
K. Judson attended for G. Gordon.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Butler, Crisler, Cummings, Frank-Stromborg, Garcia, Ghrayeb, Johnson, Kahn, Kang, Kim, Kolb, Larson, Markowitz, Meganathan, Payvar, Robertson, Smith-Shank, X. Song, Spear, Wade, Wang

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: First could I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed no? Okay, we have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 2004 FS MEETING (Pages 3-6)

President Willis: Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of – yeah, sorry. Second. All right, that was for the minutes, right? Are there any changes or corrections to the minutes? Try to say them in complete sentences if you have them. Okay, if not all those in favor of approving – oh, sorry. Could you get a mike please?

J. Wolfskill: On page 3 under adoption of the agenda, the text reads “selections of the committee members to evacuate the Executive Secretary”.

President Willis: Donna was out of town; what can I say. I’ll fix that. All right, any other corrections? My fingers have a mind of their own apparently. Okay, all those in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed no? All right.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: Let’s move on to President’s Announcements. There are a few things that I wanted to say. One is with this athletics issue that we started discussing last time. I have asked Cary
Groth to come but unfortunately she’s out of town this month or at least today so she’ll be coming to our March meeting so I would suggest that it would make sense to postpone discussion or decision on that issue until that time. She will be bringing John Rental with her also who is our NCAA faculty representative so they should be able to answer any questions. I also did get e-mail from the people who are putting together this “coalition” which I forwarded to all of you. There was one phrase which I pointed out to you which says “many of the senates that have formally joined the COIA so far have specified that they endorse the framework only in principle and that this does not mean agreement with all points. This is precisely what we interpret endorsement to mean and we feel it is the right basis a national faculty coalition aiming to accomplish practical results.” Okay, so we can, when we get to that, endorse it in principle, namely the idea of the thing without being persnickety about every single detail because those are still to be hashed out anyway.

All right. I have included on the last page the mean ACT scores for incoming freshmen for Fall 2003 and Fall 2001. Fall 2003 is separated by CHANCE and non-CHANCE. For 2001 I did not but in any case, David has been asking for this for a long time so there it is. I have to apologize for not putting it in sooner. I had apparently gotten the Fall 2001 data and in doing archeology on my desk it turned up but it really was dated like September 14, 2001 so it was probably fluffed. Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: I’m wondering about the size of the sample for the CHANCE report which I am certain is much higher than 417. You’re low by more than 100.

President Willis: That was the number they gave me.

J. Wolfskill: It’s wrong, dead wrong.

President Willis: Do they all take the ACT?

J. Wolfskill: That I don’t know.

President Willis: That’s what they gave me. This is entering freshmen. It may be that there’s more data coming in later or maybe they all don’t take the ACT. I really don’t know but that’s what they gave me. I would think it would be a representative sample in any case. Okay. So in any case, feel free to look at that and if you would like to discuss it we can do that under Comments and Questions.

The last thing I wanted to point out to you is that it is getting to be that time of year when we need to elect a president of the Senate and executive secretary of the Council. If you look on page 10 you will find all the people who are eligible to serve. There are a number of us with little asterisks there that say if re-elected to the University Council, we will know that before nominations have to be made. Anyway, what can I say, that’s the people. So one of these people is going to have to do it. So be thinking about that. All right.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

President Willis: I have no other announcements and I have no items for Faculty Senate Consideration or the Consent Agenda to let’s move to reports from Advisory Committees.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in
President Willis: You should have found a walk-in from Pat Henry at your place. That’s her report.

