
T. Smith attended for R. Butler; C. Peterson attend for G. Kim.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Bisplinghoff, Clayton, Cummings, Engel, Garcia, Ghrayeb, Goldenberg, Johnson, Kang, Kolb, Larson, Markowitz, Meganathan, Munk, Powers, Smith-Shank, S. Song, X. Song, Spear, Wade, Wang, Wickman, Willis, Wolfskill

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Lockard: What a feeling of power! I’ll call this meeting to order, March 3rd, of the Faculty Senate.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Lockard: May I have a motion to adopt the agenda please? Second. Thank you. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Thank you, the agenda has been adopted.

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2004 FS MEETING (Pages 3-5)

J. Lockard: Our next item of business is the approval of the minutes of our February 4th meeting, which you received in your packet. Is there a motion to approve? Bill?

B. Baker: There’s an issue, should I raise it now?

J. Lockard: Let’s get our motion taken care of first and then we’ll fix problems. All right? Move for approval? Second? All right, discussion, corrections? Yes?

B. Baker: Yes, page 4, section VIII “after some discussion, the motion passed” I would like the
word “unanimously” inserted.

**J. Lockard:** Can you do that, Donna?

**D. Mathesius:** Yes.

**B. Baker:** Thank you.

**J. Lockard:** All right. Are there any corrections? Yes, Pat.

**P. Henry:** This really isn’t a correction but the report that I gave for the FAC had a mistake in it that the Chair of the FAC wrote a letter about and that is now part of the on-line FAC report that I gave for that meeting. I just wanted to alert people to that.

**J. Lockard:** All right, so the on-line version has been corrected or amended appropriately?

**P. Henry:** Yes.

**J. Lockard:** Are there any other corrections, additions, changes to the minutes? I guess not. All in favor of approval of the minutes with Bill’s addition say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

The minutes were approved as amended.

**IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**J. Lockard:** Very little to add here but I will make two comments. Number one, Cary Groth was called away at the very last minute and is not able to be with us today. She has been rescheduled for the 31st, which would be our next meeting so plan on that. You’ll be reminded, of course, along the way.

The other thing that I will handle here as an announcement is to be able to share with you that once in a blue moon some semblance of sanity prevails in Springfield. It’s a rare day these days. Sue was scheduled to be away on our behalf in Springfield because of this idiotic bill to create a tenure commission that would overrule the universities as I read the bit of information about it. I just learned this afternoon that, in fact, the bill has been pulled and was not even brought up for discussion today so there is some small measure of hope that there might be one sane person left in Springfield. Other than that, I have no further announcements.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

**A. Nominations** for The Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award (Page 6)

**J. Lockard:** Point V on the agenda, items for consideration, you should have read in your packet the description of the Bob Lane Award. I think Sue did a very nice job of summarizing its history and where it stands right now. What was not clear from there is the process that’s
followed. We can certainly take open nominations from the group here today if anyone cares to do so, but the more typical procedure has been to send nominations to the Executive Secretary and the deadline for doing so this year is the 15th of April. So if you have any discussion of this award that you’d like to take up today or if you have a nomination that you’d like to make, we’ll certainly take that and pass it on to Sue for the processing that will happen later on but it does not have to happen at this particular meeting. Are there any questions or is there a nomination that you wish to enter today? All right and we have one more meeting at which to remind you if we don’t see things coming in so you’ll hear this again at the next Senate meeting. Be thinking about it in the meantime and looking at the description of what the award was created in recognition of and who you might care to nominate for that. I’m sorry, yes Beth.

**B. Miller:** It doesn’t say anything about the nature of the award other than the title.

**J. Lockard:** Oh yes, of course we don’t have one to show you here at this point but yes, Larry help me, who did the drawing?

**L. Gregory:** A student in the Art Department with John.

**J. Lockard:** A student in the art program did a nice graphic that goes along with it and it’s printed up on a certificate that is presented to the individual.

**B. Miller:** And when is the presentation made or ---?

**J. Lockard:** At the very last meeting, at the last Senate meeting of the year.

**B. Miller:** Is there any monetary award?

**J. Lockard:** We will be glad to pass the hat.

**B. Miller:** I’m just curious.

**J. Lockard:** It would be lovely but there never has been that I’m aware of. Yes, Larry? Can you ---

**B. Miller:** I just wondered because there was a mention of the other award that was never implemented and I wondered why it wasn’t implemented.

