
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: We have one addition to the agenda. The walk-in item will go under V. Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. This is an item that is always on the January agenda, but because of the longer break, we did not get it on there. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Second? All those in favor of approving the agenda with the addition say aye. Opposed?

The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2003 FS MEETING (Pages 3-6)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of our meeting of December 3, 2003? Second? Any changes, additions or corrections to the minutes of the last meeting? If not, all those in favor of approval say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: I have an announcement that was brought to me by Steve Cunningham. As
you may recall, the salary increment guidelines where we got 1.5% in July and then another 1.5% January 1, were what they call a 1.5 plus 1.5+. One of the things that they said with the + is that specific salary competitiveness issues will be evaluated including civil service pay rates, especially in the clerical/para-professional classifications and other factors, blah, blah, blah. So what they are doing is, in addition to the 1.5% for the clerical staff they are adding an additional 3% increment which is part of a several year-long program started back in 1999 to bring these people up to something resembling the average salary at comparable institutions for those ranks. So they are still relatively more underpaid than other classifications here and the administration is working on bringing their salaries up to par. So they are getting an extra 3% on top of the 1.5. I have a list of all the salary classifications that this applies to and that kind of thing but it’s basically clerical workers that that is happening for. Does anybody have any questions about that? Sara Clayton from the Operating Staff Council is here if she can answer anything also.

Yes?

S. Nord: Is that across the board?

President Willis: That is across the board, yes. Yes, the idea is not that you need merit increments right now but just that the whole base needs to move up. Okay. Any other questions? Okay.

Just one other thing that I wanted to mention is that I have applied for an ACE Fellowship (American Council on Education). These are fellowships intended for university faculty who are interested in going into administration and I’m having such a good time here that I figured why not. I have been accepted as a finalist. I go to interview next week. Most of the finalists eventually wind up being accepted into the program so what that would mean is that next year I would be somewhere else and then when I came back here I would come back in some kind of administrative capacity. I will know by around the first of March whether that’s happening or not. If it does, it means that for sure somebody else is going to have to do this next year so those of you who are eligible, if you don’t know who you are, you can look in the online Committees Book at the membership list of the University Council and the names that are in 2004-05, those are the people who are eligible to run. So, be thinking about that.

Okay, that’s all the announcements that I have so let’s move to Items for Faculty Senate Consideration and I will turn it over to the elections people.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

1. Selection of a committee to evaluated the executive secretary of University Council/president of Faculty Senate – See NIU Bylaws, Article 7 – walk-in

2. Selectino of a committee to evaluation the faculty personnel advisor – See NIU Bylaws, Article 7 – walk-in

President Willis: The walk-in here is the relevant part of the Bylaws that explains how we have to do this.
S. Nord: First we’re going to be selecting out of an envelope two regulars for the Committee to Evaluate the Executive Secretary and one alternate. First lucky person is Pat Henry. The second is Xueshu Song and the alternate will be David Wade. Okay. Next we pick two Faculty Senate members to serve on the same Committee to Evaluate the Executive Secretary. There will be two regular members from the Faculty Senate and one alternate. Following that, we will select a student and then a student alternate as well. The first one from the Faculty Senate is Nancy Castle. The second one is Ngoyi Bukonda and the alternate is Geoffrey Gordon. The student to serve on the committee is Eric Johnson and the student alternate is Adam Novotney.

President Willis: By the way, while they’re mixing their slips I just thought I would explain that the first faculty drawing was Faculty Senate members who are also on the University Council and then the second one was Faculty Senate members who are not on the University Council because that’s specified in the Bylaw here. Next they’re going to be drawing for the Faculty Personnel Advisor.

S. Nord: And there’ll be three regulars and one alternate for the Faculty Personnel Advisor. The first regular is Donald Zinger, second regular member is Sally Webber and the third regular member to the Faculty Personnel Advisor is Marilyn Frank-Stromborg and the alternate is Angela Powers.

D. Mathesius: After the meeting if all of you could come up and talk to me. I have all the instructions of what you need to do.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. I’ve actually been on the Evaluation Committee, before I was Executive Secretary obviously, and it’s not that bad and Donna does have it all laid out step by-step.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 7-10)

President Willis: Okay, we have nothing on the Consent Agenda so let’s move to reports from Advisory Committees. FAC to IBHE is Pat Henry.

