
T. Smith attended for R. Butler.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Fox, Frank-Stromborg, Ghrayeb, Kahn, Kamens, Kolb, Mehrer, Miller, Mohabbat, Munk, Musial, Orem, Rusin, S. Song, X. Song, Wade,

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: The first item of business is the adoption of the agenda. I have two changes to make to the agenda, both of them to Item X, which is New Business. The first is the items that you see under New Business, A and B, which come from Ivan Legg. He will be coming in 10 or 15 minutes, and I would like to address those items when he arrives rather than at the end. So that’s one change I would like to make. The other one is that I would like to add item C under New Business concerning the Faculty Personnel Advisor and whether Malcolm can continue to serve in the spring when he becomes Associate Dean of the Law School. So, we’ll add that under New Business, Item C.

It’s been moved that we adopt the Agenda as amended. Is there a second? All those in favor? Opposed? Okay.

The Agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 24, 2002 FS MEETING
(Pages 3-5)

President Willis: Our next item is approval of the minutes. Now those of you who have been here before may notice a change in the minutes, which I am planning on addressing in the
President’s Announcements section. Do you want me to talk about them now before we approve them? Perhaps that would be appropriate. Then I’ll come back to it. In any case, for reasons having to do primarily with money we’re having to cut back on several things. You may have noticed that we downsized our cookies and I also am downsizing the minutes. Here’s what I plan to do - although it didn’t happen this time just because this week has been so unbelievably crazy - but, in the future, what I plan to do is we will still make the transcript of the minutes so it will still exist. We will put it up on the web, which Donna actually did do yesterday, I just never had time to e-mail you all and let you know that it was there. I will write a set of minutes from the transcript. I will send that out to everybody via e-mail unless you don’t have e-mail and I have looked at the lists that I have and - I’m doing the same thing with the Council by the way - and it looks to me like between the Council and the Senate there are exactly three people who do not have e-mail. So for those three people I will send you things through the campus mail. For everyone else, I will e-mail you the minutes and the links where you can find the transcript, and if you have any changes you would like made to the minutes, you can let me know. Then at the meeting we will approve the minutes and you will have had a chance to look at the transcript. So the transcript will be available, you can print it out and look at it if you want to. The only difference is we will not be printing them out and handing them to everybody because we are trying to save money on paper.

H. Rubin: Technically, we will have to approve online minutes.

President Willis: No, I will still distribute the minutes as you see in the package here. These are minutes so we’re making a distinction between minutes and transcripts. In a sense, you can’t really approve the transcripts anyway. The transcript is just a copy of what was said, I mean, what’s to approve? But I will write actual minutes and then we will approve the actual minutes.

B. Tolhurst: So that the minutes ---

President Willis: Could you get a mike please? By the way, I do want to make two procedural points before we start. One is that in order to make a transcript, which we will still do, we have to have everything on tape, because otherwise how are we going to do that? So please make sure that you have a mike before you start to say anything. The other thing is that the way we know who is speaking, we do not do voice recognition on the tapes, what happens is that Donna looks to see who is talking and then she writes down who is talking and the first couple of words of what they say so that whoever transcribes the tapes can match that up with what’s on the tape and then we can figure out who says what. However, Donna does not know everybody so if you would please say your name before you start to speak into the microphone then that will optimize our transcript. Bill?

B. Tolhurst: Got it. This is Bill Tolhurst from Philosophy. I take it then that the minutes, not the transcript, will constitute the official record of what we have done in any given meeting so if it ain’t in the minutes, it didn’t happen. That means that there should be opportunities for folks to request the things that are on the transcript and not in the minutes go on the minutes, so that it is important that the transcript be available and that people have suitable opportunities to inspect it and – maybe I’m repeating things you’ve already said.
President Willis: Yes, and I apologize for – that did not happen for this meeting and I apologize for that. It just all happened a little bit too fast and this week has been a little bit too hectic but it will happen next time and that is my intention in general. Yes? Are there other comments or questions about the minutes? Yes?

D. Wagner: David Wagner, History. What if someone wanted to add something to these minutes after getting around to reading the transcript? Shouldn’t we be able to include that in our approval?

President Willis: Sure, absolutely. That’s the process of approving the minutes when we do that.

D. Wagner: When we approve these minutes, can they be supplemented by someone who wants to go back to the transcript?

President Willis: I don’t see why not; Ferald can address that. I assume if you bring it up to the group and say I’d like to make an amendment to the approved minutes of whatever, I don’t see why not.

F. Bryan: Well, they do that in Congress all the time.

President Willis: Yes, that’s certainly not a problem and we will keep the transcripts available on the web for a reference for exactly that purpose so they will be available at least throughout the year. I’m not promising we’re going to keep them indefinitely but they’ll be kept through that academic year in any case.

F. Bryan: Let me give everyone an overview on this because I didn’t mean to make a flippant reference to what Congress does. Robert’s Rules says that we only really need to keep in the minutes a record of what was done at a meeting rather than what was said, so we have long done more than what Robert’s requires. We have used more of a deliberative model, that is more like a Congressional record or the record of the deliberations in Parliament, as our historical record. What I think Sue’s stressing is that that historical record of what was said will continue. That will not diminish except that in order to save paper and still meet the parliamentary requirements of minutes, we’ll keep a record of what was done. If, as was suggested here, there’s some concern that it wasn’t taken down properly or needs to be amended, that certainly that is done all the time in official records; making a motion at this point in the minutes approval is how you would handle that.

President Willis: Okay, Pat?

P. Henry: Patricia Henry from Languages. Just out of curiosity, are the minutes also going to be available on line?

President Willis: Yes.

P. Henry: Okay.
President Willis: Yes.

P. Smith: Do the minutes not have a record of attendance? Pam Smith, Accountancy.

President Willis: Yes, they should.

P. Smith: We don’t have the list of who was in attendance on this ---

President Willis: Yes, you’re right you should and that should be on there. You’re right. I’m kind of making this up as I go along, so I will add that. We have that so we can just paste it in before we put it online. Okay, is there any other discussion of the minutes? Herb?

H. Rubin: I would suggest that under the new procedures we’re going to have to receive a report with some summary of the content because to me one of the crucial things that I really think needs to be up front is when promises are made. Moody made some, Jim Norris did, La Tourette did and Peters has which have action implications though it’s nothing we’ve acted on and I don’t want those to get lost so every time a report is given with something like that, I’m going to move to receive as a report that President Peters has said he’s promised us all a big raise or whatever he says.

President Willis: Yes, I think that’s fine. Again, let me emphasize that the transcripts are not going away. The only difference is that we are not distributing copies of them to everybody and that I’m making the actual minutes so those are the two differences. You get minutes besides the transcripts and the transcript you have to go get yourself. I’m not handing them out. All right, do I have a motion to approve these minutes? I know you have not seen the transcript so if after you do see the transcript, you would like to make changes to the minutes we can always do that but I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes at this time with that understanding. Is there a second? Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor? Opposed? Okay. Next time I will get everything on the web and I will send you all an e-mail in a timely fashion; once again, my apologies for not having that done for this particular meeting.

The minutes were approved.

President Willis: All right, I see that Ivan is here so I would suggest that we now go to Item X, A and B which you will find on page 25 and 26.

X. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: These two items both come from Ivan and perhaps we should take them in the reverse order since I think the one on page 26 will probably have less discussion than the one on page 25. On page 26 is a proposed composition for a search committee for the vice provost. This is Bob Wheeler’s position. He will finally be retiring at the end of this year. We’ve extended his term two or three times now as interim, so this is a search committee for that position. This body approves the composition of that committee which is suggested by Ivan and that’s the procedure that we have. So that’s what that item is. The other item is more in the sense of an information item from Ivan where he would like to consider changing the title of that position. Rather than Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School to Vice
President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. I would suggest that we look at the – the search committee is not for that position. I’m sorry, I mis-spoke. The search committee is not for that position. The search committee is for Bob Wheeler’s position. The name change is for Jerry Zar’s position which you may or may not have heard has not been filled and is now being occupied in a temporary way by Dan Griffiths for a year. So I would suggest that we first take up the Proposed Composition for the Search Committee for the Provost, Bob Wheeler’s position, and then we look at the title change for the Research and Graduate School position. Ivan do you want to say anything before we act? Come to a mike first, okay?

B. Approval of composition of search committee for Vice Provost. (Page 26)

I. Legg: As far as setting up the search committee, I pretty well stuck to the bylaws. As you know, when you set up search committees and read through the bylaws, there’s a little ambiguity but basically it’s pretty close to what’s recommended when you follow all the language and the referrals to other ways of doing searches.