**J. Lockard:** That’s a good question. I frankly don’t even remember the other one being talked about until I read it here this time.

**L. Gregory:** The graphic is a card shark pulling an ace out of the bottom of the deck.

**J. Lockard:** Going back to the original title of the award at the Bottom of the Deck award – yes, it’s quite a nice graphic.

**L. Gregory:** One more thing. I don’t think we’re under any obligation to award one every year.
J. Lockard: I would agree, yes. Correct, if it’s appropriate, by all means enter nominations but certainly it would not be required by any means.

B. Baker: David Wagner apparently has information on the other award.

J. Lockard: That may well be.

B. Baker: His memory is rather phenomenal.

J. Lockard: The Camel’s Nose Award David, do you --- the Camel’s Nose in the Tent Award?

D. Wagner: Is that the same thing?

J. Lockard: Well, I don’t remember hearing about it before at all. Larry, you can help us on this one also? We didn’t award it because no one could draw a camel.

L. Gregory: I think David’s attended too many meetings and he’s had to put some of this out of his mind. The Camel’s Nose was just another favorite saying by Bob Lane and when chastising President LaTourette saying “well, you know, once the camel’s nose gets in the tent” meaning “once we let you get away with this, we know there’ll be more following”. Same thing with the Bottom of the Deck. It was aimed right at the President.

J. Lockard: Do you recall a plan to create two awards? I do not.

L. Gregory: No, I recall a discussion about which award but I don’t recall one where we were going to use both and it was the Bottom of the Deck that seemed to be the most appropriate.

J. Lockard: Yes, okay. I’m not sure how that helps us necessarily but at least we have the history a little clearer. Any other questions about that? Okay, thank you.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

J. Lockard: As I said previously out of order here we have no Consent Agenda for today.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in

J. Lockard: Reports from Advisory Committees. Pat?

P. Henry: Yes, the walk-in here – and this is my fault because I got it to Donna very last minute – has three copies of the first page rather than one copy of the first, second and third pages, so if you think we’re being a little like ground hog day in this meeting, that’s why. We really did do other things on pages two and three; I’ll talk a little bit about that in some detail and then – Friday, will it be on the web, Donna? Thanks.
We met at National Lewis University in Chicago. Very nice place, I might add, in the People’s Gas Building, which is really cool. We had a brief discussion about a number of things under item one there especially NLU. They had a concern about the MAP grants, which have recently been, I think, redefined by the Governor as being structured with a fixed amount rather than an amount that’s depending on the tuition of the institution – this disadvantages the places with higher tuition in the private universities. Not so much the public universities but it is a concern. There’s also questions about whether early retirement would be a good thing to push as a way of dealing with the budget crisis and the general consensus was for some yes, for some no. There would be good parts and bad parts about this and we will perhaps be able to come up with a position paper that would sort of spell out the fact that this is not a one size fits all situation. Dan Layzell who is the IBHE Deputy Director for Planning and Budget, was available for discussion of the budget and for answering questions, and you see the highlights of that listed below. One thing in particularly, bullet point number two, got my attention and I honestly don’t know how this works at NIU so someone may be able to enlighten me here. Apparently part of the budget, the IBHE budget - which, by the way, the IBHE wants to stick to but it’s not clear it will be able to - there’s matching funds grants that have been in the IBHE budget. The Governor’s budget gets rid of those, and several of us were pretty concerned that this really is killing the goose that lays the golden egg because if the federal grants require you to have matching funds and you can’t have matching funds then it really cuts down on the amount of grants that you can get. It’s not clear to me, not all places get the monies from the state, and yet at least the preliminary discussion was that mostly the U of I and Northwestern and the University of Chicago were the big players in this in terms of getting state money for matching grants and I don’t know, where does NIU get its matching grant money when you have to match the grant? I know that the university comes up with the money. I don’t know where it comes up with it but if it comes up with it from the state, it’s not going to be able to do that any more. Anybody have a point of information on that? Anyway, it’s worth keeping in mind for those of you who have applied for grants that require matching funds.

The other was the part that got my attention the most. Indeed, there is consistent erosion of state funding and just exactly at the time when we don’t need it. These are real concerns in terms of whether we have the infrastructure to support the things that we need to support.