P. Henry: Thanks. Since you have had this with you, I won’t be going over it in too much detail; many of you heard this same report at the University Council last semester too. The first is a report of the meeting in Springfield on December 5. IBHE staff, there are some changes including Doug Day who’s been our liaison and is going to be leaving the IBHE. We don’t know who his replacement is yet. The FAC is somewhat concerned because a great deal of institutional memory is being lost as various IBHE staffers depart for other places. We’ll keep you posted. The rest of the meeting was mostly involved in developing the response to the IBHE Chair Kaplan concerning faculty productivity; and this has traveled along since I made this report and, in fact, on the ninth page of your agenda is an article that I pulled out from the Chicago Tribune on the 26th of December that reports on this very report, and I think it provides
an interesting range of views. The report itself, as I mentioned here, was attempting to give a little sense of the complexity of what is involved in faculty productivity and to urge the IBHE to keep this in mind and that one size does not fit all and that overly simplistic approaches can be very detrimental to the whole project. Chairman Kaplan did not particularly receive this as a helpful report, I think, from what you can get from the Chicago Tribune article. He described us as “the faculty circling the wagons”; I can’t comment on exactly why he would feel that but that was the impression he had. The rest of the article, by the way, has some very good quotes from Stanley Fish addressing some of the lack of understanding that is being evidenced by the IBHE. Also Alan Karnes, who is the Chair of the FAC, he’s the person who really put this report together and presented it with a couple of other members of the FAC to Kaplan and other members of the IBHE. It was their discussion that ultimately produced this article, although other people are involved as well. I can only tell you that it looks like there’s going to be interesting times ahead as well as essentially the return to “PQP”, although it’s now being described as “priorities, productivity and accountability”. The FAC argued to have quality put back in there as something that would actually be nice to keep in mind during the course of this; I think individual institutions will be responding to this as the time arises. At this point, I have not heard anything. The Tribune article mentions that the IBHE is going to form a committee to address this but I have not heard as yet anything about who’s on that committee or what’s going to happen with it so I’m sure we will all find out. Just further in terms of the FAC meeting in Springfield, we also talked with Kathleen Kelly, a former IBHE staffer who’s evaluating the Illinois Commitment. The FAC posed various questions to her, the concern being again there’s a lot of stuff that isn’t really looked at or dealt with in the Illinois Commitment that has a lot to do with what faculty typically feel is very important in terms of adding to knowledge and creating greater understanding and quality of life and so forth. Anyway, the IBHE is going to be considering a second look, or an evaluation, of the Illinois Commitment and will perhaps be incorporating some of our suggestions. I think you can read through the suggestions that we have there and if the article in the Tribune has gotten anybody interested, I’ll be happy to respond. There’s also, as several of you pointed out, this Sunday in the DeKalb Daily Chronicle, there was an article that I thought was very interesting and Dean Kitterle was quoted in that as well. This is what’s going to be happening soon so that’s what I’ve got to say. We’ll be meeting again at the end of this month and I’ll have another report then.

**President Willis:** Okay, questions or comments or anything for Pat? Yes?

**L. Kamenitsa:** Pat, when you mentioned this several times previously at University Council, President Peters repeatedly said “I’m not hearing anything about this, you know, my ear’s to the rail and I haven’t heard anything”. I’m wondering if you or anyone else has heard about his response to the Tribune article and the impending reality of this. I can ask him next week but I thought ---

**President Willis:** I have spoken with him about that and when he says he hasn’t heard anything, he means through formal channels. The IBHE is not going through the university presidents or administrations to do this. They’re going straight to the FAC which seems more than a little odd.

**P. Henry:** Actually, I think just this first report was from the FAC but they’ll be going to the university presidents, I’m sure now, as the actual question of productivity comes up.
President Willis: Yes, he doesn’t like it anymore than you’d think he would. Absolutely.

L. Kamenitsa: Has the president formulated any kind of coordinated response to this yet?

President Willis: Well, I think they’re waiting to see what the question is. We certainly have tons of data available. We’ve been doing this for years so I think it will be a matter of seeing exactly what we are asked and then formulating the most useful sort of response. Bill?

B. Tolhurst: I’m not sure I entirely understand this. I know that this is what Kaplan thinks and he’s the chairman of the Board but does he get to decide for the Board – does what Kaplan thinks determine what happens? I mean, how is this process really going to work; is there anything really officially in place or does the Board as a whole have to meet and decide what it will do or can Kaplan just do whatever he wants?

