
S. Mini represented D. Brown; B. Burrell represented E. Kang.

THOSE FACULTY SENATOR MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Burgess, Caldwell, Cordes, Creamer, Ganesan, Heinze, Henry, Hudson, Ilsley, Jones, Kolb, Miller, Miranda, Montague, Musial, Newman-Ryan, Orem, Payvar, Popovich, Ridnour, Song, Stephen, Stock, Wade

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: Could I have a motion to adopt the Agenda?

The motion was made and seconded. The Agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 25, 2001 FS MEETING (P)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting? Any comments or additions or corrections to the minutes?

The motion was made and seconded. The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: First I want to welcome you all to the Faculty Senate, 2001-2002. I’d like to start off actually with a thanks to Donna and to Jim King. Some of you may or may not know that I’ve had some somewhat unexpected surgery in the middle of the summer and was out for about two or three weeks and I asked – it turns out there’s no provision for this before an Executive Committee exists — and so after various frantic phone calls to Jerry Zar as to what to do, I asked Jim King if he would be willing to be a back-up just in case anything happened in the end of July or the beginning of August. He graciously agreed to do so and then Donna, of course, kept the office running and kept me informed as to what was going on. So, I’m doing
fine now and feel much better than I did and so I’m very grateful to both of them.

I’d also like to especially welcome any new members to the Faculty Senate. We did not have a retreat this year and I have not organized any formal activity but if anyone would like a general introduction to the Faculty Senate and what it is all about please come up afterwards and let me know. We can either gather right afterwards and I can tell you what I know or we could meet at some other time.

After adjournment we will adjourn into committees so that the committees can get themselves organized. I would therefore like to introduce the committee chairs. You can find all the committees – we have to approve these anyway – which is the next item. You can find them all on page 25 of your packets. The Resource, Space and Budgets Committee, the overall chair, is Gary Coover of the University Council, so Gary you can wave. The Faculty Senate has its own chair for the committee, which is Carole Minor, so Carol is back there. Elections and Legislative Oversight which will actually have some activity today, our chair is Gretchen Bisplinghoff, in the back. So especially if you’re on one of these committees you might want to check and see who the chair is. Academic Affairs is Jody Newman-Ryan, here in front. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is Carol DeMoranville, in the back. Rules and Governance is Chris Hubbard and Economic Status of the Profession is Jim Lockard. I’d like to extend also my thanks to these people. I put the committee chairs together again on short notice because I wanted to get it done before I had to go out and trying to do it in July is an interesting procedure and so I’m appreciative of everybody who responded to my calls.

You probably noticed this already in the minutes but I wanted to explain what I’m doing here. On pages 3 and 4 you’ll see a summary of the previous meeting. We have discussed in the past what format our minutes ought to take and there’s been an ongoing sentiment to keep the transcript so that the sense of discussions is preserved. However, I found at least for myself in trying to go back and figure out what, in fact, actually happened, that there is no table of contents to the minutes. You can look at the previous meeting’s agenda, but sometimes the agenda gets modified and so I thought it would be helpful to have just really what is a copy of the agenda but as it actually happened with things that may have gotten moved around and then just little notations as to whether there was a report from a particular subcommittee. If there was something that was voted on, did it pass or did it fail and that kind of thing. I made no attempt whatsoever to summarize any discussion. So this is just intended to be helpful. Well, good. I will keep doing that.

Another thing I wanted to point out which I hope you’ve all been sufficiently warned about but nevertheless, I did make a small change in the meeting schedule over the summer. So anything you’ve gotten since the summer is right. I moved the November meetings earlier by one week. We had a big gap in October so we had two free Wednesdays in October that were right next to each other and then the only free meeting after the November meetings – between the November/December meetings – was the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. So I thought if we move that all a week earlier it really makes more sense. Where you see October 30 for the third meeting of the Executive and Steering Committee, Faculty Senate and University – I’m using the wrong dates.
D. Mathesius: I put the wrong one in.

President Willis: Okay.

D. Mathesius: So this is October 24th, sorry.

President Willis: Okay, Donna put the wrong one in so what you should do is on that last page – those last things – that’s the old schedule. So where it says October 31st, make it the 24th; November 7th is October 31st. We will be meeting here on Halloween. University Council will meet on November 7th. So you can look at the old schedule in here and see where it is that I changed. As I say, I think it makes more sense. We will have -- President Peters will be visiting us at the October and March meetings. There was a desire expressed last year to have a visit once a semester so we have arranged that. Of course, his schedule is subject to last minute perturbations, but right now we are on his schedule for October and March. At those meetings we’ll have him arrive at about 3:30 so we’ll have time to get through at least the most routine parts of our business before he comes. There is one meeting which I would like to call to your attention, a conference actually, on intellectual property issues. Earl Shumaker wanted to give some details about that.

E. Shumaker: I just wanted to remind the faculty on September 28th there will a conference here at NIU and it will be copyright and intellectual property for those faculty that are interested in on-line instruction. I do have some copies of the registration with me, the registration form. Also if you go to the Faculty Development office on the website and if you click on information and then click on conferences the registration I think, is also on there. If you register before I think, September 8th the cost for the conference is $35.00. Thank you.

President Willis: Thank you Earl. I will be attending this conference by the way and probably will say something about it at the subsequent Faculty Senate meeting. The last thing I wanted to say was that when you are speaking please say your name. We have some new members who don’t necessarily know who you are or maybe you are a new member and we’d like to know who you are and I don’t know who everybody is. Furthermore, the person who transcribes these tapes does not always recognize people by their voice and so we have some poor lady sitting there with headphones on and this mound of tape that she has to transcribe so if you could say your name, that would be of great assistance. Moving on to items for Faculty Senate Consideration.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

1. Selection of Faculty Advisory Committee member and alternate to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

President Willis: The first item is a selection of Faculty Advisory Committee member and alternate to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. This is what Wilma Miranda was doing last year; she did not wish to continue. I have asked Pat Henry if she would be willing to take that position and she has agreed. Unfortunately, she was not able to be here today. If someone would be willing to place her name in nomination for that position? So Herb had placed her name in nomination. Are there any other nominees? Okay. Malcolm Morris seconded the
nomination. Would someone like to move that the nominations be closed? All those in favor of Pat Henry say “aye.” Opposed.