Now, this ends the part that you have a paper trail on. You can tell what’s coming with my table of contents at the very top. Part three concerns the business meeting. The Quality Committee had a position paper on general education; what this has to do with, primarily, is articulation, and it was adopted or supported by the FAC. There were nine people who voted against it including me and the reason I did is that it seemed to be setting things up in a rather strict way. This is, of course, advisory; it’s not the law anywhere. The concern is that general education courses that people take in community colleges, when they try to transfer them to four-year institutions, there’s often a mismatch. There shouldn’t be a mismatch but nobody’s quite sure how to get around this; my personal feeling is that it needs to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, there has to be some advising, and sometimes if people take a course that according to the rules does, in fact, fulfill a requirement, if they go in to the second level of that course, whatever it is, they may still be in for some rude surprises if they aren’t properly counseled. The guidelines that the position paper is proposing, which, in general, I do agree with, are that there should be a
representative on the General Education Panel of the Illinois Articulation Initiative that should reflect the full range of undergraduate academic programs offered by participating colleges. That a student who completes a gen ed course at a participating Illinois Articulation Initiative institution that meets the institution’s general education requirement, shall be deemed to have met that segment requirement at other Illinois Articulation Initiative institutions whether or not the student has completed an associate’s degree. That the general education program in each participating institution should be such that each student must complete some courses offered in academic programs other than those in their general area of study. This is to encourage breadth and diversity. Institutional representatives on the General Education Panel should be selected for a term of three years and that representation should alternate between the academic programs that comprise the traditional liberal arts and those in the other academic programs proffered by the institution. They have also listed a number of standards and guidelines which I think don’t differ widely from what is already in place for the Illinois Articulation Initiative - that individual institutions’ missions should be respected, should not promote a standardized general education in all participating institutions, should promote the goals of the Illinois Commitment, and so forth. When you get a chance to look at that on-line you can offer me further comments. I think this was the first draft. Those of you especially who have a lot to do with articulation, please contact me. Indonesian, I’m pretty much the only one in the state who teaches it so I don’t have to worry too much articulating with anybody. I hear things.

Okay, the other thing that was proposed is that the Public Policy Committee which is a committee I’m a member of, was to look at getting some sort of lobbying day for faculty for the FAC. Speaking as faculty, not as necessarily representing any given institution, we have people at our various institutions who do that and the administration and so forth but it’s felt by many members that there are some concerns that are true of faculty across the board whether they’re at four-year, community colleges or privates or whatever and that it would be useful to have yet another perspective speaking to the legislature about this so we’re going to look into that.

The fourth element in the meeting was Dan LaVista who is the IBHE Executive Director. He basically came in to get yelled at, and discussed the difficult situation that the Board is in walking a fine line, being an advocate for higher education but also being sensitive to the Governor and the legislature. Again, keep in mind this is the staff of the IBHE, not the IBHE. The IBHE Chair is Mr. Kaplan who has not been terribly popular with the FAC and many other people. The staff of the IBHE is working within the framework, and having quite a time with a smaller number of people working for them. They’ve been fact finding, trying to understand what’s going on and trying to maintain the integrity of the budget as it was proposed by them. They also mentioned that this House Bill 4073, which Jim just mentioned as having been pulled, is totally bad news and they really didn’t want to have anything to do with it. They were very negative too. So now it’s gone.

Another issue that will be coming along is the discussion of faculty productivity. On April 13th the Chairman will appoint a committee to review the missions of institutions of higher education. After this review, the committee will have gained insight into faculty rules and we hope the FAC’s report, of which I have talked much, will play a role in this. It will parallel the administrative review that was undertaken earlier. On March the 13th the presidents, the Board presidents, will be apprised of the results of administrative reductions, then April 13th we’re
going to start talking about the missions of institutions of higher education, thinking specifically in terms of faculty productivity. I think earlier I did give you the framework that was in the IBHE agenda. Just very quickly, this is a framework for reviewing priorities, productivity and accountability – PPA. Our system of higher education faces significant challenges. These challenges cover many areas including fiscal, demographic and so forth and so forth. The item which, again, is available on the IBHE website, outlines an additional initial framework for considering and addressing these challenges in a systematic and comprehensive manner and so the idea is to look at the priorities. Basically, the IBHE has the levers of planning and policy development, budget development and accountability system development; they will work within this, but that’s what ultimately going to be done by this committee as it’s formed in April. Just a little side note, what was mentioned is that there’s a company called Accenture – is anyone familiar with that? Actually it was earlier Arthur Andersen Consulting, which doesn’t argue well – and they have something called a public sector value model and this may be one of the kinds of things that will be brought into the discussion as a way of looking at what’s working and what’s effective and so forth. We’ll keep you posted.

