
D. Brown attended for S. Mini.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Bauman, Bilder, burgess, Caldwell, Carpenter, Caughron, Creamer, Ganesan, Heinze, Hudson, Ilsley, Larson, McSpadden, Miranda, Montague, Popovich, Ridnour, Shumaker, Smith, Song

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: I’d like to call the meeting to order. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda? It’s been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. Are there any additions or corrections to the agenda?

J. King: I’d like to add an item under New Business which would simply be a discussion of the University Council’s reception of faculty senate initiatives, a couple of initiatives.

President Willis: Okay. Any other additions to the agenda? If not, all in favor of approving the agenda as amended say aye. Opposed? Okay.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2002 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 5-20)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting? Second? Are there any changes to the minutes? If not, all those in favor of approving the minutes of the last meeting say aye. Okay.
The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: Let’s see, President’s Announcements. I assume all of you received the letter from President Peters yesterday concerning the budget. Dr. Ivan Legg is here to respond to any questions you may have about it. Let me just say what I understand to be the situation right now with both the ’02 and ’03 budget. With the ’02 budget - by the way, a lot of this I’ve put in my report from the Board of Trustees’ Sub-Committee meeting which was yesterday and this is a walk-in but let me just say – for the FY02 budget our share of the rescission which totaled 70 million dollars over all of higher education was roughly $4.9 million. This will be handled through hiring freezes and delay of equipment purchases and that sort of thing. However, the FY03 budget – that’s sort of old news and we knew about that – the FY03 budget, however, is new news. What has happened there is that our base budget will be $4 million less for FY03 than it was originally for FY02. FY02 was $118 million, FY03 will be $114 million; in addition, the state is asking us again to pick up about 3.5 million dollars in health insurance premiums; finally, our costs are going to go up by roughly a million dollars due to increases of things that we can’t help, such as utilities and liability insurance and maintenance costs associated with new buildings and that sort of thing. So if you add all that up and include appropriate uncertainties, you end up with about a 9 or 10 million-dollar shortfall for next year as compared to this year. Right now the president is working on exactly how we’re going to do that. The other two Board of Trustees Committees are meeting tomorrow where he will present his request for a tuition – next year’s tuition rates, obviously a tuition increase is one way to deal with some of this, but you can’t deal with it all that way. Clearly other ways have to be figured out, how to find this $9 or $10 million; exactly what’s going to happen I certainly don’t know, but Ivan is here, and I don’t know if he knows either, but he’s here to answer any questions you might have about what the situation is.

Provost Legg: Notice how I buried myself on the side.

President Willis: Yeah, I saw you hiding back there.

Provost Legg: That’s when I really wished I hadn’t left. But I will be glad to try to answer any questions. John could not be here and asked me to come here and help to answer any questions if I can do that you might have so if you want to take a few minutes to stop to do that I can.

President Willis: Okay, why don’t you come up to a mike.

Provost Legg: I’m coming.

President Willis: You’re coming. Okay, good. I’m getting frantic messages from the sideboards here.

Provost Legg: It’s moving so I’ll be glad to try to answer any questions.

J. Newman Ryan: Could you just briefly tell us the process that you’re going to go through to
determine how we’re going to find this $10 million or get rid of the $10 million or whatever, or a little bit about the process?

**Provost Legg:** The process – obviously one of the most important that was mentioned was that all we all have to share the rough times that are coming ahead - one of the issues which we’re processing right now, which I cannot really give you any numbers on because it hasn’t gone through the Board of Trustees, is that there is going to have to be some sharing of making up this shortfall on the part of the tuition base that we are able to charge. That will be discussed for the first time at the Board of Trustees’ meeting tomorrow, but because the Board of Trustees has to deal with it first, I cannot comment on numbers at this particular point. But it will be a shared part of the process that we will have some help from a tuition increase. In addition to that, academic and student affairs as always, at least in my experience, we will try to spare all operations as much as we can, and so we are still looking for ways we can cut the budget that will not directly impact academic and student affairs. However, we will have to assume some of the responsibility. Those are being worked on right now. Finally, we do have to remain flexible because we don’t know – this is the governor’s proposed budget. As John pointed out, we may not know until May or June of this year what the final numbers are and we don’t know what other impacts the economy might have. However, the signs are that the economy has at least bottomed out and we’ll probably be okay, and we probably won’t have any more cuts, but it is not guaranteed.

**P. Henry:** To continue, will there be committees formed on a college basis or a departmental basis ---

**Provost Legg:** We’re going to leave that to the colleges to deal with any format that they have.

**P. Brown:** Paula Brown from Management. I understand that regular salary increases are effected. What about the increase that goes along with promotions?

**Provost Legg:** We’re going to do that. That will remain.

**P. Brown:** Okay.

**Provost Legg:** I mean, I was asked that question, but had I not even had any information at all I would have told you without any hesitation that’s going to stay. Someone asked that question of me yesterday, and I talked to John about it, and John Peters says it will stay as is. That is a very important bottom line issue.

**C. DeMoranville:** Do you have any figures on when you withhold the annual raises of faculty how much income that will add back to the budget?

**Provost Legg:** None, because there was none there in the first place. See the way we get raise money, the increment money, is from the state allocation and we’re not getting any from the state so there’s no money to reallocate. If we were to do it we’d have to take it from other source.

**C. DeMoranville:** Right, but how much money would that be?
Provost Legg: Well, it would depend on what the percentage is.

C. DeMoranville: Let’s say it’s 4%.

Provost Legg: Let’s suppose we have a 100 million dollars in salaries, I don’t know what the total salary is but it’s in that vicinity, 1% of that would be $1,000,000. So 3% would be $3 million. That was not allocated so we don’t have the money anyway.