P. Henry: Thank you. This is a report from last Friday’s meeting and there are four major items that I’ll just run over real quickly. It was basically, mostly, an informational meeting since at that point actually the IBHE agenda with information on the budget and the Employee’s Ethics Act, which were two things that we were pretty interested in, had not actually come out so we’ll talk about that a little bit but that was mostly actually after the meeting. What we had at the meeting was two state legislators form the district around South Suburban College, Senator Crotty and Representative Davis both of whom had had some experience especially Senator Crotty who had previously been a representative and had been on the Higher Education Appropriations Committee for several years. It was a very interesting discussion. Basically, the FAC sort of wanted to present the faculty view as opposed to the view from sort of the official university view or the IBHE view and we felt it was a useful exercise and the people thought it was educational as well and expressed interest in possibly continuing this kind of informational meeting. Not that university presidents and so forth do not present a good view of the university to the legislature but it is, I think, sometimes useful to have the faculty perspective sort of more directly and the FAC may continue trying to present that. As far as the IBHE as mediator between faculty or universities and the legislature, it was very interesting and very educational to find out that in fact The Illinois Commitment, which has been a big fat thing as far the IBHE is concerned, wasn’t really registering that much as far as these legislators were concerned. They in fact weren’t terribly clear on it and they didn’t seem like stupid people so that raised some questions. The faculty productivity activity concerns that were the source of a lot of angst and perhaps unproductive verbiage was also not something that really registered on them. I mean, they were not aware of there being a crisis of not enough faculty productivity that needed to be addressed in any way. Actually, this isn’t too surprising because I think this does basically sort of come from the Governor and the IBHE rather than anything directed from the legislature. Just a note in passing that the Tribune article that we were talking about the last time that was so unpleasant really didn’t please a lot of the IBHE members as well although Chairman Kaplan was the one who was really quoted extensively there. We hear via unofficial sources that this was not the view of the entire IBHE and to some extent this may be dying down as far as real big concerns, however, there will be an ongoing committee and I’ll talk about that in a minute.

The second half of the meeting was a presentation by Dr. Paul Ligenfelter who’s the Executive Director of the State Higher Education Executive Officers and this was a presentation, which I can make available to anybody who’s interested by the way. There’s a Power Point presentation that I can pass on and a paper from which I quoted a little bit there at the bottom of the page and the top of the next one. Essentially his point was that we are sort of involved in a perfect storm of increased demands on higher education, very little chance for changing the tax structure and helping out in terms of money. His line of approach to this was to try to work together as much as possible with government to be creative in our approach to this versus just holding the fort because he feels there’s just not really any way that’s going to change anytime soon so I think he made some interesting points and we had some good conversation but I think that’s sort of the bottom line.

As I mentioned, the material on the budget and other stuff came out on the IBHE website. I’ve given you some links to that. The FAC has some concerns. If you’re interested in seeing the budget itself there’s also a press release that I quoted a little bit from sort of giving the basic numbers. Again, this is what the IBHE is proposing. It’s not clear exactly how much will be coming after the legislature gets hold of it but one thing of local interest that I just pointed out is that they’re proposing $476,000 for baccalaureate degree completion in business Rockford through Northern Illinois University and Rock Valley College.
Another item of interest and this was sort of new to me is that because I just haven’t been paying attention – is that the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act is apparently something that the IBHE feels needs to be addressed somehow more directly. Provisions for documentation of time worked, for travel reimbursement, for compensation and benefits – the FAC has some concerns that this is going to mean more paperwork and we’re hoping that it doesn’t.

Finally, concerning The Illinois Commitment, this is a matter that was actually discussed yesterday at the IBHE meeting and the FAC sort of tried to reposition what we’ve been talking about as the “seventh commitment” talking about contribution to enhance quality as being something a little more sort of over-arching to which all the other goals contribute to try to get out of this box of having it be something that’s really hard to evaluate and we also note with interest that the legislature may not be that aware of The Illinois Commitment.

The next section there is then the comments that will have been made by this time by the FAC representative to the IBHE meeting and I’ll sort of let you look over those at your leisure. One thing that – the very first item, or actually the second item, - faculty representation of Board established committees – there is in fact, back to the productivity issue, there is going to be a committee that will look into the new PQP which of course now is PPA (Priorities, Productivity and Accountability). We’ll try to get quality in there somewhere and the IBHE sort of informally – or the Chair asked Ken Andersen who is a member of the FAC a former chair, he’s from the University of Illinois, Champaign/Urbana, a very able person, someone that the FAC thinks would be a good member of that committee. The FAC kind of wished that we had asked first instead of just being sort of have it happening all by itself so we’re going to bring that up and who knows.