One more thing – the legislature is not completely clear because the ethics legislation still stands and as it stands, I think we discussed this briefly, this has come across on Tom Paine and other places – presumably it does call for us to really keep track of time in a way, time on the job, that we have not had to do previously. The IBHE and others are looking at how this will be implemented and everybody realizes that this can very easily become totally ridiculous. But yes, non-union faculty are supposedly going to be required, according to the ethics legislation, to do something more detailed in terms of timekeeping. We don’t know what yet. That is what I had.

J. Lockard: Yes, Joe.

J. Stevens: Another part of that story outlined along with keeping track of time for – and then it said “excluding some contractual university employees” that wasn’t specific. But there was another part mandating ethics training to be completed by the end of May. I thought you might be interested in hearing about that too.

P. Henry: It is interesting. We didn’t hear anything more about that.

J. Lockard: Give Bill that microphone. Thanks.

B. Tolhurst: I had a question about the articulation. I think previous issues involving articulation typically involved counting courses taken at community colleges toward particular majors; this gen ed articulation initiative sounds different. One of the problems that I think is an issue for many of us is that many departments have 300-level general education courses. We have a Philosophy of the Arts course, which is useful for people in PPA. Again, even if there is an aesthetics course given at a community college, it’s not supposed to be at a level for which it would be appropriate to grant 300-level credit, so if you just articulate the community college course into our course and if that’s mandated, we’ll be being forced to give upper level credit for courses that aren’t really upper level even though they may cover somewhat the same material.

P. Henry: Oh, I see so they could be ---
B. Tolhurst: So that’s why someone else would be concerned about this.

J. Lockard: Larry?

L. Gregory: At the IAI, at least in art and I think it’s the same for all of them, the AIA committee may approve a course or a course description for a lot of reasons not necessarily to transfer to the four-year schools, you still have to indicate how it will transfer to Northern so, for instance in the case you cited, Bill, we could just simply say sure, that’s what they said but we’re not taking it. We have the full control at the receiving institution. However, once you indicate that it does articulate or transfer, and in that case they use the word substitute, this is done automatically by admissions and you don’t get a chance to look at it before the student is already in your classroom.

B. Tolhurst: I was aware that when it was sent to the department we had control of it, and we would never articulate a lower level course into an upper level, but I wasn’t sure exactly what’s going on that Pat was talking about, because it sounded as though something was happening at the IBHE that would facilitate this process. When you hear processes being facilitated, you fear us getting cut out of the loop and them deciding for us and that was my concern.

L. Gregory: You definitely have to keep your eyes open and watch these things; we do it through the Transfer Center with Missy Gillis.

P. Henry: And don’t forget this is simply advisory to the IBHE, and they manage to ignore us quite a lot of the time.

B. Tolhurst: Well this is something that people that are advising them need to be aware of.

P. Henry: I can make your point.

J. Lockard: David?

D. Wagner: I vaguely remember reading in the newspaper that the Governor was suggesting that enrollments at the high-price universities be limited and the students sent off to universities where the cost was less. Was that ever discussed?

P. Henry: I think that’s in connection with the MAP grants, the Monetary – whatever that stands for.

J. Lockard: Monetary Award Program.

P. Henry: Monetary Award Program, thank you, whereas before, again, my understanding is that if you were going to Northwestern or somewhere, you would come up with an assessment of how much it would cost you and the MAP award would be granted on the basis of that, so you’d get more money than if you were going to NIU. Now you will get a fixed amount of money; you can take that money and go to Northwestern or wherever and pay for a quarter, or you can take it
to NIU where it will pay for a year. There is a case to be made for the fact that this is narrowing the options for students who need monetary support.

**J. Lockard:** Yes, it’s been a controversial topic in other states that I’m aware of as well, where they do help support the attendance at private institutions and should it be a fixed amount as he’s suggesting now or on a sliding scale as it has been. Yes, Joe?

**J. Stevens:** I might point out that around eight or ten years ago over 50% of that money was going to private universities so this seems as more of a support for public education. Public education in Illinois is cheaper, so you get a fixed amount?