W. Baker: Could you clarify what the position is or what the policy is concerning new hires?

Provost Legg: That is the key issue we’re trying to resolve right now. We haven’t come to a final conclusion on it, but there will be a continuation of the hold on positions until we are able to clarify how much money we’re going to have to come up with. But it’s clear that some of the money will come from positions that aren’t filled. Those positions will be held, though. We’re in a very different situation now then we were ten years ago. Ten years ago we were in a declining enrollment atmosphere and positions were just lost and gone forever. In this case we hope to at least hang on to the positions, give up the money for now, which we have to do in order to balance the budget, to the extent we need to draw on that resource and that’s not determined yet. Then hopefully – I’m very optimistic about this – John and I both come, as you know, from a state where higher education did not receive the attention that it does here. We’re very hopeful that when the economy begins to recover that we will have a reinstitution of the priority that this state has had for higher education and that we will be able to activate some of the held positions.

W. Baker: Could I ask a follow-up? What about searches which are now being programmed?

Provost Legg: I don’t have an answer to you there but I would hope to at least be able to fulfill the searches that are near completion. Exactly where we draw the line will be determined by the amount of money we need. I can’t give you an exact number right now but we’re going to try to minimize that impact.

President Willis: By the way, the president did ask me yesterday if I knew of any searches where we had invited people on campus to interview and then the search was subsequently cancelled. I do not personally know of any. If there are some let me know because he wants to know about that kind of thing.

Provost Legg: We will try to avoid that. That would be – obviously, we’ll work our way backwards by holding on ones where searches are completed and then working our way backwards. We’d have to stop searches that would be in their infancy or just before they start. I’m not guaranteeing you that. We may have to go a little bit further into the process.

C. Minor: I realize that we may have talked about this before but I still don’t understand or perhaps I’m resisting understanding why it is that the university has to pick up the health care costs and why it just happened this year.
**Provost Legg:** You’d have to ask the governor. I am just as befuddled as you are but I’m used to that kind of policy. Tennessee did that in spades. I mean, it’s a cop out way of reducing a budget, is what it is.

**J. Kowalski:** To follow up on that question – this is Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art – to follow up on the health care question, how will that give back be accomplished? Will this be in terms of adding new costs to our co-payments, to the amount that we’ll pay monthly or do you know?

**Provost Legg:** Right now, as far as I understand, that will not increase your co-payments; all it will be is that the amount of money that the state has provided for the matching or the equivalent amount that is going into our total costs for health insurance will now become our responsibility but it will not change co-payment. In other words you will still show up at your doctor and unless you’ve heard this conversation you will notice nothing different from the way the process has been done in the past in terms of the amount of dollars you have to come up with.

**S. Spear:** Do you anticipate that our covering the health insurance costs will go on even when things improve, or do you think they’ll reverse that policy?

**Provost Legg:** Your guess is as good as mine. I could probably make some snide comments but I’ll let it go. Okay, I’ll give you an indirect answer. I mean it’s a bookkeeping process. They’ve reduced our budget by that much, is what they’ve done. In all fairness and I don’t want to – all the states in the union are going through this right now and relatively speaking we’re doing better than many states in the union. In all fairness to the governor this has to be done in one way or another. There’s a number of ways it could be done and that was one way they chose to do it. So the net result is we’ve got to come up with an absolute amount of money. It’s a zero sum game. Whether you do it this way or some other way it had to be done. I think in all fairness it’s not right to pick on anybody for having done it. They had to do it one way or another.

**M. Morris:** With respect to the medical pickup, is central administration thinking that perhaps they’ll pass this along to the employees or are they committed to ---

**Provost Legg:** No, we’re committed to pay for it. Again, I want to reiterate if you go and use medical facilities, doctors’ offices, hospitals, unless you had had this conversation or read the paper you will not notice anything different than what has been done in the past. The way it is set now. I’m not guaranteeing you they won’t change it in the future. But the way the process is set now, we are going to pick up the payments that were made by the state in the past.

**C. Hubbard:** Is there going to be a longer lag period between when the physicians receive their billing and get paid down the line?

**Provost Legg:** Not to my knowledge. I’ve heard that in Illinois they do something like that but, you know, drag out - if you owe money and just keep procrastinating paying it, but --- so you can balance the books for awhile but the day of reckoning does show up. But no, I don’t know anything concrete on that issue at all but I’ve heard something along that line in the general discussions that have gone on.
**J. Kowalski:** With reference to the freeze on the faculty salaries, should we presume, would it be accurate to say that this freeze will also apply to staff and to administration?

**Provost Legg:** Yes, definitely, absolutely, 100%.

**J. Kowalski:** Okay.

**M. Morris:** Did I understand correctly that the game plan is to whatever the dollar figure is that we don’t know yet, that on the ---

**Provost Legg:** We have a rough idea of where it’s going to be.

**M. Morris:** That on the academic side central administration is going to go back to the respective colleges and tell them they’re each going to have to come up with their allocated share and reduce their ---

**Provost Legg:** At some point when we have a number we will – it may not go back exactly evenly but it will go back as a goal to obtain a total number. That number we don’t know yet for sure but we’re going to try to minimize that number.

**M. Morris:** And assuming that any college makes a determination that they’re going to meet their financial obligation or rescission of budget by suspending the hiring of a faculty member in an open slot, when things return to normal will they have to fight for that slot or will they be assured that that slot will be theirs when things return to normal?

**Provost Legg:** No, I think you’ll have to look at the situation in terms of demand and needs like you always do when you return to a situation where there are additional funds, and it may not just automatically go right back to where it was. My guess is that on the average you’ll find most of it going back the way it went out but there may be some shifts and changes even in that process. I mean, the process of shifting and changing positions happens all the time regardless of if you’re in a rich budget or in a poor budget. That’s just the natural process of a growing university because demands and needs change in fields. That will always apply in whatever situation we’re dealing with, whether we’re dealing with cutting or adding new money.

