University Council, Pat Henry and Sheri Spear. The alternate is Diane Musial. Student is R.J. Gravel. Student Alternate Douglas Stalker. All right. For Faculty Personnel Advisor: William Baker, Ping Woo and Robert Zerwekh, and the alternate is Betty Kay. We would like if those people could come up after the meeting and just get together. The two respective committees will have to organize themselves, elect a chair and you will need to – does the whole committee meet with you or just the chair? Okay, the chairs will need to meet with Donna and she has everything prepared, the memos and things that you can send out. So if you would all come up right after the meeting. I’ll remind you again at the end. Okay, any questions about that?

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: We have no items on the Consent Agenda so let me move to Reports from the Advisory Committees.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – Report (Pages 32-39)

President Willis: FAC to IBHE – Pat Henry has a report in the packet. Pat.

P. Henry: This is pages 32-39 and it’s actually, I apologize, it’s sort of spread out all over the place here. I’m still working on a concise format but this was for the meeting that was held in Springfield on December 7 and quite a lot of that was taken up with discussion with Keith Sanders who is the Executive Director of the IBHE. Some of the points that he brought up I’ve bulleted here. College prep for high school graduates is something that he’s especially interested in, given that that was sort of the low point on our Illinois grade card for higher education that was done by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Ed. There’s more information about this, by the way, on the IBHE’s web site. He also addressed the issue of assessment, and the FAC actually has a document on that, which I have attached pretty much in its entirety. You can look at it at your leisure, and if you have questions or comments that you wish to pass on
please send them to me. The last paragraph on page 35 was what the group felt was an important note to sound, that we’re not trying to weasel out of assessment but that we see it as an ongoing process, and that it still does however, as many people pointed out, require extra time and money that needs to be taken into account. So, he felt that was a good document, Sanders did. As to the budget, again, nobody has, and certainly didn’t have then, any particularly concrete things except that cuts were going to be there. He noted that the IBHE was trying to protect student assistants as well as faculty raises and funds for retention of critical faculty, but that the familiar 3+2+1 formula is probably going to become a 3+1/2+1/2 formula and possibly less. One interesting note - and this I think was mentioned at the last Senate meeting - is that there are members of the IBHE who also feel that Central Management Services maybe is not the best deal for health insurance for the university community; I don’t know where that’s going. That was just sort of brought out.

Finally, Phoenix University was discussed. He was aware of some of the unhappiness expressed by the FAC in the matter of Phoenix University being given permission to have on site courses. The bottom line was that IBHE would have been sued if they hadn’t given permission, given the way things were set up, and he feels that the Illinois institutions are well able to compete and that we should learn from them. Then he left, and the FAC continued with various matters related to the subcommittees. Again, I’ll sort of point these out but, again, the Assessment Committee (attachment 1) pretty much documents this committee’s work. The Technology Subcommittee is also an attachment here, I believe attachment 2, basically a summary of best practices for electronically offered degree and certificate programs, which I think doesn’t differ markedly from the kinds of things that we’ve been developing here as well, but those of you who have a particular interest in it may want to look it over and, again, forward any questions or comments to me. Attachment 3 concerns the budget and there was, again, some discussion on how to best interface with the IBHE on this, especially given the fact that nobody really knows what’s going on as far as how much money is concerned. The one point that was discussed quite heatedly was the matter of what’s perceived as a lack of balance in funding practices, where the private universities are able to essentially get state funding to a far greater extent actually than is the case in most states. The public universities had articulated the fact that it was very difficult to raise tuition in the public institutions as opposed to the private institutions, and that there were resources available to the private institutions that were not available to the public institutions, and that the IBHE might want to consider readjusting this in some way. This apparently is not something the IBHE is going to do ever, at least as far as Keith Sanders could report. It’s not something that is likely to be changed although several members of the committee, including me, made some cases that at least it could be considered, but I think the FAC to some extent is seen as a body that presents a somewhat united front to the Board of Higher Education and that individual differences are dealt with sort of on a case-to-case basis. In this case, the publics were voted down and it was not going to be brought up to the IBHE that this was a concern that we wanted to address although I think they are actually aware of it as well. I think that’s all I really have to comment on. Again if you have – there’s going to be another meeting at the beginning of February and if you have concerns that you want to have me discuss or bring up, please let me know.

