I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

M. Morris: For those of you who don’t know me, I am not Sue Willis and I’m not even Jody Ryan. I’m Malcolm Morris. I’m the Secretary of the Senate and I’m in this seat because Sue is on leave and Jody is not in town today. So the first order of business is to adopt the agenda. Do I have a motion? Do I have a second? I would like at this point to ask that we make a change to the Agenda by substituting IV for V, switching those two items because the President is here right now. I would also under new IV, like to have letter D moved to the top of the President’s Announcements. Do I have a motion to that effect? A second? All those in favor? All those in favor then of adopting the Agenda as amended? So moved.

The Agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3, 2002 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 6-26)

M. Morris: The next item is the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes? Do I have a second? Any discussion or changes to the minutes? There being none, all those in favor? Opposed? The minutes are passed.

The minutes were approved.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Report of the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty Personnel Advisor (William Baker, Chair, Pen Woo, Robert Zerwekh)

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

D. President Peters will be here to have end of year discussion.

M. Morris: I will now go to item D. President John Peters has asked to be here and we’re pleased to have him so I’m going to just give him the microphone.

President Peters: Well, good afternoon everyone. I got wet on the way over; I’m not sure about you. We didn’t plan this meeting well. I think we ought to send this to Rules and Governance. This is not good. I want to spend my time and I’ll take any questions you have
about anything, but I’ve really got to focus on the budget because that is on my mind and it will continue to be on my mind for the next two weeks and months. I’m giving you a preview of an e-mail I am sending to all faculty/staff/students for which I have a Groupwise e-mail. I will also get it distributed to those who don’t have Groupwise in other ways. You know I do this infrequently, but the end of the year, the academic year, is coming up and I need to communicate about the budget situation. I guess – it’s quicksand – there’s no bottom to this. So, I’m going to read the e-mail I’m sending out. This is a draft and I may be making some corrections later on this afternoon. Basically, the point is, this is more serious now. We’re in a more serious situation than we were the last time I spoke to you and the Council and sent an e-mail, so I want to go through that today and let you know where we are and what we’re doing. And, of course, this is the whole state. Remember don’t think that NIU or higher education is being singled out. This is a very, very bad state-wide situation. Anyway, my e-mail is going to say something like this. “I pledged to keep you informed about Illinois’s current budget crisis and I feel that the time has come for an update to my last all-campus e-mail message. Each day’s news contains new revelations about the extent of our state’s financial troubles. The sheer volume of budget-related stories has made it difficult for even the most avid reader of state politics or follower of state politics to translate these latest predictions into tangible budgetary impact for NIU. That said, it’s clear to me that Illinois’s devastating revenue shortfall,” will carry a much greater cost to NIU than anyone thought possible just six weeks ago. It is also clear that our plan to manage budget cuts through reallocation and a tuition increase will not be enough in this new environment and that our best efforts to avoid layoffs and other dire measures may not entirely be successful.” In other words, what I’m saying is we’re in a different budget environment today than we were six weeks ago and that strategy was a good strategy at that time but now we’re in the quicksand. “It appears that the state budget picture will remain in flux for some weeks.” That’s the truth, I mean we’re going to be in an environment of uncertainty in terms of the budget for a good bit of time – for several months, maybe through next year at this time. “The Governor and the members of the General Assembly are struggling to balance the many needs of state-funded programs, agencies and institutions. Public higher education is just one of many players in this scenario” and if you have been in Springfield as I have regularly and the halls are filled with individuals who have need and who have been the benefactors of state funding for very serious and basic programs like medical care, mental health care – it’s really quite sad to see it all and we’re one of those players. “My staff and I are working hard in Springfield as well as the trustees and our friends, to preserve as much of our budget as possible but I feel compelled to tell you in very plain language that the immediate for public universities is difficult at best.” Now, let me spend a little time talking about the budget scenarios that are out there so you get a flavor for this and its complexity. “Several new budget scenarios unveiled this week signal a worsening crisis in state funding. There will be several new budget plans offered by various legislative caucuses and individual lawmakers in these final weeks of the Spring Legislative Session.” We’re talking May 17 or so, which usually is the week the budgeters go behind closed doors. So between now and about May 11, graduation time, this is the key critical moment for making the case. We don’t know the final outcome at this point but all of the plans floated this far call for even greater cuts to public higher education beyond the 9 to 10 million shortfall we anticipated in FY03, the one we planned for. The shared response strategy took care of 9 to 10 million dollars in shortfall. The new crisis is above and beyond that. Anyway, I end the message by trying to rally everyone to stay focused. Let me spend a little time then reiterating to you the strategy and basically, I’m here to tell you that I am going to Springfield to carry the
message that NIU and higher education, but NIU has already been cut and that it cannot sustain further cuts without drastic negative impacts on our students and our programs and our university. I am carrying that message to Springfield and I will be asking for the help of the leadership of the faculty, of the staff and of students in that effort. We’ll be calling those people together with a plan. Our trustees are on board. Our friends are on board. We need to get our message out. If we don’t, we will certainly be cut further. All right, we must carry this message forward, now, immediately. We’ve already been doing it but now I have to step it up a level. I have prepared in draft form ideas, these will not necessarily result in a piece of paper but it is the effort to explain our situation to public officials, legislators, others that will listen within a minute because that’s usually about all you get. Okay, so in other words, I’m giving you a preview of the argument. This may be helpful to you as you convince friends that maybe know people and we’ll be working with the leadership of University Council, Faculty Senate and students and so forth to help us with this. The case I’m going to try to make is that we’ve already paid and, that 9 to 10 million dollar budget reduction that our budget was already cut mid-year $1.4 million in our base budget. This was the rescission. In addition to that, we came forward with $3.54 million for health insurance, our portion. So, mid-year, for this year, we reduced our spending by almost 5 million dollars. We’ve already done that. For ’03 we have already accommodated within the Governor’s base budget reduction, the ’03 budget from the Governor, we’ve already reduced that by almost 4 million dollars, and we have indicated we would absorb another round of the health insurance contribution. This is the institutional contribution, not the individual contribution, of $3.54 million. We will absorb the uncontrollable expenditures that are around $1.2 million for new buildings coming on line, increase in utility costs – the purchase of utilities – increase in our contract services that have gone up, that’s another $1.2 million, $1.4 million – so we’ve already absorbed 9 to 10 million dollars and you know how we handled that. So, therefore, the message is we’ve already been hit pretty hard. Then the impact of any additional cuts beyond the $9 to $10 million already received in the Governor’s