The motion passed to approve Patricia Henry to serve as the FAC to IBHE.

I do not have an alternate selected or at least, how should I phrase this, I’ve not approached anyone to see if they would be willing to serve as an alternate. So I would entertain nominations at this point or I can go lobby and we can come back with that next time. Are there any nominations to an alternate for Pat? These are the IHBE meetings, which are held at various Illinois colleges and universities around the state. I’m told that at other places people clamor to be able to go to these meetings but apparently that doesn’t happen here so. All right, let me do some finagling and see if I can come up with an alternate for the next meeting.

2. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

President Willis: The next item is selection of Vice President of the Faculty Senate. I have asked Jody Newman-Ryan if she would be willing to continue in this function and she has agreed to do that. Once again I would entertain a formal nomination. Any other nominations?

Why don’t we go ahead and vote on Jody then. All those of favor? Opposed?

The motion passed for Jody Newman-Ryan to serve as Vice President.

Very good. Jody Newman-Ryan was approved as VP. We did have a Secretary of the Faculty Senate last year and I would entertain nominations if someone is interested. This is not a position that we’ve traditionally filled and I was unable to find a description of the duties. What the VP does is serves in case of the absence of the president, namely me. The secretary, I wasn’t able to figure out what the Secretary does. Malcolm served in that position last year so – Donna said that Malcolm helped her figure out who everybody was last year. So if someone feels that we could use a nomination, then I would certainly entertain nominations. Otherwise, I would propose that we leave that position open. Okay.

M. Morris: I would fill the position only because I don’t think it’s appropriate to leave it open because it is in the rules, even if it does nothing. So, if no one wants to do it, I will continue to sit next to Donna and be happy.

President Willis: Okay. Herb?

H. Rubin: I will nominate Malcolm and I want to speak to it.

President Willis: Okay. Malcolm has been nominated and it has been seconded.

H. Rubin: We really should think in terms of general university governance issues about unnecessary committee work and unnecessary positions and I would recommend that Rules and Governance basically look at the bylaws to eliminate this unnecessary position if it is.
President Willis: All right. We will certainly take a look at that. Meanwhile, shall we vote on Malcolm as Secretary? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion passed for Malcolm Morris to serve as Secretary.

Okay. You’re Secretary Malcolm.

3. Approval of Dan Griffiths to serve on the University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees – 2001-2004. (P)

President Willis: The final item is that I have requested Dan Griffiths to serve on the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. He served in that function last year because of his position as Executive Secretary of the University Council and, of course, now he’s not serving in that position anymore. I thought it would be good to have the kind of continuity that he would provide as a faculty representative to that body. Do we have to have a nomination on that or do people just approve it? Okay. I would entertain a motion to nominate Dan to that position. The motion was made and seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? Dan Griffiths was approved to serve on the University Advisory Committee.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: We have two items on the Consent Agenda. Do I have a motion to accept the consent agenda? Second? Do we vote on the Consent Agenda? Okay. I’m new at this. All those in favor of the Consent Agenda? Opposed?

The Consent Agenda was approved.

A. Approval of Faculty Senate committee chairs of spokesperson and FS committee composition 2001-2002. (P)

B. Approval of Charletta Gutierrez (BUS) to serve on Library Advisory Committee. (P)

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President Willis: Now we move to reports from Advisory Committees.

A. FAC to IBHE

President Willis: We do have a report from – the Faculty Advisory Committee – Wilma Miranda attended the last meeting but she was unexpectedly called away today and is not able to present that so I will see if I can get a written report from her and put it in the packets for next time.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones

President Willis: The next two Board of Trustee committees are both meeting this Friday and so
I’ll have reports from them next time.

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen

E. BOT – Dan Griffiths – report

President Willis: The Board of Trustees itself met in June and Dan Griffiths had a written report that was in here but Dan is also here. Do you want to give a full report Dan or just answer questions?

D. Griffiths: No, I just want to answer questions. The report itself simply calls for the Committee reports have been in previous Senate reports so if anyone has any questions, I’ll try to answer them.

President Willis: Does anyone have questions for Dan? His report is on page 27. The Board of Trustees itself will meet again on the 20th of September and so at the next Faculty Senate meeting I will have a report from that. So no questions for Dan.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

President Willis: We move to reports from Standing Committees. Most of these, of course, have not met yet with the exception of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, which did meet last Thursday and Carole Minor has a report.

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

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair – No report

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

C. Minor: I’m Carole Minor and this is my first meeting of the Faculty Senate so I’m happy to be here and happy to tell you that this Committee met last week and it’s kind of an unusual situation. I was appointed as the Faculty Senate Chair but there is another Chair who actually runs the meeting and that’s Gary Coover and he’s here also. The meeting began by Gary stating his goal for the Committee this year to discover its – to improve the role of the Committee in the University’s governance structure and he listed some of the recent activities and accomplishments of the Committee including meeting with division chairs, division directors and helping the Division of Development and University Relations do some things to help the faculty such as lowering the copying prices in departments and increasing access. Some of the new members of the Committee asked what was the role of the Committee which led to the reading of its description in the Committee Book which included long-range planning for budget and space, advising the President and Provost, making recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the University Council and meeting with the President and Executive Vice President and Provost at
least twice a semester.