P. Henry: I think it was actually last Sunday’s article that mentioned LaVista is forming a committee; he’s the Executive Secretary. He’s not part of the Board; LaVista is part of the staff but the staff does what the Board asks them to do and my understanding from that article is that he is going to be forming a committee which, as yet, I have heard nothing about, to look into issues of productivity, priorities and accountability. That’s, I assume, coming from Kaplan.

B. Tolhurst: And he can do this without the approval of the whole board?

P. Henry: I think the Board has gone along with at least forming this committee. As to whether – what the implementation of that committee will be is, I think, not yet determined.

B. Tolhurst: So Kaplan can tell LaVista to form the committee and he does it without regard to – I mean ---

P. Henry: LaVista presented us to the Board and they approved it.

B. Tolhurst: What really confuses me is that it strikes me that Kaplan is something of a loose cannon and it’s not clear who he speaks for other than himself.

P. Henry: I think ultimately the disposition of the committee would have to be passed by the whole Board. At the last meeting, I know LaVista presented something to the entire Board as a point of information.

B. Tolhurst: So the committee will be composed of Board staffers and will act only as charged to act by the Board? Or they can do whatever they want?

P. Henry: No, I don’t think they can do whatever they want. I think they have to go back to the Board and say “this is what we’re going to do, okay?” and that will be then part of the next Board meeting’s agenda and they will have to – all of this of course then also ultimately, of course, it’s the General Assembly that has the money. I actually ---
B. Tolhurst: So as things stand now we cannot say with any certainty what will happen? That this process is not as if it were underway, right?

P. Henry: As far as I know, no. Still in formation. I did, in fact, go and bring the report that the FAC produced to Senator Burzynski and also Representative Pritchard, our new representative, and introduced the FAC concept and informed him that we’d be very interested in getting feedback as to how that was going over. I think that the other part of the picture, of course, is the Legislature and how ultimately this redounds to the budget. At this point, we don’t know anything.

President Willis: Yes, Mylan?

M. Engel: I’d like to follow up on Bill’s question a little bit. I’m particularly concerned with this one quote in the Chicago Trib article that “Kaplan suggests faculty should attend professional conferences on their own time”. I’m not quite sure what that means, since they often take place during the week, so I’m not sure how you could actually do it on your own time; or what he means when he says that going to these conferences and presenting and sharing in research, getting feedback on that research is not a form of public service so I’m wondering if you know what the general sentiment of the IBHE is in this regard since this is one of the major ways that many of us share our research.

P. Henry: Yes, that particular piece caught my attention as well. I’ve been doing this by e-mail; I think the FAC really needs to respond to this and come up with an op-ed piece or a letter to the editor or something that addresses this as a ridiculous thing. As far as I can tell in the context of this article, Kaplan was speaking only for himself there. I’ve not heard anything from other members of the Board that would go along with that and, I don’t know, it seems a little like perhaps waving a red flag or something just to irritate us which may be possible.

M. Engel: I think it’s really important because our current criteria for tenure and promotion make this one of the ways of showing that you’re sharing your research and have a successful research program and if it’s not going to be supported, or if we’re not going to be able to go during the regular work week and some of these other sorts of things, then it would have really broad repercussions throughout the university, even in terms of how we evaluate junior faculty and so on.

P. Henry: Yes, absolutely, and I think this goes to the fact that individual universities have different missions and universities with research as part of their mission have to make it clear that this research is not just one of those frills but is an integral part of what goes on at that university and what defines that university.

President Willis: Yes, I think that – let me just speak to that and then we’ll go on – I wouldn’t worry about that taking effect any time soon in reality. I do think it is indicative of a point of view which is not uncommon in this state, in particular in the Legislature and the boards and what not, that what the universities ought to be about is undergraduate education, period, and they view undergraduate education in general and productivity in particular as being class time. So if you’re not in the class then you’re not being productive and they’re not interested.
Obviously, that makes no sense for a research university. That has to be communicated somehow, which is what we’re working on.

**P. Henry:** That’s what we’re working on and in particular, I think, it’s very true that research has to be tied to teaching in the sense that there has to be a linkage that people can understand as least as far as that point is concerned.

