
J. Koch attended for S. Clayton.

Parlimentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.


I.  CALL TO ORDER

II.  ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis:  Could I have a motion to adopt the Agenda?  It’s been moved and seconded that we adopt the Agenda.  Any comments or additions?  If not, all those in favor?  Okay.

The Agenda was adopted.

III.  APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2002 FS MEETING  (Pages 3-7)

President Willis:  Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of the September 4 meeting?  These appear on pages 3 to 7.  Do I have a motion?  Thank you.  Is there a second?  Are there any additions or changes to the minutes?  Yes?

D. Rusin:  I was present, but my name is shown as absent.  Dave Rusin from Mathematical Sciences.

President Willis:  Okay, any other corrections to the minutes?  If not, all those in favor of adopting the minutes?  Okay.

The minutes were adopted.

IV.  PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
President Willis: Okay, President’s Announcements. I do not have a lot of announcements, I’m sure you’ll be glad to hear. I did want to draw your attention to the last page of the walk-in where I think I now have what was requested in terms of the status of items that the Senate has referred to the Council. These are all the things that I could find that the Senate referred to the Council during the last year and what happened with all of them. The Council minutes and transcripts are on the web, so if you want to look up any more details about any of those things I give you the dates there where they considered all that stuff. If anybody has any questions about any of that I will be happy to discuss it, but I think that gives the disposition of pretty much everything that we referred to the Council last year. All right. I had something else that I wanted to say but I don’t quite recall what it was—oh yes, now I remember. I don’t have any late news on the budget except that this was yesterday’s Trib headline [State’s Budget Gap Growing] so apparently things are not getting better; we will just have to see. I would urge you all to attend the President’s State of the University address tomorrow. I know he’s been holding back on saying some things because he wants to say them then and so we will see what he has to say at that time. All right. I have no further remarks.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

President Willis: Let’s see, we have nothing under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration and nothing on the Consent Agenda so we can move to the Reports from the Advisory Committees.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 8-10) and report – walk-in

P. Henry: Again, I’ll beg your indulgence—I’ve got a “two-fer” here because this is a report of the September 13 meeting which you got in your packets and then you have a walk-in which is for the October 1 meeting yesterday when the FAC met together with the IBHE. Since these will eventually be posted on the web and accessible to you that way as well, I’m trying to adopt a relatively more streamlined way of getting through this stuff by asterisking little points that I think are of particular import to the Faculty Senate or the University Council and, hopefully, if we need to discuss them that will then allow us to pick those out. I’ll leave it to you to read through the material that you get either in your packet or on the web.

With regards to the September 13 meeting, the relevant thing to discuss is the report on All Faculty Matter which we mentioned at the last Senate meeting as well. There is, in addition to the report itself which is somewhat a separate issue, but—oh wait, sorry—there was a letter that was sent by Dan LaVista to all the public university presidents advising them of the recommendations and asking—well, basically requesting—encouraging, the actual word is encouraging—to consult with tenure/tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty and other staff as you proceed. The Academic Affairs Committee met, I believe, to start discussing this; you may want to fill in some of this as well because I know President Peters and Provost Ivan Legg had some contact with this. Do you want to ---?
President Willis: Yes, I did ask them what they were doing about this and apparently the person who has been directed to deal with this is Steve Cunningham. I will be meeting with Steve and also Jody and Ivan in a couple of weeks to go over those. Actually, originally Ivan had set up a meeting with me and Steve and I said well look, you know, we have this Faculty Senate committee that’s supposed to be looking into this and wouldn’t it be nice if the chair of that committee came also and he said yes, that was an excellent idea.

P. Henry: Another meeting.

President Willis: So we will do that.

P. Henry: I think – the force of the letter from LaVista is that there should be input though not that there is necessarily a report from the Senate per se but that we should have input into whatever report comes out of our institution.

President Willis: I’m hoping Jody and her committee can provide that.