The budget recommendations again the FAC has some concerns and I won’t go over those in too much detail but I think wanting a more transparent presentation of the budget requests is one of the main ones and again suffering the ongoing reductions and rescissions just completely make things difficult for everybody and there’s no end of things you can say about that.

The ethics legislation again, we’ll sort of mention something that hopefully will not mean a lot of paperwork and – oh – and then the 4th item on the last page there is a sample letter from the FAC Chair, Alan Karnes, that’s he’s written to his legislators and he is urging members of his Faculty Senate at SIU Carbondale to contact their legislators with their concerns and suggests that others do the same so I thought I’d include this as just sort of a jumping off point for people who might want to contact the legislature directly and raise concerns about the budget and other matters. The one thing – just to get back to the meeting we had with Senator Crotty – was her observation that probably the best single thing faculty can do to really educate and get legislators on their side is to have them on campus and this would not just be the people that are representing this area, Representative Pritchard and Senator Burzynski, but to the extent that we could make contact with people from our students’ districts and invite them on campus and let them see what it is we actually do. She felt that’s a very useful way of sort of dispelling the image of unproductive faculty members sitting in their ivory tower not paying any attention to students, which is the sort of thing that tends to bubble up from time to time. That’s it.

President Willis: Okay, any questions for Pat? Yes, David.

D. Wagner: I don’t have a question. I just have a comment. Under number two there is a reference to Ligenfelter’s belief that there’s an environment resistant to tax increases. I know that is the conventional attitude and I know our president continually refers to it. I’m not convinced that it’s true and I’m not convinced if it is true that the university should not make a determined effort to
change the environment. I can, you know, there was a meeting of the Women’s League of Voters I think at which the recommendation was the necessity of raising the income tax which is the clearest, easiest solution to the whole problem. If not raising the tax, at least making it less regressive and I do think that, you know, that’s what our effort should be is to change the environment about tax increases.

**P. Henry:** Can I respond just quickly? Several of us have brought that matter up too that even if we, you know, whatever – we cut everything back there still would be not enough money and that really that needs to be looked at. His sort of point was that to the extent that universities at least that they’re cognizant of the fact that there is a problem and that are willing to try to sort of help from their end. This would be a means of hopefully getting the legislators to do their bit and be more open to the possibility of tax restructuring. So, he didn’t see them as mutually exclusive.

**D. Wagner:** I just think if the function of the university is to educate not only students but more generally and if, you know, we could do it without advocating just as an educational approach to examine the resources that are available.

**J. Stephen:** The link here shows that across the state we’re losing – a decrease of about 110 million dollars a year to state-supported institutions. How much more willing can we be to show our part.

**P. Henry:** Yes, I agree. I guess maybe just being more emphatic. At least I think the FAC’s approach has been to try to point this out that yes, we are doing a lot more with less even as we speak.

**President Willis:** Okay, other comments for Pat? Just to comment on Dave’s comment, it seems to me it really doesn’t take a whole lot of education to figure out that if you already have a deficit, you cannot cut taxes and increase programs without having a worse deficit. But people still keep running on those kinds of platforms so.

**P. Henry:** And they get elected.

**President Willis:** What can I say? I believe that none of the Board of Trustee committees have any reports being as they have not met. They’re scheduled to meet in March. So let’s move then to Reports from Standing Committees.

B. **BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee** – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no 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 – no report

E. **BOT** – Sue Willis – no report

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Academic Affairs Committee – William Baker, Chair – [report](Page 7)

**President Willis:** Academic Affairs, Bill Baker.
**B. Baker:** May I ask colleagues to turn to page 7 and I think I’ll read it out if you’ll bare with me. “The Committee met on January 28th and discussed the grading issue. Many responses were received and there was an overwhelming consensus and interest, throughout the university, in favor of change.”

“The Committee recommends that the Senate make a strong recommendation (I would like to insert the word “very” strong recommendation) to the University Council that this issue be addressed, and that a more finely divided grading scheme be implemented. The obvious time to do this is when the new PeopleSoft student system is installed; at that time we can have whatever system we want, but changes afterward are likely to be more cumbersome.”