**President Willis:** Are there any other questions for Ivan?

**Provost Legg:** I want to leave you, I mean, I know you’ve heard me say this before but I’m fairly optimistic that this is a short term – we will be back on track within a year possibly, maximally a year and a half to two. John has said this and, following the economy the way Illinois has historically behaved, I think this a short-term aberration and we can survive it. Hey guys, it’s not going to be easy. I do have a commitment, if our enrollments do go up, I have a commitment from the tuition raise for the new enrollment to support some more teaching so – there are just things that happen here that I just never saw happen where I was in my previous employment. I’m pretty optimistic that things are going to be good. I’m not fiddling while Rome burns, I think I’m being realistic. Okay?
President Willis: Thanks. I do want to express my appreciation for the openness that the administration has exhibited in letting us know what’s going on pretty much as soon as they know. I think bad news is easier to take if you get it early.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Nominations for the Bob Lane Bottom of the Deck Faculty Spokesperson Award

President Willis: Moving on to items for Faculty Senate Consideration, this is the time when we take nominations for the Bob Lane Bottom of the Deck Faculty Spokesperson Award, not that you have to give them to me right now, but I will be taking nominations between now and the next Executive Committee meeting which is, I forget when, but it’s in about three or four weeks. Bob Lane, for those of you who did not know him, and I knew him but not well, was a member of this body for some time. He was described by some as being a thorn in the side of the administration. The name of this award comes from him and his description of the administration as sometimes dealing from the bottom of the deck. He was rather astute at figuring out exactly when they were doing that, and so after he passed away, this award was established to annually honor the faculty member who we felt best embodied the ideal of discovering when things were not as they seemed. So, I will be happy to take nominations for this award. You can call me or write me and I will be collecting them, as I said, and then the Executive Committee will make the final decision. We have an appropriate plaque which is given, which is illustrative. I was looking through the material for this award and apparently originally there was also supposed to be a “nose of the camel” award, which was never implemented, but this had something to do with not letting the camel’s nose inside the tent, as it were, so that gives you the idea of what we’re looking for. I will accept nominations between now and the next Executive Committee meeting which is on the 27th.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: Okay, I have nothing on the Consent Agenda so let’s move to reports from the Advisory Committees.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in

President Willis: The first one is the FAC to the IBHE, Pat Henry.

P. Henry: Yes, there’s a walk-in that has two pages that describe the meeting and then an additional several pages that are supplementary and for your edification. It was held last Friday just before the snowstorm hit on the campus of Chicago State University. There were two parts of the meeting as usual. The informational meeting led with Dr. Hines who is a past FAC chair and professor emeritus form ISU who was specifically addressing the issue of state money going to private colleges and universities via IMAP grants and capital development funds. I noticed right away in New Business that there’s something from the Council of Illinois University
Senates that speaks to this issue as well. He came out in terms of the IMAP funds being a good idea in that it made more universities available to more different kinds of students as opposed to having just rich kids in the rich schools. On the matter of capital improvement funds, however, he was in agreement with many on the FAC that a better balance is needed in terms of what goes to the publics versus the privates, and he suggests that we should recommend removing private independent colleges from the capital improvement recommendation list and just pay them off with the tobacco settlement funds. So, I’m not sure how that will work. This was suggested to the FAC Budget Committee for further comment and discussion.

The other part of the informational meeting, Debra Smitley from the IBHE Budgets and Administration gave yet another perspective on what Provost Legg was just talking about here in terms of the budget. Indeed, the matter of this 45 million dollars – in the second paragraph under Deborah Smitley— is 45 million dollars total in the state that will have to be paid by public universities to Central Management Services. The question, indeed, was raised, why now? No one seemed to know. How this is going to be divvied up wasn’t clear then. Obviously, it’s a little clearer now. Our share is apparently $3.5 million and there was some feeling that, indeed, this would be something that quite likely would continue although no one was completely certain. Another side note on this, there was some question as to why this was just the public universities and not community colleges being effected. The answer was that community colleges do not get their health insurance through CMS and don’t have that extensive coverage to begin with. The IBHE is aware that this is a painful time and will be working to develop impact statements and they’re really not sure how far ahead this is going to go beyond 2003. We’ll have to wait and see how things work out.

The business part of the meeting, on page two, there were a couple of points. One referenced a web site, and I’ll be contacting some of you about this, the question of best practices for electronically offered degrees and courses. They’re trying to work – the FAC is trying to work on something that will then go to the IBHE which will then be passed on to other institutions in terms of implementing them. I think we have that pretty well covered here too.

The major issue, and this is what most of the – pretty much all of the additional pages are about – is this report to the IBHE on non-tenured faculty and this is “all faculty matter”. It is available on the web site. I have a copy of it as well. There was considerable discussion about how the FAC should respond and I would really like to get some feedback from you as well because the matter – this is non-tenured track – many different names for these kinds of faculty – some are instructors, some are adjunct, some are part-time, some are instructor level, temporary people but others are in much more settled positions and there’s a great range of opinion about what happens to them and with them. This report was felt generally to be a little bit too rosy as far as describing people as being, for the most part, pretty satisfied, If you look over on the impact – or the excerpts, I ran off the Executive Summary where it gives you the purposes, where the study came from, the key findings and the answer to four key questions on page two of the excerpts, the general response that was obtained through this survey, which is also available on the web, by the way, prepared by the Center for Governmental Studies at NIU, was that there was fairly high satisfaction. Many people on the FAC felt that that was not necessarily so. There was also a good deal of discussion that whether or not they were satisfied, there was much greater impact on education through the hiring of non-tenured faculty than was really being addressed in this
report; that with the most satisfied non-tenured faculty available it still became an issue if there weren’t enough permanent faculty – tenured faculty – to maintain program quality and continuity. Others noted that as the percentage of non-tenured faculty increased, the problem of finding enough tenure track faculty to serve on committees becomes a concern; if non-tenured faculty play a big role on hiring committees they may bring very different standards to bear on hiring decisions. There are a lot of implications, some of which we’ve discussed here before as well. The thing I would really appreciate is if you would look at the recommendations. “Conclusions and Recommendations” on pages 3 and 4 of the excerpts section would be good to look at, and get feedback to me to be able to get to the FAC before their April meeting, because they need to collect this and express opinions at the IBHE meeting in April. The feeling was that, in particular, the excerpt under “Conclusion” in the second paragraph says after it says nevertheless one can still ask are our non-tenured track faculty overused and mistreated as some claim? The committee, that is the committee that prepared this report – the committee believes that the growth in the non-tenured track at public universities and the strong reliance by community colleges on part-time faculty can touch on issues of educational quality and the FAC felt fairly strongly that “can” was kind of an understatement that it does affect and is affecting issues of educational quality and that these should be looked at very closely.