President Willis: Any questions for Pat? Okay.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths

President Willis: Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee I believe has not met. Is either Dolly or Dan here? I don’t think so.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard

President Willis: Board of Trustees Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee also has not met since our last meeting.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen – Report (Page 40)

President Willis: The Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee did meet. Jenine was not able to attend but I attended that meeting and Judy Burgess also attended. Judy has written up a report of that meeting which appears on page 40. There was some discussion, of course, of the budget, which seems to dominate many of these meetings these days, and some things about SURS and pensions and what have you. So that report is on page 40. If anyone has any questions, as I say, I was also able to attend that meeting so I’d be willing to answer any questions that anybody has. If not, let me move on to the Board of Trustees meeting which was on December 6, just the day after our last Faculty Senate Meeting.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – Report (Page 41)

President Willis: Again, I attended this meeting and wrote up a little report which appears on page 41. We do have a new trustee, Katherine Adduci who is certainly a welcome addition to the Board. She is an NIU alum and I think will be a valuable presence on the Board. There were a number of action items which came from the subcommittees, and which you therefore have seen already; I’ve listed them there. Finally there was a resolution passed giving the university the authority to acquire some land which is known as the John Deere property. This is two parcels to the west of the campus adding up to a bit over ten acres of land. All right, so does anybody have any questions about the Board of Trustees Meeting? Okay, if not then let’s move on to Reports from Standing Committees.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

President Willis: Let me just mention, as you may recall, that last time we adjourned before getting through our entire agenda. So what we’ve done is started the committee reports – because we stopped about half-way through them - where we left off and then we’re filling in with the committees which also reported last time.

A. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Jim Lockard, Chair – Report

President Willis: So we’ll start off with Economic Status of the Profession. Jim Lockard has a report which is a walk-in here.
J. Lockard: Thanks. The matters that the Economic Status of the Professional Committee looked at in November are summarized for you in this two-page report which I hope you will read carefully if you’re the least bit concerned about things like your potential Social Security benefits. The issues are complicated and, although we had a lengthy and I think very beneficial meeting with a gentleman from the Elgin office of the Social Security Administration, I don’t want to pretend that I could give you every detail in such a short amount of time here nor would I try for fear it won’t be accurate. The bottom line is that those of us who have worked under Social Security and who now work under SURS are likely, if not surely, to be affected by what is strangely known as the Windfall Elimination Procedure, that windfall being your Social Security benefits. That’s fundamentally what it boils down to and, in a nutshell, where people not involved in an organization like SURS get 90% of the first chunk that they are eligible to receive, we’re likely to get 40%. So I think my math is wrong in here. I think I misread a figure. It’s more like nearly $300 a month off the top that will go away.

That’s bad enough but it also turns out that while ten years or 40 quarters are what are required to qualify for any Social Security benefit, it’s actually based on 35 years of service. So if you’ve only worked ten, that all gets spread out over a longer period anyway and reduces the value there. The bottom line is, probably we shouldn’t be taking very seriously any statements we get from Social Security about our likely benefits because they can’t take into account these factors that are in fact going to reduce it substantially. So, if you’re anywhere in the ballpark of thinking about those things, the best advice that we can give you is to take advantage of personal counseling with Social Security. They’re in DeKalb every Thursday at the Senior Center on Grove Street downtown near the city buildings, and it’s worth it to go in and talk to somebody who can actually look up your record and figure out what the truth of the matter is.

When we started this, we thought we were looking into a second provision called the Government Pension Offset because that sounded like it might be more relevant but that’s likely to affect fewer people. That only applies to those who are collecting pensions from an organization like SURS and then seek to claim Social Security spousal or survivor benefits. The number of people likely to be affected by that, I think, would be much smaller, but the bottom line there is you can probably forget anything. The offset will take away virtually anything that you might be eligible for. I do have quite a number of copies of the publication on the Windfall Elimination Provision with me today. If anyone would like it, I’ll be glad to give it to you. I’ve also given you the URL’s at Social Security where you can find the same information.

I don’t have bulk copies of the pension offset plan. It’s a complicated business. There have been many efforts made over the years, not only within Illinois by groups like the Illinois Retired Teacher’s Association but also the National Association of Retired Federal Employees since they get hit in the exact same way, to try to repeal these two laws as being very unfair. None of them has ever made any progress. So again, I’ve given you a site at the National Association that you can check on progress on that front. There may, in fact, be a bill in Congress at this point. I ran out of time to check that out but will try to do so before our next meeting. It might be in anyone’s interest to send some letters to our own congressional delegation on the matter.