President Willis: So looking just at the composition of the search committee, could I have a motion to approve this proposed composition? Okay, there’s a motion. Do I hear a second? Is there any discussion? Yes, David.

D. Wagner: Yes, I guess, David Wagner, I guess I’d like to hear from the President of the SA if he’s here. It seems to me that students are substantially under-represented. That maybe it’s in the bylaws but I’m not sure that that makes it correct. Is ---

President Willis: He’s not here at the moment.

D. Wagner: I don’t want to speak for students but I still – it seems to me that students are under-represented, especially for this position which substantially concerns undergraduate education— I always thought that was his most important job.

President Willis: Ivan?

I. Legg: I would have absolutely no disagreement with you whatsoever. I would have no problem with two. Sometimes the students don’t come anyway and having two would guarantee at least one student being there.

President Willis: So do you want to make that change in the composition then? Okay?

I. Legg: That was only one of your Senate members speaking but I would presume there would be support for that.

President Willis: Well, we could have that as a friendly amendment.

F. Bryan: Do the maker and seconder agree?

President Willis: Do the maker and seconder agree to that as a friendly amendment? Yes, okay? All right, any other discussion? So now we’ve gone to two student members instead of
one. This position by the way, is concerned primarily as David said, with the Undergraduate College. Yes, Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** I’m new to this body but I have on occasion had to consult the bylaws as a department chair. Now I take it the bylaws are just suggestions in this regard, that we don’t have to comply with them. I think I’m in agreement with what’s been said. It’s more of a procedural question and I take it that as long as we agree, this is okay then. Okay?

**President Willis:** Yes. I believe the bylaws say that when there is to be a search for a position such as this, there is a general composition in the bylaws which says things like it should adequately represent various constituencies then it says that the detailed list like this one should be made by the provost who then brings it and gets the advice and consent of the Senate. All right, any other discussion? Okay, if not, all those in favor of this search committee composition say aye. Opposed. Okay. We like your committee.

The search committee was approved with changes.

**President Willis:** Now about this name change, why don’t you speak to that and explain what the issue is here.

**Legg:** Within the last four or five or six months as we were bringing our search for the – in the first round – to a close, John Peters recommended that I consider the possibility if we did not succeed in this round, of looking at the possibility of changing the title to Vice President of Research. Other universities have gone back to that title. Most recently I saw that happen down at Southern Illinois. They changed back to – down there, of course, they use a chancellor term instead of a president term. Indiana did it recently in all their schools. The research area has become more complex, has become more demanding in terms of the understanding of what goes on in the general playing field as well as in places like Washington, D.C., Fermi Labs where we have connections and other laboratories of that kind. It’s probably not so much a change in the duties, as a recognition of the duties that have evolved over the last 10 or 15 years into a major demand for what we expect a person in that position to do.

We in turn have made, as I outlined in the first paragraph, considerable progress in our overall mission as a university in terms of the types of recognition that we have had from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which underlies, as many of you know, the strong relationship that exists between the scholarship of our faculty and their teaching mission. We are now also a member of the University Research Association which comes to only a few schools, fewer than 100 universities in the United States belong to that. Partly because of this, we’ve become a member of NASULGC, the National Association of State University and Land Grant Colleges, which in essence comprises all the major universities which have a strong research component.

The bottom line is that we will not change the responsibilities of that person except for recognizing the complexity and growth of the responsibilities. That person will still report to the
Executive Vice President and Provost of the University but, importantly, will also have a membership on the Cabinet. Although it’s not stated explicitly here, it is clear that by having this person on the Cabinet, we will have one additional person with an academic background representing us on the Cabinet and I think that’s an important by-product of this particular position. Finally, I would like to close my opening remarks by simply saying that I’m still visiting this issue. I could stay with this structure the way it is. I’m feeling the community out. So far where I have presented the idea, I’ve had surprisingly strong support for it and I really was not that enthusiastic about it until I started throwing it out and discussing it in various groups, including the present search committee which is faculty and it probably wouldn’t be here except for the fact that I did get such strong support. So I myself in a way, am looking at it and deciding whether I want to go with it and John has made it very clear to me, John Peters, that it’s my decision ultimately which way we go on it.

President Willis: Okay, Herb?

H. Rubin: I’ve got a quick question and then to add some amusement, probably a little bit of a dissent. The quick question is – I might be experiencing Vanilla Dreams, whatever it was, the Cruise movie – experiences with reliving things but didn’t we engage in some similar name change before I left on sabbatical for some position? I thought it was this position.

I. Legg: We changed the word “associate” to “vice” which was most commonly used in the provost terminology. It was that that we changed. We didn’t change the actual title.

H. Rubin: Okay, just to make sure I’m not ---

I. Legg: You’re absolutely correct. It was Vanilla Skies.

H. Rubin: Vanilla Skies, yes, I’m really feeling that it may be ??? Drive right now. I’m not really sure which one is influencing my thinking more. The second one is, I don’t know if this is just argumentative dissent or not because the arguments being presented of having another academic voice in the Presidential Cabinet, that would be very nice. But there’s another issue that’s going on. I mean, we have, how do I put this, I can’t put it in a non-threatening way. We’ve gone overboard to upgrade the status and visibility of the upper-level administrators in this university. Abstractly, I have no problem with doing so but at the same time there is no parallel process that goes down through the line of command; it doesn’t go through faculty. Every one of us is doing more work. Every one of us has increased responsibilities and every one of us has exactly the same darn title we’ve had in the past and the same salary base we’ve had and so in some sense, I’m basically saying, you know, if the cooperative model that basically says we upgrade the titles and I’m assuming upgrading what it costs to get a position and a person in such a position, while the rest of the university is left behind. It leaves a sour taste in my mind, you know. If we are doing it and saying this is a healthier university and people are getting their due rewards and then the leaders we need to attract national figures this way, I’d be 100% supportive but it’s the dissonance between what’s happening at the higher levels and the rest of us. It bothers me immensely.

I. Legg: Your point is well made and I have thought that myself. It’s like inflation at the administrative level. The trade-off has to be what do we gain for doing it? As you pointed out in
your closing remarks, it will attract probably a more appropriate and more sophisticated person to the role. John and I are pretty committed not to changing the support base in terms of salary. It may have to be slightly adjusted but it’s not going to have a major adjustment. We’ve kept the title Dean of the Graduate School also because we do not want to separate those – I like them together because it underlines the relationship between the research and teaching mission of the university and I think it has to stay that way. But also from a pragmatic point of view we just can’t afford to create another position, period.

President Willis: Yes?

J. Engstrom: I was on the search committee and we had a discussion after Ivan left the room about that. Generally we felt that this would help us attract the kind of person that we want for the position; it might have made a difference in the current search, so I support the change.

President Willis: Okay, are there other comments or discussion? Yes, Herb?

H. Rubin: Does that mean when we reel in a good person who simply will not come at NIU’s salary, you’ll be receptive for requests for help?

I. Legg: Say that again Herb. I missed it.

H. Rubin: We have people passing through our recruitment process all the time who, when then they compare salaries, look the other way. Some people may not be worth any more, but for some of the people we lost, a few thousand here or there could have made a world of difference to them, and would increase the quality of our teaching and research.

I. Legg: There’s a difference between a few thousand and a few ten thousand. I will say that we did have – the committee was a very good committee. Jim Erman ran the committee. We did have two very good candidates. Either one would have worked out but for personal reasons neither came. One of the arguments I had and one of the candidates, at least at the beginning before we made other adjustments, was in the salary issue – beyond a certain number and I think it’s just that you do have to look at the whole base at the university.

President Willis: Yes, Carol?

C. DeMoranville: Carol DeMoranville. This is just a point of clarification. Can you refresh my memory as to what the other vice president positions are?

I. Legg: There’s Eddie Williams’s which is Executive Vice President of Business and Finance, Anne Kaplan’s position which is Vice President for Administration and Mike Malone’s position which is Vice President for Development, I can’t remember the exact title and then there’s my position which is Executive Vice President and Provost.

President Willis: Okay, any other comments or discussion? Did you need any kind of motion Ivan or are you just trying to get a sense of what ---

I. Legg: Well, I would like to get a reading of the faculty because if the faculty don’t support
this, I’m dropping it now, period. If the faculty were supportive and the Senate does represent the faculty, then I believe we would have to – there are two other steps. We would probably have to go to Council on that and then John would have to take it to the Board of Trustees; I was just sitting on the search right now waiting for that change to take place. If you could get a sense of the support that I’d have and even an approval to run it through to the Council then we could take it all the way. On the other hand, if you have a vote that’s not strongly in support of it, I’ll just drop it and we’ll open the search at the vice provost level.