“The Committee had no recommendation for the exact system to be implemented, but would not like to see that issue bog down the whole decision.” So we employ colleagues to come to a resolution today and a strong recommendation to the University Council that this issue be addressed. Thank you.

**President Willis:** Is that a motion?

**B. Baker:** Yes.

**President Willis:** We have a motion and a second. Discussion? Yes, John.

**J. Wolfskill:** Bill, can I ask you were any representatives from Registration and Records available to address the issue of whether the new software system would be able to handle whatever scheme we dream up.

**President Willis:** Maybe I can answer that. I spoke with them and they said as long as you could represent the grade by a number it was fine.

**J. Wolfskill:** By a number in what format?

**President Willis:** I didn’t ask what format. I assumed a floating decimal but ---

**J. Wolfskill:** How many digits can we have here?

**President Willis:** They did not specify the number of digits. You know, it’s a 32-bit computer or something. There are a lot of digits.

**J. Wolfskill:** So what – the reason I ask is that I’ve seen Registration stonewall on issues far more minor than this. Whatever policy is, if they say they can’t or won’t do it then it doesn’t get done.

**President Willis:** I’ve spoken to them and they’ve said they can and will do it and, in fact, I’ve spoken also with the President and the Provost about this and they have said effectively that when we make the change to the PeopleSoft system, that decision will be made, okay, because that’s part of installing the thing is that you have to decide what kind of grading system you’re going to implement. So if we want to have something to say about that, we ought to say it because – unless somebody else is going to make the decision.

**J. Stephen:** When will that be installed?
President Willis: Well, that’s a good question. Sometime after Altgeld gets finished but --- I believe it’s scheduled at the moment for either 2005 or 2006 but it’s subject to many bumps in the road. I keep reading about Oracle and PeopleSoft for example and I have no idea what that means. So --- all right, any other discussion? All right, all those in favor of making this recommendation to University Council say aye. Opposed? That was easy. Did you have anything else Bill?

B. Baker: I would just like to thank the Committee and the colleagues whose enormous impact from university - so I would like to thank everyone for that. It’s clearly a hot button issue raised by our historian over there. Thank you.

President Willis: Rick?

R. Orem: When this goes over to the University Council, I’m sure that people are going to ask what was the consensus or was there a consensus view of the Committee and you’re saying no, that there wasn’t in terms of specific changes, but was there a sense with you guys as to what was preferred?

B. Baker: Yes, I think, unless the Committee would like to contradict this, on the whole there appeared to be a consensus in favor of the Wisconsin Madison system although there was some slight disagreement over that.

President Willis: That’s the AB, BC system?

A Senator: I think that on the whole while people I would prefer this one or this one, there was also people who said whichever one was accepted, I’ll go along with. So while you might have had a personal preference; I think they just wanted a more fine way to grade their students.

President Willis: Yes, David?

D. Wagner: The Wisconsin system only has an A/B and B/C. It does not have a C/D so the Committee I think recognized two systems. One would be pluses and minuses and one would be slash grades and, you know, we didn’t make up our mind.

President Willis: It’s not up to us anyway. I’ve been doing a little research on this and I believe the appropriate place for this to go is to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and to the Graduate Council because they are the committees who decide things like grading issues. They did the last thing on pass/fail grades anyhow. So, that seemed appropriate so I can certainly pass it on to them with information that we got and all that sort of thing.

B. Baker: Could you alert us please to the progress of this now that it’s gone out of this body? Thank you.

President Willis: Yes.

B. Miller: I wanted to say too about the A/B system. The faculty that I was in contact with, many of them had never heard of that system so I think that one of the reasons that I think our Committee might not have felt comfortable pushing one plan over another was that we would have felt uncomfortable without a certain amount of education about one plan over another. You know, I think any kind of switch would require that – the value of one over another – would require that kind of – how it’s going to effect people, in which ways and you know, what would the actual grade point average numerically be. These are details that I think would have to be worked out in a lot more
detail. Clearly, the people wanted more gradation and flexibility. That was the overwhelming concern.