If you have any comments or feedback, I’d be very grateful to get them.

**President Willis:** Okay, thank you Pat. Yes, David.

**D. Wagner:** Do we ask any questions? There’s a list of percentages for all public universities. Are there percentages available for Northern?

**P. Henry:** I should think so, yes. The summary, if you go to – I’m sorry, this is sort of all over the place – but, where it starts the page of excerpts there’s a web site, http/www.ibhe etc. That’s the IBHE’s web site. The entire – with all charts and everything is there as well as the summary results of the survey. So, I didn’t pull those numbers out but they are there. Would you like to have those numbers?

**D. Wagner:** Oh, I’d sure like to know about Northern is all. This did come up last year one time and was postponed.

**P. Henry:** I'll check it out.

**C. DeMoranville:** Pat, you may not have the answer to this but I’m just looking at the compensation. I hope this is a typo – where median salaries at public universities are $25,200 and the median salary at community colleges is $24,900.

**P. Henry:** Isn’t that interesting.

**C. DeMoranville:** There’s only $300 difference between the median salary at a community college versus – it says public universities – do you know if that was including community colleges or is it all just four-year public institutions?
P. Henry: I believe universities means four year at least institutions and yeah, there were a couple of places in this survey that seems like community colleges were getting very close to public universities in a number of things and I don’t know really enough about the way in which the survey was done.

C. DeMoranville: Not to denigrate anything that anyone is doing in a community college, but they don’t have, especially for tenure track faculty at the university, the research responsibilities and service responsibilities that we have and it surprises me that these median salaries are actually that close.

President Willis: It seems actually if you look at the next paragraph it says that tenure, tenure track faculty in public universities made more than twice the salaries of full time, non-tenured track. Okay, never mind.

P. Henry: Yeah, that’s tenure---

President Willis: I was thinking it was comparing to the ---

P. Henry: It’s what they’re doing on the FTE, yeah – there were ---

President Willis: That number did strike me as being low.

P. Henry: This is what they gave me so that’s where I’m taking it from.

President Willis: Right, yeah. I’ll check it out. Okay, any other questions? Yes?

J. Stephens: On the excerpts, page four, the fifth entry, “Illinois public colleges and universities should involve non-tenure-track faculty in departmental and campus wide meetings and decision making bodies”. I don’t think that’s in our best interest for community as a college. That’s what our mission reflects, and they’re employees, not policy makers.

P. Henry: Okay, noted. You are not alone in believing that.

President Willis: Okay, other comments or questions for Pat? All right, if not then we can move on.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

President Willis: Let’s see, the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee will meet tomorrow as will the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee so we should have reports from both of them next time.
D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe – report – walk-in

President Willis: The Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee met yesterday as you may have noticed if you read the Northern Star today. Representatives to that are Judy Burgess and Bev Espe but I attended the meeting as well and wrote up a report of it which is one of the walk-ins here. Let me just – a lot of it had to do with the budget, which we’ve really already covered. Just a couple of other things. The capital improvement budget – we requested $4.9 million for equipment and furniture and whatnot for Barsema Hall. All the equipment requests were cut by 20% and so what we got was $3.9 million. Exactly how that will be handled I don’t know, but that’s what we got. Then there are a couple of things about SURS, particularly what’s called the thirty and out policy where an employee with thirty years of service can retire at full – without having any age related penalty – normally there’s a penalty associated with retiring before age 60 but with the thirty and out if you’ve had thirty years of service, then that doesn’t apply. That thirty and out provision sunsets on the first of next year and would then revert to a thirty-five and out so you would have to have thirty-five years of service in order to retire before age 60 without a penalty. The university is actively campaigning for this to be renewed but, of course, the legislature doesn’t always do what we tell it to; but they are working on that. I think that’s all I want to point out from there. Are there any questions about that committee meeting?

P. Henry: I got an e-mail today saying that it would be a good idea to write or call your legislatures about this because it may well die in committee or something. I didn’t completely understand the formalities but ---

President Willis: That’s the thirty and out, right? Okay, so yes – if that issue is important to you by all means contact your legislator about it. They are working on that this session, so --- Okay, any other questions or comments? All right, if not, let’s move on to reports from the standing committees.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Ryan, Chair – no report


President Willis: Academic Affairs, no report.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair

President Willis: Economic Status has no report.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Carole Minor, Chair – report
President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget, Carole?

C. Minor: First I’d like to thank all of you who responded to our survey and note that in the current economic conditions we probably are not going to get a lot of attention the things that you’ve said, but we are going to keep them and keep them in our own consciousness, those of us who remain on the committee.

The Resource, Space and Budget Committee met on February 7 with members of the APC including Provost Legg and Associate Provosts Wheeler and Cassidy. We discussed how we might collaborate and how the Resource, Space and Budget Committee might get information about resources needed by program areas through the program review process of the APC. The APC members who were there seemed to be very interested in cooperating with the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. There was some discussion about sending information to the committee as it is sent to the Provost. There was really no resolution to that, however. The Provost distributed the Barsema Space domino plan, that is who will move where when Barsema is occupied. He requested that we not share it with anyone until the President has made an announcement. So far as I know, the President has not made an announcement, however, all of those people who are going to be affected have been notified, we’re told. Tomorrow we’re going to meet with Dean Zar to hear his report on the status of the Graduate School, including funding for faculty travel and research, and how that has changed over the past ten years or the years of his tenure. The last meeting of the Committee in April we will address issues that came up at the last meeting in terms of direction and mission of the Committee.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. By the way, I also have called the President’s office a couple of times to find out about that. I think it’s not on the top of their minds at the moment. They’re a little pre-occupied with the budget but I will keep trying to find out if we can distribute that or not. Are there any questions for Carole?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Carol DeMoranville, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Chris Hubbard, Chair – no report

President Willis: Okay, Rules and Governance. Chris you have no report? Okay.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

1. Nominations for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of the Faculty Senate. (See list of University Council members eligible to be elected) (Page 21)

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight? I’m going to turn the program now over to Gretchen.

