
T. Smith attended for R. Butler; M. Barnes attended for K. Kahn; L. Jeris attended for A. Rose.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda? All in favor say aye. Opposed?

The Agenda was adopted.

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

President Willis: Now to approval of the minutes from – apparently March 3. Other than that, are there any corrections or additions or changes to the minutes? If not, could I have a motion to approve? Second? All in favor say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Gip Seaver will attend to discuss enrollment management.

President Willis: Under President’s Announcements, you can see that Gip Seaver is here and he is going to be talking about enrollment management. Before he starts there are a few brief things
that I would like to say. Bill Tolhurst has asked me to announce that the Faculty Grievance Committee will be meeting directly after this meeting right here, so just don’t leave. We are still taking nominations for the Bob Lane Faculty Spokesperson Award. We would like those nominations by the 15th of April so we can confirm this award and hand it out at the final meeting. Let’s see, you should have gotten or should be getting shortly sheets where you put in which committee you would like to be on and if you could send those back at your earliest opportunity that would make all of ours lives much simpler. Let’s see, at our last meeting, which is April 28, I have asked Steve Cunningham to come and talk about SURS and PeopleSoft and various things. He is very happy to do that, unfortunately, that is the date when our budget hearings are in the statehouse so he will not be able to attend but he will be happy to send probably Deb Haliczer and perhaps somebody else to address the various issues. If, of course, the hearing does get changed which it very well might, then he’ll be coming himself. So if any of you have questions you would like to ask or if your faculty have some things that they’d like asked, if you could get those to me ahead of time that would help so I can give him a heads up and he is able to look up what he needs to look up. Finally, just a brief update on workplace issues. This is a longstanding thing that I’ve been looking into really since I started here. The issue of treatment in the workplace, particularly for staff. As faculty, we’re relatively immune to that sort of thing because they can’t threaten not to renew our contracts or fire us or whatever. I mean, they can but we all know how hard it is whereas staff, particularly non-unionized staff and supportive professional staff, can be laid off very quickly and so that is a real threat and so there’s an issue of how people are treated in the workplace. I have been for the last, probably two and a half years, gathering information about that and I’m still waiting for my magic wand so that I can wave it and make it all better but I have talked to Ken Davidson at some length and he is very much appalled by the things I’m able to tell him. For the most part, when people are in particular difficulties I tend not to get a lot of detailed information which makes it essentially impossible to follow up on, you know, if I don’t know what department it is. But when people have been willing to talk to me, I have been able to go and deal with those individual situations and generally, if I lean on people, they tend to respond fairly well and, of course, the other thing is that I have high hopes for the new grievance procedure should it ever become enacted, that that would address many of these problems as well. So, unless I get my magic wand in the mail soon, it’s going to be a slow process but I hope we can continue to shine light on that. I think that itself helps.

All right, and then just one last personal note before I introduce Gip is that this is my father’s 83rd birthday. I called him up this morning and he said that in May he’s going to drive out here from New Jersey and visit. No, it will be later but, no, he’s very healthy and in good shape and he’s the only family member I’ve got left so it’s good to know he’s doing well.

So, okay, without further ado, I will introduce Gip Seaver who is the Vice- Provost having taken over from Bob Wheeler after many extensions of Bob’s tenure. I’ve asked Gip to talk about enrollment management because I was getting the impression from people that that was something about which people did not really know very much so I’ll turn it over to Gip.

G. Seaver: Thanks Sue. I asked – the note from Sue said general review – what are we doing now, what will we do in the future – and that was about it in terms of coverage so I’m not really sure exactly what it is that you would like to know. I can certainly talk to you about what has
happened since July 1 when I took the position of Vice-Provost. I can speculate a little bit on what’s happened in the past; probably only as a trying-to-be-informed faculty member, but I can certainly talk about what we are doing now for Fall, 2004 and I can also talk about what are our plans are for Fall, 2005. Obviously, we do admit students at other times of the year but nobody seems to really raise their hand at a meeting and say “what are we doing about Spring?” or “what are we doing about Summer?” so Fall is usually the one that’s of major concern.