**President Willis:** Beth?

**B. Miller:** That actually brings up my question. I’m wondering if he really has or if other members of the Board really have described their ideal university or their concept of multiple universities in the state and if part of this is trying to get them to explicate that a little more clearly, because it seems to me that what they are telling us is a lot of no’s and even in their description it seems they are somewhat hostile and raising a lot of red flags. Actually to say I think I am going to irritate people by saying this, including us, but I think they are saying a lot of things about no, but they aren’t saying what they want very clearly.

**P. Henry:** That’s a very good point.

**B. Miller:** And I think that as long as we try to talk to them about what they don’t want, we are always going to be playing this game of what we want/what you don’t want as opposed to talking to them about what it is that they envision a university to be. I think that they probably have some understanding of what a community college should be and what a college should be and what a university should be but they may not be able to be talking to us very clearly and they probably have some idea about what U of I should be and what all the other ones are and then maybe how they think about us, but if we take a slightly different tack, we might have a little bit better success in communicating that with them.

**President Willis:** Okay, thanks. Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** I agree with all that’s been said although I am perhaps a bit more dubious about whether they have any concept of whatever of what a university is, much less what it should be, but I think with regards to travel to conferences, it needs to be emphasized very forcefully that if they want good teachers, they want people who are current in their field and going to conferences is a good way to stay current in your field. So I think that to the extent that we want to emphasize this kind of activity we need to really push the idea. You expect your doctor to keep up with medical developments; wouldn’t you want your university professors to keep up with the current state of their fields? And what better way to do it than to go to the places where the kinds of things that you might want to include in teaching your courses at whatever level are going to be presented so that you can maintain the teaching level at your university? So I think it’s important not to just give the knee-jerk response that relates to the things that we care about, because we clearly do and should care more about research than they do, but recognize that there are other ways to defend what we’re doing some of which may be even more effective in this context.

**President Willis:** Okay, are there other comments, questions? All right, then we will go on.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

President Willis: The Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee has not met nor has the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee. However, the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee has met. Sara and Bev have a report.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – report (Pages 11-12)

B. Espe: Our committee had a short meeting before the BOT meeting in December. You’ll note that on page 11 and 12 is our report. Page 11 talks about some of the substantive legislation that has affected higher ed. Everything that is listed there now has gone into effect. There were three bills that went into effect as of January 1; you’ve heard about these bills in the past so I won’t go into any detail on them unless there are some questions. Then Kathy provided a report on higher ed appropriations and here again, you can read what’s there. I think the one thing that I’d like to point out, that she seemed to focus on, is that although we are seeing some revenue rebound statewide and nationally, the recovery in Illinois will lag behind any national recovery. Plus, where we’re seeing the increase in revenue is not necessarily in areas that are going to affect higher ed, and we can still expect a decrease. She was emphatic on that; I don’t think we know anything more at this point as Sue said earlier. We still don’t have any information concretely on how things stand.

The other piece of information that she provided for us was in regards to the College Affordability Index. This is an index that is going to affect all of higher ed, public, private – that states that if an institution raises tuition rates above a limit that has been set and they go beyond what was set, there can be sanctions and, of course, this is very controversial, has not been passed – well, hadn’t been passed as of then. I don’t know if anything has transpired now while we were gone so we’ll probably be hearing more about that also.

President Willis: Okay, any questions or comments? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Are there lists of senators or congress people from our districts or from Illinois that are involved in this committee – with the affordability – I mean, are there people we can write to? Do you know Sue?

President Willis: I don’t know right off the top of my head but I’m sure they’re available. Any other questions or comments for Bev? Okay, if not then we will go on to the Board of Trustees.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

President Willis: I will just give a verbal report. The full Board met on the 4th of December.
Most of the meeting was pretty routine. There were a couple of things that I did want to point out. One is that in the report given by the NIU Foundation, they have seen large increases both in amounts of donations and also in the number of people donating and so that makes them very happy. They suspect that a lot of that is probably due to the success of the football team because that got our name out and reminded people that they actually had gone there and they didn’t necessarily have to be embarrassed about it; that’s a good thing and they’re raising more money.

Let’s see, you may recall that last time we endorsed a memorial resolution for Dave Wirsing. The same resolution was also endorsed by the Trustees and they suggested that it be put on a plaque and mounted in Altgeld Hall because he was instrumental in getting the funding for the refurbishing of that building.