P. Henry: Right. The other thing that I sent you an e-mail about, everybody earlier, I don’t know how you feel about that – but it was something that came up at the meeting that I thought needed to be publicized as early and often as possible, concerns the Illinois Commitment Survey. There’s participation in performance indicators web survey that you have the URL for there. This is quite a complicated document that’s trying at this point to get input to see whether this is the right kind of survey or these are the right kind of survey questions to ask in order to assess how well we do on performing on the Illinois Commitment and there’s these six parts of the Illinois Commitment, six goals, that I’ve listed there which many of you may be familiar with. This is very much something that the IBHE is interested in using as a means of looking at universities and institutions of higher education across the state, so it behooves us to pay attention to it and the survey that they’re developing – or the questionnaire, the performance indicators they’re developing here will be something that they will work on up until December. They’ll gather input on it somewhere until December and then try to formulate an actual set of performance indicators. So this is our chance if we want to have some input to see something about the indicators by which we will be judged as to how we are working towards the Illinois Commitment. The FAC had some gripes about this in general and would like very much to see an additional Illinois Commitment put in there concerning how institutions of higher learning contribute to an improved quality of life in civic situations in their societies or their communities. That’s not going to go anywhere for a while. They’re stuck on these six and most of them – quite a few of them – have a lot to do with business and affordability and so forth. Down there, number 5, is “Illinois Colleges and Universities will hold students to even higher” – even higher – “expectations for learning and will be accountable for the quality of academic programs.” That was a point of some discussion and that may be something that people here wish to discuss as well. I know that the survey itself is the sort that puts you into a coma because it’s really very complex and, to my mind, not very clear and those of you who know more about surveys may have some more sensible things to say about that. I don’t know. Anybody concerned about that?
I strongly urge you to look at it and to get your colleagues to look at it and even if you don’t have a direct comment to make on any of the indicators per se, there’s a place where you can indicate other comments and suggestions and so if there’s any point at which you would like to have the IBHE know that you are concerned, for example, that there isn’t more about actual education here than this would be the time and the place to do it. All right?

President Willis: If I could just point something out – this survey is just sitting there on the web.

P. Henry: It’s sitting there on the web. You click on it. You don’t have to deal with any paper at all.

President Willis: And anybody could fill it out.

P. Henry: Absolutely anybody. So it’s not exactly what you would call a real scientific survey, but that’s okay. It’s anonymous as well. At least they’re going to keep it confidential although you will be asked to identify what kind of institution you come from.

President Willis: Right. Yes? Could you get a mike?

D. Musial: Hi. I’m Diane Musial. I’d just recommend, Patricia, that the Assessment Panel of this university is a perfect place where, instead of just enforcing assessment rules that they get and are stuck with, that they – and I recommend that you give them this advice – that they become proactive, take that survey seriously - the whole panel can work on it - because that is a focus of theirs anyway, and recommend to them that they take a strong stand not necessarily just saying we love these indicators and let’s add some more, but recommend that maybe some substantive reflection on indicators not only of achievement like disposition development, all the national standards talk about – we seem to lose it and the development of skills and strategies. You know, it relates to your being an asset to the community but we can get at it through that achievement language by the concept of disposition development. This is our chance to say we don’t like these indicators; we have some different ones to offer. Let it come, though, from a body. Don’t make it anonymous. Let them go on and say we are the University Assessment Panel from NIU and ---

P. Henry: I’m sure the IBHE would be very responsive to hear that ---

D. Musial: Yeah – I would just recommend – I think it’s about time we take some pro-action here.

P. Henry: I would like to talk to you later about getting specifics about who to contact on this.

D. Musial: I’d be glad to.

P. Henry: Continuing with the September 13 meeting, again I’ll let you keep track of this on your own in terms of the basic things that went on. As usual, there was an informational meeting and this was part of it. There was also quite an extensive discussion of the IBHE website which I
highly recommend to you in general. The discussion of the budget, always stimulating, came down to a number of things that are listed there as to what the FY04 recommendations are; there’s going to be a lot of trying to catch up with stuff and if there isn’t money to do it then they won’t get done. There was also the opinion that no matter which administration or who becomes governor, there’s going to be a new administration that is probably not going to be as supportive of higher education as George Ryan has been and the IBHE – and this gets to the meeting yesterday as well – is really trying to get a handle on this as far as the legislature is concerned to try and educate people as to why these kinds of cuts are very damaging and what happens when, for example, the 5th year MAP funds disappear and so forth. This is also something that they feel and the FAC feels as well, that it’s very important that we as individuals and as a body, be proactive in as well, that there’s – it’s going to be a bad few years coming up it looks like and there’s a lot of misconceptions about, and prejudices about, higher education in the legislature and it’s up to us to some extent to try to correct that.