**President Willis:** Which is why we said what we did. Right. Carole?

**C. Minor:** In my department there was one concern expressed about the plus and minus system and that was the having of the A+ and there was pretty much consensus that was not desirable.

**President Willis:** That’s another detail that would have to be worked out. I think, you know, the idea of having some gradation in between A, B, C, D is what we are urging whether there’s an A+ or whether it’s just A/B, B/C or whatever. All those are details, so the impression that I got when talking to Registration and Records and the people who are doing the PeopleSoft is that we can have whatever we want. As I said, as long as whatever we want can be represented by numbers. I would not encourage numbers that had more than one or two decimal points to them but what do I know. So we can decide what we want. We, meaning the university and the appropriate committees. Okay, anything else on grading? Yes?

**D. Wagner:** Let me just say, I was on the University Council 30 years ago when we adopted the system and it was introduced by Frances Stroup and I’d just like to mention his name that he was one of the ones that initiated this a long, long time ago.

**President Willis:** I actually meant to go ask him about it but I forgot. He’s still around. All right.

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

**President Willis:** Moving on then, Economic Status of the Profession. Jim?

**J. Lockard:** Thank you. The report that I’ll share with you today I’m going to have to do orally because I didn’t have a chance to get it all written up in time. I’ll give a copy to Donna for the records and you can get it then or I’ll be glad to share it with anybody in advance if need be.

I have a number of things I want to call your attention to. First of all, for all of you who’ve ever wondered “what did I do with my annual benefits booklet because I need to look something up”, just moments before coming over here this afternoon I learned that it is finally in electronic form and on the HR website. So if you need to refer to that document, go to the HR website, click on documents up in their little menu area or bar at the top and you will find access to the entire thing there which should be quite helpful for people who, like me, never know where the print copy is.

The second thing I would like to offer to anybody who needs it. If you did not follow the stories in the *Tribune* of late, there was a particularly troublesome one on January the 31st that ties into some of Pat’s report previously about the Governor’s latest shenanigans with retirement systems or at least what he would like to try to do. I can give you the entire article. If you wish to I can share that with Donna as well to have available there. There’s a lot to it. The bottom line is something along these lines at the moment. The FY05 budget deficit is estimated at 2 billion dollars and, perhaps totally coincidentally, the FY05 state obligation to pay into the pension plans is 2 billion dollars. Gee, if we didn’t have to pay the 2 billion we would be almost in the clear on the deficit and I suspect that is sort of the mentality that is raging in Springfield at the moment despite the fact that the Governor used our pension problems as a primary justification for borrowing 10 billion dollars last year which was going to solve all of this or so we were told. Beyond that, what they’re looking to do is, for lack of a better term that I can think of, accounting trickery. We’ll recalculate everything. We’ll say people are going to work longer and live shorter and be healthier and whatever and just change all the
assumptions and then the state won’t have to kick so much money in. All of it has no bottom line effect on us because the pensions are still a part of the constitutional guarantee that we have here. All it amounts to is pushing it off on another generation just like we keep hearing about the problem in Washington. We will get our money. The question is will it come out of funds that are there to support it or will it come out of tax dollars when the time comes. Interestingly enough, of course, the way that you address an issue like this is what Mr. Filan, the Budget Director, has done and that is he’s gone out and spent a bunch of money to hire outside consultants to come in and tell him how to do it, so that was very encouraging. There is no information at this point in time because nothing has really happened yet in terms of negotiating with the new union contract and what effect that might have on our benefit situation here. However, you may have noticed something that is quite interesting and apparently does not affect many or perhaps any of the employees here at the university but there are apparently quite a large number of state union employees who for a number of years have paid nothing into the pension plan. They got their whole contribution covered as a part of a deal over no raises several years back. They are still paying nothing, the state is paying the whole thing and the governor has suggested that maybe it is time for them to start paying again. On the other hand you can imagine the unions did not jump for joy at the suggestion that this might happen again and since the are major backers of the governor chances are that it will die quickly – a quick death in Springfield.