G. Bisplinghoff: If you’ll turn to page 21 in your packet you will see the list of those faculty who are eligible to serve as the Executive Secretary/President of Faculty Senate and who did not indicate an unwillingness to serve. You can remove from this list Sengoda Ganesan and James
King is retained because he was re-elected to the University Council and therefore is eligible. So what we do need to do now is open the floor for nominations for those folks you would like to nominate for this post. Do I have any nominations? Yes?

**J. Wolfskill:** I hope I’m not just making this up but do I remember correctly from last month’s meeting that Sue is willing to continue?

**S. Willis:** Yes.

**J. Wolfskill:** Then I nominate Sue Willis for this position.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Okay, we have a nomination for Sue Willis. We have a second. Are there any other nominations? Don’t everybody volunteer at once. If not, I guess I will move that the nominations be closed. So moved. Do we need a second?

**President Willis:** Thank you all. I know you’re all just dying to be sitting up here!

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Willis:** All right, moving on to Unfinished Business.

A. Faculty Senate [Evaluation](#) of the President (Page 22)

**President Willis:** This I brought to you last time, I think - the Faculty Senate Evaluation of the President. I rewrote this slightly to accommodate some feedback that I got. I also talked to Ken Davidson who’s the parliamentarian for the Board of Trustees about what their schedule is. He said that they do evaluate the President every year. Typically, they get it done by the time of their June meeting because that’s when the increments get decided. So my thinking is that we’ll settle on a procedure now and then we can get the actual process started in the fall, because I anticipate that the whole thing is going to take a while; that would have us getting feedback either just before or just after Christmas in some kind of final form, and then it could be transmitted to the Board of Trustees, say, at their March meeting and then they would have it to consider at their June meeting. I will be having lunch with them tomorrow and will talk to the Trustees directly about this then as well. So, if anybody has any more feedback about how we should do this or what the criteria should be, I have six areas here – as I say, this was taken from the 1997 Faculty Senate minutes so there are six areas here. What we would do is request the President to write written responses similar to a faculty service report that we all write. This then – everybody would get one. You would take it to your departments, get input, bring it back. The Executive Committee then acting as – similarly to a merit evaluation committee in the department – would write up an evaluation and then share it with the President and with the Board of Trustees.

**C. Minor:** Sue, are we going to put a written time-line on this so the President’s report would be due on January 15 or something?

**President Willis:** Yes. I will do that. I haven’t yet because I’m still thinking about when to do
it but yes, we’ll put times on it. Okay, any other questions or comments?

D. Wagner: In all departments does the Executive Committee function as the evaluation committee? I have the feeling that in a lot of departments they’re two separate bodies.

President Willis: I’m not sure my home department even has an Executive Committee. We have a Merit Evaluation Committee which is – that’s all it does.

D. Wagner: I guess I can just see some problems in having the Executive Committee and the Merit Evaluation Committee the same, but I may be wrong on that I guess.

President Willis: Yeah, well if you’d like to propose an alternative, we can certainly consider it.

D. Wagner: I also wonder would the report be made available to the Senate? Would they know what was in the evaluation? I can see it being very sticky, you know, if it were voted on by the Senate although I’m not sure I would disapprove of that, but I think the Senate should at least probably know the result.

President Willis: Okay, let me think about that. I presume we could go into executive session or something like that and do it that way.

D. Wagner: I sort of think that at least should be discussed by the Senate.

President Willis: Okay. Are there any other comments?

J. King: This is already policy, so you don’t need a motion do you?

President Willis: For?

J. King: To approve this.

President Willis: It was approved back in ’97 so ---

J. King: So this is just an update of that? You don’t need a motion?

President Willis: I don’t think so.

J. King: Okay, thank you.

President Willis: But if people want to modify it – that’s what I’m looking for is to get it into final form. Okay. Any other questions or comments? Okay.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution from the Council of Illinois University Senates (Pages 23-24)

ACTION ITEM
President Willis: Under New Business I have an item which is on, well, the explanation of it is on page 23 and then the item itself is on page 24. This comes from the Council of Illinois University Senates, which is a group that consists of the presidents of the faculty senates of the public universities in Illinois. They met last month, unfortunately on the day when the University Council was meeting, and so I was not able to go but Jody Newman-Ryan did go. Let’s see, Jody, do you want to give us a little background on the discussion and where this resolution came from?

J. Newman-Ryan: I’m not sure where it came from. This was a body that was formed last year and didn’t do a lot last year. We went through the process of trying to establish a constitution which if any of you recall, I think we looked at last year and it was one page and we all thought it was the shortest set of bylaws or constitution we’d ever seen so that was a good thing. But they haven’t done a whole lot and so certainly with the budget constraints and things people threw out the limited agenda we had and came up with this, that we should address the budget issues. So, what was decided as I understand it – what they decided to do was to draft a letter that we could send to local newspapers including university papers and pass on to bodies such as this, trying to reach out to the community as a whole to get involved in this so this is not just a faculty issue. These budget constraints will affect the university in a variety of ways, and therefore the community in a variety of ways, and so this was their first attempt to try to do that. That was the only action that we took that day. There was some other discussion about what we might do, but this was basically the only action that was taken. This letter was forwarded to Sue shortly thereafter.

President Willis: Okay, so the --- if you look at this, this addresses the issue which has already been brought up by Pat of the IMAP grants and the fact that actually more than half goes to students that are attending private universities. The average award is considerably larger for a student attending a private university because the private universities tend to be more expensive. There is a feeling that this really is unfair to the public in a sense because it represents a state subsidy to the private universities and so the recommendation is to make it more equitable, not necessarily to cut the private universities off completely but to make it so that the fraction of money that goes to students attending private universities is similar to the fraction of grants that goes. So, if they get a third of the grants then they would get a third of the money, for example. That would be one way to make it more equitable.