One thing, the last page of the September 13 meeting at the bottom of the page I mentioned the new committee that the FAC has formed, which I am on, which is named the “Public Policy Committee”; we’re going to try to focus on how to facilitate communication between the FAC and you guys and between the FAC and the IHBE and anybody else we can get our hands on. So there’s thoughts of trying to - during the December meeting we’re usually meeting in Springfield – of trying to get to talk to people in the administration and then, of course, by that time the election will be over but there’s a real effort here I think to try and get information back and forth and to see what roles we can play in affecting some of these outcomes. So, this style I’m going to try and adopt here and see how it works, is to give you talking points that we may want to discuss at meetings. What is the feeling about me e-mailing you information and/or contacting particular committees with matters that are of interest to them? I did interface with the Academic Affairs Committee and I’m more than willing to go to any other committees except only a little bit – if you have – or to pass on to you information. There’s a huge amount of information and I realize saying just go to the web and get this is not really a substitute for meaningful discussion but I don’t want to overwhelm people with tons of stuff either so you tell me what I should do in terms of getting you what you need to know. Anybody, any suggestions? Okay, well here it comes.

Here’s some more. Yesterday, I was at the – once a year in October, the FAC attends the meeting of the IBHE, which this year was at Kishwaukee, so it was conveniently close. During the morning, we listened to the IBHE meeting and some of that actually was in the Northern Star today. What follows is some more detail about some of that. Again, the agenda reports all sorts of stuff. It’s on the web and individual groups or people may want to check up on some of this. Basically, the problem is going to be it’s going to be a real challenge to try and maintain quality and affordability and accessibility in education over the next few years. I should also point out that – just a bureaucratic rearrangement here – Dan Layzell who’s the person who is, in fact, overseeing the participation in Performance Indicators web survey that we were just talking about, will now be overseeing the – will be the deputy – well, he will be the Chief Budget Officer on the IBHE staff which means he will the one who will be developing the documents and reports that have to do with salary and other budget matters so just a little point of information there.
Several committee reports follow in item #4. The FAC Chair, Ken Anderson, specifically addressed a quite extensive report which I recommend, if you’re interested, you go and look at on faculty’s – on Salary and Fringe Benefits. It’s quite broad, of course, and deals with all sorts of things in various different groups of universities but he makes a point that indeed there’s – it needs to be explained that we’re still not – faculty salaries are not so high as to be really competitive although we’re getting close to it, some of us, at least we were until the last – the latest budget crisis – that a lot of the details that get lost in averages need to be paid attention to. We have people real high and people real low and that gets lost in the shuffle sometimes. His third point was that catch-ups don’t really catch things up, and we’re still going to be in bad shape, certainly competitively in terms of salary, if things continue as they are. His particular position, that is the FAC and mine too, is that we do have a real obligation to communicate how things – what gets lost when we do lose funding and what price we do pay for this and what – if the legislature wants to go ahead and do it – then fine, then they at least understand what they’re doing. At this point, I think it’s like – we shouldn’t shred the documents is part of what we’re being asked to do here – is that we should make it clear what are the costs of losing some of this funding.

Quickly then, as we work through the – as usual they had the best practices things – this is something that happens at every IHBE meeting where people who have special show-and-tell things do it and those were very interesting. There were also reports on studies, upcoming studies, on student success that are ongoing here – this is #7 – students’ success issues underlying persistence and degree completion and related improvement strategies. This is a report that’s ongoing but there is a problem here especially in terms of dealing with students from very diverse backgrounds. Some are working part-time, some have families. The question is who’s completing a degree and how are we doing in getting students through the system such that they complete their degree. We’re looking at so many different things, including students who maybe only come for a course or two and are not looking to complete the degree anyway, but then they go in to the statistics as having not completed the degree and that makes us look bad – or makes other people look bad. It’s a complicated situation and this – losing the fifth year of MAP funds has a real impact, especially on some of these marginal situations and that’s a big concern.

The report again on the salaries and fringe benefits, this is #8, a bunch of numbers here – long story short, we were – at our public universities we’re at about 95% of median salaries paid at peer institutions, I’m sorry, in 1999 – I think that’s right and then by fiscal 2002 after this initiative to up our competitiveness in salary, we had closed the gap – public universities – overall to 98%. This is probably not going to continue given the present budget. Sylvia Manning, who is the President of University of Illinois at Chicago, made the point that while lowering – the lowering tide had lowered all boats. Some states had been able to predict high education better than Illinois and they were in a better position to recruit top faculty from public universities such as UIC and on the top of page 3 there, it might be of interest to note that in terms of NIU – and, you know, I thought we didn’t get a raise last year, but apparently we went to 101% in fiscal year 2002 comparing to peer institutions and I’m honestly not acquainted well enough with all the various statistics in this report to really understand that but I assume that reflects the past rather than what just happened and last year, yeah, so this will look different next year, I’m assuming, in the statistics that come out. So, our average overall actually was not
too bad compared to peer institutions and, again, who we are compared to makes a big difference here.