**J. Lockard:** I’m only recalling what I read in the paper at the time but it seemed like they weren’t talking about a change in the amount they paid but rather redistributing so if they didn’t give as much to private school students they would have that available for additional awards and it seems to me the talk was of a thousand additional awards but I don’t remember seeing anything about the total dollars involved or whatever so I have no clue as to what a thousand is worth and how big a help that would be. I don’t know what percentage of students here even get those awards much less throughout the whole states.

**J. Stevens:** I’d like to see the number of MAP grants going to public institutions to more than 50% and it hasn’t been previously.

**J. Lockard:** But you don’t have current figures either? I have no idea what it is. It would be interesting to know.

**P. Henry:** I’m sure those figures are available.

**J. Lockard:** Probably the Financial Aid Office here can tell you something about it at least.

**P. Henry:** I’m sure.

**J. Lockard:** Any comments or questions on Pat’s report which you want to pursue further?

**P. Henry:** The complete version, not the oral version, will be available on Friday.

**J. Lockard:** On the Faculty Senate website?

**P. Henry:** On the Faculty Senate website, right.

**B. Miller:** The April 13th IBHE process you mentioned – that’s going to have a pretty significant impact on us. Do we have a plan as faculty on how we will respond?

**P. Henry:** This is that large report that the FAC put out last semester. What the FAC is pushing for is that the complexity of faculty rules must be taken into account at the individual institutions. We should not be pushed into a simplistic model of “teach one more class”. I think it will ultimately affect us and I think it is a good thing to think about it.
B. Miller: It does occur to me that the timing of it coming in April before we’re out the first of summer ---

P. Henry: My understanding is that in April it will be just beginning its role to review the missions of institutions of higher education. The FAC actually meets through June but yes, it does seem to be the kind of time that things could happen and nobody would really notice until – surprise! – next fall. Hopefully, that will not be the case.

B. Miller: Who’s going to respond to the plan, I guess, is my question. Is this ---

P. Henry: I think individual institutions certainly will be responding to it. The FAC, I’m sure, will be looking at it very carefully and putting its point of view in. I think it’s one thing to look at faculty as one big group which do have some things in common, but each institution is going to have different perspectives on this in terms of what the expect in research and teaching and service of the faculty. I think it’s very important that individual institutions be getting their feedback; I’m not sure what the mechanism is for that bit I will try to find out.

B. Miller: I just have this slight fearful scenario coming to mind over the summer that there’s going to be a plan coming out; there’s a dearth of faculty and it just kind of seeps through the campus. Then we come back in the fall, there’s this thing that we have to respond to; it just took over a life on campus that ---

P. Henry: I would be very surprised if anything moved that quickly but it’s not outside the realm of possibility.

B. Miller: Well, we have a Chair of the Board of IBHE who is not unopposed to making comments over Christmas break and using the media to lambaste us when we are not around to defend ourselves so ---

P. Henry: I will pass this concern, which I think is a valid one, on to the FAC. We will make every effort to keep the ---

B. Miller: Not just the FAC, I think, the Faculty Senate; it’s coming out in April and that just ---

J. Lockard: I think your point is well taken, Beth. The PPA is bigger than just the faculty. Its productivity and accountability and something for the entire campus which to me makes that an excellent question to raise in two weeks at the next University Council meeting. The President, the Provost and so on need to be involved in this as well. It’s going to have to be an institutional response not just a faculty response, not just an administrative response. We can see to it that that point gets raised at the University Council meeting as well to see what, if any, thinking has gone into that already. I think we’ve got good defenders there in that regard.

B. Miller: I think the Faculty Senate need to be prepared in some way – to be prepared to work on it over the summer if necessary. I’m new to the Faculty Senate and I don’t even know if I’m staying long but whatever ---
J. Lockard: Yes, you’ll be here.

B. Miller: I think I’m just filling in but I think ---

J. Lockard: You don’t get away that easy.

P. Henry: I think e-mail is something that we can make use of in this as we hear things. We can certainly pass that on.

J. Lockard: The Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Senate over the summer as well so that’s another small group at least that is potentially available to react or proactively go after something depending on what is going on. I quite agree with Pat that past history would suggest that nothings going to happen quite that quickly but you’re right, Kaplan is a different case than what we’ve had in the more recent past. Who knows. Let’s see if the President and Provost have got insight into this as well and find that out ---

