
Otieno attended for Balamuralikrishna; Wooten attended for Carter; Key attended for Smith; Stewart attended for Song; Douglass attended for Spear

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Bisplinghoff, Burgess, Caldwell, Creamer, Ganesan, Ghrayed, Heinze, Hudson, Jones, Kolb, Lockard, Miller, Miranda, Ridnour, Rubin, Stephen, Stoddard, Wade, Wolfskill

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 3:10.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: I would like to call the meeting to order. The first business is to adopt the Agenda. I have two amendments to the Agenda. The first is Item A on the Consent Agenda, which should say “refer to Rules and Governance”; otherwise there’s nothing to happen there. The second is that we have a walk-in item, which I would like to add to New Business so that would be Item B under New Business. We can call it Review of Quality Care or some such. So do I have a motion to adopt the Agenda as amended?

The Agenda was approved with revisions.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2001 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

President Willis: Next is the approval of the minutes of the last meeting, which you have there in your packet. It has been brought to our attention that we forgot to put the attendance list in there. That will appear in the on-line version of the minutes. Are there any other changes?

W. Baker: Page 14 at the top or page 18 at the bottom of the page, during my talk with you. “I’d like to respond to that. I think, if I might say so with respect,” blah, blah, blah – “that’s a bit
of a fallacy.” Full stop or period, capital “C.” “Change in itself is not necessarily a positive, there are self-interests involved, and because it’s computing we ought not to necessarily imply” (omit the next four words) “that changes are necessary.” So, should I repeat that or is that clear?

President Willis: I got it.

W. Baker: Otherwise, it doesn’t make sense. Okay? Then retain the final sentence “They are certainly sometimes in some peoples’ self-interest.” Without the plural. All right?

President Willis: All right.

W. Baker: Thank you.

President Willis: Anything else? Do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

The minutes were approved with corrections.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: I have a somewhat extensive list of things that I would like to touch on. I will try to be as brief as possible. First, please let me apologize for the elevators, two of which don’t seem to be coming up here. We will see what we can do about that. I had to come up in them also so I understand how that is. We will see what we can do.

The next thing I want to tell you is that at our next meeting, which is on October 31, that is Halloween, President Peters will be coming to visit us. He will come at about 3:30 p.m. so the idea is that we will have time to get through the more routine parts of our agenda and then President Peters will be here. He will answer questions. I don’t know that he has any particular statement that he wants to make at that time, although he may have one when he comes, but the main idea is to have him here so that he would be able to answer any questions or address any issues that we might have. If you do have issues that you would like to bring up with President Peters, please be ready to do that at our next meeting.

There have been some questions about the State budget in light of the current economic situation, which is rather unclear. The State budget is also at this point rather unclear, which is about all I can say about it at the moment. I’ve talked to President Peters about this; he is keeping a close eye on it but right now it really is quite uncertain. We have not, as far as I know, at least as of a few days ago, gotten any specific guidance from the State as to anything that we are supposed to do in terms of any budgetary constraints, but it very well may be that these will be coming sometime in the future. Right now the picture is very uncertain. Probably the soonest we would know anything would be in January for the picture to clear up somewhat. As I say, it’s a very uncertain picture right now but certainly when I talk to the President, this is one of the things that is on his mind, and I’m sure that if specific guidance does come from the State that we will all know about it pretty quickly. Right now there isn’t anything and so what the President has said is that we ought to be prudent and not overspend, certainly, at this point, in anticipation that some restrictions may be coming in the future.
Moving to another topic, although a related one, as some of you know the Provost has asked me to organize an ongoing University response to the terrorist attacks. What I am doing at the moment is assembling a list of experts, or of people who are willing to be a resource, and willing to talk. I am also assembling a web resource, a list of web pages, on a variety of topics, which should soon be linked to the University Council and Faculty Senate web pages. I have an enormous number of pages there with links and links and links, and so there’s a wide variety of information that’s available for you to browse among and read at your leisure. As I say, I hope that will be available on our web page as a link soon. I also am planning with these experts, once I get them, a series of weekly discussions. Right now the first ones that I’m organizing are going to be at lunchtime. We may branch out to other times and venues but right now what I’m organizing is a series of lunchtime discussions, which would be downstairs here in the Holmes Student Center, either in the Diversions Lounge or somewhere else if that is Not available. The idea of these is that there would be one person, who would be a presenter, who would give perhaps a five or ten or fifteen minute presentation, and then it would open up for discussion. I already have two of these scheduled and I am hoping to schedule a few more. I should have a schedule out in the next few days or certainly by next week at the earliest. If anyone has suggestions for more experts or even if you suggest the ones I already have that’s fine. I’d rather have somebody suggested twice than not at all. If you can think of people in your departments who would be good at this kind of thing please do let me know. Also, if you have suggestions for other resources, web pages or reading material or whatever, please go ahead and send it to me. I’m collecting all of this kind of thing.