budget will have some pretty drastic implications. Let me talk to you a little bit about the scenarios that are out there and then I’ll indicate what the impact would be on us. A few weeks ago, the budgeters based upon data from the Bureau of the Budget, were asked to consider that the shortfall in the state budget was at the level of 1.25 billion dollars and there are some estimates out there as high as 1.8 billion as we speak today. You remember I talked about the quicksand? Maybe in the next two weeks – maybe when I talk to the University Council next week it will be $2.1 billion. It’s hard to say based upon the revenue forecasts that are going to come in next week. I’ve heard numbers like $1.4 million last week but we’re using $1.25 in higher education because that’s the last official negative number. The budgeters produced a very drastic scenario; they didn’t even call it a budget. Subsequent to that that, I don’t think the Governor said that he could support that but it was basically a scenario that got a balanced budget and it called for – it called for, let’s see, 700 million dollars of cuts in education. Not 70, not 7 – 700 million dollars of cuts to education to be allocated thusly – $400 million for K-12 programs and $300 million – $300 million for higher education or universities. That $300 million was divided the following way. Two hundred million dollars would come out of MAP money, that’s the student financial aid money, largely to private institutions and then $100 million to what they call universities. Now here’s a couple of rules of thumb that I use. They’re not perfect, but they kind of get you to the bottom line. If you’re talking about universities, public higher education and you hear a number like $100 million, we’re 12% of universities. All right? So 12% of $100 million is $12 million. We just cut 10 million and we’re not done yet. I
mean, we’re still working on that but we got there through the shared response. All right? The other number out there is that higher education’s share of the state GRF budget, the state General Fund Budget, is 11.5%. The other thing to recognize is that for every one – just as a rule of thumb, this is not a strategy, this is a rule of thumb – every 1% cut in state support to NIU, all right, that requires a 3% tuition increase to offset it. So it’s not one for one. Not that we’re going to raise tuition, I just wanted to give you some rules of thumb on how to get a handle on the magnitude of these numbers. Well, to me, that scenario is unacceptable. That is a catastrophic budget scenario and I don’t think that ever had much chance of success but it did point out the problem in the state revenues. Today the Senate Republicans issued a budget, their budget. Soon the Democrats on the Senate side will issue their budget to try to get a handle on this. So this is a moving target. I don’t know much about the Senate budget because I just heard about it this morning. I have a sheet, but you really have to look at what’s not said. It has reduced the deficit down from $1.25 million to about $600 million and I’m not sure what higher education’s part of that would be by the infamous revenue enhancers. I think in this Republican side and if there are people from the press here validate this because this is me speed reading in a fog – cigarette tax, perhaps gambling tax, de-coupling from the federal tax so that the economic stimulus package would not have an impact on our budget and this year it has an impact but next year it has triple the impact it has this year and it’s complicated because it lets more corporate income stream into the state if you decouple but it also has an impact on state and local government transfer payments. So it hurts, you know, you help one situation and you hurt another. Anyway, there’s that budget. No one is really talking seriously about a state income tax. I don’t know what the Democratic plan will say but here’s the point. That’s all details, and what it means is we’ve got a bad budget situation. The point is, I am carrying the message to Springfield that we have already sustained cuts and any cuts beyond what we’ve already taken will have very serious and negative consequences and that’s what I’m doing in the next ten days around the clock, on the phone, in the car. You may get a call from me asking for help but this has to be a coordinated thing. Here’s some of the impacts if you take some of these drastic scenarios - the, what I call, the unacceptable scenarios or even those that might be more reasonable. The impact of additional cuts to NIU will result in things like 250 to 400 employee layoffs. That is a devastating thing for this university and our communities. Reduced academic programming and services to be sure. Reduced access to the university through admissions, that’s a possibility. You can never take off the table higher tuition increases if we’re in that kind of an emergency. Although as I sit here they’re just options on the table – that will result in increased time to degree, postponement of deferred maintenance. You know, there are so many things that we wait for at the end of the year and if we have a little money in this pot or that pot we fix a road, we spruce up a building, we put in a smart classroom. All of those things that make our life a little better and make our jobs better and make it better for our students will have to go by the wayside. So, I don’t know – I wish I could bring good news to you. There are so many good things that are happening at the university. Let’s not lose sight of that. But right now, and we’re not alone, I mean watch the transom and see what’s happening all over but the university is in that situation right now. I can indicate that I’ve been in constant contact with the Trustees. They are working for us and we work for them; they work for us. I’ve started dialogue with student leadership. Obviously we’ve been talking to faculty and staff and we’ve got a plan. We probably won’t know the magnitude of this again for several months. Obviously because of constitutional requirements for balanced budgets in the state, there will be a balanced budget in some way come July 1. I think they’re going to try to put together in the next two weeks a
budget that is balanced. Whether or not it gets us all the way through the next fiscal year is anybody’s guess. This is a transitional – we’re in an election cycle that is transitional. Because of reapportionment all the seats are up in the General Assembly. We do have a vacancy in the governorship so there will be new constitutional officers and, but as I’ve said many, many times, when it’s all said and done the key variable is the economy, because if the money was there, this state believes in spending for higher education. Given some of the more negative scenarios, the deep end of the trough, that will wipe out all the gains we’ve made in salaries for three years and programmatic activity. So, this is a very difficult time for all of us but the last thing I say in my message and I mean this because, you know, we don’t really have a choice, “given these facts, it’s more important than ever for all of us to stay focused on our core values and our most critical responsibilities. It is a time for setting priorities and making choices. In these days, weeks and months ahead we will be guided by our shared commitment to providing education of the highest possible quality to the citizens of this region. I pledge to keep you informed as we get a better sense about the final outcomes in the current budget debate” and that’s what it is. It’s a debate. We have to join the debate. We can’t be left out of the debate. Everyone else is involved in the debate. We must carry the message to Springfield. Then I thank everyone for their time and commitment to NIU. I wish I had a way of getting off stage. But that’s what I’m about right now so with that, I’m going to take a drink of water and listen to what wisdom you have and suggestions and then get back to work.

M. Morris: I can’t believe that no one in the Senate has a question for the President. The gentleman in the back left, then Carole, and then the gentleman – was that you Jeff who raised his hand?

J. Stephens: I think in your one minute you might address the fact that we have projected enrollment increases over the next five years and now is the time that we also have to prepare for it.

President Peters: Would you identify yourself and your area?

J. Stephens: My name is Joseph Stephen, Math Department, Liberal Arts and Sciences. I’m very much worried about how we prepare for our future when we’re getting hit with a hand grenade and maybe there’s time – five seconds – to mention that.