Beyond that a few other things that are on the horizon for you all to make note of. March 24th is the date of the annual Wellness Fair in the ballroom of the Student Center here from 10:00 to 4:00. Apparently they’re going to once again be offering free massages and other generous benefits of that sort. That’s your pay raise for this year so get over there. Then if you still want to bet on the roulette wheel of SURS, the pre-retirement workshop all day session is Wednesday, the 31st of March and for that you must be registered in advance. You can do so again on the HR website in their training area. They have all kinds of information pieces there on various things. If you’ve never gone to it, having done so myself several years ago just out of idle curiosity, I would strongly recommend that you try to do that if you can. It’s a very, very enlightening day with sessions on everything from tax ramifications to setting up trust funds for the grandchildren. You name it, it covers a heck of a range of things and is really very, very well done with a lot of folks coming in from the outside to donate their time to talk to you.

On a small but pesky note for some people, you may have heard – they’re saying that the technology surcharge that went into place on campus effective in the summer was also being levied on employees who took courses. That led to quite a few protests and in response to that the President’s Cabinet added the technology surcharge to the list of fees that are waived for employees retroactively. So anyone who paid it in the summer or fall before it was waived should, in fact, have already received a refund. If not, they need to look into it; that shouldn’t be the case.

Next to last point. You should be getting an e-mail in the relatively near future alerting you to an open enrollment period for a new voluntary supplemental long-term disability insurance plan. From the way this was described by the people in Human Resources, it should be of particular interest to our newer colleagues because it builds on the plan that’s already in place through SURS. The point that you may want to share with any of your recent additions to the faculty is something that I was quite unaware of until this came up and that is that in the first two years of employment under SURS, the SURS disability coverage does apply if you are disabled due to an accident but not illness and this is a plan that can bridge that gap for people in those first two years in addition to whatever else it might have for value. I don’t know anymore than that but, by all means, pay attention to it when it comes and alert your newer colleagues that this may be something – that there’s a gap they don’t actually realize exists in the benefits that they have right now.
J. Stevens: Jim, you said we’d get an e-mail about that?

J. Lockard: Yes. HR indicated it would be coming to everyone as well as mass e-mail announcements they put it. It didn’t say exactly when.

Finally, the last one should be of no concern but because you may something about it somewhere along the way, let me just mention it very briefly. There is another proposal afoot at SURS for a change in the way the high four years for retirement purposes are calculated. The information at this point is very incomplete. It involves such things as changing the base on which the calculations are made to coincide with the SURS year as opposed to the academic year which might have a small impact somewhere along the way but according to the information I was given, they believe the primary effect is as intended and that will be on the community colleges. The whole thing is tied up with something that again, was news to me but apparently the community colleges – some community colleges – better be careful, they didn’t try to indicate who – but some community colleges have been playing some games with salaries for employees in the last couple of years and has just been beating the daylights out of SURS. The report suggests that it’s not unheard of at all but in some of the community colleges that people their last four years will suddenly see their salaries double in that amount of time and that’s having a very negative impact, especially – and it’s considered to be quite unfair when it has nothing to do with additional work requirements, additional responsibilities or anything else but just simply a game being played to benefit people at the end and so there are some things going on but that’s the impetus for it; it’s not that there’s a problem at our level but rather something that’s been going on in the community colleges and if it comes out right apparently it should hit only them.

President Willis: Okay, Bill?

B. Baker: Could I ask Jim for clarification concerning this supplemental long-term disability plan? Documentation in fact I have in front of me. Could we deal with those who are not new employees here – what is there to our advantage? Does this offer anything that is not covered elsewhere? Because what you just said was a bit confused.

J. Lockard: Having not seen it Bill I don’t have any idea. I wasn’t aware it was out yet so I have not seen it. I can’t tell you. You’d have to look at the benefits booklet I believe to see exactly what SURS provides and then look at that plan to see how much it would supplement over and beyond that. If I remember right and it’s totally off the top of my head, the SURS disability is a percentage of your earnings and it may be that through that plan you can enhance that with additional income per month. I don’t really know but when this was announced to us by the HR folks that they felt that the most interest should be among those folks in the first two years who had no protection at all for something related to illness.