The President is giving the State of the University address tomorrow at 3:00 p.m. in the Sandberg Auditorium. I will be introducing him and so I hope to see as many of you there as can make it.

I wanted to give you a little bit of an update on the group of state Faculty Senate Chairs. We have not yet met but there is some activity going on over e-mail. The issue that we will be looking into, the primary issue – this is tentative, it really hasn’t been finalized yet – but this is what people are thinking about, is looking at the way that public support in the State goes to both public and private universities within the State particularly in terms of tuition support. If you look at how much funding per student goes to the different kinds of universities, it turns out that the funding per student tends to be higher to the private universities because their tuition is higher. There was some desire on the part of the state university Faculty Senate presidents to look into that and see if that’s really the best use that we can make of these State funds. So that’s the issue that we’re looking into; also capital development funds going to private institutions in the state. That’s the issue that the State Faculty Senate presidents are looking into to begin with.

The last thing that I wanted to mention was that last Friday I attended a workshop on intellectual property issues in online education. I have a big folder of stuff as well as a book and lots of information buzzing around in my head about that, so if any of you have any questions or if any issues come up, I would be happy to answer any questions. I believe we have an ad hoc committee now, which is looking into the intellectual property statement of the university, and certainly that’s something that will need updating as the intellectual property issues associated with online material become more clear.
I think that’s all I wanted to say. Does anybody have any questions or comments?

**W. Baker:** Could you clarify who is on that committee?

**President Willis:** The Intellectual Property one?

**W. Baker:** No.

**President Willis:** No, which committee?

**W. Baker:** The Faculty Senate President Committee.

**President Willis:** This is a committee of presidents, well, it’s this thing that’s under Unfinished Business here. It’s the Council of Illinois University Senates. So it’s the presidents of the Faculty Senates of State Universities in Illinois.

**W. Baker:** Can you attend those meetings?

**President Willis:** Yes.

**W. Baker:** I would like to draw an issue to your attention that’s been raised. I can either do this publicly or privately, depending on how you would wish time to be utilized, and that is the question of the use of State funds in the university libraries for private institutions such as the University of Chicago and Northwestern, when they are taking a lot of the funding which should in fact be going to the State institutions. This is over the years, and they have alternative sources of funding, which we do not have as State institutions. There are enormous sums of money involved.

**President Willis:** That’s certainly related to the issues that they’ve had on here and I think that would be an appropriate addition to that list.

**W. Baker:** If you want further details I’d be more than happy to tell you that but I’m glad at last that there seems to be a venue where this matter can be raised.

**President Willis:** Yes.

**W. Baker:** We’re not talking about peanuts here.

**President Willis:** Right. If you have numbers and information, and can get those to me, I would certainly appreciate it. I will add that as a suggestion to the list of things that’s here.

**W. Baker:** Thank you.

**President Willis:** Any other questions or comments? All right, let’s move on to Item V. We have no items for Faculty Consideration, I guess.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Review of Faculty Senate Bylaws (especially the provision for a Secretary of the Faculty Senate).

President Willis: Do I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

Consent Agenda was approved as amended.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE

President Willis: I’m afraid you’re going to be hearing quite a bit from me here. The first is the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Pat Henry is our representative, but the IBHE met yesterday, hosted by Wheaton College - actually at the Windham Hotel in Lisle, and Pat was not able to attend, so I went. I have a small mountain of paper here, which I’m going to give back to Pat. I have not really written a formal summary of the meeting, but let me just summarize it briefly in words. Excuse me a moment and let me pull out the agenda so I can refresh my memory.

This was a meeting of the full board. The Faculty Advisory Committee met over lunch after the board meeting. There were a number of presentations of reports, results reports which every public institution has to provide showing that they’ve made progress towards the six state goals of economic growth, teaching and learning, affordability, access and diversity, high expectations and quality, and productivity and accountability. So they highlighted three of these, one from a state university which was Illinois State, one from a private college which was Wheaton College, and one from a community college which was McHenry County, which they thought were particularly exemplary, so we saw all of those.