The consent agenda passed, almost without discussion – there was some discussion which I won’t go into here – it is also useful to note, I think, that the University of Phoenix, which was a very hot item last year, is now part of the scenery and is offering the following – several degrees and those were just approved without even comment. So the University of Phoenix is alive and well and offering degrees in the western suburb approval regions, so check it out. We then had lunch and several board members including the Chair, Steven Lesnik, met with us afterwards. This was very useful indeed, to really get one-on-one and face-to-face contact with board members. I’ve summarized a lively discussion which is one that we’ve had before. The question of assessment and the way in which faculty and the IBHE look at this, not just assessment in quality but especially the push is on for quantitative assessment, for numbers that we can compare one institution to another institution, one period of time to another period of time. The IBHE’s position is that this will help them with the legislature to make cases. The faculty people generally, at least on the FAC, often see this as something that takes up a lot more time, takes away time from teaching, maybe measuring things that can’t properly be measured anyway and then might be used to punish us, especially if what we’re doing is teaching disadvantaged studies that need a lot of remediation and it slows things down, blah, blah, blah and so forth. It’s a difficult argument to have and I’m presenting the sides that emerged in the course of this discussion with the note that the IBHE takes this quite seriously as something that it uses, seeing itself on our side, to try to persuade the legislature to give us the money.

So, that’s essentially where we stand and that’s where the meeting ended. Okay?

President Wills: Okay, any comments for Pat? Yes, Dave?

D. Rusin: Can you clarify ---

President Willis: You need a mike.

D. Rusin: Is this really correct on the top of page 3, that the average instructor’s salary at NIU is $39,000?

P. Henry: That’s what this report said.

D. Rusin: Is there one million-dollar instructor? Is that what’s doing it?

P. Henry: Beats me. I refer you to the website. Actually, it’s a 42-page report. I’ll be happy to loan you a copy. This is what they came up with and I think, indeed, if there’s problems with it, we need to address those and point out that there’s a problem.

President Willis: I could find out where that number came from.

D. Rusin: It’s not our department that’s paying them $39,000.
P. Henry: Yeah, as foreign languages, that’s a pretty good salary all right.

President Willis: Okay, any other comments for Pat? Okay.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – report (Page 11)

President Willis: Let’s see, the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees, Paul Loubere and Bill Tolhurst. Are they here? Okay, I don’t see Paul or Bill here. They have a report on page 11 and I was also at that meeting and so if anyone has any questions about that, I can answer them.

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

President Willis: Let’s see, the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee also met on the 4th of September and I don’t believe I really reported on that last time although most of the things that were in there I can cover in the Board of Trustees report which comes next and which is on page 12. I gave you there the web page where the agenda is.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – no report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report (Page 12)

President Willis: One interesting note was that the Foundation, even in the present economic situation, has managed to exceed their fundraising goal by more than half a million dollars, which was good. The one item that caused the most discussion and distress, I might say, was this business of the DeKalb County Metropolitan Planning Organization and for a while there the city was mumbling about how they weren’t going to put an NIU representative on this, or at least not a voting representative. That apparently has since been ironed out, and now NIU will be represented by a voting representative on this Metropolitan Planning Organization so that has, fortunately, been turned into a non-issue. The other items that were approved came from the subcommittees including the capital budget request which the Star has done a couple of very nice articles on in the past couple of days. The first priority is the Stevens Building and, if we’re lucky, we may get money for that. Probably things further down on the priority list in this particular budget year are not going to see the light of day. The next thing is the renovation of Wirtz Hall for the people since business moved out so it can be moved back into. Okay and that’s about it for the Board of Trustees. Does anyone have any questions about the Board of Trustees? Okay.

F. Council of Illinois University Senate – Sue Willis – report (Page 13)

President Willis: There’s a new item on here in terms of Advisory Committees and that is the Council of Illinois University Senates. Some of you may remember this from last year and the year before. This is a group of the chairs of the Faculty Senates of all the public
universities in Illinois. We met on Monday, the 23rd of September and, again, I put a – my report is on page 13 and I – there is, again, a website where you can find out information. The big thing we talked about was the issue of private money going to public institutions which is something that we still feel would need to be addressed. The one thing that I wanted to bring to your attention was the last one there – not the next meeting but the thing just before that – where we decided that we would like to do some lobbying with the State Legislature, the idea being that the purpose of this group is to provide a unified voice for all the public institutions in the state and right now there is no such thing. Pat’s committee includes not just the public universities but also community colleges and private institutions as well and so it does not represent the voice of the public universities. So, this group wants to be that voice and can be that voice and felt that we could have some useful things to say to the legislature at certain opportune moments and that then, indeed, we could say things to the legislature that our university presidents would like to have said but feel constrained themselves against saying for political reasons. So, and I mentioned this to President Peters and he thought that was a great idea. In that case, we would need to have some money and so we all said that we would try to see if we could raise $1,000 from each one of our institutions by March and I looked in to whether the Foundation could spend its money for this purpose and the answer to that seems to be no. So – but then I figured if we have like fifty people on the Faculty Senate, if everybody kicks in $20.00, that’s a thousand dollars and that may, in fact, be the best way to go. In any case, we would like to be raising some relatively small amount of money to support some lobbying in Springfield. All right, so are there any questions? Yes, Carole?