President Peters: Did everyone get the question? It is in the bullets – rising enrollment – would that be effective? First of all, it’s a reality. We are – our best guess is right now we’re expecting between 100 and 200 more students next year. We have in this 9 to 10 million-dollar shortfall, we have provided, academic triage money, a small amount of academic triage money, to give students a full program. Obviously, we control our income fund which means we get to budget the income we get from new students and that is something that’s very important to us. It gives us flexibility. So, it would be reasonable for a Representative or a State Senator to say “but you have that increased enrollment that carries with it tuition and fees”. The thing is that only covers about one third of the cost. But other states have tried this – capping enrollment. Wisconsin tried it and basically the legislature cut their budget more and then attempted to take power away from the Wisconsin Regents to control tuition. We do not have tuition capping in this state nor do we have line item analysis of our budgets. We have control of our income fund,
but it is an argument that I don’t necessarily put in the bullets, but I do use it to those individuals where that is important. I turn that into access. The issue then becomes access, but I appreciate that very much especially knowing the challenge that math departments have to provide quality instruction for all these students who need a good math course or sequence of courses.

C. Minor: Speaking of mathematics, I did some while you were talking and admittedly, I haven’t done any unassisted calculations in some time but I think they’re accurate. I’m confused about the $300 million higher education cuts. If higher education is 11.5% of the state budget, did you say that?

President Peters: Our percent of the cut is about 29% on that scenario. It’s not 11.5%.

C. Minor: Oh, okay because that didn’t work out.

President Peters: You did the same math I did.

C. Minor: It seemed like we were getting twice as much of a cut.

President Peters: Well, remember this was the scenario – I don’t know what the latest plans are. That was sort of the budgeters scenario of what it would take and the 300 hundred million remember sorts out 100 million for universities and 200 million for the MAP program so, you know, the MAP program is outside that 11.5%. Don’t get hung up on the ---

C. Minor: On the numbers?

President Peters: Yes. Ultimately you want to ask the question, when it’s all said and done at the end of the day, has higher education been treated fairly.

C. Minor: That was my question.

President Peters: That’s the issue and to me fairness well, I define fairness as we’ve already taken our cut. The state shouldn’t eat it’s seed corn, that Illinois is where it is in large part because of the hundred and more year investment in education and higher education. It has made a difference. Don’t erode the investment. I’m practicing.

C. Minor: Sounds good!

President Peters: In Nebraska when we went through this many years ago, that was my contribution to sloganism. That really resonated in Nebraska. It should in DeKalb too. As a matter of fact, that is – locally, I will be carrying the message locally.

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. You mentioned rightly that we should join the debate or we should attempt to have our voices heard. To enable us to do that more effectively, more particularly for those of us like myself who aren’t always on the phone to elected representatives at the state level, I tend to do it actually more nationally than on the state level, but this seems to be the moment to either do this ourselves and/or to see if we have any
friends in the community whom we could ask to do it on our behalf. Could some of these names and office numbers be made available via e-mail as well or is there some other mechanism to make it possible for us to have our voices heard in this way?

**President Peters:** Thank you very much for offering that and that is much appreciated. Now, let me tell me from my years of experience, this has to be coordinated. The messages have to be consistent and we have to know where they go. In any campaign like this, you’ve got to stick to message and Kathy Buettner in Federal Relations and State Relations is coordinating everything. We’re going to work through the faculty and staff leadership. All right? We may have a website – we’re going to put up a website pretty quickly I think with all this information. We don’t have a lot of time and we want to make it easy for you to. There will be segmented targeting. Certain messages work better with certain individuals. Believe me, we need help outside of DeKalb. For those of you who live in DuPage, Cook and other counties, we need your help. You have different representatives and, I have to say, our local representatives are there, you know, they know – they’re there.

**C. DeMoranville:** Carol DeMoranville from the Marketing Department. I guess one of my concerns I think, if I speak for the faculty, obviously no one is happy about budget shortfalls but especially with the first 9 to 10 million dollars. We recognize the problem and we’re willing to certainly do what we can to make the university work the way it’s supposed to work and do our jobs. Do the state legislators understand that with additional cuts, especially the ones that they’re talking about, it may put us, very well will put us in a position where we cannot comply with federal regulations, federally required programs, state mandated programs. So then we’re going to be in violation of those programs and we don’t have the money to work with them so you’re sort of caught between a rock and a hard place, How do they justify that if they haven’t given us the money to comply with mandated programs?

**President Peters:** Which answer do you want?

**C. DeMoranville:** Oh, pick one.

**President Peters:** When people without jobs, without medical – I’m parroting, some people would say why should we care what the “American Sanscrit Association”, just to make up a name, says about accreditation? I mean, if there are any members of the press here don’t quote me on that because somebody may think Sanscript is important. But basically, they have a serious problem and they’re looking at it at a macro level. There are many who understand what you’re saying, but they have to make a budget and they don’t want to raise taxes necessarily. There are others who would say something very different and that is -- what is your teaching load?

**C. DeMoranville:** Personally?

**President Peters:** No, no. What is the teaching load in the Marketing Department and what is the teaching load in Chemistry? Why don’t you just ask the faculty to all take on two more courses this year? So, you’ve got to be careful. In my experience, you’ve got to be careful about
the arguments you use. To me, the best arguments right now are the investment that’s been made, the quality of what we do, the access we provide and it’s shortsighted to take that apart.

C. DeMoranville: But I think that’s essentially the same argument because some of those programs are mandated. For example, assessment and those kinds of things that we’re required to do that obviously cost money, but, accreditation – if you’re not accredited many students won’t come and that is a long-term problem if you lose those kinds of things. Not to quibble about points, but teaching is one element of what we do and one element of how we get promoted and how we get to be recognized in our fields. If we were only teaching I think many of us would say, sure I’ll teach an extra course or two. But I only have so many hours in the day, what do you expect me to give up in order to do that? Am I going to be penalized for that when it comes to promotion?

President Peters: I’ve never had, in many, many, years of lobby – I’ve never had very much success with that because, who are the accreditors? It’s a rhetorical question. We are. Those people, those legislators who have thought this through – the reason for accreditation is to protect public health and safety. It is not to ensure that a faculty member has so many square foot of office space, so many dollars in operating, so many nips of computing. It is to protect health and safety. Now, who’s the accreditors in the American Bar Association? It’s us. But, there are some who say that argument is a very potent one.