One of the continuing members of the Committee suggested that this Committee had really not asked the President and Provost the question “what are the major challenges of the University and how can we help” and he suggested that we do so. Just then, the President stopped by and Gary very smoothly asked him that question. The President said – actually, he said that Ivan Legg would ask us to look at areas of strength and areas of opportunity and he listed some areas which he thought the University would need to deal with within the near future and those were teacher training as well as access to the University. He said the issues in which the legislature was interested that may not have much of an impact on NIU because we’re not in too much trouble about them are crime on campus and too many out-of-state students. He also suggested that we need to shape our priorities to take advantage of state priorities and that enrollment management whether or not to grow would be an important issue in the near future as well as developing a strategy for technology and determining our niche in the distance education market. He also asked the Faculty Senate to consider what we would like in terms of an honors college and that’s on the agenda a little bit later. He did offer the Committee the opportunity to have input on the “big picture”.

Also, Walter Czerniak, the Associate Vice President for Information Technology, met with the Committee and the big issue that he was coming to talk about was the issue of corn accounts for faculty members. He told us that the corn server is still operational and that will continue for two or three years; that the rumors were false that faculty e-mail was going to be shut down and that faculty members with corn accounts will be contacted when they decide to shut down this server and individually given options of how to access their e-mail but that will not happen for two or three years. He also told us about the new twenty-four hour service center for technology, which replaces the help line I think. That number for your information is 753-8100. It sounded like an important number to remember to me. He indicated that they had done a lot of improvements in training and in supervision. They expected to improve the accountability of this customer service center over that of the help line. Her also indicated that NIU resident halls are some of the most technologically advanced in the country all of the rooms having either Ethernet or DSL connections and that Ethernet connections are expected to go into all the rooms as renovations take place. He indicated that their goals for faculty support included further support of Blackboard, access to site licenses that faculty want or need and getting onto Internet II. Questions about privacy of faculty work stimulated his reiteration of the statement that faculty do have a right to privacy for their work on campus and that unless he has a subpoena or some other kind of court order that no one will go into your computer to see what you’re doing unless they ask you first.

The Committee will meet again tomorrow at 3:15 and we expect that Provost Legg will meet with us then. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

**D. Wagner:** This space is part of your thing and I just wonder – there was an article in the Northern Star about a new building that’s going to be built near the Psychology Building and that was sort of the first I had heard of it and I wondered where it was going to be built.

**C. Minor:** The Committee doesn’t know anything about that but we will certainly ask when the
Provost meets with us tomorrow.

**President Willis:** This was in today’s Star?

**D. Wagner:** Pardon me, no, it was in last week’s.

**M. Martin:** Was that Center for the Study of Family Violence and Sexual Assault? The Star was in error on that. It’s going to be built on the other side of the Convocation Center. Ground is going to be broken for that fairly soon. The current site of the Center is in the basement of the Psychology Building so they may have gotten confused because of that.

**D. Wagner:** Does something like that come before this body or the University Council for, you know, discussion?

**President Willis:** Gary maybe you can discuss that; you’ve been on the Committee longer. My impression is no, but ---

**M. Martin:** Where that particular piece of money came directly from the federal government and it’s the first building I believe, ever to be built on campus that was totally funded by federal funds. So my understanding is that the building will be the first of many that will be built on the west side of campus that relate to, particularly relate to research. It’s going to be a research park sort of subdivision over there, hopefully.

**G. Coover:** The Committee has tried to get involved somehow in long-term planning on space on the University campus and to that end we have been informed a little bit about the development of the west campus master plan and will pursue that further as now it’s the far west campus plan. Also, last year we tried to get as much information as possible about the plans for Wirtz Hall after the movement of the Business College to their new building and I believe we were updated pretty well. Decisions about that were made after our meeting and we have not had further information about what they decided or how they decided. I hope that in the future we’ll be involved in some long-range planning.

**H. Rubin:** I hope these remarks are taken, they’re meant to be strong but they’re not meant to be hostile because I’m as much to blame as anything. RSB was set up originally when Jim Norris was very concerned about the hidden budget of the University, our inability to interpret the budget and get that sort of information. It was supposed to be done that way. It’s evolved to fill very well two functions, one of which is a sounding board for ideas that come from the administration and secondly as occurred with the printing problems and other stuff like that, almost as a faculty ombuds type of function, at least a quizzical function. But I would like to see it really working in I think one of its third functions which is to coordinate the different faculty committees, APASC and others which are talking about plans for the University that have space and resource implications and try to do what to me shared governance ought to be about which is to let faculty proactively shape the University. What I’m hearing is we hear this report and then we respond. We hear this report and respond. To me what has to be done at some point if we’re ever going to get beyond this veneer of shared governance is for faculty to be saying we want a big business school and we’re pleased with Barsema. We want to expand halfway to Des
Moiines because that’s what universities are about. Okay? And things like that or we don’t want to. If this committee isn’t doing that, you know, this is the committee that really has to start moving in this proactive way and, you know, I failed that during my time on it I’d ask such questions and you’d get a foggy, you know, nice phrases back. Cooperation, you know, they’d tell you one secret thing so you’d feel good but you still don’t have any part of agenda setting. If we don’t get it that way, I mean, we really need to get into the agenda setting part. Enough of a speech.

President Willis: I’m encouraged by – we do, of course, have a new provost and so I think that gives us an opportunity to take that kind of role and both the President and the Provost seem willing at least by their words to let us do that. So I’m encouraged and we just have to – I think if we don’t act they’re not going to sit around waiting for us but I think the opportunity is there. Okay, any other questions for Carol? It occurs to me I flew a little quickly through the other committees. Let’s see, I’m assuming I should address them directly and make sure they don’t have reports. Jody, Academic Affairs? Okay. Jim, Economic Status? No, okay good. Let’s see Rules and Governance, Chris Hubbard? No report.