B. Miller: I also raise – maybe this is not exactly the right time – but I also was one of the representatives who met with the NCA accrediting team at the faculty open meeting; they didn’t have a clue when I met with them at the end of the first day that Kaplan had been talking about us in the context of being unproductive. After reading the assessment and the committee report I raised that and just said, we appreciate your comments about us being a great faculty and all, but we’re working in this environment right now. They were a bit shocked when I told them about some of the comments, and some of the other faculty that were there also raised that issue to them. So this is the milieu in which we are now working; they were quite surprised that the person who’s supposed to be our champion is saying this about us as faculty. That does change the way we are productive. They asked us if we felt as if our administrators had a plan for us, and I don’t know that we know that they do. I’m not saying that they don’t, but I don’t know as faculty that we know that they do, so when you look at April coming and a program coming out, a new program coming and summer coming and next fall and someone saying well, keep up with your hours to which I say fine, I’m more than happy to, bring them on ---

J. Lockard: Where have I heard that before?

B. Miller: Bring them to my class and I’ll keep up with my hours, but I keep saying, let’s see what the plan is and share with us what it is, or what are the open lines of communication; maybe it is clear in the University Council but it’s not clear to us in the Faculty Senate.

J. Lockard: Well, it certainly isn’t clear in the University Council at this point. We’ll see what we can learn in two weeks for a lot of these things. Yes?

L. Gregory: I just want to second some of their concerns. I am on the University Council and repeatedly when Pat brought this over the fall, President Peters, who I think has very good intentions in this area, kept saying don’t worry, this isn’t going to happen, don’t worry this is going to go away. I’m not hearing anything about this and it’s not yet gone away so I too am wondering if the Faculty Senate wants to have our own plan in place to respond. I think he will
take this more seriously but for a while, at least, I had the sense it wasn’t really on his radar screen.

**J. Lockard:** You may be right.

**P. Henry:** Just to respond a little. I think two things. One is that the IBHE had just mandated inspection or cutting of administrative bloat that went on previously; it will be interesting to ask President Peters and others in the administration as to how that worked out because that may be the model for what’s happening with the faculty. The other thing is that I can’t agree with you more about keeping the communication open both within the university and to the IBHE. There is a member of the Committee, Ken Andersen, who is going to be in touch with the FAC as a member of the FAC; one of the things we want to clarify to them through him is the need for transparency, because nothing is more demoralizing than having these strange systems just fall out of the sky on top of you. It’s very bad for faculty morale to be judged in that way, and I think they should know about that.

**J. Lockard:** The one thing that I think we could do at this point today, if that is the desire of the group, would be to entertain a motion to ask Ngoyi’s committee, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, to look into this and begin to develop a response on our behalf. It would seem to fall to that group as our committee structure is set, but that’s up to you. If there’s a motion, I’ll entertain it. If there isn’t, we’ll move on.

**B. Miller:** I so move.

**J. Lockard:** Second. Okay. Discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Ngoyi, your committee needs to meet. We can talk with Sue when she gets back as well. Okay, thank you.

The motion passed.

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

**J. Lockard:** According to the schedule here and what we’re aware of at this point, there are no reports from any of the Board of Trustees. Bill, is that right for your report?

**B. Tolhurst:** No meeting, no report.

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

**J. Lockard:** Same for Finance and Facilities. Xueshu are you here? I don’t think he’s here, anyway we know there wasn’t any report there.

D. **BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – no report**
J. Lockard: Bev, nothing on your end.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

J. Lockard: The Board itself has not met at this point so that’s fine.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

J. Lockard: We’ll move on to reports from Standing Committees. I was asked by the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee to announce and/or remind you that that group needs to meet immediately following this meeting here in this room today. You have business to attend to.

A. Academic Affairs Committee – William Baker, Chair – No report

J. Lockard: Bill, you have no report. Correct?

B. Baker: Correct.

B. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Jim Lockard, Chair – No report