Then there was a report; they have a commission on persistence and degree completion which was addressing a concern, that in Illinois we score very high in accessibility and affordability, but not necessarily so high in degree completion. So they had a committee looking into why that is, and one of the things this committee pointed out was that if you have very high accessibility then in general you might expect the degree completion to be not quite so high, because you have a lot of students who aren’t necessarily looking for degrees as a final outcome. Sometimes you get students who just want to take some courses for enrichment. In any case, that report was presented.

There were a number of other things that were also presented. One thing that I thought was interesting, although this is a preliminary thing and what they’re looking for is further recommendations, is that there is a recommendation that all high school students in the State take a college prep curriculum. Right now it’s only about half of them that do that. The minimum
State requirements for graduation from high school are relatively low compared to what other states require and quite far from what college entrance would require. The idea is to require all students to take a college prep curriculum. They haven’t passed that yet, but they’ve passed a resolution to look into it.

The last item that I thought was of interest was a recommendation for certificate of approval and authorization to operate from the University of Phoenix. The University of Phoenix, as you may know, is very big in online education, but they also do face-to-face education. They don’t need any approval to operate online courses in the State. You can log on to their web site on your computer and give them your credit card number, or however it is you do it, and sign up to take a course, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education has nothing to say about that. However, they are proposing to open campuses in Illinois; to begin with one in Schaumburg and one in Naperville/Downers Grove at a later time. In order to do that they need approval. They received that approval at this meeting to open those campuses. They do not yet have approval to award any degrees, so they can offer classes, but if they wish to offer degrees - which, of course, they do - then they have to come back to the Board with each degree program and get specific approval on that. This created some discussion among the Board, as you might imagine, but it did pass.

After that the Faculty Advisory Committee met over lunch and had a discussion much of which centered on things like Phoenix. Then several Board members joined us after lunch and there was some further discussion, not very structured, but asking questions like “if these guys can come in and offer all these programs, how come you can’t do it” and then we said “well, why don’t you give us some money” and they said things like “why do you need money” so we tried to explain that. As I said, there was discussion so I took some notes, which I will pass on to Pat. There will, I think, be further discussion between some specific Board members who expressed an interest in meeting with the Advisory Committee, discussing these things at greater length and with more structure.

C. Minor: From your observations of members of the Board there, what would be your projection of the reaction of the Board when the University of Phoenix comes back and asks for degree granting authority in Illinois?

President Willis: I think they will look at it very closely. I think that the University of Phoenix will have to demonstrate that what they’re offering is of sufficient quality to be worthy of approval. I would say it’s not going to be a rubber stamp; they will look at it.

C. Minor: But you think it will probably pass then?

President Willis: I don’t know. It’s hard for me to say. My impression of the University of Phoenix people is that they are very skilled at satisfying requirements in a variety of states. They’re operating in quite a few states already with these kinds of satellite campuses and so they know how to jump through hoops. My guess is whatever the hoops are they will figure out how to jump through them, but that’s just my own personal prediction.

C. Minor: Thank you.
**President Willis:** Are there any other questions?

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

**President Willis:** Moving on to the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee, guess what, I went to that too. At the time that that met, Dorothy Jones was not able to attend and we hadn’t appointed Dan Griffiths yet. This was last September 7. Fortunately, that meeting was relatively short. The only action item at that committee meeting was approving the collective bargaining agreements, which had been agreed to by the university and the bargaining units. Most of the meat of that meeting, most of the other things that went on at that meeting, were a bunch of information items, some of which were action items for the next committee meeting. After that, you won’t have to listen to me too much.

**F. Bryan:** I’ve been told that the information about that contract, for instructors for example, they’re not supposed to discuss it. Is there a reason why? I mean I know what the terms are and they’re favorable. I think those people deserve the raise and all that they received, but I was bothered because I’ve had several instructors who happen to teach in my program who said well, we’re not supposed to discuss it. Is there a reason why the lid was on?

**President Willis:** I think it needs to be – my understanding is that it just needs to be put into final form and get all the final signatures on it. The last printed version that came out, I think, was not the final version. They agreed to some modifications to that, and then they need to get all the modifications in writing. Steve Cunningham came and showed it to me and he didn’t tell me I couldn’t talk about it. He did say there were parts of it that weren’t final and they didn’t want to put it out until it was all printed up all nice but after that as far as I know, it should come out. Are there any other questions about that?