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

President Willis: We do have a couple of election things that do have to be done at this first meeting. So I’ll let Gretchen take over and explain what she’s doing. I did skip over Carol – Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. No report, okay, thank you. I did get new bifocals but I still don’t see everything that’s on the page.

1. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee (P)

G. Bisplinghoff: We have two procedures to take care of today the first one being the selection of the members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. That is fifteen names plus five alternates that will be selected and they’re simply drawn by lot out of the magic envelope. The first name is and please excuse me if I don’t do a very good job with the names, is Rick Ridnour, David Wagner, Carole Minor, Earl Shumaker, Gary Coover, - I feel like somebody should say Bingo – I forgot to pass out the little cards – Sengoda Ganesan, Gretchen Bisplinghoff. I don’t know how that works, I really don’t and, you know, lotteries I never win. Dennis Brown, Richard Orem, Patricia Henry, W. Scott Bauman, Dianne Cearlock, Laurie Elish-Piper, Susan Montegue, and Winifred Creamer. That’s the Committee and I’ll draw five more names for alternates.

James Lockard, Jody Newman-Ryan, Mark Cordes, Diann Musial and Xueshu Song. All right.

President Willis: Can I ask you one thing about that?

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes.
**President Willis**: We have a small problem with the chair of that committee which is that there is no continuing chair. The person who was vice-chair last year is no longer eligible to serve on that committee. So that committee at the moment has no chair so if the members of that committee would come up right afterwards before you go to your other committees and just let me explain what you can do about that. I’ll go over the procedures with the committee.

2. **Election of University Council alternates** – see sample ballots – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting (P)

**G. Bisplinghoff**: We’ll now proceed to the election of the University Council alternates and I’ll need the help of my committee members to hand out and collect so would the members of the Election Committee please step forward and help me with this. What we’ll be doing is asking the various members of the colleges to please raise their hand to receive your ballots and then we’ll collect those. There are sample ballots in your packet that you received. We’ll hand out for each one of the colleges then we’ll pick those up and we’ll step to the back and count those as soon as we have them collected. All right? Question?

**M. Larson**: Do University Council members vote for these?

**D. Mathesius**: Yes.

**M. Larson**: Okay, thank you.

**G. Bisplinghoff**: All right, would those in the College of Business please raise their hand. You get a green ballot. College of Business you should be receiving a green ballot. Please leave your hands up. Those in the College of Education – okay, I’ll wait a sec.

**G. Bisplinghoff**: Okay, again, would the College of Education raise their hand please. You will be getting a blue ballot. You folks will get a blue ballot. College of Engineering you have a white ballot. Would the College of Engineering folks raise their hands? Okay, the College of Health and Human Sciences, that’s a yellow ballot. College of Visual and Performing Arts you get a salmon colored ballot. Visual and Performing Arts. Visual and Performing Arts, salmon. Okay, and finally College of Liberal Arts and Sciences would you raise your hand. LAS is pink. Okay, the committee members are going to collect all the ballots now and we’re going to sort and count in the back. So if the committee members would please collect all ballots.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Willis**: Okay, while they are counting we can go ahead with the next item on the agenda, which is Unfinished Business. Let me explain where this Unfinished Business comes from. What I did is I went through all the minutes of the Faculty Senate meetings from last year and looked at stuff that had been referred to committees and looked to see what happened to it and so things that things that got referred to committees that I never saw again I put under unfinished business and there are also a few things that came up at the last Faculty Senate meeting most of which I have under Unfinished Business. Then there’s some New Business, which we’ll get to next which there are things that came up since the last Faculty Senate meeting.
There are five items here. I just put them on there really for informational purposes; they don’t require any action, just to point out that these are items that are in committees and just to let you know that I know they’re there and they ought to be coming back out again at some point.

A. Administrative vs. Instruction cost: in RSB, from 9/6/00

President Willis: This is something that went to Resource, Space and Budget at the beginning of last year and so I’ll see if I can resurrect that and see if anything happened with it, if we know anything.

B. Annie Glidden underpass and bike paths: in RSB, from 9/6/00 (update would be nice)

President Willis: There was a question about what’s going on with Annie Glidden; are we going to get bike paths, are we going to get an underpass, what’s happening with all of that. I believe they’ve installed a temporary traffic light there now which is supposed to help somewhat. This is related to all that’s going on, I think, on the west campus so there again this is in the nature of an informational item. I think it would be nice to get an update on what’s going on; whether our students are getting run over on their way to class and that sort of thing.

C. Coordinate start dates for Executive Secretary and general UC/FS membership: in R&G, from 4/26/01

President Willis: There was an item referred to Rules and Governance which was about coordinating the start dates for the Executive Secretary and the general membership of the University Council and Faculty Senate. I took office on July 1st, the rest of you all formally started on the 16th of August and so there was a question as to wouldn’t it make sense to have whatever the date is be the same. It arose in the context of the Executive Secretary having to already be a member of the University Council but then in the context of needing to replace an Executive Secretary temporarily during the summer, it would also make sense if you had a structure which all rolled over at the same time. So that’s in Rules and Governance.

D. Review office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor: in FRR, from 4/26/01

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is looking at the role of the Faculty Personnel Advisor.

E. Investigate fees for employees taking courses at satellite campus facilities (Rockford, Hoffman Estates, Naperville): in ESP

President Willis: Economic Status was looking into fees for employees taking courses at the off campus facilities. If you’re an employee taking an NIU course, you can get a tuition waiver up to some number of hours depending upon whether you’re full time or not and that sort of thing but it’s a tuition waiver not a fees waiver and at some of the off-campus sites, the fees are quite high and so Economic Status was looking into whether it made sense to waive tuition but not fees at those off-campus sites.
F. Status of campus master plan

**President Willis:** Now, there are three items which were brought up at the last meeting but did not get referred to committees and which I would like to see get referred to some committees so that some work can start getting done on them. The first one was a question about the status of the campus master plan. Again, this would be an informational item at this point although I’m hoping that – well, I’m suggesting this ought to be referred to Resource, Space and Budgets and I’m hoping in the longer term we can have some input into what the master plan looks like but a status report on what it is now would be just that, a report. Does anybody have any questions or discussions about that particular item?