President Willis: Okay, could I have a – oh, yes?

J. Stephen: If we do the change then how many vice provosts will this leave us?

I. Legg: We have right now a Vice Provost which is Wheeler’s position. A Vice Provost for Student Affairs and a Vice Provost, the one we’re discussing now, three.

J. Stephen: My understanding of the term provost is that it refers to academic affairs as opposed to the business side. Is that correct? Or academic situations.

I. Legg: You know, I’ve never really been able to determine where this provost word comes from; the one I get kidded on a lot is that you’re the provost marshal, put everybody in jail – but it has a long tradition. It goes back in the English language, but it is one that is not widely understood still by the public and doesn’t carry quite the impact that as the word president. Now when I was at Memphis I was offered the same title and I said no, I just want to be provost; the way it was defined here it was Executive Vice President/Provost so I could not change that. I must admit that when I use the word provost people look at me and wonder if I’m in charge of food service or something. So provost basically does not have the widespread understanding even within academic circles that the vice president does.

J. Stephen: So we’re looking at the same type of recognition and status as when we upgraded Eddie Williams to an Executive Vice President.

I. Legg: I don’t know the history of that one at all.

J. Stephen: Okay, thank you.

President Willis: Okay, would anyone like to make a motion to endorse or not endorse this change of title?

M. Larsen: I move we endorse the title change.

President Willis: Okay. It’s been moved and seconded that we endorse this change. Is there any further discussion? If not, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? There you go.

The responses were mostly ayes, with a few scattered noes.

I. Legg: Can we bring this to Council meeting then?
President Willis: Sure.

I. Legg: Because it would be nice to have it resolved. We do need to fill the position one way or another.

President Willis: Yes and we can discuss it there as well.

I. Legg: Is that all that you need me for?

President Willis: I believe it is, yes.

I. Legg: Okay, well thank you very much.

President Willis: Okay, thank you, Ivan. All right, let us get back to Item IV, President’s Announcements.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Jan Rintala will speak about the North Central accreditation process – handout

President Willis: Jan Rintala has been patiently waiting and would like to speak briefly about the North Central Accreditation process, which is involving a number of us this year.

By the way, you have a walk-in handout about this that was at your seat.

J. Rintala: Thank you Sue. I know you have lots of agenda items to take care of so I just will take a few moments with you to share a brief overview of the process we’ll be going through in the North Central Accreditation. I know many of you have been through a North Central Accreditation before but for a few of you who may not have, this is an institution wide accreditation that we go through every ten years. It is not only about the academic units and programs but also support services, campus life, basically if it has to do with NIU, North Central Accreditation takes it into account.

The purposes of the re-accreditation process and the accompanying self-study are really two-fold. Obviously, one of them is to get ourselves re-accredited. The accreditation is very important. It impacts federal funding opportunities. It impacts certainly whether our students can on to graduate programs and a number of other kinds of factors that being an accredited institution is key. I think ultimately the more important purpose of this is to undergo a self-study that can provide some guidelines for long-range planning.

With that in mind, we are organizing our report and our sub-committees by what we’re referring to as “functional units”; you can see those on the bottom of the sheet as you see the titles of the steering committees. These will be the titles and the organization of the chapters in the report. The report itself contains two major components. One is a set of general institution requirements which are fairly objective things: do you have a mission statement, are you authorized to grant the degrees that you’re granting, do your faculty degrees come from accredited institutions, etc. The other sections are five very general criteria with an awful lot of types of questions and
information that will support those five general criteria. This is what the main body of the reports and the chapters will deal with.

The committees and the resource persons have been identified. Again, down here you can see the members of the steering committee. Many of you in this room have already accepted the invitation to be members of the sub-committees or serve as resource persons and I thank you for that involvement. The back side of this paper shows a very brief overview of what our schedule will be. This fall the sub-committees are gathering information and preparing initial drafts of their reports. During the spring, these drafts will be circulated through a wide variety of constituencies across campus. They will be made available to the campus at large. Certain chapters will be specifically funneled to appropriate committees. For example, the graduate and professional programs, I’m sure, will go to Graduate Council. Things from the undergraduate program will go to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council, undergraduate curriculum committees and those things so you can expect those drafts of reports to go out throughout the campus community. The opportunity then will be there for members of the university community, and I hope many of you will participate in this, to review it and provide feedback to the sub-committee chairs telling us whether we’ve managed to miss addressing something as we’ve done our evaluation. Did we hit or miss the mark? Then these sub-committee chairs will have the opportunity to revise the drafts of their reports prior to next summer when I will be working on the final report.

Next fall the final report will be reviewed by the steering committee and then we will prepare for the site visit, which will take place in February of 2004. During the visit there will be a team of consultant evaluators, probably in the vicinity of a dozen of them, but it could be plus or minus a few people who will be coming on to campus, first to evaluate whether we warrant re-accreditation, but secondly they also put on their consultant cap and based on what they see both through the report as well as during their visit, provide some recommendations for us about some plans or thoughts we might want to undertake in the future. It closes that loop of both accreditation evaluation as well as long-term planning.

That’s the overview I wish to give. I will entertain any questions if anybody has any.

President Willis: Are there any questions for Jan? Yes, Carol?

C. Minor: How often does the review happen?

J. Rintala: Every ten years, although there is a new move that the North Central is going to called quality improvement plan – there’s an a in front of it but I can’t remember what that stands for. That, I believe, will be considered as a new way of doing it, and rather than a ten year cycle of accreditation it’s a matter of identifying some things that as an institution you know you want to work on and then developing a plan that will seek to work on those things, and then identify something else a few years later. I don’t know whether the institution is going to make the commitment to make that switch and so it’s possible that this could be the last of our ten-year re-accreditation things. We might look at another way of quality improvement within the institution.

President Willis: Yes, David?
D. Wagner: David Wagner. How is the steering committee appointed or established?

J. Rintala: The deans, the Senior Cabinet and others were asked for some input, for people they would recommend to chair the committees. After I had been identified, I took a look at people who had been actively involved in various things on campus. We also were very cognizant of wanting to make sure we had representation from all of the colleges on the steering committee as well as taking into account the concerns about diversity which our constitution and bylaws mandates that we have on our committee so, based upon that, those were the ways that the steering committee members were selected.

D. Wagner: Did faculty have any input? From what you just said, it didn’t sound like it.

J. Rintala: Well, from the standpoint as a faculty member myself, I had some input into that but in terms of going to the entire faculty, no. Some of the deans, however, did ask for faculty input and I’m not sure how all the deans handled it within their own colleges.

President Willis: Any other questions for Jan?

J. Rintala: Okay, thank you Sue.

President Willis: Oh, was there another question?

C. Garcia: How did we do in the last report that we have; the last accreditation review, how did Northern do and was there anything that we were supposed to be doing?

J. Rintala: We were re-accredited and we were re-accredited for the full ten years. There is a report, an evaluation report, that they have submitted that they did ten years ago. One of the things that I will be doing this fall is looking at that report a little bit more carefully and assessing and making some comments about how we addressed or did not address some of the suggestions that they had. It has not jumped to my priority list in terms of what I have looked at at this point. In scanning it, there were some suggestions and I believe some of them have been incorporated.

President Willis: Okay, anything else for Jan? All right. Let’s see the rest of the President’s Announcements.

B. Budget, refreshments, and minutes

President Willis: I already explained that we have downsized our cookies and our minutes due to budget constraints. If anybody has any questions about that I can talk about it in more detail but I don’t how interesting that really is.

C. Update on workplace issues

President Willis: I put on here an update on workplace issues. This is an item that came up last year. It originated with the previous Faculty Personnel Advisor’s report identifying some
concerns about workplace issues across employment categories, most heavily affecting SPS and Operating Staff because they do not have the protection of tenure and therefore are more vulnerable to awkward situations. In any case, I was asked to look into what was going on and I have been doing that. I am still doing that. I have talked to a number of people, both people who are upset about things that have gone on in their workplaces and people who have dealt with people who are upset about things that are going on in their workplaces and I am still working on seeing if I can come up with some specific recommendations. I’m still open to input if there are more people around who have issues which they would like me to incorporate and to also look at as part of this. This is still an active thing that I am doing so if there are other things that I should be aware of, please let me know. This is not something that is going to happen quickly. It’s a very large and complex issue and I am trying to deal with it delicately. My goal in all of this is to come out with something that is working better and not to just antagonize everybody; that’s were the delicateness comes in. This is still an active thing that I am doing and so if there are things that people would like me to look at or if you know of people that you think would like to talk to me, I am looking at general trends and not necessarily at specific cases and so if I actually make some kind of report it will not have specific cases in it so people can be assured of confidentiality of their particular situations. It’s still underway and there are things going on that I think need to be fixed and I’m trying to bring that to the attention of the appropriate people. Yes?