P. Henry: Patricia Henry, Foreign Languages. My question is more on the other end as you close your e-mail by saying that you will keep us informed. I just want to underscore the fact that we’d like to be kept informed also of the process by which cuts will be made -- whether this will be something that committees will have control over, colleges and so forth. It will be a matter of great concern.

President Peters: I appreciate that. Obviously the Vice Presidents have been working on scenarios for months and I hope that through the normal process of building budgets in departments and colleges that there is and I would expect input. I know it varies considerably and you know, we’re going to go through a phase now at the University where – you make a budget and then you take a look at what you did and you try to make it more rational. I mean, if you’ve got to cut this kind of money, it’s obvious what’s going to happen. But then you have to go back and say, okay, what are our priorities, what are our good programs that need to be protected, and you try to fix it up over a period of two or three years. The results of something like this take you a while to straighten out and it happened this quickly and so deeply that you don’t have a lot of time for rational discussion. The other thing is right now. I’ll tell right now I’m thinking of one thing. Arguing the case so that we don’t get cut anymore. That’s what I’m focused on right now. But when the other thing happens, we’ll have another strategy.

J. Lockard: John, I appreciate your comments and the efforts that you all are making. It’s a tough, tough situation. Your comment about the 700 million to education was 400 for K-12 and 300 for higher ed, sounded a little off in terms of the commentary from our dear friend Mr. Roshenberger on the radio this morning who indicated that K-12 was to be spared as much as possible.
President Peters: In the Senate budget it was, yes.

J. Lockard: My question about the possible 300 million for higher ed, that split between MAP money and actual university budget money is a interesting one. Obviously it’s going to be the privates who will scream over the MAP thing. How effective is their lobbying effort in Springfield?

President Peters: That’s their issue. How effective? I think, let me answer that generically, I think aid directly to students in any form is hard to cut. It hurts us too, of course, because it goes directly to the access issue. The other thing is that there is a, well, let me just say that’s enough said on that.

J. Stephens: On the last question, you talked about the possibility of 300 perhaps people losing their jobs. How are we going to meet that? Not filling positions? I don’t think we have that many open positions.

President Peters: Oh yes we do.

J. Stephens: Three hundred that are already unfilled?

President Peters: Don’t forget this is rolling – the university budgets are never snapshots. They’re always rolling. There are always vacancies that come up every year.

J. Stephens: Okay, so people who talk to me and supportive professional staff whatever don’t have to worry too much about ---

President Peters: No, I didn’t say that, no. Layoffs are – there will be – retrenchment is what I call kicking in vacant positions. Layoffs mean people who are employed being laid off.

J. Stephens: And there will be both of those?

President Peters: Yes, under this – if we get this ---

J. Stephens: Under the worst-case scenario.

President Peters: Yes, or if something that approaches ---

J. Stephens: Or close to?

President Peters: Yes.

C. DeMoranville: Would it be helpful if we tried to get students and/or student’s parents to enlist in this political ---

President Peters: It’s in place.
C. DeMoranville: Is it? I’m thinking as faculty members with students in our classes, to encourage them to either write to the legislators or get their parents to write the legislators.

President Peters: Yes, we’re going to work through the Student Association and students are, let’s face it, they’re more effective than any of us.

C. DeMoranville: I think maybe also if the faculty person standing up in front of a classroom may give them that extra impetus if that would be appropriate in the classroom to do so.

President Peters: Again, we want to work through the faculty leadership to get it coordinated. The SIU students are in Springfield right now, independent, but I think they might have a different issue.

P. Henry: With coordinating students, I mean, I’m thinking the same thing, if students get closed out of classes and they’re finding this out now, could you refer us to a website or something when you get it, then we could tell students about that as a way of focusing things?

President Peters: Yes.

M. Morris: Are there any other questions?

D. Wagner: Does anybody discuss the possibility of raising taxes or are we all so frightened by George W. that we can’t even consider it?

President Peters: Well, the Republican version this morning as I understand it is proposing to raise cigarettes .22 cents a pack, and is proposing to raise the gambling tax. If you’re talking about larger income tax rates, the press release I read from the Senate Republicans this morning said “no”. I have no idea what the Senate Democrats will do.

D. Wagner: But is there anybody who discusses this? That’s all I’m asking? We haven’t discussed it at all and, you’ve implied that there’s not any discussion of this possibility.

President Peters: I never thought it was effective for us. It is for public officials who are elected to solve the budget/revenue problem. It’s for us to make the case of why we shouldn’t be cut. When you begin to make the case for them for raising revenue, I’ve never known it to work and I’ve known it to backfire most times. I am sure there are people talking about this.

D. Rusin: Dave Rusin, also Mathematical Sciences. I have a question about – going back to working the students on this. One of the things that I think is going to be important to the students is to hear some finality about the possibility of tuition increases. They already know that there’s an increase this coming year. Am I hearing that there are going to be mid-year increases and, if so, I mean, do we – if a student pays on August 15 are they clear at least through December 31?
President Peters: In this environment, I’m not willing to take anything off the table. I mean there are states last year, I think Iowa had a mid-year – several states had mid-years – I don’t think we can take anything off the table.

D. Rusin: Well, to stand up for the students here, let me just say that I know a lot of them are trying very desperately to balance their very small budgets on a yearly basis. So if we can give them some clarity and at least, limit the damage in advance, I know they’d be very appreciative.

President Peters: Okay, I appreciate that. I’m the last person in the world who wants to raise tuition or any fees. To me, that’s always the last thing. I’m in sympathy with you on that but I can’t really in good conscience take it off the table at this point because we don’t know what we’re facing.

J. Stephens: Have you thought about writing a letter to the newspaper before the end of the semester to appraise students of this so that – one of the more important things and I’ll talk about this in my math class on Monday is how we translate these numbers which goes great for a core competency level math course and to what it means to them. If they leave at the end of the semester with a great deal of uncertainty as to the economic future of their ability to go to school, I think that message might go to some other voters who are real interested in that topic too. So it might be beneficial just to be straightforward about the idea, with the students, that we don’t know what the state is going to do and that they might want to communicate their concerns also.

President Peters: Let me just say how impressed I’ve been with our students, particularly our student leaders over the past two years and their political savvy about these things. I’ve really been impressed with them and we’ve been in fundamental discussions with them about strategies and what I walk away today with is that faculty feel they have a role to play with students and also you’re speaking for students. That’s very good and we’ll – remember, we have hours to put these things together and, you know, we are in a very targeted, stratified approach to making our point, very quickly within the next ten days and we don’t have a lot of time to do a major grass roots parent’s association but we will heavily rely on students.