Let me talk to you a little bit about what we’re doing now for Fall, 2004 because that’s the – there’s been little bits of information. The President did come to you at the beginning of the year and kind of talk about where – what was the status of our enrollments for this semester and, as you know, we were up over 18,000 undergraduate students and up a little over 25,000 total students. Late last summer/very early fall we in the Provost Office established an Enrollment Committee. Now, prior to this year, late summer/early fall, there had been an ad hoc enrollment committee which was used by the Vice-Provost in particularly but also the Provost Office to monitor pretty much what was going on in enrollments. That committee was made up – it’s a very large group and I still meet with them on a monthly basis – it’s simply is represented by all of the offices that report to the Vice-Provost through Registration and Records, Admissions, Student Financial Aid, Honors, Scholarships. It also includes Housing and some other areas in the student services side as well. But as we went through this last summer and we went through looking at the enrollments that were facing us for this coming fall, the Provost Office decided to set up a smaller enrollment management committee to address first what we were going to do for this fall. In other words, Fall, 2004 – this coming fall. That committee is made up of the Provost, I chair the committee, Frederick Schwantes, Vice-Provost for Money and Space – that’s not really his title but we all know it’s money and space. Frederick Schwantes is there, Bob Burke, Director of Admissions, Don Larson who’s the Executive Director of Enrollment Services, LeRoy Mitchell who is the Director of CHANCE and Joe Cruse who’s the Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. That pretty much makes up our committee. We do have the ability to bring in other people and we have been meeting on about a monthly basis but now, once we have started to move through various landmarks during the year, we’re meeting a little less frequently and as we now get a little closer to May, and I’ll talk about the significance of May 1st in just a minute, we’ll start to meet on a pretty regular basis. But that group basically – the first goal of that group is to review what happened in terms of enrollments for Fall, 2003 and then to set parameters and targets in enrollment for Fall, 2004. So we discussed those as a group. We did bring the President in and talked to the President about our thinking about what our enrollment target should be for Fall, 2004 and came to an agreement as to a number we could tell admissions that we wanted to work with and that number was to include what we thought the number should be for undergraduates, primarily on campus, but also kind of a target figure for overall. However, realizing that in my office, the Vice-Provost’s Office, I’m only concerned, or I deal, strictly with the undergraduate piece of it. The Provost has been very adamant that for Fall, 2004 our undergraduate number should be 18,000 and if we can be a little under that, that would be fine but – and that’s about 239 or 240, depending upon, if you use the official ten day count, I have two numbers; 239 and 240 or, excuse me, 2,239 or 2,230 somewhere in there – as to what that number might be. To get to 18,000 and looking – the other part was to talk about what our mix might be in terms of, obviously in the Fall, we need to be concerned about incoming freshmen as well as transfer students, and the targets of 3,000 incoming freshmen and about 2,000 to 2,200 transfer. I should also say sitting on the Enrollment
Committee is Dan House who’s Director of Institutional Research and you can hardly do any of this without combining data from Dan House and Bob Burke based on past experiences. In their looking at previous data sets that we have, that the feeling if we’re around 3,000 freshmen and we’re somewhere between 2,000 and 2,200 transfer students, that that would translate into just about 18,000 students. Maybe even a little less, which is what the Provost’s feeling that if we can come in 17,800 to 18,000 that would be fine. So those were the numbers that were given to admissions and that we wanted things done that would allow us to get to those numbers. Now, part of the problem we’ve had at Northern which you’ll all remember is that we’ve been pretty much a free and open society as it relates to admissions. In other words, we will pretty much take applications right along, admit everybody and then we’d hope to get to some number based on what the show rate was. Well, obviously it doesn’t take rocket science to figure out the last few years it’s been very high demand and many more people have shown up at the door over the last couple of years so part of what – as you remember for last year, this incoming last fall, we did put a cut-off date in terms of applications. We did put in a minimum GPA for under 60 credit hour transfer students. In other words, anyone who had less than 60 hours as a transfer student could not – we would not admit them if they had a GPA under 2.5. Okay? So anybody who was going to be transferring after one year, you know, less than 60 hours, they had to have an accumulative GPA of 2.5. That would control that group and it has. It has really limited the number of students who have transferred here under 60 hours. Later in the summer, we also put on a cut-off date for transfer students and simply said we will not take any more applications for transfer students. So last year we started to put some controls in to try to limit what the numbers would be that would show up. This year our feeling is that we had to do that in advance. We couldn’t wait to see what the numbers were like so we need to start to talk in advance. So, in a preliminary way we started to say okay, we think based on previous data, numbers that we probably ought to think about somewhere along the line of maybe April 1st, maybe March 1st, somewhere around there that will cut off admissions, applications I should say, admissions for the undergrads – for freshmen in particular – figuring that based on how things would usually come in, that would get us to roughly the number of applicants and you can go back and look over the data for a number of years and we know that “x” number of applicants historically will turn into “x” number of admits which will traditionally turn into “x” number of people who actually confirm and show up. So, looking at those kinds of data – well, as we started to get, and many of you heard very early on, that we were getting data that were coming in – our applications were running as high as 40% above the previous year. Now, everybody has attributed that to football. Some of us would like to contribute that to other things at the institution but I guess maybe that played a role. Other of us as we started looking around, a lot of the institutions have gone to very early applications deadlines, November in fact for priority consideration. So in our talking through Admission with high counselors, etc., what was really happening as well as doing well in football, what was happening was that students were just making all their applications out early so if institution “x” down the road was asking for applications by November 15 – they’re just filling them all out. So what we were experiencing – the data of this last Thursday – would seem to indicate that our applications are not still up 40%. Our applications now really compare to last year at the same time. Up about 19%; 18.8% is exactly where it is. So we’ve come back a little bit but we’re still way up for a lot of reasons I think and that number of about 18.8% or so is actually running quite high, is running higher in the state than some of the other institutions. Northern and UIC tend to be the two that are tending to be up in terms of numbers of applications for freshmen. What became really apparent
as these large numbers of applications were coming in that it was apparent we were going to get the number of applications we needed over the break. Now, if you remember over the break, all the mail collects out at some barn out here on the west side of campus so we figured – we immediately got hold of our counselors in about November and said it looks like we’re going to have to move up that cut-off date for admissions – a priority filing date if you may – sooner than that and we let the high school counselors know and said you know, you need to get with your students and tell them you need to get their applications in earlier. It might well be if they wait until after the first of the year or so or after February, that’s not going to happen. We kept monitoring, came back after break and Bob Burke, Director of Admissions, said it was something like the “Miracle on 34th Street”. People were walking in with big huge bags of applications and dumping them on the desk. We immediately, within about a week, closed and immediately went to a priority filing date in January. So since mid-January, we have just been simply processing applications and then putting them on a waiting list, other than recruited individuals in some of the areas. So we cut it off early. So what we tried to do this year was to put controls in place that would allow us to shut off the flow earlier depending upon the number of applications so we now have a number of applications and a number of admissions that we think will translate us into right around 3,000 students. I go to meetings and people will say well, I understand now you’ve got us in the situation of, I think someone told me the other day, way up – 3,500 freshmen. No, we don’t. We really don’t know exactly what the number is but we’re looking at using – we have kind of a window that if the acceptance rate of the students accepting us is really on the low side it will run, you know, 2,800 or 2,900. If it’s on the high side it runs in another figure but we really won’t know what that is until we get a little bit further along. We did shut off, we closed down very early this semester, we closed off any transfer students under 60 hours so any students now – and this has been for a number of weeks and I grabbed the wrong folder – I was going to grab that exact date – but we’ve been closed down to under 60 hours transfer hours for probably close to a month or more. Again, we got to the community colleges and let them know that we were going to do this in all likelihood because we don’t want to burn our bridges with our feeders. We are continuing to take applications for transfers who have an associate degree but we can close that off as soon as we need to. So as we’re watching now – the people who are telling us they’re coming. Also what we’ve done for the first time ever this year is that we have told students you need to notify us by May 1st or you will lose your spot. Northern has never really done that in more recent years. So now what we’re saying is that if you don’t let us know by May 1st, we’re going to give your spot up. So we put a May 1st deadline in where we can again look and recalibrate where we’re at.

We also monitor housing reservations. You have to put, I think its $150.00 deposit in on housing. We are monitoring those. Housing gives us – as we look at housing from week to week, it starts to give us a pretty good idea of what our show rate will be. We’re also monitoring, will be monitoring, reservations for orientation. So we have three sets of data points that we can watch and we have a history that we can take a look at as to where we will be. Housing tends to be a pretty good indicator by the way. So we now have again, another control as we start to move closer to May 1st that looks like we’re going to be on the high side of 3,000. We can shut off transfer admissions right away and, in fact, we have the articulation conference here. We have all the community colleges represented and we will talk to them about that as this will be a possibility so keep your students – I mean, your students need to get applied and they know that. Bob Burke’s office has been in communication. So this year what we tried to do was
to put some controls in where we could turn the taps off to get us at those numbers that the Provost has been very adamant that we be at and that’s the 18,000 undergraduate students. Nobody can really predict right now. We know basically we can look at this year versus last year in terms of numbers that confirm. It’s a meaningless number because we suspect what’s happening is because they’ve applied sooner and now that they have this May 1st deadline, more of them are probably saying they’re coming. However, there’s no money attached to that so if they don’t send in their housing, they can walk away from that at no penalty. So, again, those of you who’ve been in limited admission programs either at the undergraduate or graduate level, you know how difficult it is sometimes to get to that final number. But we feel we have put the controls that we could put in place this year to be able to control that so now the last thing we have left, is that we’ll watch this. The last thing that will show up will be our transfer numbers.