L. Kamenitsa: I’m not really sure about what we’re talking about. You’re being so delicate that I don’t know what workplace issues are.

President Willis: Okay, what are the workplace issues? There were concerns in general that there were some situations where people were being treated inappropriately perhaps – there are things that are clearly illegal, like sexual harassment and that sort-of thing – that we have ways to deal with. This is more the kind of thing where people are rude or they’re threatening or something like you but you can’t tie it to a specific thing which the law says, you can’t discriminate against this person because of whatever, so it’s not one of the whatevers. It’s creating what we call “a hostile work environment” in other ways and so people are human, okay, we’ve got thousands of people on this campus and, you know, every once in a while people are going to get upset at each other and act inappropriately, so, the goal is not to stop that from happening. The point is, when it happens how do you deal with it and if there is a pattern of this kind of thing happening over and over and over again, are you dealing with it in an appropriate manner and that’s the kind of thing that I’m looking into.

M. Cordes: Mark Cordes from the Law School. Just to clarify that last point. I think that perhaps the greater concern from Rights and Responsibilities wasn’t just the fact that some of these things were taking place, which to a certain extent are almost inevitable when you have as many people as we do, I think the bigger concern was how the university administration was handling some of these issues and I think not really dealing with them head-on, especially – and I don’t know if these actually took place or not – but the allegations would suggest that there were certain hot spots on campus where there were a number of continuous problems and the university really never dealt with it so I think that’s the real major concern that came out last year.
President Willis: Right and there were concerns of retaliation that when people would bring complaints that they would wind up worse off then when they started and that kind of thing. Because a lot of this does involve the response of the university as an institution, that’s were a lot of the delicacy comes in. This is where I’m trying to tread carefully because what I’m trying to do is get a more positive response, so you can imagine. Yes, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: Well, I’m new to the Faculty Senate but I was on the University Council last spring, ex-officio, and is this connected then to the move to possibly have the Faculty Personnel Advisor serve the needs of Supportive Professional Staff, is that connected to this at all?

President Willis: The Faculty Personnel Advisor does serve the needs of Supportive Professional Staff. That’s clear.

B. Tolhurst: The issues surrounding the Faculty Personnel Advisor aren’t connected to the things you’re talking about then?

President Willis: These things had their origin in concerns which were raised by the Faculty Personnel Advisor, but the whole thing has become broader than that so it’s not – that’s kind of a historical reference but that’s not the core of it. I’ve talked not just to SPS and to faculty but I’ve also talked to Operating Staff because the whole issue is how are we, as a university, how do we treat each other and how do we deal with each other? There are problems that don’t fall into the categories of employment and so my intention is to look at the whole picture. Yes, Bev?

B. Espe: Bev Espe from SPS Council. I’m wondering Sue, last year coming out of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities the recommendation was to have an ad hoc committee perhaps look at these issues. Is that a direction you’re still leaning towards as an outcome of your investigation?

President Willis: That recommendation was made by the Faculty Senate to the University Council. The University Council decided to refer to the Steering Committee and the Steering Committee essentially referred it to me, so my sense is, at the moment, because of the sensitivity of some things that it’s – right now I’m a little more comfortable just doing it, making inquiries myself and then if it looks like it would be useful to have a committee, then I would come back and do that or if it looks like I can just meet privately with people and threaten to do whatever, or be nice to them and say, why aren’t you being nice to these other people or whatever. I will do what it seems is most effective and if that involves a committee then it involves a committee and if not, then it doesn’t. Yes, Herb?

H. Rubin: Does this link at all, I assume, to the floating around report on the revision of grievance procedures?

President Willis: Again, peripherally. That committee which has been rewriting the grievance procedures was constituted before all of this happened but clearly it’s relevant. One of the problems has been with the grievance procedures and are the grievance procedures that we have, do they serve us well, do they need to be rewritten, are we following the ones we have and all that kind of thing. Yes? Could you say your name?
C. Garcia: Yes, I was going to. Sorry I didn’t say it before. Clersida Garcia from the Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education. Do we have for these workplace issues, is that a committee or – because you talk about you, like people go to you to talk to – and are there any actions planned to be taken – is there any program? What’s – I was on sabbatical so I don’t know if there is anything done from the time – from the last time I heard this conversation but I kind of feel like things are going to you and then what happens?

President Willis: Okay, well the intention is not that if somebody has problems in the workplace that they should come to me. There are places for people to go, okay? There are grievance procedures and there are – that’s not the intention here. The concerns were that when these things happened, that grievances and workplace difficulties were not being dealt with appropriately so what I’m doing is taking a more global look and saying do we have – not in all the particular incidences that are going on because, of course, there are – but do we have some kind of global problem that really needs – if there are global problems which it looks like perhaps there – it’s like anything else. It looks like the truth is kind of somewhere in between, I mean, everything is not perfect. Neither is everything horrendously wretched. There are places where there are problems that need to be dealt with better than they’re being dealt with and I’m working on that. For people to come to me – if they think there are pieces of this picture that I may not have so that I can better understand what the full picture is. Not that I’m necessarily intervening in any particular situation and helping anybody, that’s not my thing. I’m just trying to get a general picture of what is going on. What as an institution should we be doing that we’re not doing or could we be doing better that we’re doing worse at the moment. Does that clarify anything?

C. Garcia: Then what happens after that?

President Willis: My intention is to come back with a plan of action. To say okay, I’ve identified these particular problems and, again, because these are all personnel issues and there’s a lot of confidentiality involved, I may not be able to be very specific in order to respect everybody’s rights and confidence in these things; I may have to be more general than people might like but my intention is to come back and say here’s what I found and describe as fully as I feel appropriate and warranted and then here’s what I think ought to happen and then I might ask a committee to make some kind of recommendation or for the group to make a motion that I could take to somebody in administration or something like that but I’m not really quite to that point yet. Yes, Bill? This is a big can of worms by the way.

B. Tolhurst: Yes, I’m trying to understand it. I gather then that it’s not our perception that we need to be the solvers of the problems that the folks in the workplace have. We’re just faculty members. What we need to do is to get our take on what’s going on and the ultimate solvers of the problem have to be some folks in administration who need to do their jobs differently, presumably better in this respect and so what we need to do is not address the problems directly but to try and find a way that the institution, through the administration can address these problems. Is that what we’re talking about? So that’s why people shouldn’t go to you with all their problems to get them solved, although they should go to you and give you the information you need to help us to make recommendation to the administration.

President Willis: Right.
B. Tolhurst: Got it.

President Willis: That makes about as much sense as anything. Okay. This is in the sense of a progress report from me to you. I don’t necessarily need any of you to do anything at this point but people have said well look, you know, we discussed all this last year in the Senate, made these recommendations to the Council and what is going on so I’m coming back here and telling you what is going on which is I’m nosing around to – I’ve not forgotten about it. That’s essentially the bottom line. Okay? I’m working on it. Any other questions about that? All right, I have one other – no, two other things.

One is, you will see under the Consent Agenda, that there are some questions that have come up about the Institutional Review Board. By the way, these are questions – these are things which are problems not only here but at many places around the country. Discussions have been going on on Tompaine, as many of you may know, and so I was sensitized to these things. As a physicist I don’t necessarily deal with them myself, but now I know more about it than I did. So I was sitting around in Borders one day drinking coffee and reading the magazines, and came across this one, which is the Skeptical Inquirer, which has actually a very interesting article. Herb has read it and can substantiate this, about difficulties that people at a couple of other institutions had with their Institutional Review Boards which sounds worse than anything we’ve seen here. In any case, this is not exclusively an NIU problem. We are dealing with the NIU ramifications of it but this is not something that’s created by a couple of people here who don’t really understand how they’re supposed to be. This is a real problem which is manifesting itself here as well as at a bunch of other places. Okay, anyway, there is a conference about – a national conference – about IRB issues in San Diego in November. We have funding from the Graduate School and the Provost’s office to send three people to this conference to learn more about these issues and so I’ve talked to Dan Griffiths about this. He’s the one that’s been suggesting to me that some of us ought to go. I would like to go so that I know what’s going on with these things. I would suggest – well, I’m going to bend some arms and see who’s available to go. We will be referring these things to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee here in the Senate and also to the Academic Policy Committee in the Council and so an obvious choice of other people would be the chairs of those two committees. I haven’t talked to them to find out if they were available. This is in the middle of November, I think it’s the 18th and 19th, that weekend. Mark is back there looking like “oh, no”.