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

**President Willis:** Finally, there was the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee to which I also went. That’s this green thing here. Here there were a number of action items. By the way, these two committees have already reported to the University Council because they took place after the last Faculty Senate meeting but before the University Council, so those of you who are also on the University Council have heard this before. The Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee had a number of action items although not a lot of discussion about them. The main ones were passing various budget requests, which will then go on to the IHBE and to the State. There’s the capital improvement budget. This is a list of nine items which then, as I say, gets forwarded to, I think, the IHBE and then to the State. Exactly how many of these wind up getting funded depends on the State’s budgetary situation. What I’m told is that typically it runs between one and three of the top items on this list will be funded, more in good years, fewer in bad years. So who knows? The top few items on this list are planning money for the renovations of the Stevens Building. That’s number one. The way these capital items work is that first you get planning money so you can hire architects and draw up blueprints and all that kind of thing; then you get construction money so you can actually build; then after it’s built you
get equipment money so you can put things in it. So it comes in three steps. You get planning, you get construction and then you get equipment. So this is planning money for Stevens. The next item is equipment for Barsema Hall. We of course got a gift of the planning and building money, but this did not include equipment, so this is for equipment to put into that building. The third item is planning money for Phase II of the renovation of Wirtz Hall and then after that is some money for road repair and infrastructure improvements and so forth. So that’s four items. I can read you the whole list of nine, but what happens is that, as new items get added, they tend to get added to the bottom of the list. The ones that get funded go off the top and things percolate up. So that was approved. There’s also non-appropriated capital budget, which is non-instructional funds, which are smaller amounts of money which go for various kinds of repair and whatnot. Then there are smaller construction things. Then there were a couple of fees approved for programs, one for off-campus delivery for graduate programs in computer science – they requested an increase in that fee to more closely match their cost – and then for delivery for the alternative teachers certification program, which is a new program. Those were the action items at that meeting. Then there were a number of information items, various tables and things showing where money had been spent, and updates on various construction projects such as Barsema Hall and the Convocation Center and whatnot. Any questions?

C. Garcia: The money for the repairs of roads, what roads need repairing?

President Willis: Let me see if it says here. It looks like there are quite a few around campus. They say that the only construction projects that have been finished in recent years are Lucinda, Castle Drive and a section of Stadium Drive West. Deterioration of campus streets has progressed to the point that maintenance efforts can no longer keep up with the deterioration on a localized basis. In addition to normal freeze-thaw damage, repairs due to construction projects have led to a patchwork of street services, each with seams to let more water penetrate and add to the deterioration. It says short-term repair that only included resurfacing has just been completed on the west loop road adjacent to Stevenson and Grant Towers as well as about 60% of University Circle Drive. Complete road reconstruction will be necessary, however, to withstand constant vehicular traffic as well as the additional burden of the Huskie Bus Line. It sounds like they’re planning on a lot of different roads around the campus. They are requesting something like 5.5 million dollars for that. It doesn’t really list what roads exactly. It sounds like a lot of roads need fixing. Are there any other questions?

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

J. Povlsen: We have no report.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

President Willis: I was going to talk about that too but actually Jim has agreed to give that report, figuring you all would get tired listening to me.

J. Lockard: I’m not sure this is any improvement, Sue, but at any rate, the Board met on the 20th of September. Once you’ve heard the individual committee reports, that pretty much is the
Board report as well, because basically they just approve the things that the committees have already done. To just try to pick out a couple of highlights that were news to me there at least, maybe they’ve been announced at other places, Chair Manny Sanchez was very proud to announce that on the 9th of November there will be a conference on Latinos in Illinois Higher Education held at our Naperville Center. I’ve seen nothing else about that thus far myself but if you’re interested in that kind of topic that may be of interest to you. The most interesting of the very beginning reports that were received probably was the one from Mallory Simpson for the Foundation. Last year’s total receipts by the Foundation in the way of gifts were up 25% to over $27 million, which was a new record high for the University, so that was certainly good news there.