C. Minor: My question goes back to the private money going to public institutions. Isn’t that really public money going to private institutions?

President Willis: Yes, I have that exactly backwards here.

C. Minor: Because I didn’t think we’d have an objection to private money going to public universities.

President Willis: Yes, you’re absolutely right. That would be a nice issue to discuss – we wouldn’t be opposed to it. Yes, thank you. My brain was backwards when I wrote that. Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: I really think it would be an excellent idea to have another voice representing public universities because there are indeed, points at which the public universities and the private universities and the community colleges do not have a single point of view although I think it’s useful to have one voice also for the faculty – and, by the way, it’s the case that there is a student representative on the IBHE. There’s a student member of the Board. There is no faculty member of the Board and that, in a way, makes it so that there’s less faculty voice anyway and having another lobbying voice from the Council would be an excellent idea.

President Willis: Well, I may be coming around asking you each for contributions at some point. Carole’s got hers out. All right, any other questions about the Council of Illinois University Senates? If not, we move on to Reports from Standing Committees.
VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

President Willis: Jody Newman-Ryan called me up this morning. She is home sick and has no report but is hoping to have one next time.

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

President Willis: Economic Status, Jim Lockard.

J. Lockard: Yes, our Committee was given two things at the initial meeting of the Senate this year. One was to revisit and see what had happened on the issues related to the flexible spending accounts, MCAP, DCAP, and so on. That issue – I can report that the Human Resources Office has taken some steps to try to avoid the problems that we encountered last year. They have asked their benefit staff members to be much more explicit in talking with faculty who are signing up for these programs to make certain they understand all of the details including when they can and cannot be reimbursed for things. They claim that they also made a bigger point of this during orientation for new faculty and staff this year and are in the process of taking some additional steps including more detailed information on the HR website and are in the process of developing some kind of a brochure to be included along with the CMS document which was part of the source of the problem in the first place because it was so poorly explained there. So it appears that, as long as the follow-through actually takes place as it’s going on now, that things are at least moving forward so I think we’ve accomplished something there.

President Willis: So are they actually fixing it so you can use your thing in the summer or just telling you that you can’t?

J. Lockard: They can’t. The law is quite clear in terms of having to be on pay status and if you make an option to do other than the 9/12 you have some problems that you will not be able to avoid except by very careful planning. That is the only option that really will solve the problem for those people.

President Willis: So if you do spread your pay out over twelve months ---

J. Lockard: Then you’re fine. That is not an issue. Beyond that, the other matter that was referred to the Committee had to do with the perceived changes in payouts through our health insurance under Cigna and that is still under investigation. Hopefully, we’ll have some information next month.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. Any questions for Jim?

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget. C. T.?
C. T. Lin: Well, the Committee had its first meeting on September 18 and it was chaired by Herb Rubin. Now I saw Herb is here already. He may want to give you a detailed report.

H. Rubin: I included the report in the back up material, was it included?

President Willis: I don’t think we had it in this packet. I think we have it for the Council.

H. Rubin: Okay. What we basically did was worked out agenda items for the year which will be in the next report. Okay?

C. T. Lin: Well, if you want I can read through your report and then you can add something into it.

H. Rubin: You have the copy.

C. T. Lin: Generally, we had an extensive discussion on the role and the purpose of the Committee. There are four items we suggest for the coming year’s agenda. So I’ll read through the four agendas. The first one is everybody shares in the excitement of the new building of the College of Business, Barsema Hall, and as a whole the examination of which innovations in the use of space for pedagogical purposes in Barsema Hall can be extended to other parts of the university and the effect they cause. The topic then extended more generally to how changes in the physical design of classrooms and of offices affected teaching mission. That is the first item.

The second item is the problem in class scheduling caused by the expansion in physical size of the campus. As part of this concern, issues on internal transportation on the campus would also be examined. That’s the second item that we are interested in.