M. Cordes: Sounds pretty good but I’ll get back to you.

President Willis: Right but in any case, I wanted to let you know that this is around and I will go and as I said, my first choices would be the chairs of those two committees to whom I expect this to be referred but I would also take other suggestions and volunteers of people who are interested. Yes, Herb? You’re on my list too by the way.

H. Rubin: It’s one of these things because I have attended meetings and often times they end up as being cheerleaders from the bureaucrats who enforce these provisions to reinforce what they’re doing rather than discussions of the problems so we have to be aware of it.
President Willis: Yes, and I would not be surprised if there was a fair amount of cheerleading. It will be interesting for me to see that. In any case, all right, so I will be contacting those two chairs and also, as I say, if they can’t go another suggestion would be Senate members who have dealt with IRB issues, you know who you are and I have a list, so I will be contacting people who is interested in going and three of us will go. All right, are there any questions about that? All right.

The last thing that I want to say and then I really will move to the rest of the agenda is that – this is in response to another request which was made by the Senate last year which that there was a request to be kept up on what is going on in the University Council because although all the Faculty/University Council members are on the Senate, Senate members are not on the Council and so they wanted to know what’s happening. Actually, this time it’s pretty easy because at the first Council meeting not very much happens at all except that we approve the – it’s very much like what you see here. We approve committees and review the same issues that are on our Consent Agenda are on their Consent Agenda and we have committee reports and what have you. The only extra thing in there has to do with the Committees Book which is something that the Council concerns itself with and the Senate does not. There’s a relatively minor change to the Committees Book but I also intend to propose a motion in the Council to have the on-line version of the Committees Book be the official version rather than the paper version. So we would continue to produce the paper version but it would be essentially a convenience for people to have something to hold in their hands; the on-line version would be the official one so I intend to make that motion at the Council.

I think other than that – oh, at the last meeting of the Council in May there were some issues that were voted on. There were a lot of things that were voted on by the Senate having to do with the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s Office some of which came up at the last Council meeting. Let’s see, and some other items as well. Let me see here. There was an item to reform the Honors Committee with fewer student representatives. That failed. There was an item to move the start dates so that everybody’s term starts on the first of July instead of – I start on the first of July and you all start on the 16th of August - that passed so you’ve all been Faculty Senate members since the first of July whether you knew that or not. There’s a thing regarding an alternate for the Executive Secretary which also passed so if I am indisposed at some point then we have a line of succession. The Vice President of the Senate and the Secretary of the Senate, who we will be electing shortly, will take over in that order and run meetings if I’m unable to. That also passed. Let’s see, there was an amendment talking about the storage of the Faculty Personnel Advisor files which passed and gave the Faculty Personnel Advisor some direction on what to do with the files. There was an amendment saying that the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s annual report should go to the Faculty Senate and to the University Council that passed. Everything else either failed or was tabled. The amendment that the Personnel Advisor be an advocate failed. [Actually, it was never brought up; what failed was the addition of the word “may” before the list of the FPA’s duties]. There is an amendment about whether the Personnel Advisor can be precluded from attending meetings. That was tabled. There was an amendment extending the Personnel Advisor’s appointment to twelve months, which was also tabled. There were a number of other changes which at that point too many people had left so none of the other ones were brought forward so they are still pending. So that’s – Donna is laughing over here. So in any case, that’s what happened at the last Council meeting. By the way, I’ll be doing the same thing with the minutes and transcripts of the Council that we’ll be doing with the Senate so those will be
available on the web also if you want to read them for yourself. They are either there now or they should be there shortly. All right, any questions about any of that? Yes, Carole?

**C. Minor:** That was my first University Council meeting that I visited since I was elected in the spring and I’m wondering if there is a – if anybody has ever thought of putting it on the NIU television channel that people could market. Everything gets tape-recorded and verbatim minutes are written but it might be interesting for people to have access to that. That’s something that just popped into my head that perhaps I shouldn’t have said but I have.

**President Willis:** We keep the audiotapes I think for a year. I suppose if people wanted to come listen to them they could do that or I suppose – are you talking about having somebody come in and videotape?

**C. Minor:** No, have that on live like ---

**President Willis:** Oh, you mean like streaming audio?

**C. Minor:** C-Span, yes. On the website.

**President Willis:** We’ll take that under advisement. I’ve no idea what that would involve, well, I do have an idea but we’ll see. Yes, David?

**D. Wagner:** As I recall from last year what we asked for was not on a report on the University Council meeting but that within the agenda, the status of any initiatives sent by the Senate to the University Council be included. They weren’t in this and I don’t know ---

**President Willis:** Yes, I forgot but I will in the future.

**D. Wagner:** Okay.

**President Willis:** I mean I remembered yesterday but I’m still getting my act together for the fall. Yes, I will do that. Let me move on then to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Annual items for FS consideration.

1. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

**President Willis:** The first item is the Selection of Vice President and Secretary. I have been around twisting arms and have gotten Jim Lockard to agree to serve as Vice President and Carol DeMoranville to agree to serve as Secretary so I would entertain a motion to nominate them. Herb? Second? Do I hear a move that nominations be closed? Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? You’re not allowed to vote against yourself, by the way. All right. Thank you Jim and Carol and hopefully, you won’t have much to do.

V.P. and Secretary were elected.

President Willis: The next item is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. We have people on three-year, overlapping terms. Dolly Jones finished up her three-year term and Bill Tolhurst has agreed to serve for the next three years. In addition, Dan Griffiths was elected to a three-year term a year ago but he is now acting Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost for Research and, therefore, cannot continue. Paul Loubere has agreed to finish out his term. I would entertain a motion to approve those two appointments. Second? Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The appointments were approved.

3. Elect Joan Quinn to the Holmes Student Center Board

President Willis: The Holmes Student Center Board is a committee which is actually not in the Committees Book but we’re supposed to elect somebody to it anyway. Joan Quinn who is, she is in FCNS, in any case, the kind of things she does involve what the Holmes Student Center is all about and she’s been on that Board for quite a while and is interested in continuing and so I would entertain a motion that she be appointed to that Board. Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The appointment was approved.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: We now come to the Consent Agenda and indulge me for a moment especially for those of you who are new while I explain the Consent Agenda a little bit, just what it is. What we do with the Consent Agenda, this contains items which are generally non-controversial and on which we do not expect any discussion. Usually, and there’s one exception on here but generally what I put on here are items which are being referred to a committee for study and then we expect that committee will come back with some kind of recommendation. There would be supporting material in there explaining what those particular items are but when we vote on this, we’re not voting on those issues. We’re just voting to refer them to a committee to look at them so that’s why we expect it to be not particularly controversial. Now, this time because it’s the first meeting, we also have the composition of the committees and committee chairs which, by the way, I would like to extend an enormous thank you to everyone who has agreed to serve as a committee chair because I appreciate very much the efforts that everybody puts into that. There again, we don’t expect a lot of discussion about that and so it goes on the Consent Agenda. The procedure is that we vote to approve the Consent Agenda as a whole. If someone wants to discuss a particular item which is on the Consent Agenda, you can move to have it moved off the Consent Agenda then we can discuss it and we can either pass it separately or put it back on the Consent Agenda, but if you want to discuss one of those items, we have to move it off the Consent Agenda first. Am I right? Okay. So in any case, that being said, do I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Second? All those in favor? Opposed?
A. **Approval** of Faculty Senate committee chairs of spokesperson and FS committee composition 2002-2003 (Page 7)

B. **Insurance issues**: Cigna reimbursements; access to medical and dependent savings accounts – refer to Economic Status of the Profession Committee (Page 8)

C. **IRB issues** – refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee (Page 9)

The Consent Agenda was approved.

**VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**President Willis**: Let us move to the reports from the Advisory Committees.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – [report](Pages 10-12)

**President Willis**: The first one is the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Pat Henry has a report in your packet and there’s also if you go back to the thing that was a walk-in from Jan, the second page of that actually had nothing to do with accreditation. That was another walk-in from Pat. So, Pat?