**J. King:** Do you need a motion?

**President Willis:** We need a motion to refer it if there’s no discussion.

**J. King:** I so move to refer it to Resource, Space and Budget.

**President Willis:** Okay. Any discussion? Okay, it’s been moved and seconded to refer that to Resource, Space and Budget. All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion to refer to Resource, Space and Budget was approved.

G. Value and use of ACT/SAT/HS records in admissions

**President Willis:** Item G was brought to this body by the President when he came to visit us I believe at the first April meeting last year. This is something that he requested us to look into and, therefore, I think we ought to do it and this has to do with the value and use of the ACT – we don’t use the SAT but there’s been a lot of information generated about the use of SAT in admissions and so some of that information might be useful and the relative value of the ACT in high school records and all that sort of thing. He brought it up again as Carole mentioned when he came to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee about enrollment management. He would like some faculty input on that. I would suggest that the appropriate place to refer that would probably be Academic Affairs but I would certainly welcome any other suggestions or discussion.

**C. Minor:** I move that we refer that to the Academic Affairs Committee.

**President Willis:** Any discussion?

**H. Rubin:** Perhaps request some input from APASC so they get going in a parallel thing?

**President Willis:** I would also suggest, presumably Academic Affairs can generate it’s own request, but I would suggest that anyone who does have information that would be useful or any input on this issue to contact the Academic Affairs Committee and let them know. Jody, did you want to say anything about that?

President Willis: Okay, so it’s been moved and seconded that we refer this item to the Academic Affairs Committee. All those in favor? Opposed.

The motion to refer to Academic Affairs Committee was approved.

H. Establishment of an honors college

President Willis: The final item concerns an honors college. Again, this was discussed at I believe the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. The President is very interested in having an honors college. When it was suggested and I think properly that the guidance and the impetus ought to come again from the faculty and from the Faculty Senate. Again, this is an academic affair presumably. Is there any comment or discussion on this? Kathryn?

K. Gately-Poole: Kathryn Gately from School of Theatre and Dance. I think it’s a very good idea speaking for my department because even though we seem to be getting stronger and stronger students we can lose very good students sometimes, very talented students because when they compare us, not just name-wise, but when they compare us with other programs academically, even though they’re pleased with the training part of the program we do lose students like that so I think this would be a wonderful idea. Just speaking from our department alone.

President Willis: Any other comments?

D. Wagner: I was the one I guess who introduced this. I hadn’t meant it quite as new business but there was an article in the paper that morning at which time the Northern Star was correct I think, that the President supported such an idea and I thought it should be brought to the attention of this body. I’m not sure I mean it as new business. I’m not sure – I sort of think it’s important enough if action is taken that it would be a separate committee that would investigate this but maybe that could grow out of Academic Affairs.

President Willis: Well, we have the option of referring it to an existing committee or creating an ad hoc committee to consider it.

D. Wagner: I move that an ad hoc committee be appointed.

President Willis: Okay. It’s been moved and seconded that an ad hoc committee be appointed to consider this issue. Did you want to say something or just second it?

W. Baker: I was just seconding it.

President Willis: Is there any discussion?

H. Rubin: I’m serving on an ad hoc committee. I have trouble with ad hoc committees just in general philosophically since it does fit within the purview of one our established committees
that could then recommend what I think should happen, that it should go to other purviews in at that point where you don’t have a structure you go to ad hoc. We have a structure right here. And I agree with its significance, I mean, it’s a terribly significant issue.

C. DeMoranville: I tend to agree with Herb on this. I think that we have enough committees and unless there’s some compelling reason we don’t need to have an ad hoc committee. I think Academic Affairs is one committee that could look into this issue. It might also be something under the purview of Resource, Space and Budgets as well maybe after it comes out of Academic Affairs.

President Willis: Okay, any other discussion? We have a motion on the floor to create an ad hoc committee to consider this issue. Are we ready to vote on that motion? All those in favor? Opposed?

That motion has lost.

I would entertain a motion to refer this to Academic Affairs or some other committee. To Academic Affairs? Okay. It’s been moved and seconded to refer this to Academic Affairs. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion to refer to Academic Affairs was approved.

X. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: These are things which have come up since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate.

A. Corn/Groupwise upcoming transition

President Willis: The first item is something that came up over the summer when there was some flap over what was happening with the corn machine. I would suggest this has been dealt with in the Resource, Space and Budget report at least for the moment, but certainly if anyone has any further questions about it we can look at those.

W. Baker: I would just like to say generally that this was and is quite an important issues in terms of affecting many faculty colleagues first of all. Secondly, in spite of the fact that it was the summer I was very grateful not only to you but to other colleagues that they were genuinely concerned about this issue and it is an issue which affects us all. And it illustrates that when we really feel strongly about something we can get together even though it is a vacation and actually influence and affect things. In that sense, a positive has come out of it and we in a sense showed that we are not going to be bamboozled by so called administrative decisions and that we show as a faculty if we stand together that we’re not exactly stupid. I think that’s very important because it does effect us all and we ought to monitor it and keep monitoring it and look at it very closely and not necessarily believe everything we are told. That’s my comment on that.

President Willis: Thank you. I think that we will certainly keep an eye on it. I think to be
realistic one has to understand the pace at which things in the computing world change and not expect that the way you are doing something you can keep doing it indefinitely so one always has to keep one’s toes for changes but of course, we also have to be aware of changes in enough time to accommodate to them also.