J. Lockard: I have no report from the Economic Status.

C. Resource, Space and Budget Committee – C.T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 7)

J. Lockard: C.T.?

C.T. Lin: Our report is on ---

J. Lockard: Could you get a mike so we can all hear you?

C.T. Lin: We had a meeting on February 18; the report on page 7 was written by Bill Goldenberg, Chair of this Committee from the University Council. I just wanted to point out a couple of points that may be of interest to everybody here. One of the points is that Provost Legg expressed great confidence in our current leadership in this area of Resources, Space and Budget including President Peters and Vice-President Williams as well as Vice-Provost Schwantes and he says likes this so-called decentralized NIU administrative system in which the deans of the college retain most control of funds. Then he pointed out that the central administration is trying to encourage a policy for hiring 2 assistant professors when senior professions retire instead of getting 1 senior professor at a higher salary. Point number four is that he summarized the budget cuts which shows that in the Provost’s Office, the absolute cut is 13% this year and non-instructional support is 4.5% and the academic colleges is 3.2%. He is also concerned about the declining number of tenure/tenure track professors and the rising numbers of instructors. One item of good news is because of the anticipation of a possible mid year rescission, NIU has reserved 3% of the budget. It appears that now it looks like there is no rescission and so the 3% will be channeled back to the deans. Hopefully, we’ll hear something about that.
One of the very interesting things also is that last year we had a four-day summer work week which is still under consideration because last year’s four-day summer work week has saved almost $300,000 and the committee members encouraged our administration to inform the university community as soon as possible in order that planning can begin for the summer.

Finally, on April 14 we have a meeting and Chief Grady is going to come and talk to us about campus safety. Thank you.

**J. Lockard:** Are there any questions for C.T. on this report? Sure, Frances?

**F. Jaeger:** I just have a question about the policy of hiring 2 assistant professors to replace each retiring senior professor. Since when has this been implemented?

**C.T. Lin:** Well, I have no idea.

**F. Jaeger:** Because we just had a retirement in Spanish and if they could hire 2 assistant professors it would help us.

**C.T. Lin:** The information here is to encourage the policy of hiring that so, you know ---

**J. Lockard:** John?

**J. Engstrom:** As a retiring senior professor, I wish I made twice as much as junior assistants. I don’t think that’s going to work.

**J. Lockard:** A very interesting point. Yes?

**J. Stevens:** I think the key word there is encourage. When we replaced senior professors, I can’t remember the last time we got two for one.

**J. Lockard:** I think most places would be thrilled if when 1 senior goes, 1 assistant gets hired if you’re lucky. Yes, exactly. It sounds good if you can hold the Provost to that. Absolutely, we’ll call him as soon as we get out of the meeting here and ask him where it is. David?

**D. Wagner:** This one about the developing concern at the declining number of tenure track and raising numbers of instructors, is there any exact numbers that make explicit what the decline is?

**C.T. Lin:** Again, I don’t have a statistical data for this but he did mention about that. So if you want, we can go back and get the statistical data.

**D. Wagner:** How do we get the statistical data?

**C.T. Lin:** From the Provost’s Office.
D. Wagner: Could we ask for that?

J. Lockard: Of course, certainly.

D. Wagner: I move we ask the Provost for specific numbers.

J. Lockard: I don’t think we even need a motion for that. We can get it. That should not be a difficult thing to get our hands on. It just needs to be requested. Other questions/comments? Yes?

B. Miller: I would like to ask him to comment about that issue of hiring 2 professors in place of 1 and about his policy. I don’t know that we all see that actually happening and he might encourage it, but many of us feel like we’re not getting 1-for-1 right now and it would be nice to know when we’re going to get that 2-for-1.

J. Lockard: I think you’re quite right. The only thing that seems to be increasing around here is the number of students. Everything else is in decline.

B. Miller: And I think particularly in light of his concern about the other issue ---

J. Lockard: They do seem to be a bit in conflict with one another, don’t they?

B. Tolhurst: I’d like to concur with that opinion both because it seems to me that in many cases if a department has been subject to cuts, there are retirements where people haven’t been replaced at all. It’s questionable whether they need two additional people. Secondly, where there are so many senior faculty retiring it’s going to be occasionally necessary to hire a senior faculty member to retain the strength of the department; it’s very unclear what this policy is supposed to do, how it’s supposed to do it and announcing it with this considerable lack of clarity is going to do more to make people nervous than to help reassure us about anything.

J. Lockard: First thing that would come to my mind is that is has no necessary connection to departments at all. One loss at the senior level in a college might somewhere be replaced by 2 others but it might have nothing to do with the department in question. Paul, I think you were next; then we’ll get to Parviz.

P. Stoddard: I was at the meeting and it certainly was my impression that this was not an official policy of any sort. The Provost was simply indicating that one way to gain savings is to hire junior level faculty to replace senior level faculty. I think the number 2-1 probably was thrown out there as a number to deal with; he said this in the context of trimming the budget without cutting into the meat, just trimming fat. He said one of the ways we can get savings again is by hiring junior levels instead of senior levels. There was no intention on his part to say that well, if you lose a senior level we’ll get 2 junior levels to replace them.