**P. Henry**: Thank you. Yes, this is actually a report on two meetings that were held last spring and summer. First, I’d actually like to say a few words about just what the – well, actually the Faculty Advisory Council now. We changed the name of the committee last year. I’m not sure exactly what that means. It consists of representatives from public universities, private universities including independent not-for-profit and independent for-profit institutions and community colleges and we are supposed to serve as a liaison between the IBHE and you guys, the faculty. We meet once a month and basically move around from places within the state. Next month, I should point out, the IBHE is meeting – the FAC is meeting together with the IBHE and that’s going to be at Kishwaukee College on the first of October. So that will be the one meeting during the year that the FAC meets together with the IBHE. The rest of the year we meet separately. The Chair of the FAC, who is Kim Anderson from the University of Illinois, Champaign/Urbana attends the IBHE meetings and reports things back to us. We try to keep abreast of the issues that the IBHE is considering. We try to get our input into it in a timely manner from the perspective of faculty as a whole. Obviously, there are different perspectives between, especially, private and public institutions and universities versus community colleges. One that came up last year that was fairly heated was different points of view about the monetary – MAP, Monetary Award Program grants. The higher tuition in private institutions means that students who were applying for MAP grants there have more demonstrable need, and more money goes as a result to students who are going to privates as opposed to publics; whereas publics, of course, are much more restricted in terms of how much we can raise our tuition since we’re usually under pressure from the legislature to keep tuitions affordable. So this was – the IBHE said it was pretty much committed to the preservation of choice for Illinois students and did not want to address that issue. Another issue that is continuing from last year was the study that the IBHE had done concerning non-tenure track faculty at Illinois public colleges and universities and this was put out by the IBHE. The FAC had some concerns with it. The entire study, by the way, is available on the IBHE website. It’s called “All Faculty Matter”. The recommendations, however, are ones that we basically support and I’ll be pulling that out in my
report but these are sort of the sorts of things that we look for. What I try to do then is come back with information. Usually, there’s an informational part of each meeting where someone from the IBHE comes and tells us the budget horrors and other such things. We try then to get input to the IBHE concerning the priorities that come to us in turn from the various kinds of institutions.

The two meetings that were held – to refer to the report here – on May 31st it was at McHenry College. We had a meeting with Daniel LaVista who’s the new Executive Director of the IBHE who is having a baptism of fire under the circumstances with the budget. He did make several points, however, that I want to make sure people are aware of. This is a transition period. He’s new, there’s going to be new people coming into the legislature in November plus we have a budget crisis which makes for a very fluid situation. He wants to, as much as possible, engage the legislature and individual legislators in a kind of mentoring process to try to keep it clear what higher education is all about and he’s hoping that various members of the legislature and people in universities and other higher education institutions can help him out with this. Some other points of information I’ve listed there. He again, as I mentioned, is very intent on stressing the importance of educating the legislature and the public concerning the need and value for investing state money in higher education. We discussed various other matters of budget. There was an Association of Colleges and University Presidents call which is the Campaign for Advancement of Liberal Learning which, again, is available if you're interested at the website for the Association of Colleges and University Presidents and I will be passing that on to President Peters. The FAC is asking presidents to sign this. It’s primarily a symbolic demonstration of support for liberal education; you can read it at the website. There were other reports concerning strengthening of high school curriculum, privacy for faculty electronic communications, endorsements for best practices of electronically offered degree and certificate programs; those were passed on to the IBHE at the June 4th meeting.

Another item is an effort which I think, so far, is unsuccessful to add a seventh item to the Illinois Commitment. The Illinois Commitment as some of you may know is this list of six things that the IBHE is committed to with regard to higher education. Most of them are quite practical and the desire is to add that higher education has an important role in contributing to the quality of life in the community. The FAC is interested in having that added to that.

The June 21st meeting was held in Chicago at Loyola University at Water Tower Campus. Debra Smitley who is the Director Deputy of Budgets and Administration again gave us continuing grim news about the budget and made several points that it was not going to improve quickly. There continue to be questions from the FAC as to whether Central Management Services is really providing the most cost-effective model for health insurance. She felt that the volatility of the budget situation would make change difficult at this time. She mentioned that the issues for the ’04 budget would include faculty productivity, accountability, accessibility and time to completion of degree. The business part of the meeting in Chicago, the FAC committees – I should point out there are four sub-committees in the FAC. There’s the Budget Committee, the Quality Committee, the Technology Committee and the Personnel Committee. I was on the Personnel Committee but all of the committees address a variety of problems. “The Budget Committee will continue to investigate ways of communicating with the legislature and the public. A recent (2000) dissertation, ‘A Critical Policy Analysis of Access and Opportunity in Higher Education’ by Gayle Saunders of NIU’s College of Education, was recommended as a
useful discussion of how ‘outsiders’ can affect policy.” The Quality Committee again addressed this issue of the seventh item for The Illinois Commitment. The Technology Committee has introduced a website which is still a work in progress. I list the url there. The Personnel Committee introduced a resolution on the IBHE report “Part-Time and Non-Tenure Faculty” and again we note some concerns about the survey itself and that it has tended to gloss over differences between very different kinds of situations with part-time and non-tenure track faculty. In general, we endorsed the recommendations with a couple of additions. I should point out that on page 12 I’ve listed the recommendations from this report. The entire report again is available on the IBHE’s website as is a lot of other stuff but the recommendations are things that eventually will be something we’re asked to respond to. At the bottom of page 12 the last recommendation states that “Illinois public colleges and universities should establish plans that identify short-term and long-term goals, objectives and strategies for developing and making the best use of non-tenure track faculty and that to implement the Board’s policy for non-tenure track faculty, institutions should transmit these plans to the Board by December 31, 2002”. I’m not sure how stringent that deadline is going to be and in exactly what form our response should be but that’s another little piece of information that I think we should be aware of.

Finally, the FAC chair did attend the August 20th meeting of the IBHE and reported that there would be a major study of affordability of higher education over the next 14 months with a strong possibility of legislative action required to implement its recommendations so we’ll be keeping an eye on that. There is going to be a preliminary report on establishing performance indicators to assess progress towards meeting the goals of the Illinois Commitment. The final report will be due for action in December. Another major focus will be a study on faculty diversity resulting in part from the Governor’s Executive Order. So it will include to female faculty and faculty with disabilities. Information will be sought on pools of potential faculty, the hiring process and campus leadership. Again, I’ll try to keep you posted as to any information or action that is coming along on that.

Finally, with regards to the walk-in, this was just a summary of a meeting that was held with the Executive Committee of the FAC and summarized some points that Dan LaVista made about the budget picture and it’s not terribly cheerful as you can see. One point that he does continue to reiterate is the need to educate the legislature and that likely priorities will be budget, affordability, assessment, teacher education, accountability, faculty diversity, and economic development. I think it’s clear that budget problems will continue to be a major point of discussion and that the case needs to be made that public universities are not a for-profit institution; the business model is not going to work for many numbers of things that we do so, that’s my perspective on it but I don’t have much hope that it will necessarily prevail. The other thing is that I really would appreciate feedback from you as to what you would like me to report on on this or what you would like me to carry back to the FAC and you can do this by e-mail or in person, however.

President Willis: Thanks Pat. Any questions? Yes, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: I heard this morning on the radio that Blagojevich wants to cut waste at universities or something. Do we have any organized way of interacting with him on that through this body or some other – do we have any input on that?
P. Henry: I heard that too and I think that what he stated was that this getting again back to the raise in tuition question that he would be very attentive to tuition raises that didn’t involve cuts in administration I think is one thing that he put into it. But yes, that’s exactly an issue that I think should very definitely be looked out.

President Willis: Let me speak to that just briefly. I have an article here from the Daily Herald about that. What he said essentially was that, at least what I heard on the radio, was that he said that he didn’t want to approve tuition increases unless there were cuts in administrative costs. This article has a graph of the Illinois state universities and their administrative costs as a percent of the total budget. NIU is last. We have the lowest administrative costs of anyone in the state so that certainly is a good thing. In any case, it’s a good thing. There’s a – it sort of makes you wonder what’s going on everywhere else, right? Certainly we can address this and there’s a meeting also of the Presidents of the Faculty Senates of these universities which is in a couple of weeks to which I will go and that would be an appropriate topic for us to address as well. Okay, anything else for Pat? Yes?

M. Engel: I’m Mylan Engel, Philosophy Department. I’m also new to this body but looking at these recommendations, the second recommendation on page 12, “Illinois public colleges and universities should monitor hiring and seek to ensure that the balance between tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track is education appropriate.” That’s suitably vague. What exactly is that recommendation?

P. Henry: I think that recommendation is purposely vague because it is meant to apply to a very wide variety of institutions. I think there was no recommendation that came down from the IBHE and this was something that many members of the FAC felt was lacking in terms of coming up with a number of what is an appropriate percentage or proportion and they did not do that. I think we infer from that that each institution has to define its own profile.