Now, I took this and talked it over with Kathy Buettner, because she’s our legislative expert, and she recommended that in the third paragraph there’s a sentence that starts about halfway down that says “We feel that this policy is untenable given the current fiscal conditions facing public institutions, which are constrained by state legislation from significantly raising their tuition, fees ---” that’s not true, there is no such state legislation. We are constrained really only by political considerations and by what our Trustees will allow us to do but there is not any state legislation that directly addresses this. There is a bill, and apparently there is almost every year, a bill introduced into the legislature to either prohibit universities from raising their tuition or to, if they do, to cut their appropriations by an equivalent amount. This bill never goes anywhere but Kathy was a little worried that, you know we don’t really want to get the legislature thinking
about such things. So I would like to delete that sentence from this. Okay? Since it represents an inaccuracy. So I will --- yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** Would it be equally disturbing if you just wiped out the “by state legislation” and had it “which are constrained from significantly raising their tuition fees”. It seems to me that that’s a true statement.

**President Willis:** That were constrained in ways that ---

**P. Henry:** Yeah, then we don’t have to go into detail in how we’re constrained.

**President Willis:** Okay, yes so just scratch out “by state legislation”.

**P. Henry:** Yes.

**President Willis:** Okay, I have no problem with that. Okay, so is that all right?

**P. Henry:** Constrained from sounds a little strange.

**President Willis:** Really? Sounds okay to me, but ---

**P. Henry:** I’m getting used to it.

**President Willis:** It’s grammatically the same whether you cross that phrase out or not. If it’s strange now, it was strange before. I would entertain a motion to pass this resolution with that deletion so we cross out “by state legislation”. Is there a second? Okay. Discussion? I would then --- if you look at what it says in the letter here, if we do pass this, I would then submit it as an op-ed piece to the local papers, the Chronicle and the Midweek and the Star. So, okay. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor? Opposed. All right, thank you. That was quick.

The motion was approved with changes.

**J. Lockard:** Can you share that information, about there being no legislative restrictions, with the rest of the CIUS members?

**President Willis:** I already have. Okay, let’s see there are some information items here --- oh, sorry. Oh, Jim – all right, I’m sorry, Jim. I had that written right here.

**J. King:** If you really want to do it.

**President Willis:** I really, really do. Item B under New Business, which we added, and I need a big red pencil for this so my aging eyes actually see it. It’s the University Council reception of Faculty Senate items, from Jim.

**J. King:** Well, I thought it would be neat to have some sort of follow up, and I can furnish some of it, supported I hope by everybody in the room who’s a member of the Rules Committee of the
University Council. I can’t probably do very much on the other item that is before the University Council, that is the matter that came up pertaining to investigation of follow-up on grievance procedures that – I think you know immensely more about that than I do. But at any rate, Sue Mini isn’t here right?

President Willis: No, she isn’t.

J. King: All right. Well, the Rules Committee took up the Faculty Senate initiative regarding Faculty Personnel Advisor and, you’ll recall, I think there were five, six or seven separate suggestions. Most of these proved fairly uncontroversial but – you guessed it – as to which one generated the controversy and that was the introduction of the term advocate. That is that the Faculty Personnel Advisor will advocate. This is going to go to the University Council and we may anticipate a fight. The Rules Committee had the unusual honor of having a vice president and the university lawyer, George Shur, attend UC committee meetings. This was a rare event. There was a number of concerns that they addressed, but the principal one, I take it, and I wasn’t there for the whole meeting, I had overlapping meetings, so I had to leave but I take it that the principal focus was on this advocacy point. There were a few side issues too. The discussion was so protracted the matter was carried over to a second Rules Committee meeting and at that Rules Committee meeting the idea of dropping, deleting the Faculty Senate initiative on advocacy rules for the Faculty Personnel Advisor was made, and that was defeated. All the faculty members present at the meeting spoke out against it; but that’s only the beginning. I expect that there will be a real battle at the University Council and I honestly think that it will probably – I’m never sure, I mean, who speaks for the Faculty Senate at a University Council meeting. If it is a Faculty Senate initiative, does Sue have to do it? I mean, she’s also an officer of the University Council with constitutional and bylaws responsibilities. If you let it by default just fall to those of us who are Faculty Senate members and University Council members and go to both meetings, I’m not too sure that’s good enough. That isn’t a very professional way to do it. I’m half inclined to think that if we know in advance that there’s going to be a fight, we should have the chair of the Faculty Senate Committee that advanced the issue be recognized and address the University Council. I don’t know. Malcolm was at the Rules Committee meeting and he wants to add something I’m sure.

President Willis: Did you want to say something Malcolm?

M. Morris: I think Jim – I don’t want to but I am – I was at the first meeting. I was under the impression the matter wasn’t going to come up at the second meeting because I was out of town so I don’t know what happened at the second meeting, but I think Jim accurately portrayed what happened at the first meeting of the Rules and Governance.

P. Henry: I’m just a little confused. If you could clarify what was voted down and it was just the Rules Committee that voted it down or what?

J. King: Exactly. The matter is still between the Rules Committee and the University Council. Is it going to be on the agenda at the next meeting?

President Willis: I think so. Could you clarify what the language is that’s survived the Rules
Committee?

**J. King:** Advocacy. It’s included.

**President Willis:** It’s in there.

**J. King:** It’s included and there will also be a two page statement, single spaced, summarizing the remarks of George Shur and I suppose also of Anne Kaplan at the meeting. Because if you don’t give it to them on paper, they’re going to say it again at the meeting so might as well just let the University Council members read this in advance. So, the initiative – I don’t know if the – the Council committees are pretty loose and I don’t know if it was actually a motion – but the idea was that it was suggested that the Rules Committee strike out the idea advanced from the Faculty Senate that the Faculty Personnel Advisor will play an advocacy role. That was the initiative and that initiative was struck down and all of the faculty members, the University Council, who were at the meeting voted – and spoke against it. But we know there’s going to be a fight on the floor. I mean, the Vice President is not going to let this pass.

**C. DeMoranville:** Jim, could you tell me or inform the rest of us what was their main problem with the word advocacy?

**J. King:** Oh they had half a dozen problems with it. Some of the same arguments that we heard, namely that the Faculty Personnel Advisor loses credibility with the other side – the side opposed to the person for whom the FPA is advocating – and ought to be playing a mediating role. What are you going to do if the two different persons in the same department or persons in different departments both go to the Faculty Personnel Advisor, the clumsiness of deciding who, which will be represented by the Faculty Personnel Advisor and which one won’t. Then the other will be supported by the Alternate Faculty Personnel Advisor. Then there was also some stuff that I wanted to stay away from because bringing this up, it seems to me, to be a side issue and that is George Shur expressed a good deal of concern over the idea that the Faculty Personnel Advisor should be a lawyer. A faculty member who is a lawyer and that struck me as silly but at any rate, that is what he said and I’m sure that’s going to be part of the discussion at the UC meeting. I can’t comment on that it just seemed like to me such a dumb thing to say that I couldn’t get into it at all.