M. Morris: Any other questions?

President Peters: About anything other than budgets? The Convocation Center is moving along nicely. You’ll enjoy that. We’re going to have some openings right when we get back. Barsema Hall is moving along nicely. We have a $4 million request for furniture in the state budget on the capital side and we’re working very, very hard for you in the College of Business and that’s critical. But that looks pretty good. Altgeld Hall is moving along. It is a very complex project. Ivan Legg informed me that we are moving closer to hiring an Education Dean. We are interviewing for Manfred Thullen’s vacancy. I interviewed a fine person today. I don’t get to much involved in that, I give them a courtesy interview and try to sell NIU. We have Dean Zar’s replacement, so we are moving ahead on those. That looks pretty good. Our professors and students continue to win awards. We were out in California for the first time in many, many years with an alumni group in Silicon Valley, hosted by Dennis and Stacey Barsema. We touched people who graduated here many years ago, who hadn’t been touched, and they are excited about what is happening and we will continue to work. Our federal agenda
is good. We are working that. There is still some money available in the federal government for us so that we will have some announcements coming up soon on some things there. So we continue to move forward.

D. Rusin: Can you say something else about enrollments for the fall? You mentioned that we are going to be up a couple of hundred students. Do we have dorm space? Are you thinking of cutting off admissions in the summer?

President Peters: I think what happens with dorm space, as I understand it, is that we want to guarantee freshman if they want, to live here in a dorm. What that means is if you are out dorm space, the upper classman don’t get space and then they have to do the private market. If you want to do something interesting someday, maybe you have already done this, get in the car and drive on West Hillcrest and Twombly. You being a mathematician, get your clipboard out and start counting housing units that are going up that are basically rental units. It is amazing, there are a lot of rental units. But again, I don’t feature us building new dorms. That is a three or four year project you can bond against it. We need to improve those that we have, that’s a major focus. If you have been to Stevenson, has everybody been to Stevenson, go to Stevenson sometime and get a tour if you want to see what a real first class “redo” of a dorm should look like. And that’s what the students want. Interesting, on students, we just completed phase one of our marketing survey where we have done focus groups and everything on prospective students, parents and guidance counselors. I’ll be presented with that sometime next week. It’s very interesting, very sobering. You have to have a strong stomach to read marketing surveys but, then you read the good thing and I mean our quality is really appreciated. The faculty is appreciated. We have to work on some things like student life issues, some dorm issues – I call them dorms – residence halls, right. When I get down and I’m not that way, I’m always the glass is half-filled kind of person, I go in the dorms or I start talking to students and that lifts me up. I always remember that, we’re working for the students and to give them the best possible education and I think we’re really doing well. It’s unfortunate that all of higher education is hit. When you talk to the presidents as I do, they’re all going through this.

C. DeMoranville: I would just like to, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, thank you for coming to talk to us and your forthrightness about these issues and keeping us informed because obviously it does impact all of us. I think the more we know about what’s going on the better we feel that we have some modicum of – well, not control – but we feel better. I’d also like to thank you for your dedication to Northern and making sure that our message does get out there and enhancing its image, so I appreciate that.

President Peters: I appreciate that. I need to know that because it keeps me going. Sometimes, you know, -- I like politicians very much. I’ve made the study of politics my academic life. I like politicians but that doesn’t mean it’s easy when I walk in their presence sometimes and have to hear some things that I don’t want to hear. But by and large, when we get representatives and public officials on campus and they see what we do. Just like students, when we get students here to recruit them, they come. When I can get the politicians here and I started that this summer, bringing representatives to campus and they like what they see and we’re going to continue to do that, but right now public higher education across the country in forty states are in varying degrees of deep trouble and I would say we probably are right in the middle of that, you
know. There are some that are getting off easier and many that are getting off a lot worse. Now, keep trying to think ahead that when the money comes back on the revenue side, this state always invests in education.

**M. Morris:** Well, John I want to thank you for coming and I’m sure I speak for the entire Senate when we say good luck in your efforts.

**President Peters:** Thank you. I’ll see you next week. Now I’m going to run back and try to decompose the suggestions. I wrote some of them down and locked some of them away in the data bank. We’re working on it through the night, so we’ll see you.

A. **Recognition of Faculty Senators whose terms are expiring.**

**M. Morris:** We will quickly return to the President’s Announcements. Item A. is the recognition of those Faculty Senators whose terms are expired. I will read their names so that they make it into the minutes at least once in their careers and I apologize in advance for any mis-pronunciations. Dennis Brown, Paul Brown, Charles Cappell, Phil Carpenter, Linda Derscheid, Laurie Elish-Piper, Kathryn Gately-Poole, Toni Heinze, Christopher Hubbard, James Hudson, Maryline Luckacher, Carole Minor, Judy Popovich and Peng Woo. Thank you all very much for your service. You can see the people whose terms are expiring. They are not expiring and they will be returning to us along with Omar Ghayed who was re-elected so he is coming back and we have the newly elected people, some who are old friends, are returning. Add to that list Donald Zinger from Electrical Engineering and David Kamens from Sociology. There are also other elections still being held in Illinois and Florida as I understand. It’s now my pleasure to ask Dan Griffiths to come up or he can make his comments right there.