They extended the President’s appointment to the 30th of June, 2010 which he said he’s just thrilled about. They also voted to give him a raise. What they gave him was the same raise that everybody else got, 1.5% on July 1st and 1.5% on January 1st which, in my own personal opinion, is reasonable although I’ve seen some carping about it.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is that I did say to the Trustees that they might be interested in shadowing a faculty member around for a day just to find out what it is we really do, because even though they’re very much on our side, they really don’t know what we do all day. They were very interested in that suggestion, so I may be contacting some of you about that. I haven’t heard anything from them since then but I will remind them because I do think it’s a good idea. It was also suggested that they could shadow staff as well because not only do they not know what we do but they don’t necessarily know what admission counselors do or whatever. All right, so that was the meeting on December 4th.

The Executive Committee of the Board – this is the first time they’ve met since I’ve been here, I think – met in a teleconference on the 18th of December. The main topic of discussion was the replacement of the student system; they would like to move to step two of the acquisition of that system. There’s some time priority involved in this because there were some discounts and things; you had to shop by some date or it wasn’t 40% off any more and that sort of thing. So, they wanted to do it while the discounts were still available. The Board did approve that so they’re moving along with putting in the replacement student systems program which, as you may recall, is going to be from PeopleSoft. So, let’s see, does anybody have any questions? Yes, Carole?

C. Minor: Can you remind me what that system does? Is it a registration system or records system?

President Willis: It’s anything that involves students. It’s registration and records, it’s grades, it’s class lists, it’s just all of that stuff.

C. Minor: So we’re going to let PeopleSoft have that also?
President Willis: Well, there aren’t a lot of choices. I don’t think we want to do it ourselves. Our old one has to be replaced; it’s ancient and PeopleSoft, much as their business thing was tedious to implement - and I think part of that was because we were one of the first places that did it - their student thing has been around for awhile and so presumably most of the kinks are out of it. Other institutions report good results from it and poor results from other alternatives and so it looks like it probably won’t be all that bad a thing. Plus which it will interface with everything else which is nice. Okay, any other questions? Yes, John?

J. Wolkskill: Do you have a timeline for when that system would be in place and implemented?

President Willis: We do although it’s a little fuzzy at the moment. It depends on various things. It’s a couple of years, probably 2005 or 2006. Somewhere in there. There’ll be plenty of advance warning. Okay, any other questions? Okay.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs Committee – William Baker, Chair – The Academic Affairs Committee will meet on Wednesday, January 28, in Room 303 of the Student Center.

President Willis: Let’s move on to Reports from Standing Committees. Let’s see, Academic Affairs – Bill Baker asked me to put their next meeting date in here, which you can see. Bill, did you have anything else?

B. Baker: Yes, briefly to thank Senate colleagues on behalf of the committee for the overwhelming response on this matter and those responses have been forwarded to members of the committee and we will begin to discuss them on Wednesday, January 28 but we need to remind folks that this merely reflects Senate opinion on the matter.

President Willis: The matter being the grading system and if I might just add to that because it links up with the previous thing. The idea would be that if it is decided that a change is a good idea, the time to implement it would be when we switch over to the PeopleSoft system because at that time, we’ll be changing everything anyway. I’ve already talked to them and the incremental cost is likely to be very small if not zero because it’s a functionality that’s already in there.

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

President Willis: Economic Status of the Profession – oh, sorry Bill?

B. Baker: It’s been pointed out to me that if people, of course, want to send us more input, they are, of course, welcome to do so.

President Willis: Yes, and you can send it either directly to Bill or you can send it to me and I’ll send it to Bill. Okay, is that it? All right, Jim?