A couple of other things we were asked to look into. If you have eligibility to purchase
additional service credit in the SURS system and haven’t done so yet, the provisions are all in place to be able to do that now with pretax dollars by payroll deduction. You don’t have to come up with lump sums any more as was true in the fairly recent past. However, if you make that election, it’s an irrevocable one. Once you tell them to start deducting from the payroll for buying service credits, you cannot get out of it until you’ve met your obligation that you contracted for. Again, there’s a URL in here that tells you how to get at that. The advice that I can give you on that, speaking from personal experience, is the first thing you’ve got to do is get those outside years validated by SURS. That can take six, eight, twelve, eighteen months sometimes to get that done. Once that has been done, they will then send you a letter explaining what your costs are. Those costs increase monthly. When I got my first one, I couldn’t remotely afford to buy all the years that I was eligible to so I had to let some of them run out. I then had to request SURS to give me a new statement of what it would cost at a later date. Took them six more months and in the meantime my cost was going up a hundred dollars a month. So, do get on this if you’re eligible for it and have any thoughts. Getting it certified commits you to nothing. It just has everything in place saying you’re eligible. You still have to make the financial decision as to whether you can do it or not.

We had also been asked to look into educational benefits and what the real rules and regs are here on the campus. It’s all available, we discovered, as part of the Board of Trustee regulations and, again, there’s a URL for your convenience there to read exactly what those policies are.

We haven’t yet gotten to the pre-tax medical expense account issue which we need to get into here in the very near future.

Then finally, let me report that I also attended the University Benefits Committee meeting as the liaison from this group. That committee met on the 13th of November. It’s now being chaired by Mary Monroe from the library. Dennis Devito had bad words for us there. Again, based on the budget situation, in a nutshell he said if you think this is a good year to try to get better benefits, forget it. It’s not likely to even be on the radar screen for anybody. One thing, though, I think is quite intriguing, given the fact that we do have so many budget shortfalls already in the state, is that he was quite concerned that the stock market performance had taken such a toll on SURS that it might, for the first time, actually trigger the provision of the general revenue funds of the state having to kick in to make up the shortfall at SURS, which would be yet another expense on the general budget that is not normal. It’s never happened since the law went into place that said SURS has to be appropriately funded. This year may be the time in which that actually happens. Then, beyond that we’re in the middle of some work on dental coverage, trying first to figure out just exactly how bad off we are comparing payment rates to local services, knowing full well that they are higher in suburban areas closer in to the city, and we’ve also been asked to join the President’s Committee on the Status of Women, I think. It hasn’t come through yet. It’s going to be at tomorrow but I believe that’s the body that’s sending it through. Concern about the fact that our prescription drug benefit will pay for Viagra but not for contraceptives and that’s being viewed as a gender inequity issue and we’ll see what happens out of all that. Are there any questions? I can’t promise I can give you a decent answer but I’ll try.

E. Shumaker: Jim I just have a couple of updates.
J. Lockard: Yeah, please. Earl is one of the committee members.

E. Shumaker: In regards to the Social Security offset if you take a look at the Surs homepage you’ll notice that part of their legislative agenda is to work at abolishing this piece of legislation. They would like to see that repealed and it is part of their legislative agenda. It’s right at the bottom of their list though. Also, in regards to the purchase of service credit, there was a piece of legislation that was recently passed. As a result of this piece of legislation we will be able – if you have 403B account to roll over money from those 403B accounts into Surs and Surs they have forms available. I have been in contact with Steve Cunningham and they are in contact with the attorney’s office here because they’re setting up the procedures, but eventually when this takes place then you will also be able to use 403B account money to roll over into Surs.

President Willis: Okay, Pat?

P. Henry: I just wondered in terms of communicating this to the faculty at large, what would you recommend? Just telling our department faculty or college faculty about these URLs or do you have other ---

J. Lockard: I don’t know of any better way to do it, Pat. I think that’s our obligation as members of this body, to carry it back to our respective areas, and hopefully it will get to departments that may or may not have a representative here at the time.

President Willis: Was there another question?

B. Resource, Space and Budget Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – Report

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget, Carole?