B. **Presentation of Bob Lane Faculty Advocacy Award**

**D. Griffiths:** I was asked to present the Bob Lane Award because, not everyone remembers Bob Lane, but for those of us who do we certainly know him. I was initially going to be a little humorous and I decided not to, but then I think I will go back to it because I do think what he stood for is important especially in this time. Just as a background, I just got back from Reno where I attended a conference. I was surprised that my wife who sometimes goes with me but generally doesn’t, decided she wanted to go. Neither of us are gamblers and there’s not much else to do in Reno. When she entered the Reno Hilton and saw all the slot machines, flashing lights and card games she said, “this is disgusting”. That reminds me of Bob Lane. Not that he was disgusting but he felt that the administrators frequently did disgusting things. The Bottom of the Deck Award is given, I call it the Bottom of the Deck Award, I guess it’s properly the Faculty Advocacy Award, is given annually to the faculty member who keeps up the tradition of Bob Lane, a long-time faculty member who had a knack of catching administrators doing things they didn’t want us to know about. He and fellow collaborators – or the administration would call them collaborators – such as Sherm Stanage were superb in keeping the pressure on administrators with comments like “administrators deal from the bottom of the deck.” Shown in the award. You want to show it up there. If you can see that and “administrators do their dirty work in the summer”. Bob was very well known by administrators. I mentioned that because we’re going to have tough decisions over the summer and I’m glad to hear that the faculty are
involved. One thing I was going to close with before introducing Jim who couldn’t be here was that one year during the April Faculty Senate Meeting when members approved sending nominees for open committee vacancies to the President for his approval and you people will be doing that today. Some of them go to the President and he selects one of the two nominees. In one case, there were no nominees/volunteers and so this body had to nominate two for the President to select one and Bob Lane was the first nominated and then almost immediately after that someone nominated Sherm Stanage. Actually this committee the President chairs and the President would deal with this person on a monthly basis. Immediately after Sherm Stanage, who was as I said, was very similar to Bob in watching administrators, about a dozen of the Faculty Senate members voted to close the nomination or shouted “close the nominations.” So I think John LaTourette got the message because at that time, the Faculty Senate for some reason was very upset at John and they sent him a message with a choice of Bob Lane and Sherm Stanage, which I thought was hilarious. Anyway, last year when I was sitting in that chair I had initially nominated Jim King for the award to the Executive Committee, but in discussing it with the Executive Committee we decided Bob Suchner who also was deserving and should get it because he was retiring. Just again, a brief history of some of the other recipients, David Ripley, Ken Bowden, Lorys Oddi, Sherman Stanage, Herb Rubin, Robert Suchner and this year Jim King. It is well deserved and I know will keep up the good tradition. So, that was the announcement.

M. Morris: Thank you, Dan. I will admit the reason Jim King is not here is because he called me and asked me if there was anything important on the Agenda because he had to be at another conference. I had forgotten all about the award and said “no Jim, we’ll press on without you”. So, so much for that. We’ll give Jim a chance to say some words in the Fall because he’ll be back on the Senate. Thank you Dan.

C. Report of Director of University Honors Search

M. Morris: The next item is a report on the Director of the University’s Honor Program Search. You may remember at the last meeting there were some issues raised about the change in job description and whether the search was proceeding properly. Carol DeMoranville who was on that committee contacted me and directed me to the Bylaws which say that the person who makes the final appointment has the authority, it’s Bylaw 17.3, has the authority with consultation of the search committee to change the job description. I spoke with Bob Wheeler who happens to be the person who does the appointing. He said that he did in fact change the job description on consultation with the committee. Therefore, the search goes forward properly and matters have been handled according to the Bylaws. I think that puts the quietus on the matter. At this point, I’m going to turn the podium over to my good friend, for the moment, William Baker and he is going to bring you into Executive Session for the purpose of evaluating the Faculty Personnel Advisor. So all people who are not non-voting or ex-officio members of the Senate and the Faculty Personnel Advisor will excuse themselves.

The Faculty Senate went into Executive Session from 4:05 – 4:10.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION
VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Amendment of Faculty Senate Bylaws 2.2 – refer to Rules and Governance

M. Morris: Consent Agenda. You will see that there is one item on the Consent Agenda, amendment of Faculty Senate Bylaws 2.2. Basically, we are referring an amendment to the Senate Bylaws to Rules and Governance. The amendment addresses actually defining some duties for the vice president and secretary of the Senate. In the eventually that we actually pass bylaw changes in the Council, those two officers will be authorized under the Senate rules to assume those positions if necessary.

C. Minor: I move that we approve the Consent Agenda.

M. Morris: Do I have a second? All in favor? The Consent Agenda is adopted.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 27-28)

M. Morris: Reports from Advisory Committees, Pat Henry

P. Henry: Yes, I really don’t need to make much of a report. I wasn’t able to be at the meeting in Rend Lake. On pages 27-28, you have basically my crib notes from one of the member of the FAC who was there. There will be another meeting this coming Friday and I think I can report on that more fully. The material you have is mostly concerning information meeting on the legislation that give the IBHE some control over approving various public institutions and private institutions. I note with interest that private institutions have rights and public institutions have responsibilities. She also mentioned that the University of Phoenix is an interesting thing to keep an eye on. There may be a tendency for private corporations to buy up institutions in financial difficulty, which we may have more of now. And that this would then something that could be used to continue things on the University of Phoenix model. The FAC will be thanking, especially the Executive Director, Keith Sanders, who is retiring and there will be resolutions honoring Rock and Sanders at the next meeting.

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

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe – no report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

IX: REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
**M. Morris:** There being no other reports from Advisory Committees we go to reports from Standing Committees. The first one is Economic Status of the Profession, Jim Lockard.

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

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair – report – walk-in

**J. Lockard:** You have a walk-in at your places that summarizes the work of the Economic Status Committee pulling it together at the end of the year here. I don’t want to take any more time than necessary but it may be that as we hear more and more about budgetary problems throughout the state we all need to look at our own financial situation more carefully. Most of the things that are in here relate to that in one way or another. The item on the first page is one that has been before the committee much of the year and has not led to the resolution that we had hoped for in large part because it was simply not possible to drag the information out of Human Resources as to how things actually work. All promises made were unkept in dealing with that office. The bottom line is simply this. Anyone in the University who engages in these flexible spending accounts may not be aware of some of the limitations that apparently – and I want to say that, apparently – apply in these cases. What it basically boils down to is this. The committee received word of a faculty member who had placed money into a medical account last year, knew of work that needed to be done and rather than take time off from teaching duties, choose to postpone the services until after the semester ended in May and then learned that the money set aside for it could not be used. The question was why. The answer as best we have been able to piece it together comes from the booklet that the state’s CMS puts out on these flexible spending accounts. It says “participation is limited to employees working full time or not less than half-time”. It was difficult to understand how a faculty member would not be classified as such all year round but apparently that is not the case. That indeed a faculty member is considered to be essentially unemployed between mid-May and mid-June and you cannot incur services to be paid for under these plans nor can you get the money out to pay for them during the period of time when you are not eligible. I don’t know if this effects more than the one individual in the University but I think it behooves us as a body of the University to alert anyone that we can to make certain they get an absolute clear explanation of what is and is not possible in this case. In the case that was reported to us, the money was not a trivial amount and in effect, the individual paid twice, once by putting the money away and being unable to use it and therefore losing it and secondly having to pay the full cost of the services on top of all of that so it became a doubly expensive proposition. The best I can tell you is this that in several efforts to get answers to this question of how does this really work and is there truly this period of unemployment that matters and so on, I got no help at all in trying to understand when the next contract begins. The individual was particularly incensed since there was a summer teaching contract involved, but the services were apparently between mid-May and mid-June and therefore there was no contract is the best I could figure out. That was never clarified but I got enough information from HR to feel fairly comfortable in the general interpretation of what’s here and was told that this is not a Northern problem of course, since CMS is at the root of it, it is a state-wide problem. So I think it’s something that matters. In discussing this with the Executive Committee last week the committee felt that the Senate should indeed go on record with a resolution asking Human Resources to establish procedures to carefully and fully explain
all aspects of flexible spending accounts to anyone who is enrolling or re-enrolling under those plans to avoid future problems of this sort. It’s important that it be both enrolling and re-enrolling because these do not carry over from one year to the next. If you participate, you have to do it during benefits choice period on an annual basis. So, I would offer that as a recommended resolution for adoption by the Senate so we can get it to Human Resources in time for this year’s benefit choice period and hopefully spare someone else from this kind of a problem.