**W. Baker**: I’d like to respond to that. I think, if I might say so with respect, that’s a bit of a fallacy. Change in itself is not necessarily a positive; there are self interests involved, and because it’s computing we ought not to necessarily imply that changes are necessary. They are certainly sometimes in some peoples’ self interest.

**President Willis**: I agree with that. I’m just saying it’s an area where things do tend to change quickly and not just here and so it doesn’t hurt to be on top of things and aware of the possibility of rapid change there. You know, my father is still using a DOS computer with a 20 megabyte hard disk but he’s having trouble buying his 5 ¼ inch floppies now.

**W. Baker**: Is he complaining?

**President Willis**: Yes, he’s complaining but he does not want a new computer.

**W. Baker**: Then that’s another story.

**H. Rubin**: To strengthen what Billy said, originally we were told “a” has to be the case and there’s no alternative and with political pressure we were told “a” need not be the case and of course there’s an alternative. You know, just to make things very simple.

**President Willis**: Right, absolutely. Yeah. I’m certainly not saying we should put up with change just because things tend to change quickly, I’m just saying this is an area where potential changes will tend to come up rapidly and so it needs a lot of attention. Okay, any other comments on that issue?

**B. Function and purpose of Faculty Senate**

**President Willis**: The next item is kind of a general one which parallels something that Jim King brought up at the University Council and which is going on as an agenda item for the University Council and also goes along with Herb’s proposal to eliminate useless or at least positions with no functions such as the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Part of this is to look at the Faculty Senate and how are we functioning and can we optimize our function and part of it is to – that’s one part which is kind of internal which includes some housecleaning things like looking at all our committees and officers and making sure that all the things which are defined make sense and then another part of that is looking more globally and how do we fit into the overall structure of the governance of the University and are we having the maximum impact and are we really doing all that we can here. So I don’t know Jim, if you want to say something about what you said at the University Council?

**J. King**: The question of the purpose and function of the Faculty Senate was reviewed by a committee, the Dowen Committee, gosh, I think it was about six years ago and the document that
came out of that came out in April if I’m not mistaken and the result was that we we’re too busy to devote much attention to it. There were a few important recommendations in that and so if a committee, I suppose this one might be an ad hoc committee, I don’t know, if a committee of the Faculty Senate wants to address the question of function and purpose a place to start is with the Dowen report which is in the files. What Sue referred to as my comments at the University Council meeting last time I’ll share with this body but I want to make it clear at the outset that I don’t feel the same way about the Faculty Senate and the University Council. I see the Faculty Senate as basically a gathering of colleagues and I see the University Council as a charter body of the institution. In my view, shared by very few I’m sure, University Council is altogether too big. It’s got seventy members. If you look at its agenda for the last six years and if you can find something that warrants a meeting of seventy people, some of the most talented people or at least some of the best paid people in the institution, okay, I will be your eternal admirer. I don’t think there’s anything there and accordingly I think that body should have at the time we reviewed the committees of the institution, cut itself in half size wise. It refused to do so. University Council oversaw the downsizing of every other committee in the Committees Book and when the motion was made that it downsize itself, okay, it died for lack of second. I think it’s about time to take a hard look at that body. This body I see as entirely different. I see this as a kind of voluntary gathering of people with common interests and concerns, okay, and to my mind I wouldn’t change anything about it. I like this body the way it is.

President Willis: I have no proposed action at this time. I think in general, looking at ourselves is a good thing to do but I’m not sure we need to do it formally. This does however, remind me of something that I meant to make in my remarks at the beginning and forgot and that has to do with committees. Being a Faculty Senate member includes not only attending these meetings but also participating in the committee work and just like I tell my students in class, just sitting here doesn’t do it all. Really, most of the work goes on elsewhere and it’s just as true here as it is in my classes. So you’re expected not only to be here but also to be a member of a committee and, in some cases, even more than one committee because we have some colleges which have very few members and so I wind up with people on two committees. So those of you who are only on one committee can be very grateful. Really, the bulk of the work that this body does goes on in those committee meetings and so I would ask you all to take that seriously. It’s a responsibility. It’s work and it’s time and I know what that’s like but really I think, as I’ve said earlier here today, we have a relatively new president, a brand new provost. They are inviting us to advise them on things like the long-term vision and future of this University. We have an opportunity here and if we don’t take it they’re not going to stand around offering it forever. So I would encourage you all to please take your committee responsibilities seriously. I really don’t want to hear about committee chairs not being able to get their committees together and doing all the work themselves and all this sort of thing. I would be very put out. All right, now I’ll get off my horse about that.

C. Disposition of Faculty Personnel Advisor’s files (P)

President Willis: Item C has to do with the disposition of the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s files. There’s a description of what the issue is here in your packet on page 34. Malcolm, do you want to say something about that? The point is there are all these files and they’re sitting in Malcolm’s office right now and so the question is do we want to keep keeping these files
indefinitely or do we want to get rid of them after a certain amount of years. If we want to keep them do we want to provide a place to keep them rather than in somebody’s office. Anyway, Malcolm?

**M. Morris**: Thank you Sue. My apologies on line 2, this is on page 34, there’s an extra, next to the last word on that line. “A” should be eliminated. I typed this on e-mail. I don’t have the editorial abilities I do when I hand write. I think what you should know has happened, I guess has been happening every time there’s a new faculty personnel advisor, is that there’s just a transfer of all these files some of which are rather old but all of which, I feel, I have no right to stick my nose into since I wasn’t asked to. So, I’m technically a custodian of these files. I don’t know what purpose these files serve. Some may be active in that a member of the faculty or SPS may call and say “well, there’s a file that you have that I generated starting two years ago”. I mean, I just don’t know. So, I’m concerned that I have all these files. It’s one, a space problem but two, eventually I’m concerned that someone will walk into my office and see a name on a file because they are no longer just in the cabinet. There are about fifty to sixty files sitting in a box because the cabinet isn’t big enough to accommodate all the files. Another problem I have is it’s really not this body’s files. It’s not my files. They’re personal files of individuals on the campus. So, I really don’t know what to do with them. An option I did not suggest because I’m not sure I want to do it would be to go and call everyone who has a file and say “what do you want me to do with it?” which would necessitate one, me getting information that maybe I shouldn’t have and two, it would be very time consuming. So, I brought this here principally because I am elected by this body and I think to some degree I respond to this body.