The Board does not normally, in my experience from attending these meetings, deal with the Consent Agenda, but this time they shuffled about two-thirds of the regular items into a Consent Agenda, including the kinds of things that Sue was just talking about. So those were not talked about at all within the Board meeting itself. The one item that did come up for a bit of discussion was the successful replacement of the turf at Huskie Stadium. They were so proud of all of this that they presented little, what would you call them, shadow-box like things filled with bits of dirt, granules of sand, ground up rubber and strips of whatever this artificial grass is. Each of the Board members was able to take this truly distinctive gift home with them from the meeting. I’m sure they are sitting proudly on coffee tables throughout the suburban region here today. They were quite different.

A fair amount of time was actually given over to a presentation from the CEO of the US headquarters of a Canadian company called Twin Lights that has entered into an agreement with the School of Business for some kind of partnership that wasn’t clear to me, having to do with development of interactive video training materials. So they showed off a little bit of what’s going on with that project. That actually took a fair amount of time. The other most significant thing is that in order to increase our visibility throughout the region, each member of the Board of Trustees received a lovely lapel pin to identify themselves as Board members, so that they can now wear that to their meetings elsewhere.

**President Willis:** Any questions for Jim? Let’s move on to the reports from Standing Committees.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. **Academic Affairs – Jody Ryan, Chair**

**J. Ryan:** We have no report yet. We’ll meet two weeks from today. Jay Wagle from the Honors Program will be meeting with us, so we hope to have a report from the Honors Program/College ready for the 31st. If anybody is interested in giving us input about that you may come to our meeting on the 17th or contact me before then.

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

**President Willis:** Thank you Jody. Economic Status of the Profession, Jim?
J. Lockard: We are still in the process of getting organized. I’ve asked the members to please meet with me briefly after this meeting to make sure we’re on schedule for a meeting time that will work for folks.

President Willis: Okay, very good. Resources, Space and Budgets, Carole Minor.

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

C. Minor: This is the report of our second meeting. That’s due to the University Council Chair of this committee, who is Gary Coover, getting this going and scheduling the meetings and scheduling things to be done at the meetings. Vice President Williams attended the meeting briefly; he is a member of the committee. His report was that People Soft is working. He said that People Soft is working much better here than at SIU or U of I. At one of those, and I can’t remember which, they had to just scrap the system because it worked so poorly. SIU, someone says. Most of the meeting was spent in conversation with the Provost and he indicated to us that his primary goal is to have the best possible faculty at NIU. He said that faculty governance is more powerful here than anywhere else he’s ever been. He thinks that’s good. He sees faculty salaries as a key issue and hopes to get merit money to retain and recruit faculty. The topic of reallocation of program dollars came up, and he indicated that personnel money is being retained in the colleges now so that reallocation needs to be done within colleges. He asked if he gave us a hypothetical million dollars for program development, what kinds of programs – how would we use that program money? He also indicated the view that the award system needs to reward people who teach, and said that the amount of scholarship is not as much of an issue as the quality of scholarship and how it informs or makes you be a better teacher. He also mentioned that President Peters had consulted with a public relations firm in Chicago to try to help him improve the image of the University throughout the State. The committee decided to request the following information for its next meeting. As I said last week, President Peters had come by and talked to us about teacher preparation that being a major goal for the University. We were going to request current enrollment information in teacher preparation programs across the campus. We also are going to request from Vice President Williams to see the master plan for the west campus and the east campus and to hear information about the process of space reassignment when Altgeld construction is finished and when Wirtz becomes available because the College of Business moves into Barsema Hall.

The next meeting will be October 11 from 3-5 p.m. and we’re scheduled to meet with Vice President Williams at that time.

President Willis: Thank you Carole. Are there any questions for Carole?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Carol DeMoranville, Chair

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Carol DeMoranville.

C. DeMoranville: Our committee met last week in September and the issue that we’re looking into currently is the Office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. We heard from Malcolm Morris,
who is the current Faculty Personnel Advisor, and also from Tim Griffin, the University Ombudsman. We’re going to be meeting again on October 17 at 3:00 p.m. to sort of continue this discussion and fact-finding mission and we probably will have a report on the office including the disposition of the files by the next Faculty Senate meeting on the 31st.

**President Willis:** Okay, very good. Any questions for Carol?

E. **Rules and Governance – Chris Hubbard, Chair**

**President Willis:** Rules and Governance, Chris Hubbard.

C. **Hubbard:** We have no report at this time but we will be forwarding at the next meeting proposed wording for the Faculty Senate bylaws for the concurrent installation of the Executive Secretary and the members of the Faculty Senate and University Council so that everybody is on board at the same time.