M. Morris: Chair accepts the first statement as a motion. Is there a second? Any discussion?

C. Minor: I’d just like to say that I got caught in this too and I would really strongly support this motion. I think that Human Resources needs to inform everyone about the limitations before you put your money in it.

J. Lockard: If you have a hint that this is what’s going on, you can almost make it out from the wording in this booklet. It’s one of those few cases where the legal profession did itself proud in writing this.

D. Rusin: Does that mean we’re eligible for unemployment benefits in the summer?

J. Lockard: That’s a very good question.

D. Rusin: If we’re unemployed – you know, call it one way or the other but you can’t have it both ways.

J. Lockard: I know it’s the strangest thing. It also appears to make no difference if a person elects to be paid over twelve even though they’re working for nine. That has nothing to do with it either.

E. Kay: Elizabeth Kay, Allied Health. I would like to make a comment. Is this a new interpretation because in the past I have always had my work done during the summer and I’ve been reimbursed from my MSA. I’ve never had a problem.

J. Lockard: Was your work done while you were on summer contract?

E. Kay: No, I’m on a straight nine month although I get paid over twelve. I do not work during the summer and I always get my medical work done during the summer, and I’ve always been reimbursed.

J. Lockard: It’s clearly the case where we’ve got people reporting both sides of the story which leaves us in the middle of nowhere.

E. Kay: Well, I guess that the issue I was going to bring up if that’s the case, I used to do the savings plan for dependents when my child was in school. Does this mean that once the academic year is over, if your child continues to need care until their school year is over that you lose that money too?
**J. Lockard:** If you want an opinion, I would be worried about that.

**E. Kay:** Well, I was going to say because I think that’s another issue that needs to be clarified for those parents as they choose their allocations for the year.

**J. Lockard:** And that is why the resolution said flexible spending accounts because there are only two, there’s medical and there’s dependent care and while no issue has been brought to us regarding loss of money for dependent care, we heard it clearly in the medical one and as far as I can read in the booklet, I don’t see why there would be a difference between the two.

**M. Morris:** Were there any other comments before we vote? The hour is growing late so, if this passes I will have Donna write it up and have it delivered to Steve Cunningham. All those in favor of the motion? Opposed. Abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you Jim.

**J. Lockard:** Very quickly, just on the remaining pages let me call your attention to a couple of things. The reminders you can read for yourself. They deal with a number of items that might be of interest. For those who have yet to figure out the difference between 403(B) and 457 plans, and that should have a (B) after it as well, I very recently learned after I wrote this up. If you are not approaching the retirement period you may well want to look into this. I was not clear on what it was either until I spoke with someone just today about it. Fundamentally it amounts to a 457 plan having the same tax benefits as a 403B but without the penalty for withdrawal at an early date. So it sounded to me like that there’s no reason, particularly in the earlier years of working, would not be better off in a 457 than a 403. Obviously, I cannot give you tax advice or anything else but I think you should explore that if you’re looking into tax deferred compensation because it looks like there is an advantage to the 457 which have not until recently had here primarily because it had a lower limit. But today you can put as much into that as you can into the other types and probably with advantages. The third reminder is that there’s a very critical typo. I wrote this rather late. In the second line it should say “employment, you may now” – which is entirely different from not – all right, “you may now pay for.” So please, third reminder, second line, “employment, you may now pay for”. It was written as a prohibition and in fact, it’s exactly the opposite, so do please correct that. The one on legislative benefits you can read that for yourself. I’ve given you the web address where you can follow what’s going on in the legislature including budgetary matters. There is some movement even in this dark fiscal situation to making permanent the “30 and out” which was believed dead not long ago but as of yesterday, it went into the record as a second reading. So, that may come back into place. Then finally, the committee reported to you at a previous meeting about the Social Security government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions which basically mean we’re all in deep trouble if we think we’re going to get any Social Security benefit. There is a reprint here from the State University Annuitants Association noting that there is an effort again in the Congress in Washington to change, basically to repeal, those provisions. It tells you here who has and who has not in Illinois signed onto it and gives you information on how you might contact them. So if you would like to see if you might by chance get your Social Security benefits back, you may want to follow up on that.
M. Morris: Thank you very much Jim. Next report is from Carole, Resource, Space and Budget.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Carole Minor, Chair – report

C. Minor: Thank you. This is a short report. The committee met last Thursday and the purpose of the committee meeting was to determine what we were going to do for the next year, to discuss the direction of the committee and how we should operate. I need to tell you, I apologize for not being here last time, I was ill but that month before that we had met with the APC. The members of the APC were very amenable to transferring information to the Resources, Space and Budget Committee. We had also previously heard the report from Dean Zar about the Graduate School. The discussion of the committee in the last meeting came around to the fact of making our purpose as stated in the committee book which makes things simple, fact finding and disseminating information. One of the things we decided to do was to every fall determine what are the current resource issues on campus, try to investigate those and try to put forth information to the Faculty Senate and other appropriate bodies. Two things that we determined were important to look at for next year were the vision for the Graduate School and examining with the new Dean of the Graduate School the role of graduate education and research in the future of the university and how they will be supported in the context of the current budget situation. We also found out a little more about the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. The Chair of the University Council, and the Chair of the Resources, Space and Budget Committee automatically sits on the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. It also seems quite amenable to suggestions form the Resources, Space and Budget Committee of things that need to be addressed on campus. So that was identified as another vehicle of getting some things done. The last recommendation that we had was to suggest some stability in the membership of this committee because it takes a while to get up to speed, to know what’s going on in various parts of the university and to really become familiar with what questions to ask. So that is a recommendation of the committee that as much as possible, that the committee membership be stable from this year to next year.

M. Morris: I will pass that along to Sue who makes those appointments. Thank you Carole.

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

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

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

M. Morris: I’m now going to turn this meeting over to our distinguished Chairman of our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Gretchen.