C. Minor: The Resource, Space and Budget Committee met on December 6, and what I’d like to do is first give you a short report on that and then tell you about a couple of things that have happened since the meeting. Vice-Presidents Legg and Williams both attended the meeting. The issues discussed included the current budget issues with a few comments made, faculty salaries being a main issue. The Provost was speaking most of this time. We had access to a multi-million dollar program proposal that he had put in to the IBHE, which he said he expected we would get zero dollars for next year, and that a tuition increase was possible for or being discussed for 2002-2003.

Space issues discussed included the issue of remodeling Wirtz when Business moves to Barsema; Wirtz will be closed for some time but they don’t know yet because they had, at that time had not – I don’t know if they have decided now who’s moving in – but they had not at that time. So they didn’t know what kind of remodeling would need to be done there. So that building will be closed for some period of time unknown.

Another issue which was discussed was ADA compliance; Vice-President Williams talked to us about this. The money comes directly from the state and is released as the state has money. The Provost stated that within three or four years he thought that the ADA issues on campus would
have been substantially addressed. Our president, Sue Willis, had provided us with a memo from Jim Bryant of Finance and Facilities stating that bids were going out on December 8 and another day – the 15th maybe – there were eight elevator projects on campus that were to be funded by the state under ADA and the work was to start in March if the bids were to come in within budget. But if the bids were to come in over budget, then they would have to prioritize and that would delay everything. Just an update on that. I did e-mail Jim Bryant and he e-mailed me back that there would be a bidding conference on January 24 for those, and that departments that are affected will be notified when work is to begin on their buildings. He also agreed to keep the committee informed of the status of these projects.

Another issue discussed by the Provost was program review. He stated his intention to improve the program review process. We thought this was good news. Members of the committee suggested that outside accreditation reports be able to be used for the IBHE program review. He seemed to think this was a good idea. Those of you who might be interested in the possibility of this might want to mention that in other venues. He also talked about assessment and the importance of assessment, one of his questions being how has the money we’ve spent on technology increased the literacy of faculty and students in technology, and that we need to have some data on that. One of my concerns with the committee has been that people keep telling me we need to ask the right questions, and I’m not sure that I’m aware of what the right questions are. So, I talked with Gary Coover, who is the UC chair of this committee, and we agreed it might be useful to do a survey of the Faculty Senate about issues of space and facilities, programs and budget. I wrote the survey but I didn’t get a chance to get it duplicated for you for today, and I’m wondering if it would be the best thing to give that out at the next meeting and have you fill that out while you’re here, or to e-mail it to every member of the Senate and try to get it back before then. Send it with the minutes?

**President Willis:** I think either e-mailing or snail mail for people who don’t have e-mail would be the best way because that way people can sit and think about it rather than trying to do it on the spot while we’re sitting here.

**C. Minor:** So sending it with the minutes would be better than any other way?

**President Willis:** Or you could send it to us and we can send it out as a separate mailing, whichever you’d like.

**C. Minor:** Okay. He suggested a separate mailing because the minutes won’t come out for a while and the survey is ready.

**President Willis:** Yeah, I think that would be good also.

**C. Minor:** Thank you.

**President Willis:** Yes?

**M. Martin:** Carole, I was concerned about closing down Wirtz. Did they talk about closing down the classroom space as well as the office space, because our entire college is located in that
building – in terms of classroom space, I don’t think the whole rest of the university could accommodate all those classes.

**C. Minor:** They didn’t give us the details on that. They did just say Wirtz would have to be closed for remodeling and they didn’t know the extent to which it would be or the time lines. He said it could be two weeks or two years.

**M. Martin:** Well, you know, we were out of there for two years before so that was – but it’s very difficult to absorb an entire college’s classes and, you know ---

**C. Minor:** I think we remember that.

**M. Martin:** I know, you guys were very nice to us.

**C. Minor:** In the basement of Adams 3, something like that.

**M. Martin:** So anyway, if it’s brought up again, I would hope that somebody would mention that there are things in Wirtz other than offices and that it’s essential that those classrooms and labs and other kinds of things be kept open while they’re trying to get the money together to renovate the rest of the building.

**C. Minor:** Thank you. We will keep bringing up that comment.

**President Willis:** Any other questions or comments for Carole? You’re done, right Carole?

**C. Minor:** Thank you.

C. **Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee** – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

**President Willis:** Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Gretchen did you have anything other than pulling names out of boxes? Okay.

D. **Rules and Governance Committee** – Chris Hubbard, Chair

**President Willis:** Let’s see. Rules and Governance? Chris Hubbard. Is Chris here? I believe they do not have a report.