**President Willis**: Herb and then Bill.

**H. Rubin**: I’m reminded of – I don’t know if it was Cecil DeMille or somebody in Hollywood who said “destroy all the files but be sure to make copies”. I’m thinking of that with regard to these files. To me the storage problems and stuff like that other than the security problems should not be a consideration. If people want to keep the files we need storage. Certainly, everybody shouldn’t pry in the files and I think it should become part of the statement of the duties of the Faculty Personnel Officer who has dealt with the case to clearly indicate in a non intrusive fashion “this case is totally done; the person has left the University and it’s not relevant” and so one can look at the outside and make a decision. That being said, my basic sense is that so long as the person is employed by the University, perhaps he’s an employed person, files must be kept and I would argue for two reasons. One, most of these cases involves some form of contention. They’re contentious cases. Okay. If it’s a contentious case it involves some sort of reactions from another official part of the University. There will be records kept there. Later, if a similar case were to be reopened, the University will have its record saying “this is what occurred in the past”. Okay? To protect the faculty person if some other thing had happened, they need the records to be maintained by the Faculty Personnel Office and it really needs to be kept and I think that reason would be sufficient. The second reason, however, often times we have no idea of the disposition of cases and sometimes people have a feeling that people are something running in circles and nothing’s being accomplished and if somebody should ever want to systematically investigate that, these files provide information especially on the informally settled cases. So I would really think you need a locked room. You need a better filing system so you really can eliminate the people who have totally retired and have no
relevance to the University. Other than that, I think once a case is opened it should be saved forever or at least while the person is employed.

President Willis: Okay. Bill?

W. Baker: Three issues here I think. Malcolm, if I could ask Malcolm directly, to generalize what are the nature of these files? That’s the first thing I would like to ask.

M. Morris: Well, I haven’t really looked into the files because I didn’t think it was appropriate so I’m guessing based upon the work I’ve done to date from my own files what the files probably are is a compilation of letters by complainants explaining what their situations are and responses from central administration or supervisors, you know, and maybe a final disposition from a University official. That is what I’m guessing is in them. I just didn’t think it was appropriate for me to start, you know, rifling through the files, which is why I called Sue and said “what shall I do”. I will say that Natalie, I did have a conversation with Natalie who was the previous Personnel Advisor, and her comment to me was “I’m going to do you a big favor and I’m actually not going to transfer these files to you”. “I’m going to destroy them”. But she didn’t, so, you know, I don’t – maybe Tim could agree or disagree with me as to what he thinks might be in the standard file. Tim would you say what I identified as probably what’s in those files?

Tim is the University ombudsman.

T. Griffin: Tim Griffin speaking, University Ombudsman. I have never seen the inside of one of the files kept by the Faculty Personnel Advisor. I can respond as a person who has worked very closely with each of the past five of them but only on an informal working relationship, not in a formal nature and, as I say, I really cannot tell for sure what’s in any of those files. I’ve never seen them.

J. King: Well, how long do you keep your files?

T. Griffin: There are two answers; actually three answers to that question. One is the State of Illinois requires any official files that are kept by an office and titled that of ombudsman to be kept for a period of five years. Since the Office of the Ombudsman at Northern Illinois University, consistent with the standards of practice within the appropriate professional organization, however, does not keep any official files is a question that really has no answer. The realistic answer is that we keep certain written records long enough to get them entered into a computer data base that compiles the numbers that you see in our annual report after which time those so-called records, immediately after entry into that data base, are destroyed. That varies in terms of how long it takes depending on the time of year and how busy we are but it certainly never goes past a matter of a very few weeks after a case has been judged or deemed to be completed.

President Willis: Bill you had a couple of other remarks?

W. Baker: The second question about the time limit factor. The third question is this whole issue of confidentiality, which perhaps you could say something about.
T. Griffin: At the risk of taking your time on a beautiful afternoon when you’ve got more on your agenda, there are many layers and levels of confidentiality concerns that I believe are legitimate in this matter. The first of those is perhaps, in no particular order, the confidentiality of the person who originally contacted the Faculty Personnel Advisor and in whose name the file perhaps resides. The second individual would be the individual who may responded in some formal or informal way, perhaps only to that person or to an administrator, the Faculty Personnel Advisor coming by a copy of that indirectly as forwarded to them by one of those people not to the knowledge of the person who wrote it or responded. If indeed the Faculty Personnel Advisor was involved in an effort to informally to resolve this there would be yet third parties potentially involved in some kind of record that may have been kept by the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s own hand or in some written or other kind of informal, presumably confidential kind of response. As Malcolm indicated, if there were official ultimately dicta or other kinds of actions taken by administration at some point there would be potentially then people who, especially if it were a personnel matter, would presume that their dictations and dicta in such a degree would be again kept confidential at least in terms of what would be normal for personnel documents at the University. These are just those documents and records that may be predictable and would not, of course, encompass any unique kinds of less predictable records that might exist in one or more of these files. There are also issues of confidentiality which I believe Malcolm got to however related to the whole purpose of his position and this body’s intention for maintaining it to use as a potential parallel to a certain degree the position of ombudsman as designated by University Council a portion of my job as elucidated says and delineated, that I’m to analyze long and short term trends and report those for the benefit of change within the institutional community. If indeed it is the Faculty Senate’s desire that the Faculty Personnel Advisor have at his or her availability the opportunity to identify certain trends or problematic policies or procedures based on longitudinal reviews of the cases, given the level of turnover in that position, it seems to me incumbent that some sort of records or files be maintained.