The third item is the Committee would continue discussions on technological changes and their impact on pedagogy.

The fourth one is the general brainstorming about the direction the university should take in developing the western part of campus, which has 240 more acres. So those are the four items that our Committee will pursue and maybe Herb has some more new agenda ideas to add into it.

H. Rubin: I’ve introduced several for the Committee but since the Committee hasn’t seen them yet it’s not time to report on them.

President Willis: Okay, fine. Any questions for Resource, Space and Budgets? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Would this be the appropriate committee – the problem that exists in our department is that if too many people schedule Tuesday/Thursday classes, we run out of space rather quickly. Is this the sort of thing that – I can formulate this more eloquently if that’s the committee that I should address this question to?
H. Rubin: I don’t think so. There’s a standard university committee that handles that and we’re trying not to step on its toes. It was more the issues of physically running across campus from the Liberal Arts teaching buildings to Barsema Hall, you know, that sort of issue and then all of a sudden it dawned on us with our expansion west to the Mississippi it’s really going to get very problematic especially if we move teaching functions over to the west campus. So, we were using that to brainstorm and what we were trying to do on the issues is – you’re not going to believe this with me being on the Committee, but rather than trying to do these things confrontationally, these are things that I think the administration really wants to brainstorm about and we want to contribute to it so that’s our direction because there is a committee that handles scheduling on campus.

President Willis: Okay, any other questions?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Mark Cordes, Chair

President Willis: Okay, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Mark.

M. Cordes: The one item that was referred to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities was the Institutional Review Board matters that have arisen recently on campus and some concerns that faculty members have raised about the IRB. The Academic Policy Committee of the University Council was also given those matters and that’s chaired by John Wolfskill. John and I got together and decided it made the most sense for our two committees to act jointly instead of going off in different directions so for the time being at least, our two committees are meeting together jointly to look into these matters. We had our first meeting two weeks ago. At that meeting we spent a few minutes together as a committee talking about the direction that we would be going and what our charge was and then various representatives from the IRB, including Lori Bross who is the Special Assistant to the Dean, Sharon Plowman who’s the Chair of the IRB, and several members of the IRB, met with us. It was an informational meeting to a large extent. They gave an overview of the IRB, how it operated on campus, what its purposes were and then they entertained a number of questions from us. Some of those questions were for clarification but a number of them were questions that did concern some of the matters that had been brought up recently; they weren’t there to defend themselves, but I think it’s fair to say to a certain extent, that’s how the meeting evolved and that was okay. I think that they did a good job and they made a very reasonable presentation but we were only hearing one side of the issue.

Our next meeting is in two weeks and at that meeting we want to begin looking at some of the concerns that have been raised and John is in the process, I think, of contacting some of the more vocal critics of the IRB here on campus and asking for some case histories and some various information on what’s worked and in particular, what hasn’t worked and the problems they’ve had. I would take this opportunity right now and offer a general invitation to any faculty members here at NIU if they have had problems and experiences with the IRB that they think need to be addressed, we would like to hear those stories. If you could contact either myself, I’m Mark Cordes at the Law School, or John Wolfskill at the Math Department and John’s sitting right in front of me right here, we would appreciate that. That would include not only people on the Faculty Senate but colleagues you have that might have had experiences with the IRB. We would like to have that information. Ideally, we would like it in about a week so that we could
get it to our committee or at least within two weeks so that our committees can look at it. I realize that’s a short time frame. If you can’t get it to us before then, that’s fine, we would still want to have that information.

Finally, one other matter that relates to this. The university – there’s federal regulations that govern these matters that in terms of our own compliance we sign a document that is essentially an agreement between us and the federal government on how the IRB here is going to work, what its jurisdiction is and so forth. Once that document is signed, that is essentially the law that applies to the university. We are bound to follow that. The process has been that that’s renewed every five years. They’re going to a three-year period starting shortly but our document is supposed to be renewed on November 30 of this year. To be honest with you, I don’t think that there’s time to do a full examination of all the issues that are involved with these matters. If we have it renewed under the current understanding, it would be at most a three-year period before we would have to go through it again and have another situation where we would have to sign the document with the federal government and so forth. I have asked Lori Bross whether it’s possible that if we sign a renewal form on November 30 that is similar to what we currently have and we decide in six months or a year that we would want to have a different document, would it be possible to contact the federal government and have that changed. The answer she gave me initially was she thinks yes, but she’s not sure; she has contacted the proper official that will give us an answer to that question. That’s where we stand right now and, again, I would encourage anyone in this body or if you have colleagues that have had experiences that have been problematic with the IRB if you could contact either myself or John Wolfskill as soon as possible, we’d like to hear that information.