J. Lockard: Just a few comments here. In the discussion earlier with Pat and her report from the Faculty Advisory Committee, I heard a term that I thought somebody must have anticipated
my report and that was referring to someone as a loose canon and I’m here to talk about the Governor again. Anyway, just by way of a little bit of information, you can get from me or from Donna – is that all right Donna? Maybe you didn’t even get it. I forwarded a file to you this afternoon. At any rate, it’s a file that contains two news articles from just last week from downstate papers that you might be interested in. They go along with some of the things we’ve talked about in previous months related to economic issues as they pertain to us here. One came out on the 4th of January in a paper called the Southern out of Carbondale which has such key phrases in it as “state employee fringe benefits will be in the crosshairs during upcoming contract negotiations”. Huge surprise. Now this obviously pertains to the negotiations with AFSCME for the new union contract. As I’ve told you before, that does have an impact on what happens to us as well. The Director of the Budget, the ever popular John Filan, was quoted in the article as saying “pension benefits and health care insurance for employees are two of the four primary drivers of the state deficit”. So, how do you fix the deficit? Well, you fix the things that are driving it, I would assume. That seems fairly logical and, of course, they’ve reiterated the Governor’s original pledge that there shall be no increase in income or sales tax to help in any way to solve these problems. The union has pointed out to the Governor that they’ve already lost 10,000 people in the state employment ranks since July of ’02 to which the budget director replied “state government seems to be purring along just fine despite a reduced work force”. So, clearly fewer can do more. The possible bright side in that article is that it could be hot air coming out of the Governor’s office from the standpoint that the sixth largest donor to his campaign fund is AFSCME, the union and being no fool when it comes to money, he may be less inclined to tangle with the union for fear of what it’s going to do to his campaign fund if he does and if that should happen to be the case, we might come out better than we would think otherwise. The other article that’s included in here is from the Bloomington paper and it is an editorial as opposed to a news article. The headline given to it was “No Call for Outside Expert to Review Pension Funds”. You’ve heard previously as well, the Governor would love to get his hands on all the pension money and fold everything together. Given that our budget is in such wonderful shape, he’s proposing to go out and hire a bunch of experts to come in and study the pension funds to figure out how they can be made to work better. The State Treasurer is quoted in there as saying she thinks “the Governor may be trying to free money from the pension system to use for other things”. Interesting commentary. If you would like the whole articles, I have them and would be glad to give them to you by e-mail or if Donna doesn’t mind ---

D. Mathesius: If you get them online I’ll link them to the ---

J. Lockard: I don’t have them from that. These were forwarded as just simply text from the Annuitants Association. You can put the file up online for us as well. Thanks.

One other thing I should point out, our committee did meet just before this meeting and Frances here pointed out a very interesting thing, having taken the time to explore the Governor’s website. If you want to understand where he may be coming from when dealing with state universities, look at the fact of where he got his own education. He knows nothing about the public experience. Northwestern and Pepperdine.

President Willis: Okay, any questions or comments for Jim? All right.
C. Resource, Space and Budget Committee – C. T. Lin, Chair

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget. Is C. T. here? No report?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. No report

E. Rules and Governance Committee – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance? No report. Okay

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight committee – Stephen Nord, Chair

President Willis: Elections – Steven already did his thing.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform, from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (Pages 13-14)

This is a coalition of faculty senate representatives from Group IA, started by faculty at several BCS schools. They would now like to expand their membership, and are requesting that schools in the MAC consider endorsing the Framework. They are already using the Framework in discussions with the NCAA and its Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, the Knight Commission, and so on.

The Executive Committee presents this to the Senate for consideration. A majority voted to recommend endorsement, although doubts were raised about its potential effectiveness.

President Willis: All right, I have nothing under Unfinished Business but I do have an item under New Business. Page 13 is an Executive Summary of something called the “Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform”. Page 14 is the e-mail that they sent me saying would you please have the Faculty Senate look at this – we’ve asked you twice already – so I brought to the Steering Committee and they thought it could be brought to the Senate by the Steering Committee itself. So the Steering Committee voted; they all agreed to bring it. Everybody except one, I think, recommended endorsing it. They did want me to point out that not all of them were convinced that it was going to make any difference, but I personally think that it’s a promising step. This is coming from faculty senates. It has nothing to do with athletics, people who are administrative people or whatever. This is faculty. It was started by faculty in the BCS, Bowl Championship Series institutions; they know who they are. They started that themselves and then thought they would like to expand it to other Division 1A schools and particularly the MAC, which is us. They actually did write me earlier last fall but I was a little swamped with
other stuff so I felt maybe it could wait, but then they wrote again so I thought well, okay. Their framework is an outline of what they think would enhance the academic relationship between the university and the athletic teams while not cutting off either one of them. They have five topics there that they’re looking at. One is academic integrity, presumably all of you know what that is – but to admit only people who you think might actually graduate, don’t give them a free ride and things like that. Athlete welfare so that the non-academic time of athletics like when they’re training and practicing and all that kind of stuff, should be limited so that their academic side doesn’t suffer. Let’s see – governance, they suggest shared oversight of athletics between the faculty, athletics representatives, campus athletics committees and faculty governance which is us, essentially. Let’s see – finances, they think there should be more revenue sharing and that there should not be such a tight link between finances and whether you win or not because that distorts the whole business and then finally to avoid over-commercialization in athletics. So, that is this framework. What I would ask for is a motion to endorse it and then we can discuss it.