**D. Wagner:** If Shur’s statement is going to be written out, is the Faculty Senate’s position going to be written out? I mean, it should be if you argue that writing it out is important; then the argument on the other side should be written out. I would think this body especially would agree with that.

**President Willis:** I’m trying to remember if there was a rationale that accompanied the original passage. I think there was although it was short. Carol, do you remember?

**C. DeMoranville:** Well, when we brought the resolution – I don’t believe the resolution included a rationale. I think that my discussion may have done so and I’m sure it’s in the minutes but I don’t believe that the resolution – I try to keep those fairly short without a lot of rationale in it.
President Willis: Okay, do you want to write something? Do you want me to write something?

C. DeMoranville: Do you want an honest answer, Sue?

President Willis: Well, if you write something I will include it.

C. DeMoranville: Okay.

J. King: Well, I raise the question of who represents the Faculty Senate and since it’s been mentioned I would like to think that we could call upon the committee chair to at the UC meeting to represent, stand behind, the Faculty Senate initiative. I think that’s the way to go.

President Willis: Okay, I have no problem with inviting Carol – I think there’s a procedure for that for having people who are not members of the Council address the Council which I think is pretty straightforward.

D. Wagner: Well further, if there are specific objections that were made, maybe they should be addressed, not just a general preliminary justification for the original proposal but a response to Shur’s arguments.

J. Newman-Ryan: I have two questions. So we’re asking for a faculty advocate to advocate for a faculty advocate, is that right? Okay. The second one, more seriously, Jim, is anyone willing in the administration to provide another faculty advocate? I mean we talked about that at the Executive Board – I doubt that they’re willing to recommend that anybody else serve in this role or fund that are they?

J. King: No.


J. Stephens: I think in preparation for this letter it might be useful to talk to the ombudsman because he’s put into the situation where he has to balance being an advocate and a representative and he might be able to help us with clarifying the language on what we want to accomplish here.

President Willis: Did you want to address that, Tim, or not?

T. Griffin: I will say only that the ombudsman, as the role is currently defined by the constitution and bylaws of Northern Illinois University is never an advocate, and is prohibited from an advocacy role, so I really cannot speak from experience in terms of being a representative or an advocate.

J. Stephens: Is that a professional standard?

T. Griffin: Yes and no. It is a professional standard for ombudspersons within higher
education. Governmental, federal agencies and certain prison systems and other places that have
individuals with a similar title do allow advocacy as a part of their role, but within the context of
colleges and universities in North American it is a part of the standards of practice of the
University and College Ombudsman Association.

**J. Stephens:** In terms of day-to-day practice, do you see a conflict with these two goals that we
want out of a faculty representative?

**T. Griffin:** Between the role of ombudsperson and the Faculty Personnel Advisor?

**J. Stephens:** No, excuse me, the role of advocacy. Do you see that it conflicts with the other
things that we want from a Personnel Advisor?

**T. Griffin:** I believe that the advocacy role for Faculty Personnel Advisor might best be
envisioned in my mind or used as an analogue, what is done frequently in state governments that
have ombudspersons, the ombudspersons that are approached and charged in state governments
generally are charged to attempt first to resolve matters as informally and objectively as possible.
If that fails, they are empowered at their discretion to become an advocate or more actively
advocate for a particular outcome or a particular side or dispute. It seems to me that the Faculty
Personnel Advisor role as we have had it historically here, including the recent changes that are
proposed, are somewhat consistent with that kind of an approach. To ask if there’s a conflict, it
seems to me that it does require a great deal of mature wisdom and discretion on the part of the
incumbent to know when to switch those roles and for which cases he or she might most
appropriately advocate and for which he or she might say look, I can’t get on board with this one.
I think you’re wrong and I really don’t feel that it’s fair or right to be your advocate. Now, does
that represent a conflict, back to your original question, I think on some levels perhaps for the
individuals most intimately involved in that particular conflict it may represent a conflict, but if
you’re asking me if that conflict is inherent and unavoidable in the role as defined, I would say
from a more global perspective, no. It may be, in fact, exactly what you want and need here.

**J. Stephens:** Thank you very much.

**B. Espe:** Jim, could I ask in regard to George’s, George Shur’s comments regarding the FPA
and being an attorney, is that related to the past issues with the grievance procedure and ---

**J. King:** I don’t know. I couldn’t make any sense out of it.

**B. Espe:** Okay.

**J. King:** I’m at a loss. Do you know what he was talking about?

**M. Morris:** I thought Anne was more attuned to that than George.

**J. King:** Whatever, can you make sense of it?

**M. Morris:** I don’t know, Jim.
President Willis: All right. Let me double-check on the calendar when this issue will come up before the University Council, and Carol, would you be willing to come to the University Council meeting?

C. DeMoranville: Yes.

President Willis: So we will arrange that.

F. Bryan: We do have a provision to designate her as a consultant to the University Council.

President Willis: Okay, that sounds good to me.

C. DeMoranville: I have one question. Is there combat pay available?

J. King: The other item that went before the University Council and relates to the same, meaning the SPS issues and that – my impression is that the Council was simply befuddled because there wasn’t very much information available and then Sue, you took over and said that you were going to take it to the Steering Committee and sort out the issues. Is that right?

President Willis: Yes, I invited Carol to the Steering Committee meeting and she gave us quite a bit of background on what the issues were. We agreed at the Steering Committee that rather than forming a subcommittee right away to do this, that I would do a little sort of under cover work and see how much information I could gather and report back to the Steering Committee next time with the idea of identifying if there are particular hot spots that need to be looked at and if so, where they are and that kind of thing. I’m sort of a committee of one investigating that at the moment. If it looks like it could benefit from a larger committee then we’ll look at that.