President Willis: Okay, thank you Mark. Any comments or questions for Mark? Herb?

H. Rubin: I’ll try to keep this procedural because the committee has either or indirectly received a lot of comments that either came from me or come through me, but we’re in a situation where I believe that the Dean of the Graduate School, Acting Dean of the Graduate School and some of the IRB professional staff are rethinking some of the very simple issues that I think have created disproportionately large problems. What I would like to suggest to the two committees is, as much as we’ve had to raise these issues in a polarizing way, the solutions are really not polarizing and I would hate to have a situation in which the IRB is talking about some incredible potentials for some harm in justifying keeping the status quo. If we can just go reasonably slowly, I think a reasonable number of these accommodations can be made. They’re types of courtesy behaviors, changing of some small words in some documents and then to some extent, what is missing, some monitoring of the IRB to make sure that it’s following its own procedures which to me would be the only substantive change that’s really needed. I’ve heard Lori speak recently and a lot of what she’s now saying is very acceptable; my only problem was that it contradicts evidence that I have of practice. If we have some way of reconciling these two I think the problem is solved and so, I know, it was partially because of me we started this committee structure but I don’t want it to end up with a win/lose situation when I think we are fairly close to a win/win situation. That’s why I was late to this meeting.
President Willis: All right, any other comments or questions on the IRB issues? Okay. I have received some things which I think you already have but I will forward them again to you anyway just to make sure you have them.

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Okay, Rules and Governance, Gretchen has no report.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – John Novak, Chair

President Willis: Okay, let’s see, Elections and Legislative Oversight, John Novak. I believe they also have no report. I don’t see John.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: Okay, let’s see, we have, as far as I know, no Unfinished Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: I do have a couple of items of New Business which I would like to bring up. They, I hope, are brief. The first one is in the walk-in. Some of you may recall we talked last year about doing an evaluation of the President and so I’m bringing this back. What we decided last year was that we would use this process and begin in the fall so that we could be done in the spring and transmit things to the University Advisory Committee and then, presumably, to the Board of Trustees. So the first step here is for me to request that the President respond to these six areas there. When he does that, and I would ask him to do it within some time period like a month or something like that which would get us to the beginning of November which I think is still plenty of time, then each of you would get a copy of that. You would take it to your departments, get input from your faculty, then that would all go to the Executive Committee which would serve as sort-of the personnel committee in this instance. The Executive Committee would then write up an evaluation based on all the information that it had and then share that with the President and then presumably with the Board of Trustees. I’ve spoken with the Board of Trustees about this and they’re certainly perfectly happy to hear what we have to say. So, I am just bringing this to you again to remind you that we said we were going to do this and with your approval I will then take this to the President and get the process started. Yes, Dave?

D. Wagner: Will your report be reported back to the Senate?

President Willis: Yes. Presumably in Executive Session because it’s a personnel matter but – yes, let me add that on there. Okay, any other comments or questions about that? Okay, I think we voted on this in the spring but it probably wouldn’t hurt to do it again.

F. Bryan: I think a formal motion that we have the criteria now ---
President Willis: Okay, so I would entertain a motion that we get this process started in accordance with what’s set down on this page including under #4 that the evaluation will be shared with the Senate as well as with the President. Is there a second? Any more discussion? If not, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, I will get that underway.

The motion passed.

President Willis: The other item which I do not have a handout for you, but I just wanted to bring this to you is – there was approximately – this is a note that came to me from George Shur, there was approximately three years ago a committee formed to provide recommendations to the university on how best deal with the issue of sweatshop labor and ensure that no sweatshop labor be used in producing items that bear the NIU logo. This committee met, I think, a couple of times; the university has affiliated itself with a couple of organizations which vet things like that and give you information on what manufacturers are up to. We are members of two such organizations, each one of which has dues of about $1,000 a year and so now there’s a question of whether we could cut this down to one and, if so, which one and so George would like to get this committee back together again. There were two faculty members on this committee. One is Byron Anderson of the University Libraries who is willing to continue; I have spoken with him. The other was Dan Griffiths who is, of course, no longer technically a faculty member and so we need to find someone to replace him. I have done some quiet asking around but haven’t gotten any firm commitments from anyone so if anyone knows anybody who would be interested in this issue – I suspect this committee is only going to meet a couple of times. I don’t think we’re talking about a big commitment here but if you are interested or if you know anyone who’s interested in the issue of sweatshop labor and ensuring that it is not used to produce items with NIU logs on them, please let me know, preferably within the next week. Any questions about that?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any Comments or Questions from the Floor on any subject? We’re almost done here, believe it or not. Herb is sitting there looking ---

H. Rubin: We’re virtually done – then I have time for my crucial comment.

President Willis: You have time for your crucial comment.