So that’s kind of where we are for this year. Next year as some of you may know, APAS approved an additional set of procedures that we will use where we will go to a November 15th deadline. All credentials must be in by December 15th for priority consideration. We make decisions on those and I don’t have those dates memorized yet but again, this will be for people who satisfy the minimal credentials and they’ll be considered on a competitive basis and they’ll be notified by the 15th of December of 2004 as to their acceptance. After November 15, 2004, they’ll be considered on a competitive basis – we’ll just hold them – on a competitive basis until they’re notified on March 1st. Now in that time, as we’re moving through there, until February 1st we will be giving priority consideration to students who meet the minimums of having been in the top 10% of their high school class and have an ACT greater or equal to 19 and also who are in the top 33% percent and an ACT composite greater than 21. So even though we’ll say, you know, 11/15 – those people in that priority – they’re going to come in and we’re going to keep admitting those people. So we’ll be making our class. Now we’ll realize that even using this mechanism, we will not fill a class with that first group that comes in and as the people in the top 10%, 19 ACT and above or top third, greater than or equal to 21 composite, will still keep coming though having those people come through until February. Then after that, we’ll shut everything – we’ll keep taking things but we’ll make decisions as we go along to see how we fill a class. We’re putting our controls much earlier now relative to the incoming freshmen class. Transfer students will continue to – we have not set dates yet in terms of when we will tell community colleges and transfer students what their deadlines will be. Probably what we’ll do is we’ll use – the transfers will give us some flex so we can shut those things off early if need be.

Now – what happens for the last three years, we’ll dealing with new sets of variables so it’s very difficult to go back and predict exactly where you will be so we don’t have a lot of data right now to know how our yields will come out and now there’s another variable that will go into place for Fall, 2005 in that we will be charging an application fee. We anticipate that that will result probably – data that we have from other universities suggests that will probably result in a reduction of about 20% of our applications. If you work in admissions, they’re quite happy about that reduction of about 20% but that’s kind of what we’re projecting. So we don’t – we still really don’t know what that’s going to do until we start to get into that. So that will be an additional variable that we’ll be dealing with and that approval was just obtained here in the last couple of weeks. I know some of you know that APAS and others have been pushing for that for some considerable period of time but we were able to get the President to approve that for the undergraduates.
So that’s basically where we’re at. We meet on a pretty regular basis. I think the other thing to say about enrollment management is while you can talk about the numbers, the other thing that I think that – particularly Frederick Schwantes has tried to do in consultation with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, particularly Joe Crush, and also with the departments and the deans and the departments across the campus where there was very high demand in the under division courses, is we’ve tried to watch our enrollments very carefully as to where the students are going so that we can make sure that when a student comes here, we won’t go through what we did – many of us remember that students would come and couldn’t get seats and we were monitoring literally daily, every day orientation in the fall for these students that were coming in to make sure that when they got here, they could get five classes. Now, they might not be able to get exactly the right ones they want and they might not be exactly at the times they want, but they could get five gen eds. So we watched that very, very carefully. Our orientation staff was watching very, very carefully as the students were registering to see if the options were available. So Frederick working with Joe, Frederick working with the upper divisions across the different colleges where the high demands are, really tried to make sure we have seats available for students when they come and many of us remember the disastrous effect that had on Northern when we had tons and tons of students coming who couldn’t get classes and how that really destroyed our reputation for a number of years – don’t go to Northern, you can’t get into the classes. So the other part of the enrollment management is really trying to watch and work with the individuals who are scheduling classes so we have seats available and I think that’s another part of enrollment management that Fredrick working not only with the deans – the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences particularly as it relates to incoming freshmen – but also working with Finance and Facilities and our chief financial officer to make sure we can get those seats open for the students.

So that’s kind of what’s happened. That’s what we’re looking for. We will be adding, as I mentioned before, someone from Student Services because another issue of the enrollment management obviously is housing and housing is having to tell a large number of sophomores-to-be that have to leave and so we’re looking at how our decisions about the mix between freshmen and transfers, how that effects the availability of rooms and housing as well so they will be joining us as part of this enrollment team and we will continue with the enrollment team on into the future. It’s very high priority for the Provost. That’s about what I can think of as to where we’re out now Sue. I didn’t bring the data guys with me. Usually, when I go to these things I make sure Bob Burke, Dan House and Don Larson are with me because they just rattle the numbers off right and left. So if somebody goes back and says I remember when Dan House was here and he said it was “x” number – you got me, sorry. Questions?

**J. Stephen:** I have three. One is what’s the application fee going to be?

**G. Seaver:** $30.00

**J. Stephen:** The other one is are we committed to keeping our enrollment of undergraduates at 18,000 for the period of the next four years while high school graduations increase?
**G. Seaver:** We have not talked about what the number will be after Fall, 2005. I would say that the sympathy in the Provost’s Office is to keep it at 18,000. You’re right on the second half, as you all know – you heard the President – we’re going to be under tremendous pressure because of the increasing size – we got kind of a pass this year – but the increasing size of the students who will be coming to us, not only freshmen but those people as they get in community college coming back, so we’re going to be under increasing pressure. The President’s aware of that. The Provost continues to make the President aware and others aware of the fact that we only have so many faculty.

**J. Stephen:** Now, one hard question that we had difficulty getting the answer to three years ago ---

**G. Seaver:** And you think you might get it this time?

**J. Stephen:** I’ll bet I don’t.

**G. Seaver:** It’s probably because I don’t know the answer.

**J. Stephen:** Every year there’s a certain number of students that are what we might call exceptional enrollments. People who don’t meet our standards for enrollment, transfer or enrollment through special programs and I’m wondering if you know how many we admitted this year under such circumstances.

**G. Seaver:** I can tell you how many CHANCE students we admitted.

**J. Stephen:** No, those aren’t the ones I’m talking about.

**G. Seaver:** I don’t have the exact numbers in terms of sponsored admissions from departments or were director reviews out of the Admissions Office. I just do not have those numbers. Those are not huge because usually what I get every year I get ---

**J. Stephen:** Well, we were told that three years ago and it turned out to be 640.

**G. Seaver:** Well, the sponsored admission – I mean the directors review from admissions, I see what they’re results were for that semester and I can tell you it wasn’t 600 that got to me and I doubt that they’re hiding from me ---

**J. Stephen:** Okay.

**G. Seaver:** But I can find that information out and get it to you.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, thank you.

**Northern Star:** That $30.00, does that need to be approved by the BOT or is that something you guys can just automatically institute.
G. Seaver: It has the blessing of the Board of Trustees.

Northern Star: And how was it decided that $30.00 was going to be the amount?

G. Seaver: A lot of research was done by Bob Wheeler and a number of other individuals of looking at what the application fees were at other institutions and so a lot of that went in the terms of the amount of what was charged in other areas not to be prohibitive to our students. In addition to that, back when this was first approved by APAS, I think two years ago and someone who may have been on APAS at that time remembers that, there was a great deal of discussion about what to do about students who could not afford to pay that. There was a great deal of discussion or concern by a number of groups as would this be automatically eliminating a number of students who would not be able to apply. There was a process in place for students to get a waiver on that, a pretty liberal process, and it was one that was really not only recommended by APASC but also was based on recommendations that came from the Advisory Committee for ESP. So it will be based on things like ACT waiver, a waiver request from the high school counselor, student financial aid information, that type of thing so it’s a liberal process that will be available.