E. **Academic Affairs Committee** – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

**President Willis:** Okay, Academic Affairs, Jody.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** No report. I think we have a meeting scheduled for the 30th, two weeks from today. I’ll send out a notice to the committee. No report today. Thank you.

F. **Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee** – Carol DeMoranville, Chair
President Willis: Okay, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Carol?

C. DeMoranville: We have no report but our next meeting is scheduled for a week from today. If my committee members would stop by I have an agenda and meeting schedule.

President Willis: Okay, very good.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: We have some items under Unfinished Business. These were New Business items at the last meeting which we postponed so that we could all go home at some decent hour last time, so now we have them here.

A. Approval of Joan Quinn to serve on the HSC Board.

President Willis: The first item - I don’t have a write-up on this, but the Director of the Holmes Student Center last semester asked me to find a faculty member to serve on the Holmes Student Center Board. This Board does not appear in the Committees Book, so I had to do a little digging to find out what the deal was with it. In any case, I figured the School of Family Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, I’m sure I don’t have that name right, but – it’s got all those words in it – but anyway, I figured they would be the ones that would be most, to which this position would be most relevant and so I called them up and asked them if they had any faculty members who would be interested in serving on this board. They got back to me with the name of Joan Quinn, and so I would present to you Joan Quinn as a candidate to serve on the Holmes Student Center Board. Of course, if anybody else would like to serve on that board, we could actually have an election. Otherwise, I would just ask for your approval of Ms. Quinn. Any discussion?

All those in favor? Opposed?

Joan Quinn was approved to serve on the Holmes Student Center Board.

B. Substitute for the University Council Executive Secretary – see memo from Jerry Zar – refer to Rules and Governance (Pages 42-44)

President Willis: The second item is a substitute for the University Council Executive Secretary. There is a memo about this from Jerry Zar with a number of options. The issue here is that in the Faculty Senate we have a vice-president who if I, as the president, am not able to be here for whatever reason, we have a vice-president who can take over. In the University Council there is no similar replacement for the Executive Secretary, and so it was thought that it would be a reasonable idea to have some provision in place in case the Executive Secretary became ill (as I did) or whatever and so, as I say, there are a number of possibilities here. The proposal would be to refer this to the Rules and Governance Committee. This came from the University Council Rules and Governance Committee. They thought that the Faculty Senate should look at it because some of these alternatives require Faculty Senate action or amendment of Faculty Senate bylaws, in particular requiring that the Faculty Senate vice-president be a University Council
member and then also would be able to serve as an alternate for the Executive Secretary. So, I would entertain a motion to refer this to the Rules and Governance Committee. After we have a motion and second, then if anybody has any suggestions or discussion we can discuss it. Okay. Is there any discussion of any of these alternatives? Okay, if not all those in favor of referring this issue to Rules and Governance? Opposed?

Motion passed to refer to Rules and Governance Committee.

C. Statement of Professional Ethics – see statement from University Council – refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Page 45)

President Willis: Then the other thing left over from last time is the Statement of Professional Ethics. As you may recall, this body passed a Statement of Professional Ethics, I believe at the end of last academic year, and then forwarded it on to the University Council. The University Council amended it slightly and has sent it back to us in the hopes that we could agree on a common language, and then we would presumably forward it back to the University Council; then the Council will figure out what to do with it. The Council also has been given ethics statements from the supportive professional staff and the operating staff, and so they will need to figure out what to do with all of these things. I think it would be a good idea if we could come up with one common language for the Faculty Ethics Statement before we do that. So, the changes are indicated in the text on page 45, deleted text is crossed out and added text is underlined. I believe the changes are relatively minor but there is a proposal to refer this back to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to take a look at it and then, as I say, we could vote on the amended language or whatever Faculty Rights and Responsibilities recommends at that point. Yes?

J. Stephens: A comment on the insertion on point 3, the third insertion is grammatically incorrect where it reads “other faculty member or staff” and are we going to consistently use faculty to refer to us as a body or are we going to use faculty members?

President Willis: Whatever. Yes, consistency in that matter would be grammatically pleasant, I agree. Let’s see, is there a motion to refer this? Second? Is there any other discussion? Yes?