President Willis: Bill is that the end of your questions?

W. Baker: I would have to think very carefully about some of the answers.

S. Bauman: Scott Bauman in Finance. It seems that the issues being raised here have some potentially serious legal implications. We’re dealing with personnel and individuals in terms of the principles of due process and civil rights and possible liabilities that may occur through improper disclosure of information. Therefore I would suggest that this question be referred to our University legal counsel as to what would be appropriate guidelines and appropriate procedures to follow that would provide adequate protection in terms of these types of files.

C. DeMoranville: I don’t know whether we need to act on that motion or not but I would suggest that we refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee who is already looking into the office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor and can discuss this issue and bring in the University Counsel to talk about those issues.

J. Povlsen: Jenine Povlsen, President’s Supportive Staff Council and SPS also utilizes the Faculty Personnel Advisor in terms of grievances or potential grievances that SPS staff may be
filing. Two questions that come to mind is a definition of whose files are those, the employee’s files or are they files of the University? Who do they actually belong to is a question I have and point two it is quite conceivable that information that’s in the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s file may not be in the actual personnel file of potential grievance and at some point to arbitrarily decide to destroy it may not be in the best interest of employees at Northern. Those are two observations I made and if I think of any others I’ll make sure that I raise them. Thank you.

M. Morris: I am willing – I think Carol’s idea and Professor Bauman’s suggestions are fine and I will be more than glad to continue to house these files until the matter is resolved. My goal was really to bring it to the floor and that’s fine. I will do my best to keep interested parties away from the files. I pray that the committee acts expeditiously.

H. Rubin: I am glad there will be a committee doing it because I think there’s a world of difference between a committee asking the University attorney a question which is perfectly appropriate and the University attorney is the University attorney, the person is not the faculty attorney. We lack such a position on this campus so it’s a very different case. So having Carol’s committee ask University Counsel is fine but I think it should go only through the Faculty Senate committee.

F. Bryan: There needs to be a motion to refer to the committee.

President Willis: I was just going to ask for that. I would certainly entertain a motion to refer this.

M. Larson: I move to refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

President Willis: Is there a second? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed.

The motion was passed to refer this item to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

D. Accessibility of campus buildings

President Willis: It was brought up over the summer that the accessibility of various campus buildings to the handicapped ought to be looked into. I would suggest this is a matter for Resource, Space and Budgets to consider. Carole, you’re the one who brought this up. Would you like to address that at all?

C. Minor: I believe there are several buildings on campus that have accessibility issues and I would move that this item be referred to the Resource, Space and Budgets Committee.

President Willis: Okay. It’s been moved and seconded that we refer this to Resource, Space and Budgets. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The motion was passed to refer this item to Resource, Space and Budgets Committee.

E. Constitution for Council of Illinois University Senates (P)
President Willis: I would like to have some action on this now if you all are willing. This is on page 35 of your packet. The Council of Illinois University Senates consists of the chairs of all the public university senates in Illinois so we would technically be members. They are requesting that all these senates approve of this constitution, which is contained entirely on this one page here. I believe most of the other ones have already done so. Are there any questions about this document? I personally don’t think there’s anything strange or objectionable in it. It’s really – this body is a way of the different of the academic senates in Illinois public universities to communicate with each other, which I’m a big fan of communication. I think it’s a good thing. Okay, there’s a motion to approve this document. Do I hear a second? Any further discussion?

D. Wagner: Is it absolutely necessary to approve it today? I don’t think you should approve it without having read it.

H. Rubin: I agree.

President Willis: Okay, we can postpone it until next time. Let’s see, do I need a motion to ---

F. Bryan: There is a motion already on the floor and once it’s retracted then you can make another.

President Willis: Postpone it until the next meeting?

H. Rubin: I move that we postpone discussion until the next meeting.

President Willis: It’s been moved that we postpone this motion until the next meeting. Do I hear a second? Yes, Carol.

C. DeMoranville: I’m just wondering if we can take five minutes and read it now and discuss it if there was some time element here where it needs to be done before the next meeting.

President Willis: I don’t think they’ll throw me out of the meeting. They plan on meeting in September and I don’t think they’ll throw me out if we haven’t approved it. It would be nice to approve it expeditiously but I think giving people time to read it would be fine. I think if we approved it at the next meeting that would be fine.

C. DeMoranville: There is a typo.

President Willis: There’s a typo? Well, this is what they mailed to me.

C. DeMoranville: In Section IV. It should be “according to the wishes of its members”.

President Willis: I suspect there won’t be a problem. Herb?

H. Rubin: I mean we object when the administration wants us to see something and approve it
instantly and we should be consistent ourselves.

**President Willis:** So it’s been moved and seconded that we postpone this until the next meeting. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? The ayes have it. We’ll bring this up next time.

**XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**President Willis:** Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Let me remind you that I would like you to adjourn at least briefly to your committees so that you can at least get to know who you are and perhaps set up a meeting time. Also I’d like to see the grievance committee just for a minute or two.

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**President Willis:** I’ve included some information items many of which are relevant to the SAT/ACT issue.

A. Article from *Chicago Sun-Times*, “Tuition is soaring at many public universities” (P)
B. Article from *Northern Star*, “College application no longer a cakewalk” (P)
C. Article from *Business Week*, “Why colleges shouldn’t dump the SAT” (P)
D. Article from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Two Cheers for an End to the SAT” (P)
E. Article from *Chicago Tribune*, “State’s ACT scores 12th in U.S.”
F. Article from *Rockford Register Star*, “Average ACT scores unchanged; more take test” (P)
G. Article from *The Christian Science Monitor*, “To learn to think in college, write – a lot” (P)
H. 2001-2002 meeting schedule (P)

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**President Willis:** Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 to go to sub-committees.