B. Baker: No they don’t, so it kicks in after two years.

J. Lockard: Yes, that’s right but it’s still a percentage. Minimum disability if I’m remembering right out of SURS won’t come anywhere close to paying you 100% and so the question is is this a way of building some of that – taking care of some of the difference between whatever the SURS amount is and what you normally would receive.

B. Baker: Would it be too much for us to ask – I don’t know if it’s in your bailiwick – if you could investigate this and get back to us? Would that be in order?

B. Baker: I think we have to reply to this. I think we have to return it to the insurance office by February the 29th so the next Senate meeting is going to be when?

J. Lockard: After that.

President Willis: March.

B. Baker: Would it be possible to e-mail and to circulate it to members of Senate.

J. Lockard: Sure.

B. Baker: Would that be possible?

President Willis: Absolutely.

B. Baker: Thank you very much.

J. Stevens: Jim? I think we also have an optional plan that we could have enrolled in about three years ago. Could you include comparisons with how this would add if we’re already enrolled in that?

J. Lockard: Okay.

President Willis: Okay, other questions for Jim? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Just concerning the pension funds. Was there anymore – I looked at that article but didn’t see any mention of threatened combining the universities with others. Is that still around?

J. Lockard: There is nothing in the article related to that but yes, what we hear back from HR primarily from the state level that this is not something that the Governor is going to let go of. He’s going to continue looking into it and apparently the plan – it actually sounds like it might be even worse than what I had originally anticipated because the discussion last week at least in the media was that what he really was aiming at was to take all of the money from all the five pension plans and put it into that State investment pool. I’ve forgotten the exact name of that. My vague recollection is that that pool has performed so badly Eddie Williams refuses to put any of the university’s money into it. Of course, we do have some other options. At one point I thought he was saying just combine them and we’ll do something like the five have done independently but the State pool is something even different from that and apparently worse yet.

President Willis: Okay, are there any questions? All right, thank you Jim.

C. Resource, Space and Budget Committee – C. T. Lin, Chair- no report

President Willis: Okay, Resource, Space and Budget has no report.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair – no report

President Willis: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities I believe also has no report.

E. Rules and Governance Committee – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report
President Willis: Rules and Governance, no.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight committee – Stephen Nord, Chair – no report

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight, no.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: I know of no Unfinished or New Business so I would entertain Comments and Questions from the Floor at this point. Yes, David.

D. Wagner: You did say this was the time to comment on the ACT thing I believe.

President Willis: Yes.

D. Wagner: I just noticed there’s, you know, been no effect on the ACT scores with the increased enrollment. At least it didn’t go down but basically it hasn’t changed. I do know that ISU somewhere in a pile I have a report that they, you know, used the increased enrollment to raise their ACT about a point or something like that and I’ve said this before but it seems appropriate to say this again that, you know, I would think the fact that the ACT hasn’t changed is sort of disturbing.

President Willis: I think things like that are being considered but have not yet been implemented. There are strong feelings among parts of the campus that – to remain as open as possible to as many students as we can but, of course, we’re bursting at the seams if we haven’t already burst yet so that’s an obviously way to limit enrollment.

D. Wagner: Wouldn’t this body by the appropriate place to discuss that at the very least though?

President Willis: We could certainly discuss it.

D. Wagner: I mean if there’s a lot of discussion going on we should be involved in it.

J. Stevens: I see nothing wrong with our ACT for our non-CHANCE students.

President Willis: Okay, any other comments or discussion? If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Bill, what? Oh, you’re adjourning are you? All right, see you in March.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Letter from Sue Willis announcing the procedures for electing the Executive Secretary, with a copy of the Bylaws and a list of who is eligible (Pages 8-10)
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
E. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
G. Minutes, Graduate Council
H. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
I. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
J. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
K. Report on ACT scores (Page 11)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.