1. Election of President of the Faculty Senate for 2002-2003.

G. Bisplinghoff: Okay. First I’d like to address the election of the Faculty Senate President/Executive Secretary of the University Council and I would like to ask that we have a motion to accept the nomination of Sue Willis, close the nominations and unanimously approve
her election to this position. Thank you. Do I have a second? Okay, all in favor say “aye”.
Opposed? Okay. That’s passed. That was quick.

2. Election of UCPC representatives from Faculty Senate for 2002-2003 – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting – voting will be by college – votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified – sample ballots are enclosed. (Pages 29-33)

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Next we have election of the UCPC representatives for the 2002-2003 year from the Faculty Senate. These are those famous color coded ballots, coded by college. We’re going to proceed to hand out the ballots by college. So, we’ll go through and we will ask you to raise your hands and indicate your college. We’ll pass those out then we’re going to save a little time today by collecting them all at once at the end instead of trying to circulate back and we’ll just collect all of them at once and then Donna will be our sorter and counter and all of those things that happen behind the scenes. Okay, our first college is College of Business. Would you please raise your hands. If there are committee members who could help in handing these out, that would be appreciated. Okay, College of Business should be getting green ballots. Now we have the College of Education. Would you raise your hands please. That’s a blue ballot. Next we have a white ballot for the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. Would you raise your hands. College of Visual and Performing Arts with a salmon ballot. Are we ready for LA&S? Okay, everybody LA&S, please raise your hands. Okay, are we ready to collect the ballots? Okay, would everybody just pass in all the ballots.

**M. Morris:** The lucky winners will be announced in the future.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Right, exactly. They’ll be sorted and counted and then the new members will be notified by next week.

**M. Morris:** Don’t turn off your e-mail.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Exactly.

**D. Mathesius:** If anyone is wondering why their college didn’t have an election it’s because these positions are two years and the term has not expired yet. Health and Human Sciences is rolled over to next year.

3. Committees of the University 2002-2003 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select – ballots will be distributed at the FS meeting.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Okay, we have one final set of business to take care of or businesses, however you do that and that’s for the committee vacancies that we need to vote on. Those are part of your walk ins, the green sheets that you have. In the first batch that says on the top “Academic Policies and Procedures Advisory” in all of those committees, with the exception of one, we only have one person running to fill the position so if I could have a motion that we accept those folks. Yes?
D. Bilder: I so move.

G. Bisplinghoff: I’m sorry, I thought you were making a comment. Second? We have one, evidently there was an erroneous situation with the University Press Board three-year term. That’s your very last committee and there are two folks running for the position to replace Ferald Bryan. We have Theodore Keisel, I believe it is, and Ferald Bryan is also on the ticket there. So we have two names for that position. So we do have to vote on that particular situation and what we’re going to do as we go through these is simply do a raising of hands and a count to see at that point who has the majority. I’d also like to ask if there’s anybody as we go through these who would like to speak on behalf of any of these folks, to please let us know. Is there anyone who would like to speak to this particular position for the University Press Board?

M. Morris: Ferald is going to go to the restroom.

G. Bisplinghoff: Just like in grade school. Step out of the room and we’ll raise our hands. We could put our heads on our desks but --- all right. So, we’ll now vote by hand. Would you raise your hand if you would like to vote for Theodore Keisel for this position. I believe I’m, okay. Okay, thank you. Vote for Ferald Bryan. Okay, Ferald will be replacing himself.

M. Morris: Is Ferald on any other ballots?

G. Bisplinghoff: No, no. Would somebody knock on the door and tell Ferald he can return? The next committee, which is the University Scholarship Committee for the College of Business, we have two folks who are running to replace Terry Bishop. Does anybody want to say anything on behalf? Yes? They have letters by the way, of course this would be a speed-reading situation if you haven’t already looked at them. There are letters attached for the folks, nominating letters.

C. DeMoranville: I know Tim personally and I’ve worked with him; I’ve done research with him and worked with him on a number of committees and I would strongly support his election. He does have experience in the marketing department having served on the Scholarship Committee for two years there. So I think he’s an excellent candidate.

G. Bisplinghoff: Thank you. All right, we’ll again take a hand count for this situation. Would you raise your hand to vote for Don Tidrick please. Thank you. For Tim Aurand. Okay, so we have elected Tim. The next – and this one’s going to be a little more difficult, it may take a little more time because we have four folks replacing in the Unity in Diversity Steering Committee for replacing Promod Vohra. I guess we will go through and will take each name in turn unless there’s something – would anybody like to speak to the names on this list for the Unity in Diversity Committee? We have four names. Yes?

D. Musial: I would just like to speak in behalf of Nadine Dolby. Nadine is a committed, passionate individual who spent most of her professional career which is still just getting started to be honest, but she has spent many, many years both overseas and here searching to provide ways for students to find identity in diversity. She’s committed to that area in her study and spends much of her life in efforts trying to support equal access to all.
G. Bisplinghoff: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

D. Wagner: She says she’s applying for something else.

G. Bisplinghoff: Really, evidently she applied for both. She’s on – we also have a blue walk-in which is there just for information only and those are for appointments. We don’t have to vote on those. So evidently she’s applying for both positions. This is our understanding but she seems to have written it directed at the one. Okay. Her name was submitted for both positions so she evidently didn’t mention the other one. All right, we’re going to go ahead and vote now for Nadine Dolby. Okay. Okay, is it Ete Olson. Laurel Smart and finally Mr. Vohra. All right, we’re going to have a run-off between Nadine Dolby and Promod Vohra. Okay, it’s Nadine, thank you. We have one final hand count to do and then we’re done because as I say, the blue is for information only. That’s Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. We have two names, Julie Robertson and Karen Carrier. Does anybody wish to speak to their position here? Okay. We will vote. Please raise your hand if you would like to vote for Julie Robertson. How about Karen Carrier? Okay, the winner is Julie Robertson. Thank you very much.

M. Morris: Thank you Gretchen. Well, that ends our business for this meeting.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

M. Morris: There are some information items in you packet.

A. University Council Agenda (latest available) (Pages 34-35)

B. Minutes from March 4, 2002 Academic Planning Council meeting (Pages 36-39)

C. Minutes from March 4, 2002 Graduate Council meeting (Pages 40-47)

D. Minutes from March 7, 2002 Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting (Pages 48-51)

E. 2002-2003 Meeting Schedule (Page 52)

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

M. Morris: Before we adjourn I just want to wish everybody a pleasant summer and thank you for a good year. Motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.