H. Rubin: This is a report back that I did give to the Steering Committee or whatever it’s called on the crucial problem of the cookie size. Okay, I was in a committee meeting that was sponsored by the Central Administration and I would like to report they served us full-sized cookies. Okay, so there is some discrimination going on.

President Willis: We know where the money comes from. Are there any other comments or questions? Yes, Kevin?

K. Miller: Yes, good afternoon everyone. My name’s Kevin Miller; for those of you who don’t know me, I’m the Student Association President and I’ll be serving as the Student Association
liaison this year. I want to apologize for coming in late. My Board meeting which was scheduled for 2:00 p.m. went later than expected. I just wanted to bring one thing to everyone’s attention. Last year, I’m not actually sure what the Faculty Senate involvement was in the issue was, but there was an issue regarding Social Security numbers and this year already I have had to personally put my Social Security number on a test form so the issue is still out there. If you could all please go back to your departments and make sure everyone is familiar with the fact that for most instances, and I don’t know all the technicalities of this – I’m sure Dr. Willis knows or can find out – but in most instances, faculty are not allowed to ask for a student’s Social Security number because it is a potential security risk. So, if you could please do that I would much appreciate it and please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

J. Kowalski: Are you talking about a Scantron test score?

K. Miller: Yes, and I have tried to pursue the issue with Dr. Gresholdt and the gentleman in charge of testing services; it’s my understanding is it’s not required or necessary or even relevant for a Scantron test because, I believe, the Z-ID numbers are being used now.

President Willis: The Z-ID is the number that we are supposed to use now instead of the Social Security number.

J. Stephens: Testing Services has just today sent around a memo concerning that which helps those of us who have 240 Scantrons from two weeks ago.

President Willis: Okay, well don’t look at the Social Security numbers on them. Yes, David?

D. Wagner: Since there is a little time, I’ve been waiting to ask this for a long time, but why do faculty have to give social security numbers to the library?

S. Mini: Not just the library but also parking services. If you want a receipt – get a parking fine – and you want a receipt you need absolutely to give them your Social Security number. I would be willing to bet they make students do it too.

President Willis: Yes, Herb?

H. Rubin: Why doesn’t Sue simply inquire of HR, because basically on our pay stubs, which is the one thing that Social Security is probably legitimate on, they’re now moving so I’m now #31268218----, whatever it is. You know, they’re now using alternative numbers the same way they offer the students and you’d think that should go throughout the university.

President Willis: Okay, so it’s on the library and the parking and what else? Anyway, I will find out.

H. Rubin: What makes it interesting is the password to get into Registration and Records class list that you need to put in, requires your Social Security number. Okay, where you get the Z-IDs of the students and there’s some irony to that one.
President Willis: Yes, Tim?

T. Griffin: Addressing only the issue of Founders Library, I can speak from personal experience, that if you request a so-called “dummy” Social Security number they will provide you with one and your actual Social Security number will not be required by the library for use of their services.

President Willis: Okay, but presumably it would be nice to have some institutional solution.

T. Griffin: Absolutely!

President Willis: Rather than having them come up with thousands of dummy ID’s but, yes. Yes, Kevin?

K. Miller: I’m sorry. If I could just speak one more time quickly on the issue. I know last year it was brought up and many of the systems on campus, especially for students, I would imagine the same would go for faculty, are interlinked and it would cost tens of millions of dollars, is the number I got, to completely revamp all this which, as you all know, we’re in the midst of budget crisis right now so that’s probably not going to happen this year. I was actually contacted by a couple of faculty members last year saying why isn’t anything going on with faculty regarding this issue, why is it just the students? Well, I don’t have time to pursue issues for everyone but if the Senate would like a copy of some of the Student Association’s ideas, if you haven’t seen that, I would be more than happy to forward that on to Dr. Willis and I’m sure she could get that out to everyone if you guys want to pursue the issue for the faculty. I would recommend it.

Also, one last thing, I know the Student Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously passed a resolution this last meeting regarding the use of Social Security numbers on university campuses. I don’t know how much attention that’s gotten already here, if at all, I was just told this a couple of hours ago. So, this is turning into a statewide issue now.

President Willis: Okay, I will certainly look into how we can avoid having faculty and staff plaster their Social Security numbers all over everyplace as well.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate List (Page 14)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.