J. Lockard: I’m sure you’re right, but it’s cheaper yet not to replace the person at all or to use an instructor. Absolutely. Parviz?
P. Payvar: As I understand, the official policy has always been that even if you have a retirement or resignation, and you want to fill the so-called vacancy, you have to search all over again, fill out a justification form about why you need to hire at all. I’m not aware that that policy has changed.

J. Lockard: I think you’re right. Quite so.

P. Payvar: That’s the current policy as I understand it.

J. Lockard: It sounds more like a warning to departments to not think automatically that a senior person gets replaced with another senior person, but we all know that an awful lot are not being replaced at all. That’s just the way it is at the moment. Other questions or comments for C.T.? Okay, thank you.

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

J. Lockard: There is no report from Nguyi today. Is that correct?

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

J. Lockard: Gretchen I didn’t see today but we had no advanced word of anything from there.

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

1. Nominations for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – See list of University Council members eligible to be elected (Page 8)

J. Lockard: Steve Nord, we have a little business to do here.

S. Nord: Do I need to speak into a mike?

J. Lockard: If you would.

S. Nord: All right, as most of you know, Sue Willis was not re-elected to the University Council which is a necessary provision to serve as the president to this body, so what we need to do is open the floor for nominations for people who might serve as the Executive Secretary/President. If you turn to page 8 of the booklet of our agenda, there’s a list of eligible faculty. Sue Willis, obviously, the second name from the end needs to be omitted. Donna is there anybody else that ---

D. Mathesius: No.

S. Nord: Everyone else I guess is eligible. The nomination needs to receive a second and, of course, the person being nominated will have to accept; the election will take place at the last meeting of the semester. So I move that we open the floor to receive nominations for faculty to serve as the Executive Secretary/President.
J. Lockard: Steve, you’re running things here so ---

C. Booth: I would like to nominate Paul Stoddard who’s had considerable experience on the Senate and on the University Council and certainly I think will do a very active and conscientious job.

S. Nord: We need a second.

J. Stephen: Second that nomination.

S. Nord: Any other nominations? Yes?

B. Miller: I would like to nominate Carole Minor from the College of Education.

P. Henry: I’ll second that. I can also speak to the fact that I have been on a committee that she has chaired, and she’s done an exemplary job.

S. Nord: Any other nominations?

B. Miller: This is just a point of order question. Are these nominations only made in the Faculty Senate, or are they also made in University Council?

S. Nord: Good question, Donna, I think just here, right?

J. Lockard: Only here.

S. Nord: Any other nominations. We have but two. Yes?

J. Kowalski: I would nominate William Tolhurst.

B. Tolhurst: I’d like to decline.

J. Stephen: I’d like to nominate William Goldenberg. I’ve worked on numerous committees with him before but he’s not here today, I don’t think.

W. Tolhurst: I would second if he would be willing.

J. Lockard: Since he’s not here we’ll have to check with him after the fact.


J. Stevens: I move the nominations be closed.
J. Lockard: All in favor? Opposed? Very good. All right, we have a slate of three candidates then for the election assuming that Bill Goldenberg is willing to stand. Otherwise, a slate of two. Excellent. All right, thank you.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. A Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform, from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (Page 9)

J. Lockard: Unfinished Business was the discussion of the Athletics – oops – I’m sorry, Beth?

B. Miller: I’m sorry, I don’t know how this is normally done but could I ask that the candidates put forth some information about themselves before the election?

J. Lockard: Donna doesn’t have a mike there but nomination letters will be in next month’s packet.

B. Miller: Thank you.

J. Lockard: Which hopefully will answer your question. Okay, and those who’ve been nominated should start writing their campaign materials today. Just no screams please. All right. The Athletic issue was the other part of the agenda and it was really tied to Cary’s visit which did not work out for today. If you’re interested in discussing anything related to the Athletics Reform material we’ve had for two months now, I believe, before us we certainly can; otherwise I’ll assume that will be a major part of the next meeting in hopes that Cary will be available at that time for us. Any further discussion on that for today?

X. NEW BUSINESS

J. Lockard: If not, is there any New Business?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Lockard: Are there any comments from the floor? Any questions?

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

J. Lockard: Is there a motion to go home?

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.