**President Willis:** Very good, sounds like we’ll be busy next time. Any questions for Chris?

F. **Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair**

**President Willis:** Elections and Legislative Oversight, Gretchen. Is Gretchen here? I think they have no report anyway.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. **Constitution** of Council of Illinois University Senates.

**President Willis:** Moving onto Unfinished Business, you’ll find on page 26 the proposed constitution of the Council of Illinois University Senates. They request that we approve this so that we would then become formally members of this group and then I would go to their meetings. I’m already on their mailing list but the idea is to have this body formally approve this. As I say, it was in the packet last time. I don’t think it would go in part of our bylaws, we would just approve it in principle and say yes, we approve. Does anybody have any questions or comments about this constitution?

**M. Larson:** Do you see any pitfalls in it?

**President Willis:** No I don’t. I would need a motion to approve this then. Any discussion?

**R. Caughron:** What’s its purpose?

**President Willis:** Well, let’s go to Section 2, Purpose here. I can read you the Section and then tell you what my take on it is. The idea is that the Council of Illinois University Senates would formulate policies and positions which further the common interests of faculty in Illinois public institutions and then share information with its membership, public officials and the larger community; and advocate for changes in public policy and law on these matters. So the idea is
to have the public institutions of higher education in Illinois get together to find what issues we have in common and then approach the legislature with a common voice to advocate for things which we feel are in our benefit.

P. Henry: Just to follow-up on that, does the advocating have any formal status or is it just a sort of lobbying kind of thing?

President Willis: As far as I know, it’s a sort of lobbying kind of thing. We go and stamp our feet in unison. Any other discussion? It’s been moved and seconded that we approve the constitution of the Council of Illinois University Senates. All those in favor? Opposed? Thank you. I will let them know.

The constitution of the Council of Illinois University Senates was approved.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Issues raised in Faculty Personnel Advisor’s Report

President Willis: This report was given to the University Council but I wanted to include it in your packets as well so you could read it. I’ve indicated with little arrows places where Natalie Clark, last year’s Personnel Advisor, has raised issues, which she thought were deserving of attention. We discussed this in the Executive Committee and would recommend referring these items to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee but I wanted to put it under New Business here rather than the Consent Agenda so as to allow for any discussion or questions that you might have about the issues that are raised in here. If there are none, I would entertain a motion to refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Does anyone have any questions or comments?

J. King: Well, relating to the first point that is that the position looks like it’s going to be year round, consequently a twelve-month contract, it’s currently eleven, right?

President Willis: Yes.

J. King: I’ve never been able to understand why the position of President of the Faculty Senate is not a twelve-month contract either.

President Willis: Well, that’s a good question.

J. King: I don’t k now – I don’t see the two questions as being connected except by association of ideas. Perhaps our committee work won’t be so heavy this year that we might ask them to find time to address that question as well. The other question that struck me as very interesting is the back up for the advisor. When I was Executive Secretary I inherited one of these by default. The Faculty Personnel Advisor could not handle it, the case, all right, and the grievant, if you want to call a person that, needed somebody and so it just got dumped in my lap. I’ll be very interested to see what we come up with as a plan for back-up when there is a case which the Faculty Personnel Advisor cannot handle, especially this year because, look, I mean – the easiest
thing in the world would be to turn to your past advisor, the person who occupied the office previously, but the last two advisors are retired. So, that really doesn’t look like a successful gambit. In the meanwhile, be advised that as President of the Faculty Senate you are default for that.

President Willis: I understand. By the way, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee is already reviewing the office of the Faculty Personnel Advisor anyway so this fits in with what they are already doing. Are there any other comments?

C. Garcia: I know my question might sound stupid for some of you but for me, I don’t know what SPS means.

President Willis: SPS is the Supportive Professional Staff.

C. Garcia: Okay, thank you.

President Willis: Okay, anything else?

J. Polvsen: I’m the Supportive Professional Staff Council President and I would just like to add that this issue a significant issue for members of the SPS and I’d just like to add that our own Council has a Workplace Issues Committee. It deals with a number of these issues, so I’d like to encourage the faculty that if you need any assistance or help in this matter, we’d be willing to provide you with any additional information and support you may need. I think there’s quite a bit out there and it will be a challenging job this year, so, good luck.