D. Musial: I just want to call attention to everyone that the one edit in number 2 starts the “they do not” kind of language, there’s a parallel language in number 3 where we just talked about the grammatical correctness or lack thereof where it’s a do not. Those are the only “do not” statements, I think, if I read this correctly; I just personally want to say, as we refer this to the other committee, when you start talking about “do nots” you get yourself into all sorts of complex questions like what else don’t we do. So I would just encourage if we refer this that we think about that statement and see if we can say it in a way that is not listing what we don’t do. That’s all I have to say, thanks.

President Willis: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? All right, so that goes back to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.
X. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: Is there any New Business? I have none.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Comments and Questions from the Floor? Yes, Jim?

J. Lockard: I was quite intrigued this morning on whatever it is, the early morning show on National Public Radio to learn that we’re now going to be part of a four year institution in Rockford.

President Willis: Yes.

J. Lockard: Where did that come from? Did I sleep through something in the last month?

President Willis: I don’t know the history of that in any detail. I believe it’s been talked about for awhile, I think I’ve seen murmuring of it. But yeah, I don’t know the history of it but I can ask the president at some point.

F. Bryan: We were just talking about it before the meeting and it is the lead story in today’s Rockford Register Star with a photo of Peters and the president of Rock Valley College and, I agree, having sat in the same University Council sessions as many of you have, this is the first we’ve heard of it.

J. Lockard: I hope the President is planning on doing all the teaching because he seems to have made a commitment for our programs that we can’t staff now.

F. Bryan: Well, and my comment to Sue was that the timing, I mean as great as the program sounds, the timing seems very awkward in terms of with the doom and gloom we’re hearing about budgets, it seems very unfortunate and those of you who don’t subscribe, I think it was on their web site, the Rockford Register Star’s web site does give more detail than the NPR story did.

J. King: Can I ask for clarification – it sounds like there’s a two-year community college program.

J. Lockard: Basically, the way it was described on WNIU, which may or may not be quite accurate I suppose, was we’re in some kind of a partnership signed by the presidents of NIU and Rock Valley to deliver four year programs, help me Ferald, computer science, education and ---

F. Bryan: There were eight majors specifically listed.

J. Lockard: I only heard three mentioned on the radio I thought.

F. Bryan: There are eight listed in the newspaper story.
J. Lockard: Okay, it made it sound – the words that were used were particularly strange because it made it sound as though the student did not even have to apply to another institution, that they would make one application, begin at Rock Valley and sail through four years.

J. King: Well, the obvious comment is this sounds like the beginning of a flood of similar events. I can’t imagine another community college president in our service region who won’t say “um, sounds okay to me.” Well, I hope you will talk to the president about it and tell him we’re wondering what the hell is he up to.

President Willis: Perhaps that question could be raised next week at the Council meeting also. What I can do, if it’s okay with Donna to impose on her, is I do have a copy of the article and perhaps we can link it to the Faculty Senate web page so you all can read it. Yes?

J. Lockard: Our center has grown.

J. Shaffer: A question about that, do we actually staff those courses or are we simply accrediting material that is going to be taught by their faculty?

J. Lockard: A fascinating question.

J. Shaffer: That’s the issue I think that really needs to be considered.

President Willis: There was another question. Yes?

L. Derscheid: Since I’ve been part of the negotiations between Family and Consumer Nutrition Sciences and Rock Valley and working with Head Start teachers in order to achieve a four year degree, part of this has come out of two year institutions’ national trend of wanting to become four year, and they are hiring a lot more of their instructors with Ph.D. degrees so they can legitimately offer upper level classes because they have people with Ph.D. degrees. So, I was called by the President’s office to work vigorously on trying to achieve some kind of negotiation with Rock Valley. We will be approached, I’m sure, by other community colleges and I said, “who is going to teach these classes, I am so impacted with students right now” and they said “don’t worry about it, we’ll figure it out when it counts, when it happens.” So, that’s sort of ---

President Willis: Now it’s happening so they’re going to have to figure it out. Are there other questions or comments? If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. University Council Agenda (latest available) (Pages 46-47)

B. Graduate Council Minutes (latest available) (Pages 48-53)

C. Undergraduate Coordinating Council Minutes (latest available) (Pages 54-49)
D. Article from Chicago Tribune, “Ryan’s budget cuts have U. of I. Fretting” (Page 60)

E. Article from Courier News, “State has money but can’t duck cuts” (Page 61)

F. Article from Pantagraph.com, “State budget woes won’t fade” (Page 62)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.