L. Kamenitsa: I have a question about whether past data gives us any idea of the likely impact on the diversity of this pool. In other words, the earlier deadlines, is that going to have any – is that likely to have any impact on diversity and sort of a follow-up on the fee question as well although I think you’ve answered that?

G. Seaver: The diversity issue about moving up the date was one that was of great concern to us and so as we were monitoring and trying to make decisions, we were very closely monitoring what – where the applications from diverse groups were coming from. Were they falling by – because there is the – you hear a lot of people talk about that the diverse groups and different ethnic groups tend to apply later. They don’t tend, you know, they tend to come in after, you know, much later in the fall – that has not had an impact. So we will, I mean – actually we are up percentage wise in the number of those groups from where we were last year. Everything was way up. It’s all come back but it has not had a negative impact. That was one of the things that we’ve been watching very closely.

J. Stephen: Are you actively making sure high school counselors know about these changes?

G. Seaver: Yeah, Bob Burke does a phenomenal job – Director of Admissions – does a phenomenal job of communicating to the high school counselors. We try to get letters out well in advance. Of course, our admissions people are out in the high schools quite often talking to them but as we were making decisions about when we thought we might put deadlines in place, we were giving the high schools considerable lead time to know what that would be and it was kind of funny for it was almost – for a while there we – I think we almost sent them two letters in two weeks kind of thing but we really pushed to have their kids get things in before Christmas break – before they left. We don’t want, and Bob’s very sensitive about our feeder schools – both our high schools and our community colleges – so one thing that’s nice about the group is Bob can say okay, I know you guys want to shut this off tomorrow but I have to have some lead
time to get the letters out and let the high school counselors and let the counselors at the community colleges know as well. Yeah?

**R. Meganathan:** It seems to me that about ten years ago we had an ACT score in the 20’s – around mid-20’s if my memory is right so why don’t we use ACT scores to restrict enrollments rather than numbers which we’re aiming for now by various means that you are describing?

**G. Seaver:** Well, we do have ACT in class rank minimums that we use.

**R. Meganathan:** Yeah, but if you want to reduce the numbers, simply increase it so we get better students.

**G. Seaver:** Well, it’s not that I haven’t heard that before.

**R. Meganathan:** Okay.

**G. Seaver:** You can’t – we can’t – you can’t change that now, I mean you can’t change that right now to be able to be an influence.

**R. Meganathan:** For the next year?

**G. Seaver:** As you look at the impact of ACT – as you look at – let’s just take ACT scores and people say well, what if we go to 20, what if we go to 21, you start to look at the distribution of the number of students in that, let’s say 19-21 range, as to let’s say for Fall, 2005, we’re not going to take those, that’s a sizeable number of students that will not be – that come out and so decisions have to be made one, as to where are you in that number – how does that fit relative to the size of the university that you want to have and, of course, then there’s the other question because of the nature of Northern and the access as to does the university want to go to a 20 or want to go to a 21 so those are things that have been discussed and I’m sure will continue to be discussed by faculty and faculty groups.

**D. Wagner:** That was my question. I’ve asked it about eight times I think over the course of the last two years and the last time I asked that Sue said well, they’re talking about it. You’ve said faculty is talking about it? There’s no talk about it on the Senate. There has never been talk about it on the Senate. What I find upsetting is that the people making this decision are not faculty members and at the very least, faculty should be included in the discussion especially about setting the limit on ACT’s. I’m sorry that Bob Suchner is not here who could explain how difficult it is to teach a class with ACT running from 19 to 26 or something like that.

**G. Seaver:** I still believe that all the, I mean, the changes in how applications will be processed did go through APAS which, as I counted around the room, is made up of faculty. There are various mechanisms where committees can bring things forward through UCC, particularly as it relates to requirements for undergraduates, that go through APAS so there is a faculty government. The Provost’s Office doesn’t sets these minimum ACT’s and these were not – to the best of my knowledge and I’ve been here a long time – to the best of my knowledge, faculty set these originally at some point in time so there is a mechanism for the discussion of where
these criteria would be. The question becomes in terms of are you going to use ACT’s to control enrollment size or are you going to talk about credentials – and I like to talk more than just about ACT’s because there are over variables that one can look at to predict success. High school class rank, for instance, is another one that some universities will look at in addition, but the question is – I understand and believe me, I heard Bob for years as a faculty member, talk about that. But the question is what’s your benefit? Is it just to cut your numbers or is the benefit to look at retention, is it important to look at graduation rates so any of a number of those things in terms of as you start to talk about minimal credentials is to what are going to be the outcomes that you want to take a look at. So ---

**A. Windelborn:** I heard you describe some mechanisms by which you informed high schools about these dates. I’m curious about mechanisms that are used to inform faculty advisors who are talking to the students about these dates. I don’t recall having ever gotten any of this information.

**G. Seaver:** We talked about it to the deans to some extent and we rely a lot on the deans going back. I’m here for this now. Yes, I realize Augden, that’s it’s after the fact for part of it but I think that was part of Sue’s thinking as well was to try to keep the communication and that’s why in trying to look to Fall, 2005 of developing that with the advising group that represents many of the advisors from the colleges was then to get it to APAS and then on so UCC had it as well to be able to see so that we know and then also in the catalogue and the feeling is now to with the – going to be November date that puts controls in place that we can now manage. You’re right, it’s been very ad hoc I think over about the last two years because of just – we can’t keep the door open just to let the bodies just continue to walk through. A lot of it has been discussed with the deans or the advising representatives from the colleges as to what’s been done and also to talk to the deans about it so, obviously it hasn’t filtered back to the extent ---

**President Willis:** Yeah, Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** I just wanted to get clarification. There’s a lot of information coming by and I gather there are certain priority deadlines but I thought you said at a certain point, you know, we then just go through the applications that have been stacked up and admit folk on a competitive basis. Does that mean that at that point – that’s not what you said?

**G. Seaver:** No.

**B. Tolhurst:** Okay, so there’s no point at which we end up in a situation where we say well, we can only admit so many more students and we’re just going to pick the very best ones that we have the applications for?

**G. Seaver:** We have not decided yet how we’ll do the waiting lists.

**B. Tolhurst:** Is there some thought of taking qualifications into account?

**G. Seaver:** That would be one thing you certainly want to consider. There’s other things too Bill, I could hear where programs might say, you know, my numbers are down a little bit and I
know there’s four students in that pile that clearly meet the criteria and are very good students and we need more students in major “x” and you don’t need anymore students in major “y”, so there, I mean, there are any number of variables that could be looked at in terms of trying to meet the demands of the department. If your department has more majors than you know what to do with already, there might be some argument – it’s like, you know, don’t – unless they’re just stellar, don’t send them this direction kind of thing. Some people have talked about that as a criteria as well.

**B. Tolhurst:** Well, I take it when we’re talking about freshmen, they’re not already aligned with departments in any sense.

**G. Seaver:** Some are, yeah.

**B. Tolhurst:** But I would take it that that would be, you know, if they want to be in some particular department and there’s not space in that department, that would sort of disqualify them.