M. Engel: Well, is there a great deal of pressure to start replacing tenured people with non-tenured people? I mean, when I look at all of the other recommendations they’re dealing with adequately compensating non-tenured people and giving them appropriate reviews and so on. Almost all dealing with non-tenured faculty so is that what’s going on here, a major push to replace tenured faculty, on the part of the IBHE, to replace tenured faculty with non-tenured faculty?

P. Henry: The IBHE does not acknowledge that. However, that is a concern that the FAC brought repeatedly to the IBHE but it hasn’t taken a stand against it; I guess that would be one thing that you could derive from this report. I think there will be pressure and I think that will come from the legislature. We’re hoping that we will continue to persuade the IBHE to resist that pressure but I think that’s a clear and present danger.

President Willis: Yes, David?

D. Wagner: Yes, I vaguely remember asking this in the spring but this report calls for the establishment of plans – to report to the Board by December 31st of this year and it seems to me we should take, we should establish a board or something. So, is it appropriate to make a motion here?
P. Henry: Is there some committee that this perhaps could be referred to?

D. Wagner: Or sent to committee?

President Willis: That would certainly be appropriate. Let me see, I would guess ---

D. Wagner: Academic Affairs?

President Willis: I would certainly entertain a motion to refer this issue to a particular committee. I’m just looking at what we have. There are a number of committees where I think it might fit in. Rights or Responsibilities or Academic Affairs, for example, I think either one of those might be appropriate.

P. Henry: I would think maybe that, well, Academic Affairs seems ---

President Willis: It was suggested that the Steering Committee could deal with it over the summer but the Steering Committee unfortunately did not do that, so ---

D. Wagner: That’s what I remember you saying.

President Willis: Yes, and the idea of having the Steering Committee doing something over the summer was that the Steering Committee was maybe around during the summer which, of course, they’re not. In any case, that was the motivation behind that. I think at this point it would be appropriate – it would make more sense to refer to a more appropriate committee where this would fall under the mandate of that committee. It may, indeed, be preliminary for us to do something here. It might make more sense for a Council committee to deal with it or we could both deal with it in parallel. I don’t know. There’s not enough time if we want to have something done by December to refer it to a Senate committee and then have the Senate committee refer it to a Council committee, which is the way we typically do these things. Carol, did you ---?

C. DeMoranville: I was just thinking if you’re going to refer it to one of the standing committees I guess my personal preference is that it go to Academic Affairs because I think if the issue is tenured versus non-tenured, just the perception that it’s coming out of Rights and Responsibilities is an indication about – we’re afraid you’re taking something away from us but if it goes through Academic Affairs, it’s more really an issue of what is the role and capabilities of tenured, full-time professors versus non-tenured.

President Willis: To go back to the statement that was brought up before, to ensure that the balance between tenure/tenure track and non-tenure track is educationally appropriate – that should be the tack by which we address that. Do you want to make a motion? Okay.

D. Wagner: I move that it be sent to Academic Affairs to consider this proposed plan.

President Willis: Okay, there’s a motion. Is there a second? Okay, discussion. Yes?
J. Stephen: I don’t think it should be sent to Academic Affairs. This crosses too many boundaries. In particular, input from different colleges and also personnel and also academic issues but I don’t think the main issue is an Academic Affairs issue here. There’s real problems. One of the problems is are they educationally appropriate? I don’t think we can or want to define that from the level of the Academic Affairs Committee because what is educationally appropriate differs from college to college and from departments within the same college. For instance, the number of instructors we have in math would be completely inappropriate for history. I think there are too many issues here just to send – it’s not just an academic affair.

President Willis: Well, I think, I mean, it says here “Illinois public colleges and universities should establish plans that identify short-term and long-term goals, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah”. That’s not the kind of thing that the Senate really does anyway. The Senate is advisory. Now, we may very well want to give advice and it’s not entirely clear to me that the Academic Affairs Committee is an inappropriate committee to give such advice. Herb?

H. Rubin: Again, a Vanilla Sky experience, but I remember very distinctly when we were concerned about the mistreatment of the instructors on this campus. This body or the UC, I forget which it was, passed some motions that had two-sided natures to them. One of them was very strong support that the instructors be fairly compensated but the other was fairly strong statements that the University might become a university dominated by untenured faculty and we should have records of that some place in some of our minutes. I think we’ve already accomplished much of this.

President Willis: Yes, I believe that was done in the Senate a couple of years ago. I can go back and look that up. If the Senate is already on record with its views on this then we can certainly refer to that. All right, we have a motion on the floor to refer this to Academic Affairs. Is there further discussion of that? Yes, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: Do we have any idea of what we want Academic Affairs or any other committee to do with this?

President Willis: Well, I would say that they should at least make some statements about what – we need guidelines for what would be appropriate.

B. Tolhurst: I thought that had to be decided at a college or even departmental level?

President Willis: Well, in terms of numbers yes. But in terms of overall policy, like the statement that Herb was making that the moving towards having fewer tenured faculty and an awful lot of untenured temporary instructors and that kind of thing that – what are the educational ramifications of that will be, I think, something that we need to make a statement on although we already have.

B. Tolhurst: So we should make another statement and say the same thing again?

President Willis: We could do that unless we have more thoughts about it.

B. Tolhurst: Okay.
President Willis: I mean it never hurts to repeat yourself on these issues.

B. Tolhurst: I do it all the time in class.

President Willis: It may be that the committee doesn’t need to do that. It’s up to this body whether you want it referred to committee or just have me look up what we already said about it. Yes?

M. Engel: This is Mylan Engel again. Whatever recommendations the – whichever committee comes up with have to be transmitted to the IBHE right?

President Willis: Probably not by that committee. It says the institution should transmit it to the IBHE but the IBHE I don’t think wants to hear from the Faculty Senate Sub-Committee.

M. Engel: Right, but presumably the Faculty Senate Sub-Committee would report back to this body in a relatively short period of time with some proposals that then at least this committee could perhaps make recommendations to whoever will be issuing these – the institutional recommendations to the Board and I mean there’s not much time. There’s four months.

President Willis: Right, three but yes. Yes, Clersida.

C. Garcia: I think with the time we have it seems like we have to have something by December 31. I don’t know how busy is Academic Affairs this semester but it seem perhaps it would be a good idea to have a committee to look at this, a task force committee and have some specific. In terms of what to do I think the last recommendation give us an idea of short and long-term goals and objectives for accomplishing these differences that are recommended so we have two recommendations. One of these – perhaps have a task force that look at this and secondly objective to be the last recommendation can guide their work.

President Willis: Okay, I think generally if we can refer something to a committee that already exists I think that’s preferable to establishing, you know, just setting up another committee. Right now the only things that we’ve referred to committees are the two things under the Consent Agenda and neither of those has gone to Academic Affairs and so right now Academic Affairs has nothing to do in some sense. They may very well want to keep it that way but ---. Okay, the questions been called. All those in favor of referring this to Academic Affairs say aye. Opposed? Okay, the motion carries. Academic Affairs. Yes, Pat?

The motion carries.

P. Henry: I’d like to say if there’s any – I’ve looked into this quite a bit in the context of the FAC and I’d be very happy to share whatever I’ve learned with that committee.

President Willis: Thank you. I think we do have some elections that we need to do and so I’d like to get through the rest of these reports as quickly as possible because I know the hour is growing late.
President Willis: The Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee met in June and there is a report on page 13.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – report (Page 14)

President Willis: The Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee also met on the same day and there’s a report on that on page 14. Those two committees also met this morning so we do not have reports prepared from them yet although if anyone wishes or are ready to give a verbal report from that meeting. That’s Paul and Bill. The written reports – if you have questions about them, I was at both those meetings and can address any questions. Otherwise, we can hear from what happened this morning.