If we do endorse it, what does that mean? It gives us a seat at the table so our opinions are heard. It puts us on record as being in support of it. There is no big policy thing that’s going to happen here. We’re not obligating NIU to do anything. We’re just saying as faculty, we think that intercollegiate athletics needs to calm down on the athletics and money and commercialization side and do a little better on the academic side. All right, so could I have a motion to endorse this? A second? Okay, so it’s been moved and seconded. Discussion? Yes, Rick?

R. Orem: I don’t really have a problem with the framework. It seems very logical from the perspective of a faculty member in a mid-major school. I’d be curious to know how Cary Groth would respond to this as our director of intercollegiate athletics, just to get a different perspective on it because I think that faculty probably come at it from a very different perspective and I would be very open to hearing a different one.

President Willis: Okay, I have not spoken to her about it and I think the idea here is not necessarily to come up with anything that athletics or the administration is necessarily agree with straight off but just to inject a larger faculty voice than there has been.

R. Orem: I also get that, but reading down those and after coming off this football season and watching the bowls and watching to the reports of the salaries that some of these football coaches are getting – 2 million, 2.5 million, 3 million dollars – we’re in a different world. I don’t see how this is going to have any impact on business and football is a business and it’s entertainment but, again, I would probably support this but I just don’t know how important it is in the greater scheme of things.

President Willis: Well, I don’t either but I think it’s a good idea to at least say what is being said here and what these people are trying to do is not trying to convince one university to start changing because that will never happen – but to work with the NCAA and other organizations to try to get a uniform change because if anything is going to happen, that’s the only way that it’s going to happen. So, yes, it may be a futile gesture, but how many of those have we made? Bill?
B. Tolhurst: Yes, I just want to get clear on what we’re doing here. We’ve got a document. Is this a work in process that’s being developed or is this set in stone and we’re endorsing it as a whole?

President Willis: We would be endorsing it as it exists.

B. Tolhurst: Then what would we be involved in in the future? You suggested that by endorsing this we’ve gone on record as being in support of it and we’d have a seat at some table some place. What would those at the table do and why would we want a seat there?

President Willis: Well, those at the table would be discussing how to make this work, and we would not have to be there but we would have the opportunity. Yes, Mylan?

M. Engel: It seems to me that some of these goals are better than some of the others. I certainly, for example, am strongly in support of the academic integrity goal; we should not bring people in that have no chance of getting a degree. That’s just purely exploitative. But I’m wondering about the details say under finances, just what is envisioned under broadening revenue sharing and which universities are going to share revenue with which universities? Is it just going to be ---

President Willis: Well, I think they mean within the university, that athletics ought to share with academics for example.

M. Engel: But it’s important to know what that means because it could also mean that it doesn’t matter whether you get in a bowl or not but money generated by a bowl for a given conference will be shared equitably across all people, so I would want to know what they mean by broaden revenue sharing for one thing before formally endorsing it, I mean, since it’s ambiguous and, of course, what does this have to say about the other fact that the more successful your sports team, the greater alumni contributions. So there’s still going to be pressure to have highly successful sports teams and that’s going to be putting pressure on the commercialization side. The first three goals seem to me laudable, I’d like more details about what the second two goals exactly are.

President Willis: Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: I interpreted the finances and especially the revenue sharing maybe as having something to do with – some sports make money and some sports don’t and this has come into play with Title IX discussions as well in support of women’s athletics and whether you throw away your men’s swimming team because it doesn’t make money or something like that but yes, it could be a little more clear I suppose.

President Willis: Well, as I said, this is an existing document. I don’t think it’s written in stone and part of sitting at the table is further discussion and refinement of the details. I think they would keep the general focus – academic, integrity, athletic welfare, governance, some sensible way of dealing with finances and not too much over commercialization - but the details would, I believe, be subject to continuous reality checks. This is kind of a negotiating position because we
know we’re on one side and so then the hope is that somewhere we can meet in the middle without giving up too much. David?

D. Wagner: Do I understand that you are saying that if we accept this you will explicitly say in the letter that we wish to be considered and have the possibility of attending subsequent conferences? I sort of thought you said that.