D. Wagner: Are we done with that?

President Willis: I think so.

D. Wagner: I take it there is a third initiative about proposing an honors college. As I read what was adopted, I wasn’t here, but that sort of died. I keep trying to get it before the Academic Affairs Committee but it hasn’t yet happened.

J. Newman-Ryan: It didn’t die. I talked to Mary today about it.

D. Wagner: All right.

J. Newman-Ryan: I assume Mary will pursue that.

D. Wagner: It takes a while to get it done and it wasn’t clear if your full report was submitted originally. I pushed to get the full report. Again, it raises the problem of exactly the relationship between the Senate and the University Council but I take it that your report was given to her
W. Baker: Carrying on with this business on the relationship with the university - between us and the University Council and back to the other issue. A very strong statement was sent from this body to the University Council. Am I right in assuming that that is now going to be buried somewhere, and I know you are a constituted committee of one to sleuth, but eventually are we right in assuming that you will report back to the University Council because there was a very strong resolution which passed unanimously from this body.

President Willis: Yes, I put that entire resolution into the University Council minutes so they have seen it.

W. Baker: I’m aware they’ve seen it, but you were there and I was there and Jim was there – they simply pushed it aside to put it simply until – because there wasn’t enough data.

President Willis: Yes, I will be reporting back to the Council and to the Senate as to what the upshot of all that is.

W. Baker: So it may well be that we shall again have to pass another resolution which will then have to go before the University Council?

President Willis: What are you thinking of?

W. Baker: Well, again, to repeat Jim King’s question, it is not clear – things – we pass resolutions, we discuss them, we put them before University Council and then somehow they get buried.

President Willis: Okay. One of the things I want to keep doing is keep track of things that have been referred to different committees and make sure they don’t get lost. If you recall, I did that right at the beginning of the year, looking for things that had gotten referred to committees and hadn’t come back out again. So, it’s certainly my intention to keep doing that and make sure that all these things that get referred for action in fact come back and have some kind of action or resolution attached. I will keep on top of that.

W. Baker: Surely one’s perception of action is not simply to put it to another subcommittee.

President Willis: Right.

W. Baker: So when do you think you can come back to us on this particular issue?

President Willis: I expect – I will give you a progress report at the next Faculty Senate meeting and let you know what I’ve found out so far.

W. Baker: Thanks very much.

President Willis: I doubt it will be finished by then but I will tell you where it is. Okay, any
other discussion?

P. Henry: This is just very minor but I wanted to clarify something I said earlier. These reports actually do not draw out any individual universities when talking about tenure track faculty so that information actually isn’t there. Sorry.

President Willis: Okay. We’ll see if we can find it for NIU. I wrote that down already. Okay. Let’s see, moving on.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any Comments and Questions From the Floor? Not that we haven’t been having them.

J. King: I wonder if anybody else noticed Governor Ryan’s remarks about privatization of the pension funds for state employees? This was, if I’m not mistaken, in the governor’s state of the budget, his budget message. If you read the follow up on this, he was interviewed or encountered some reporters and they asked him questions that he had said in his budget message and he denied he had said them and this was one of them – “what, did I say that”. That’s reported on page two of the Tribune. I don’t have the date but it happened. Does anybody know anything about this because if they are trying to move to privatize SURS completely without anybody’s say so, they might be able to pull a quick one on us just as they did with regard to the health insurance coverage being passed off to the universities. I’m not so sure this is a terrible idea. I’m just wondering whether we might – is this a fitting matter for the committee on Economic Status to look at – to look into?

President Willis: I can see what I can find. I’ve heard nothing along those lines.

J. King: Okay.

President Willis: But I’ll see what I can find out. Okay, any other comments or questions?

C. Minor: I’m going back to the statement made by the Provost about the health insurance and I would like to have all of us acknowledge the political nature of the Faculty Senate and the University Council. Jim has talked about that how we need to advocate for our positions with the Faculty Senate. If we’re to ask the governor what’s happening to our budget, it’s possible that we could get a governor who might be a little more supportive of higher education and I’ve not made my decisions about how I’m going to vote next week – next week or whenever it is – but it seems to me we should be asking some questions and we should be attempting to get a governor who would be more supportive. I would like to say one thing about community colleges. In Pat’s report, Carol noticed the similarity between the salaries in the community colleges and higher education. A number of years ago I went to a conference and I roomed with someone who was an administrator at a community college and her rules for reimbursement allowed her to get a lot more money for going to that conference than I did. Every aspect of the allowances for travel for the community college was higher than ours at NIU. There is also – there are many other aspects of teaching at a community college and teaching at the university
which sometimes make me wonder, if I think about them, why I am here? Because I could be doing a lot better economically if I were teaching at a community college. So, ultimately I’d like that observation and I’d like to urge us all to see if we can’t get a governor who’ll be more supportive of higher education.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. I have no idea myself of what their various attitudes are. Okay, any other comments or questions?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

President Willis: Okay, let me just draw your attention to the Information Items. G. and H. are sort of historic interest now, since the budget situation has totally changed since I put those in there, but they’re interesting.

A. University Council Agenda (latest available) (Pages 25-26)
B. Minutes from November 19, 2001 Academic Planning Council Meeting (Pages 27-29)
C. Minutes from November 26, 2001 Academic Planning Council Meeting (Pages 30-31)
D. Minutes from December 6, 2001 Undergraduate Coordinating Council Meeting (Pages 32-39)
E. Article from Chicago Tribune, “College chief to lead state board” (Page 40)
F. Article from Daily Chronicle, “STATE BUDGET: Education funding cut for first time in Ryan years” (Page 41)
G. Memorandum from Keith R. Sanders, Executive Director of Illinois Board of Higher Education, Governor Ryan’s Fiscal Year 2003 Budget (Pages 42-43)
H. Press release from NIU Office of Public Affairs, “NIU President Says Governor ‘Honored Commitment to Education: In FY03 Austerity Budget Plan’” (Page 44)

I. Alternate Policy List (Page 45)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

President Willis: I’d like to entertain a motion to adjourn. Okay, see you all later.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.