**G. Seaver:** We don’t do departmental or college admissions like others but people have talked about that. I’ve heard faculty talk about boy, wouldn’t it be nice to use the U of I model or another model that way but honestly, we really think that for this year we won’t even get to the waiting list. In fact, I talked to Bob Burke yesterday and his feeling is after April 1st it’s just kind of silly to take applications anymore for freshmen. We just don’t – we never got to the waiting list last year; we don’t think we’re going to get to it this year either and I’m already getting pressure when people start to look at what’s on their waiting list – well, maybe we can sneak another twenty in or twenty-five and I’ve said no, not until we know where we’re at. One is just to decide agreement on the criteria that would be used and so somebody can sit there and say well, you know, we have a bunch of top 10% “x” numbers, why don’t we just sneak those in and I’ve said no, not at this point until we can decide how we can do it to be fair.

**President Willis:** Yeah, Jody.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** You haven’t said much about how decisions are made about enough students in department “x” or too many are not enough in department “y”. Do you have anything to say about that?

**G. Seaver:** No. Well, I mean as a formal program director as you well know Jody, when you watch – you start to think well, my numbers are kind of dropping off, I wish I could get more here or recruit more there and we do break it out by intended major as far as the students designate and I, you know, I hear other programs that, I mean, people say we don’t need any more majors in “x”, I have more than I can take care of but other than people just kind of dancing around that topic, there hasn’t – nothing from the Provost Office saying we ought to go this direction or not. That obviously would be something faculty and the deans would have to deal with.

**President Willis:** John?
J. Wolfskill: I’d like to ask not about recruiting of the general student population but specifically for new freshmen admits. Has there been any thought to increasing target recruitment of entering freshmen who would appear to possess very outstanding academic qualifications.

G. Seaver: Yes.

J. Wolfskill: Can you tell us what those are?

G. Seaver: One is looking at target high schools. We know some of those target high schools; we know what our success has been in the past and admissions does try to target those areas. There’s other things that are needed to recruit those students to Northern. Money is one of them for scholarships and in particular large scholarships. We have the Centennial Program, which is paid for out of the Pepsi funds. That’s not a significant amount of money. At the top level, at the top level for incoming freshmen transfer students, we have seven what I would consider to be top – about $10,000. That’s very, very, very small in relationship, for instance, ISU where they put a huge amount of money in the last few years to get – I think it’s $8,000 scholarships and it’s a fairly sizeable number and so we’ve talked about – the Provost Office has talked about various ways that – as to, for instance, what it would take to offer a significant number of full rides and, of course, now you start to talk about okay, what do you call a full ride and, in fact, we’ve run the numbers for me to give to Ivan to talk to the President about and so, let’s say, anybody in the top 10% of their high school class with an ACT of 31 and above. Actually, I’ve run the numbers from 32, 31, 30, actually down to 27, which is the cut off for entrance into honors, so it’s a sizeable amount of money that would need to be given for those students to have a guaranteed free ride. That would help us tremendously. We’ve worked with – I’ve had a couple of meetings with the Development Office to try to talk about what we can do for more centralized scholarships of significant value that we can use to recruit more academically talked students. But one thing that would help us a lot is being able to entice those students with significant scholarship money and that’s a big one. Money talks. We have good, actually we have great academic programs here and I think if you can get the students connected to the faculty, to the academic programs, I think we can get them interested but if they’re interested in university “A” and university “B” and university “C” and the other ones are giving them money and we’re giving them $1,000 Centennial Scholarship, you know, I think that’s a huge part of what we need to be able to do. Having a strong honors program is also something that’s helpful. The USOAR Program is a program that I think - and the URAP Program – are things that we can use – those kinds of things that we can bundle to show academically students what they can gain by coming here. We had the USOAR luncheon at noon today and how those students respond to getting those grants to be able to carry out those research projects – they’re very appreciative and they’re very talented students so I think we have to think about where kinds of enticements we can give to those academically talented students to recruit them here but a big part of that would be scholarships.

J. Stephen: I would suggest that we might move some of the large numbers of tuition waivers that are available over to the academic departments.
**G. Seaver:** There is a committee that decides where tuition waivers are to go to undergraduate students and so that committee started in July so I go, I only have about four more months and I can pull that crap. I think we do use tuition waivers heavily for recruitment.

**J. Stephen:** In very special places.

**G. Seaver:** Yes, we use some for honors. We use some for other areas that have made their case with that Tuition Waiver Committee about the need to use those tuition waivers to recruit students, academically talented students, to their particular areas. As a former chair who always wanted to get in on that and never did and now coming to the Provost Office and being able to see that, we need to look at how we do that process and I will be ---

**J. Stephen:** We feel locked out.

**G. Seaver:** I’ve heard that and I can say I said that too. We will be looking at that process. I can’t guarantee that it will change but I think it’s time – for a number of reasons – I think it’s time to look at that and re-evaluate how we make those decisions. Now, Rich Holly’s going to hear about that and then within about 30 seconds he’s going to be on the phone and say you’re talking all of them from Visual and Performing Arts, we need this to get theatre people and other people – I know, I know, but I think we need to look at that process. We are limited in the number of tuition waivers that we can get although we’re trying to look at that and how we can redirect some of those or are there other ways we can get more tuition waivers to make it more of an open process, can we use it for seed for other kinds of programs to recruit students to Northern. By looking at the process not only how we allocate them now and the decision making process but how we can look at the entire process and how we can use it for our benefit.

**President Willis:** I would propose that we take maybe two more questions, I saw a hand here, and Dave and then if people have further questions, maybe you can give them to me and I can get them to Gip and get you answers.

**G. Seaver:** Yeah, maybe a post office box ---

**President Willis:** I’ll just bring them up and dump them on your desk.

**G. Seaver:** This is the kind, seriously, this is the kind of dialogue that’s needed and I think we don’t gain anything by thinking that we have a magic drum in the Provost Office that we pull a number out of as to what the number of students are going to be in the fall. So I did appreciate – although I have to say, I’ve been a faculty member here since 1975 and this is my first visit to the Faculty Senate. So, everybody warned me it was going to be awful but maybe it’s yet to come. Jody just said well, good luck.

**President Willis:** I think we had two last questions.

**D. Robertson:** Hello, Deborah Robertson, School of Theatre and Dance.

**G. Seaver:** You’re going to tell Rich aren’t you?
D. Robertson: You bet I am! No, no I want to talk and I want to support the case for those waivers that are going to as you describe “other areas”. I myself do the bulk of the recruitment for the School of Theatre and Dance undergraduate. Most of our programs are selective admission. I travel all over the United States and I recruit for this program. I see from my one program alone, the B.F.A. Acting Program, I see between 400 and 450 students all over the country. I am touting the name of NIU in order to draw the most talented students from all the country and if I lost those I would be in dreadful shape and I think this national recruiting that some of us do in the arts is an enormous benefit to NIU. I’m sitting there at the table with Julliard, NIU, every big program in the country in lots of areas, it’s not just the arts and I have to say that I think that it would be a shame if NIU will not help us in what – I think we do all of the arts programs in the college that lift the profile of NIU in many, many ways and many of our students do not register on the academic screen early on but they are incredibly motivated and work very hard and I think do a lot of good for NIU.