President Willis: I think they would automatically assume that. I wasn’t necessarily going to volunteer.

D. Wagner: I think it should be explicitly in a letter then.

President Willis: I can do that, yes. ’I’d just say we’d like to be represented ---

D. Wagner: At least the opportunity.

President Willis: We would appreciate the opportunity to be represented at future discussions and what have you. Mylan?

M. Engel: I just wonder if before endorsing it, it would be possible to contact this person who e-mailed you, this Bob Eno, and ask him to clarify what’s meant, for example, because since there are a couple of different conceptions as to what revenue sharing might mean, if it means within the university, then I think it’s more important to get Cary Groth’s input because this could be putting controls over how – the things the director can do in carrying out her responsibilities. Now of course, I’m no fan of dumping sports that lose money. Fifteen years ago I was very active in the fight to save men’s gymnastics, a nationally ranked team that was cut so that we could add baseball, but these are some of the realities. So I would again be very curious about what is meant by revenue sharing before endorsing the proposal. Yes?

J. Lockard: I was just wondering, since this is listed as an Executive Summary, is the full document available from someplace perhaps that you would have time to look up?

President Willis: Yes.

J. Lockard: Maybe that would answer some of the questions.

President Willis: It’s actually not super long.

J. Lockard: When I read revenue sharing I thought we were talking about some more like major league sports do where within the conference, those who bring in more money would give us some or whatever.

President Willis: Okay, let me say a couple of things and then I’ll get back to talking to people. One is that we can certainly postpone voting until next time when all these things have had time to percolate and be discussed. I can e-mail everybody the full framework and not just the Executive Summary; it’s maybe six to eight pages and that’s not huge. If that doesn’t clarify
some of these questions I can certainly ask them. I can talk to Cary Groth and see what she says and e-mail you that and so on and so forth.

**B. Tolhurst:** Move to table.

**President Willis:** Postpone, you want to postpone – you don’t want to table.

**B. Tolhurst:** Whatever, postpone.

**President Willis:** Can we still talk about it? You don’t want to table it. That’s too complicated. All right, so it’s been moved and seconded that we postpone the vote, the whole thing.

**B. Tolhurst:** Until the next meeting.

**President Willis:** Is there any discussion of that. Yes, David?

**D. Wagner:** Would it make sense just to respond to him and say that we discussed it and postponed without any kind of decision?

**P. Stoddard:** Can we direct the chair to try to gather a bit more information from Mr. Eno and from Cary Groth perhaps about this?

**President Willis:** Sure, and I would like some guidance on exactly what information you would find useful.

**L. Kamenitsa:** Other people are going to say something before we postpone vote. I just wanted to point out in the letter on the back, they ask us to consider endorsing the proposal and its framework. It might be possible for us to endorse the coalition while expressing some reservations or questions about its framework for reasons I won’t go into because we stopped the discussion.

**President Willis:** All right. That would certainly be a possibility as well. All right. So why don’t we vote on whether we’re going to postpone the vote and then I suppose if people just want to talk. So, all those in favor of postponing until next time raise your hand. All those opposed? All right, so we will postpone until next time and on my list of information that you would like I have Cary Groth’s reaction, clarification on some of those issues, exactly what it means when we endorse it, the full text of the framework and what am I missing. Anybody have any other suggestions? Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, how set in stone this framework is and what they intend on doing with it once everybody endorses it.

**President Willis:** By the way, they did tell me that some universities have actually modified it so if there are parts of it we don’t like, we could do that. I would suggest not doing it in the full Senate. In any case, let me get this information. I will get it to you and then we can revisit it.
next time and see if that’s enough or if you want to have a committee look at it or whatever. Any other comments? Yes, Jim?

**J. Lockard:** I’m just remembering, Sue, that a number of years ago, this body invited Cary to come and talk to us about the status of intercollegiate athletics on campus, something I found to be very interesting. Perhaps this would be an opportune moment to consider having her come again.

**President Willis:** Good idea. I will say that also when I talk to her. Okay, any other comments or questions?

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

**President Willis:** Having reached the end of the --- oh, any random comments and questions from the floor? Those were pertinent comments and I guess these are the impertinent ones. Okay, if not I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Would everybody whose name got pulled out of the envelope come on up?

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council  
B. Minutes, Athletic Board  
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality  
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification  
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum  
F. Minutes, Graduate Council  
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council  
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel  
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.