B. Tolhurst: We got introduced.

President Willis: The meetings this morning we’ll get a report from those at the next meeting when we’ve had time to write something up.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Beverly Espe – report (Page 15)

President Willis: All right, the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee met in May although they did not have a quorum and therefore did not have any action items that they actually acted on. So there’s a report from that on page 15.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report (Page 16)

President Willis: The full Board met on the 20th of June. Essentially what happens when the Board meets is that they pass all the things that got passed by the sub-committees so if you read a sub-committee report you don’t need to read it again in the Board of Trustee’s report. That’s why that one is so short. Every once in awhile something comes up. If anyone has any questions about those reports they are in the packet and you can ask questions now or later, whichever. Are there any questions?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

President Willis: I would like to briefly run through the committees and just have the chairs if they’re still here, wave so that if you are on a committee you know who the person is who is going to be calling meetings. Let’s see, Academic Affairs – Jody Ryan is over here. Economic Status, Jim Lockard was in front, I think he had to leave. Resource, Space and Budget, C.T. Lin is the Faculty Senate Chair of that and Herb Rubin who just snuck out is the University Council Chair. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is Mark Cordes back there. Rules and Governance is Gretchen Bisplinghoff hiding back in the corner and Elections which we will now do finally is John Novak up here and so I will turn the meeting over to him at this point.
A. Academic Affairs – Jody Ryan, Chair  
B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair  
C. Resource, Space and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair  
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Mark Cordes, Chair  
E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair  
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – John Novak, Chair  

1. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee (Page 17)  
2. Election of University Council alternates – see sample ballots – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting (Pages 18-23)  
3. Election of UCPC representative from LAS to replace Jim King for one year (Page 24)  

J. Novak: We’re going to start choosing the members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. All of our names are written on pieces of paper and so we’re going to choose them aleatorially as it were and the rules for that committee is on page 17 if you want to know what it’s all about. It’s a committee that may or may not have to meet from what I understand.  

President Willis: This is where we draw the names out of the hat.  


D. Mathesius: No, he’s already the chair of the committee. I put him in by mistake, sorry.  


President Willis: This committee by the way only meets if it needs to in order to hear a grievance. So if there are no grievances, this committee does not meet.  


[Note: Errors were made in the selection of names which went into the hat, so this lottery was redone later.]  

We will now be voting for University Council alternates. These will be on individual colored ballots depending on your college and I could use members of my committee to help pass these out. This is such as you Chad Cameron, Rodney Caughron, Parviz Payvar, Mary Pritchard, William Baker, Stephen Nord, Robert Zurvek. If you can help us pass these out. You’ll choose for as many members as your particular ballot says to choose. The green is Business, blue is Education ---  

D. Mathesius: Let’s do it one at a time.
J. Novak: We’ll just do one at a time.


President Willis: What we’re electing here is alternates for the University Council so if a University Council member cannot attend the University Council meeting what you’re supposed to do is find someone from the alternate list from your college to serve in your place so what we’re doing is making these alternate lists.


President Willis: LA&S we do last because that’s the biggest. By the time we finish passing those out everybody should have a ballot of some color or other and it tells you on here how many to vote for. Right, Law and Library don’t get one.

J. Novak: Mary will pass Visual and Performing Arts.

President Willis: Okay, while you are voting let me explain one thing here as to what we’re going to do next because we need to have one other election which normally we do not do at this meeting which is that – usually, at the last meeting in the spring which we did, we elect UCPC representatives. We elected last spring among others Jim King. Jim King as you may or may not know, has decided to retire over the summer and so we need to elect a UCPC representative to replace him. However, we need to know who the University Council alternates are from LA&S before we can do that. So, what’s going to happen is that the committee will go and count those votes and then we’ll come back and do that. In the meantime, after all the ballots have been collected, we will go with the Agenda which we’re almost done with.

M. Larson: I’m on the ballot here for UCPC but I’m going to be on sabbatical in the spring so I don’t think I could do this.

President Willis: Do we have the UCPC ballots yet?

D. Mathesius: We’re just voting for the alternate.

President Willis: We’ll deal with that when we get to it. Yes.

J. Novak: So we need to do the pink ones now? Will we write this in or will we have them write the person’s name in?

President Willis: All right, have we collected all of those ballots? Okay. Malcom, I’m going to need Jim in a minute. Okay. While they are counting those ballots and before we do the final election of the UCPC representative, I’d like to move on to the Unfinished Business that we have.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
A. Presentation of Bob Lane award to Jim King

President Willis: This comes from the last Faculty Senate meeting in the spring when the Bob Lane Award was awarded to Jim King in absentia since Malcolm told Jim that he didn’t have to come to the meeting. I wasn’t there so it wasn’t my fault. In any case, Jim and I have talked since then and I offered to deliver his award to him over the summer but he decided that he would rather make some remarks and so I said that that would be all right and so I would like to present to Jim his award at this time and then Jim would like to make some remarks so Jim if you would come up. For those of you who don’t know, this is called the Bob Lane Bottom of the Deck Faculty Spokesman Award and it is awarded to Jim King for his advocacy of the faculty. Congratulations.

J. King: Could you give me a minute for a couple of remarks?

President Willis: Sure, yes.

J. King: Okay, well thank you.

President Willis: I’m sorry this meeting went so long. Usually we go a little shorter.

J. King: I’m gratified to receive your award. I knew Bob Lane and Lane was the best extemporaneous speaker I’ve ever heard. He was such a significant leader of the faculty that it wasn’t just kidding around that we said we wouldn’t allow a meeting of the University Council to start until Lane got there. Lane and Stanage both. I think we actually slowed down the beginning of the meetings if either of them was absent. Having received the award puts me a position to say something about it that I would never permit myself to say otherwise and that is that I think that the character of it has changed. It changed about seven or eight years ago and it took on the picture of the bottom of the deck and so on and so forth and I think that has tremendous value as humor but I don’t know that it sends the message that you want to send that we view our administrators as equivalent to card cheats. Perhaps. I think that that direction could be reversed and the award given a character that is narrowly and exclusively positive for contributions made by faculty members to shared governance and leave it at that. Just a suggestion.

The other thing I’d like to say is that I regret the inconveniences that are associated with my retirement. It came as a surprise to me. I didn’t have time to think about it until after I turned the grades in and I’ve learned a lot about taking retirement from this place and if any of you are thinking of it and you want to counsel with someone, I’d be happy to talk to you because I am going to be around. You haven’t gotten rid of me yet. I have switched effectively to part-time status. I gave up tenure track position and I gave up membership in my department and memberships on all the committees and so on but I continue to be teaching one term on, one term off for a while. I don’t know about – I can’t generalize – but I did not want to make a total break from Northern. I like the place. I like the people and I can tell you it was a terrible struggle to get any kind of continuing arrangement. You can’t imagine what it’s like to deal with deans when they have you in an all-win position for them. I have talked to people in Human Resources and I think it’s possible to create a category of employees, a new category. What we do now is wrong in my view. We work, work, work, retire, nothing. I think there ought to be something in
between like the ad hoc and completely contingent arrangement I’ve got. Many of you won’t want that. You will want to start a new career or move away or retire and just be pissed-off at the place. But right now there is no option for the individuals who are willing to give up the position that hopefully some young person can be hired who’s desperate for a job but still is attached to the institution, to the department, to students and/or research and wishes to continue in some role. So what we need is a new category that combines these four factors, emeritus, continuing work either as teaching or research, okay. Part-time and willing to work for chicken feed. Okay? That is a plus for some faculty. I encourage the Faculty Senate to give some thought to this. It is not self-serving for me. I am out of it. It’s for you to give some thought to creating such a category and, in fact, to give more thought than you have in the past to the whole retirement issue. I am grateful for the award coming from you. Thank you.

President Willis: Okay, are we ready to do the next thing?

J. Novak: Okay, just members of the Liberal Arts and Science College are voting for a UCPC representative to replace Jim King. You vote just for one and you’ll be adding in a name that you can choose to vote for or not and that is Gretchen Bisplinghoff.

D. Mathesius: And take Mary Larson off.

J. Novak: And take Mary Larson off. Do not vote for her.

President Willis: With your indulgence, perhaps while this is going on we could move to the last item on the Agenda. Is that okay with everybody? It’s brief.

X. NEW BUSINESS

C. Continuation of Malcolm Morris as Faculty Personnel Advisor

President Willis: As you probably know, Malcolm Morris is the Faculty Personnel Advisor. As you may or may not know unless you listened carefully when I was doing this at the beginning, he will be Acting Associate Dean of the Law School beginning in January, beginning in the spring semester. Now we have looked carefully through the bylaws and consulted with people who are bylaw gurus and there is nothing in the bylaws which precludes him from continuing to serve as Faculty Personnel Advisor while he is Associate Dean and he is willing to do so but I would like to get the consent of the Senate that that is indeed okay with all of you for him to continue doing that. Malcolm, would you like to say anything about that or ---

M. Morris: I think you’ve stated it. That’s fine. If someone else steps forward – I’m just going to finish out my term. I will not seek reappointment next year.

President Willis: Okay, I would entertain a motion to endorse Malcolm’s continuing until the end of his term in June. Second? Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? You can abstain.

The motion passed.
XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Meeting Schedule (Page 27)

President Willis: The only Information Item I have in the packet here is the meeting schedule which is on the last page so if you would enter that into your palm pilot or daytimer or however it is that you keep your schedule I would appreciate that. Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Excuse me. If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Okay, see you all next month.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.