G. Seaver: Yeah, but – I hope your questions, your response, was directed at him. You can go through every – and I have – I’ve talked to all the associate deans, I’ve talked to all the representatives on that program and, in fact, in the cases where you’ve run out of tuition waivers, the Provost Office and my office has tried very, very hard to have the Scholarship Office to help bring some of those additional students, even some who are late in terms of trying to get through the process. I don’t think anybody would question – I heard one young lady give a speech today – she did a great speech at the You Soar – who is here on a forensic scholarship. You could not find anybody that would go to disagree with the fact that they’re not used wisely. I think the question is the perception of a closed process and I think that the bigger issue is the fact that we just don’t have enough that we can branch out into other areas as well and I think that’s almost – I mean, I think any program can go and say if I could just have one tuition waiver I could get that very talented person in and you name the major. So, the process needs to be looked at that everybody is aware of the fact that it’s an open and a fair process which I believe it is and, as I said, at the end of that is the discussion that we need to figure out ways that we can support more students under the tuition waivers and some of that can be done by finding other ways of supporting students to take the place of those tuition waivers where we can use tuition waivers in other areas and this ties back to the question of trying to recruit academically talented students we’ve got. There’s a number of things we need to do to be able to go after those students.

J. Stephen: I’d like to make it clear. I’m not after their tuition waivers.

G. Seaver: You’re after the honors, right?

J. Stephen: We would like the opportunity to attract higher qualified candidates and I do realize that VPA is one of the most visible colleges at NIU and oftentimes when you hear an interview with someone like Joan Allen you hear a nice reflection on NIU through the quality of the program that you run. But we’d like the opportunity to get some of these “A” students too.

G. Seaver: I think we all would and that’s the process where we just need more resources to go after those – the academically talented students.
J. Stephen: Get us more tuition waivers.

G. Seaver: Yeah, there is the perception there’s a big bucket of money in the Provost Office. I still haven’t found any; maybe I haven’t been there long enough.

J. Stephen: Could I help you look?

President Willis: Okay, Dave?

D. Wagner: I won’t repeat myself but last week it was “they” were doing it and today it’s “we” are doing it and I still don’t quite see where the faculty is involved in the decision making. Three years ago the senate recommended having an honors college rather than an honors program and that just got ignored. I would think that would be one way of – it would be a good way of raising money. You can call honors’ graduates and they would support it especially if it were a college.

G. Seaver: I did read Jody’s report, actually just recently. Jody, you chaired that committee; was a part of it. I did charge the Honors Committee along with Carol DeMoranville who’s the chair. Carol and I talked from early on before we started in the semester and we talked about three things I would like the Honors Committee to focus on this year. One of those was to put together a plan to establish an honors college in terms of comparables, what it would cost, how it might look so that we would have a plan coming from the Honors Committee and I am aware of the Faculty Senate and that Jody and this Committee did as a part of that. So it is something that is a committee, that is working on it made up of faculty and that’s one of two different things that they’re working on. We have – Mike Martin and I – have met with Development to talk to Development about the Honors cause. About – because I agree with you. I think this is something that can be market to donors. Donors like to do things that make their degree look enhanced and I think – you agree – it’s very marketable. There are other universities who are not unlike Northern who have been very successful going out and tracking money for facilities, buildings, financial support. Mike Martin, in fact, last week when I met him provided me with a budget update and he took comparable institutions and looked at what the budget was for Honors at Northern versus what the Honors at any of a number of institutions and, thank God, Mike didn’t bring in the University of Georgia which – they have gazillions of dollars. But he did get comparable institutions so there are things – those are things that we are looking at.

President Willis: Okay, well I would like to think you for coming very much. Lots of information.

G. Seaver: Thank you. I would be happy to come back almost anytime. No, I’d be happy to come back if there’s information you need. You know, I’ve been a faculty member at Northern for a long period of time and I know nothing gets gained by just having things fester around without having someone come in and answer the questions and I’d much deal in that format than try to put out fires because rumors are flying around and nobody’s bothered to just sit down and clear things up so anytime, I’d be more than happy to come back.

President Willis: Okay, thank you very much.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Nominees for Student Grievance Procedure Taskforce – walk-in

President Willis: Continuing on with the Agenda, under Items for Faculty Senate Consideration we have Nominees for the Student Grievance Procedure Taskforce. As you may recall this was a suggestion that came from the Senate that it would make sense to have a student, a revised Student Grievance Procedure, which would allow grievances by students against faculty and staff very much parallel to the Faculty and Staff Grievance Procedure that we are just in the process of trying to serve through the University Council. So, on the first page of your walk-in are four names of people. Since I typed this up I have received a fifth name which is Beth Miller so if you would please write down Beth Miller and so now I have more people than positions so what I would suggest if any of these people or someone who knows them is here if they would speak to why they want to do this then I think we can just vote by a show of hands. Make sure you don’t vote for more than four. If that doesn’t work, we’ll go to plan B. Why don’t we start with Joe Stephen.

J. Stephen: I’ve always been interested in the rights of students. I was on the Committee that prepared the document that was forwarded to – well, through the Faculty Senate and upwards. I’m very familiar with the material that needs to be reviewed and the process of the discussion as we left it off beforehand. I’m committed to the idea that this needs to be done but it needs to be done very carefully. If it’s done improperly, I think it could be a very dangerous thing for the faculty and if it’s not taken seriously, I think it could be a very poor thing for the student. I’m very pro-student but on the other hand, I don’t like some of the nonsense that comes out of things like this.

President Willis: Okay, Pam?

P. Smith: I was also on the subcommittee that this document came out of. Actually, I was the one that initiated it to the Committee and gave them more work, which didn’t make me extremely popular at the time. But unbeknownst to me, this was also recognized by University Council as a hole in our grievance procedures. We don’t have such a procedural in place for student grievances against faculty. I also think that the faculty rights part of our faculty rights and responsibility is usually the more popular part of discussion whether than responsibilities and the initiate of this issue came out of my awareness of some really egregious situation and, frankly, I would like to have colleagues that conduct themselves in a professional manner and I think that’s what most of us and most of us advocate but when we hear of a situation that we would rather have not happened, we need to have procedures and mechanisms in place so that those students don’t leave here feeling bitter and so we don’t suspect ourselves to any other kind of litigation. So, that said I agree totally with Buck. This has to be done very, very carefully. We have to have an appropriate screening mechanism so we’re just not opening ourselves up to all kinds of trivial complaints that we have to address by students. We have researched with other universities, dozens of other kinds of procedures that are very, very similar to what we’re looking for and so as much as an advocate I am for the students, I’m extremely much an advocate for limiting the types of things we’ll expose the faculty to.
President Willis: Okay, thank you. Now Lin is from FC&S. Is there anyone here who knows her or who can speak to her experience? She was nominated by her department chair by the way, and I do not know her personally. Okay, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: I think I’m on this list because the Rules and Governance Committee of the UC put my name on it.