President Willis: Okay, anything else? If not I would entertain a motion to refer this to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

This item will be referred to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

B. Walk-in: Review of Quality Care

President Willis: This came to me as an e-mail. I took off the names of the people involved to protect their privacy. There’s a story up at the top. The main thing is in the last sentence where it suggested that there are difficulties with the quality care system and with the reimbursements through it and that it might be a good idea for some faculty and some staff perhaps from the insurance office to get together and talk to Senator Burzynski who seems to be sympathetic to these difficulties. I would suggest that this item be referred to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee. Does anyone have any questions about it? If not, again I would entertain a motion to refer it.

W. Baker: If this is being referred, could I again reiterate our concerns that dentistry and the lack of sufficient reimbursement again go to that committee, so it’s not in fact forgotten; because it’s not only in this area - I’m sure fellow senators will agree - that there are very, very serious deficiencies.
President Willis: This letter raises specific concerns. I think that the charge to the committee would be to look into the Quality Care plan in general and identify deficiencies and requests that we have; and so, yes, so any request or suggestion that you have would certainly be appropriate.

W. Baker: Especially dentistry.

President Willis: Dentistry, right.

P. Henry: Which committee was this again?

President Willis: Economic Status of the Profession would be the appropriate committee. Are there any other comments or questions?

C. DeMoranville: I could be mistaken about this but I seem to recollect that this health care plan is something that is determined by the union, of which faculty are not members, and that whatever the union approves is what the faculty gets as well. So I think the Economic Status Committee, I know that they have looked into this, maybe peripherally at other times, need to look into it again about how these benefits are negotiated for the faculty.

President Willis: It seems to me there are two issues. There is the issue of which benefits do we have and which ones do we not have; and then there’s the issue of given the benefits that we have, are they, in fact, paying them? Are they covering things that are supposed to be covered? What are they calling reasonable and customary and is it reasonable and customary here really; or are they not paying what they ought to? So there are two separate issues there; both, I think, are worthy of being looked into.

W. Baker: Could this come back up again, say later on in the academic year, because we raise this every year and then somehow we are all in agreement and we don’t get anywhere.

President Willis: I would think the committee would report back and say what it has been able to find out and what it’s been able to do.

W. Baker: Let’s monitor this.

President Willis: I will. Jim is busy taking notes here. Are there any other comments? Oh yes, that’s right. Jim by virtue of his position as Chair of the Economic Status Committee is also on the University Benefits Committee.

W. Baker: I make a motion to refer it to the committee.

President Willis: Okay, it’s been moved and seconded that we refer this issue to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee. All those in favor? Opposed?

It was approved to refer this item to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee.
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any comments or questions from the floor?

J. King: A few years ago for reasons that I don’t understand or remember, the President of the Faculty Senate ceased the practice of filling the Faculty Senate in on matters that were pending with the University Council, issues and problems that would be of concern to the Faculty Senate. I just wonder whether there’s anything coming up this fall that you know about at the University Council that we ought to be attending to?

President Willis: Let me not trust my memory. I happen to have the minutes of the last meeting here with me and so let me see. I can do this a little more formally when I get all of the list of who’s paying attention to what. Things which are being considered by University Council at the moment, well the Resource, Space and Budgets Committee we hear about also here because it’s a joint committee. Let’s see, there are some issues that are going to Rules and Governance but most of them are just cosmetic changes in things in the Committees Book to bring descriptions in line with reality. They are also in the process of considering a mail ballot provision for changes for the bylaws. I believe they’re coming back with a report on that next week. They’re working on the Professional Ethics Statement and they also – there was a question about ethics statements from other segments of the University and President Peters is having the Provost and the Director of Human Resources look into what exists already so whatever they write is consistent with what’s already in the constitution. So there is some action going on there. The “University Council past and future” items, with which you are familiar, which the Steering Committee has discussed, will be referred at the next meeting, so we can look at the functioning of the University Council and how it can be optimized. Right now that’s all that we have pending. One thing that I can do is I can include in the Faculty Senate packets a copy of the agendas from the University Council. They are on the web page also. They’re available for those who have web access and are interested to see them. Any other comments or questions?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

President Willis: Let me call your attention to the information items including the list of alternates which are the result of the election we had at the last meeting. If you have any questions about finding an alternate when you cannot attend a meeting, please contact either me or Donna and we can clarify that. I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

A. Corrected 2001-2002 meeting schedule (Page 33)
B. Alternate Policy List (Page 34)
C. Faculty Senate Membership List (Pages 35-37)
D. University Council Membership List (Pages 38-39)
E. UCPC Membership List (Page 40)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.