President Willis: They said you were willing to serve.

B. Tolhurst: I am willing to serve, yes. I’ve been involved in the process of fine-tuning the current grievance procedure that’s wending its way through. I share Buck’s concerns. Having been a department chair, it seems to me that most of the things I’ve heard about but probably not all, could have been dealt with adequately had department chairs been doing their jobs and so my hope is that even though we do need a grievance procedure, my hope is that it won’t be used much and that it will provide a structure outline informal measures that will encourage department chairs to listen to students and address their concerns appropriately.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. Then the final nominee is Beth Miller who I believe is not here today but at least we all know her. Yes? She’s also in FC&S, Family, Consumer, Nutrition Sciences. What used to be Home Ec like when you and I were taking it in grammar school and what not. All the boys got to take shop. All right. Well, here’s a thought. Since we have heard from Buck and Pam and Bill, why don’t we see if there’s any dissension – should we just go ahead and approve all of them? Is there a motion to do that? Okay, is there a second?

B. Tolhurst: I’m not sure what we’re doing and why we’re doing it this way.

President Willis: Oh, okay. Well ---

B. Tolhurst: Is this in accord with appropriate process to exclude some of the nominees from the voting?

F. Bryan: I would prefer that the entire slate of candidates.

President Willis: We can do that. Okay. Yes?

D. Wagner: Do we need to do this today?

President Willis: We need to do it by the 15th so if we don’t do it here, we would do it by e-mail, which is certainly possible, I think. Is that possible? If we can do it today, that would be good. All right. Okay. All right. So what we are doing is we have five people who are interested in being on this grievance procedure taskforce. We are to name four people so somehow we have to figure out which four. Because that’s what it says in the thing that the University Council passed, four faculty.

P. Henry: It seems to me we really should have some sort of written ballot. If we could each just take a piece of paper and write down the four people that we want.
**President Willis:** Yeah, we could do that. Unfortunately, I’ve been – you could write them on your little yellow sheets. That would be possible. Okay, not on the yellow sheets. If you have a blank yellow sheet that’s fine. Yeah, we’ll just count them. There are more blank yellow sheets up here. Does anybody need them? Oh, Donna, you are so good. No, don’t use anything that has your name on it. Use a blank one if you do have one next to you by the way David. All right. All right and then we’ll go and count them and let you know if that is okay with everybody. I apologize for not having them ready but this is so much more fun. Yes. Yes, I think they all are. Okay, thank you very much. We will let you know as soon as they are counted. All right.

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

**President Willis:** Going on, Reports from Advisory Committees, Pat Henry?

**P. Henry:** I wasn’t able to get it together and get a written one out even as a walk-in so I’m just going to give a very brief oral report and I think the written form I’m going to get to Donna and that will be available then on the website as usual on Thursday. Okay.

I first wanted to report we did in fact, three of us on the FAC go lobbying. The day before we went to the meeting – Thursday, the 25th – three of us went to Springfield. Me and a representative from Northwestern University and the FAC Chair who’s from Southern Illinois and it was quite a scene. We found out many things. One of which was that it’s really not a good idea to go at the end of the month because it’s just like a madhouse because everybody’s trying to get stuff done. Nobody was in their offices so you couldn’t see them, make appointments or anything plus there were a whole lot of other people lobbying including Vandalia Correctional Center, people and help for the homeless, it was museum day and it really is an amazing sight to see outside the House of Representatives. You basically hand people a card – or hand the Sergeant at Armes a card and they will go in and bring the representative out and talk to you and you and a whole bunch of, well, you’re very best friends all crowding around there. I would suggest if we do this again we should get our own T-shirts and should have “higher education; cheaper than prison” on them. It was actually, it was really very good to see the kinds of things that are putting pressure on the legislature. Ken Zehnder, who’s our NIU lobbyist was very helpful and gave me many hints and names and tips and stuff. We saw three people. We saw Senator Jeff Shoenberg, who’s a democrat on the State Appropriations Committee. We saw Representative Ricca Slone, who is the democratic Chair of the Higher Appropriations Committee and Representative Kevin McCarthy who is a democrat and Chair of the Higher Education Committee and all three of these were pretty much – we were sort of preaching to the choir which was, as Ken noted, something that is fairly easy to do with higher ed. Our basic message was that we supported the IBHE versus the Governor’s budget that cuts 2%. That we’re concerned very much as faculty over what damage budget cuts have already done and that this is having a long-lasting impact on the quality of education that we can offer in
Illinois. It will take a long time to recovery from it. Higher education is a vital resource for the state of Illinois and that we also, given that we were preaching to the choir, we wanted to know if there was anything they could tell us that would be helpful for us as faculty to do to help them get the message across to other parts of the government for making the case for higher education. Generally, they were supportive. Some were thankful that the Governor’s cut was only 2% from the IBHE budget. One thing that was pointed out sort of in passing was that the opposition that some people had in higher ed to the line item budget was seen as singularly unhelpful and is sort of part of this – I don’t think this was actually with a problem with NIU – we all sort of get tarred with the same brush that we’re just too busy and too important and too tied up with our own stuff to bother with such things as line item budgets. Not a good image. It would be a good idea according to – and particularly Representative Slone – thought it would be a good idea to send letters to the Governor and to John Filan, who is the Director of the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget, copies to the Speaker of the House Madigan and Emile Jones who’s the President of the Senate and to her expressing our concerns about the budget cuts and in particular for those of us who are so inclined, we could mention the fact that the perhaps the present tax structure does not support us in the style to which we’ve become accustomed or in a way that is adequate to the task. Understanding that nobody’s going to support tax hikes at this junction, but I think it’s useful to at least make the case that not everybody is dead set against them if they are, in fact, absolutely necessary. Again, I think it was overall useful and I think it would be even better and next time what we’ll try and do is target the newer members who aren’t necessarily on these committees but who are interested in higher education. We should by the way, and if any of you are interested in doing this, it is good for us to sort of show that we’re involved and not just sitting around gripping about accountability but we shouldn’t be pesky and we should also not be there so often as to be asked how come we’re not teaching our classes. So, I mean, it’s best left to the lobbyists for the most part but I think it does help to have some faculty involved some of the time. We are, in fact, drafting a letter that I hope to get out to you, we’re still sort of in process, and this will provide some talking points for those of you who are interested in writing to your representatives, the Governor, John Filan and so forth. One think I should note in this context is that if you do do such a thing, many of you I’m sure know this already, do not do it on NIU letterhead and use your own stamp because otherwise you’re using state funds and that’s not considered good. What we’re going to try to argue in this letter is again, to urge and try and support the initial IBHE budget for FY05 which attempts to reduce the structural deficit cuts. This includes fully funding the SURS pension without which the state’s investment in talented faculty is compromised and may lead to a loss of our institutions vital core. Like I say, I’ll get this actual letter to you. Some of the points – the FAC also asked for a cessation of increased reporting requirements while administrative costs are further cut. Administrator serves a critical role in providing student support; institutional stewardship, public accountability and further cuts will impact both the quality of instruction students receive and support services they are provided. Like I said, I’ll get more details of this when we sort of rough this out but in essence, it’s what we’ve been talking about all along which is it really is important to support higher education because otherwise a lot is lost from the state economy.

We had our meeting then the following day, where – at Blackburn College which is a very interesting place. It’s a working college where all of the students work and they have contracts. They do everything – all the jobs in the university. They cut the checks, the run the food service. Everything is done by students. It was a very interesting place. Their president talked to us
about a number of things that are sort of concerns of the college and I find this actually quite
useful to sort of get the picture over the whole state of the kinds of things that are problems in
common and some of them more particular to particular kinds of colleges or regions. One thing
she pointed out that I think was very useful and this sort of ties in with the student grievance
procedure is that higher ed really should have a better disciplinary system other than sort of the
all or nothing at all situation we have once tenure is granted where either you get dismissed for
cause – I mean, you can get smaller pay hikes – but basically I think such things as this grievance
committee or grievance procedure will make it I think easier to clarify student grievances and
make them feel less like faculty are sort of the untouchables. One thing that she also mentioned
and I think this is really something I’ve been wanting to bring up in the context of the Faculty
Senate here is that it would be a really good idea to target legislators who serve the districts that
our students come from, invite them on campus, have them come to meetings and so forth. I
know I’ve mentioned this before. Is there any committee in the Faculty Senate who would like
to sort of address this because I think everybody I’ve talked including in the legislature says “you
have a week I’m on campus, we really get to see what’s going on – it’s cool” and they have a
much better picture of what’s going on as opposed to sort of being labeled with all these abstract
prof scam type generalizations which I think are sort of in the discourse. I have no idea of how
this would work procedurally but I higher recommend that we look into that.

**J. Stephen:** How about invite to spend the day with us.

**P. Henry:** Cool! Absolutely. I mean I couldn’t agree more, I mean, not when they’re in session
obviously. No, I think – and again another thing is it’s not just our representative or senator, I
think Bob Pritchard and Brad Burzynski have, you know, certainly have been around long and
Senator Burzynski has been around quite a well and has been educated to some extent. It’s
always worth continuing that process but I think we have so many students from the Chicago
area, the representatives and senators of which may not have much of an idea of what Northern is
and what Northern is doing and I think targeting them and trying to get some interaction with
them would be a plus. Couldn’t hurt. So, I just throw that out. I should in passing mention that
ISU did, in fact, bring their state representative, Dan Brady, to their Faculty Senate meeting and
we might well consider bringing at least Bob Pritchard to a Senate meeting just for Q&A and
sort of what are our concerns and what they found was that, for example, according to Dan
Brady the Governor still thinks there may be some fat to be cut in administrative ways. So, you
know, it’s nice to have a little back and forth. There is a big concern about, I think it’s House
Bill 4877, I think that’s the SURS bill. You may want to talk about that. There’s a lot of issues
out there and the budget situation, bottom line, is not getting any better and I think this year is
not good and next year will be not good also as far as budget cuts are concerned.

Just one final thing, there were suggestions that we should document, this was something from
one of the sub-committees, that as full-time tenure tract people retire or quit or leave and are
replaced by part-time or adjunct professors, certain things don’t get done and it would be a good
idea to document what it is that we’re losing. What is sort of the cost both educational and
economic of what doesn’t get done when you get more and more part-timers as opposed to full
timers because that is often cited as something that is a cost saving measure. That if you get rid
of all the lazy professors and hire lean and mean instructors who are part-time, then that’s seen
often as an economic issue and we need to make it clear what actually is lost in terms of what
full-time faculty do. So this is not a committee that I’m on but I think if anybody has antidotes or acts or especially statistics or figures about what doesn’t get done; what the real cost of not having full-time faculty is, I would be very interested in having you pass that along to me and that’s it.

President Willis: Okay, Paul?

P. Stoddard: Yeah, Pat mentioned not knowing what committee to refer these ideas to. I’d point out that the phrase “legislative oversight” was added to the Elections Committee name specifically to deal with issues like this several years ago and I would like to move that that Committee take up Pat’s call and consider some things we might be doing.


The motion passed.

President Willis: Any other comments or questions for Pat?

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – report (Page 6)

President Willis: If not then let’s move on to the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees, Paul Loubere and Bill Tolhurst. They have a report on page 6.

B. Tolhurst: Paul was at the meeting and I wasn’t but if he’s not here I’ll give the report.

President Willis: He’s here.

P. Loubere: A pretty standard meeting. Just a couple points of interest that I included in the report. One is that the number of requests for sabbatical leaves was down significantly this year for reasons that nobody seems quite to understand but that might be something interesting to keep an eye on and the other was some numbers that I thought people might find generally interesting on the salary basis for different groups on campus. Other than that, there’s nothing I think of outstanding interest there to report.

President Willis: Okay, any questions for Paul?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – report

President Willis: For the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee, I went to the Legislation, audited an External Affairs Committee and I also went to it because neither Sara nor Bev was available to go and also went to the Board of Trustee meeting so I figure I’ll just do that all at once and fairly briefly.
Let’s see, the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee considered a number of things most of which are fairly routine, renewal of contracts, pass-throughs to pay for things up front that then get reimbursed later and that sort of thing. They did vote to forward the proposed student fees to the full Board. The student fee structure well, if you look at it overall, there’s about 6% increase in fees. However, that includes a 9% increase in the health care costs and a 9% increase in the bus contract because we contract with some company to supply the Huskie buses and the prices have gone up. If you leave out those two, which we really have no control over, then the increase in fees due to things we do control is about 3%. So – and they worked with the students on this so that seems to be satisfactory. In fact, the President was saying that the students wanted to raise it more but he thought 9 was plenty or 6 was plenty. I don’t know, maybe it was the housing. Anyway. All right. So that was the student fees then there was the room and board fees, which are up an average of about 9%. The increase is going to fund just the general operation of the residence halls and what have you. Increased prices for everything just about, particularly utilities and that kind of thing and also some necessary maintenance and repairs. For example, they’re replacing all the floor in Douglas which currently is mostly that yucky stuff like I have in my kitchen, you know, from dozen of years ago, you know, those tile things. Not real tile, just the linoleum type stuff so they’re going to be replacing that with carpet which should help keep the noise down and also they can get some pretty tough carpet so it should last a long time. I don’t know about the library carpet but that’s certainly lasted a long time already.

All right, then the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee reported on legislation that was relevant to the university. I don’t believe there were any surprises in that, at least that was reported at the time. Let’s see, well, at the state level we have of course, truth in tuition which you already know about, that wretched bill on the tenure commission or whatever they called it was tabled and we’ll have to keep an eye to make sure it doesn’t rise up sometime in the future but for the moment it’s not active. Let’s see, they have or are proposing to – I’m not entirely clear on the status of this – I’m not entirely clear on the status of this – redo the way they do the MAP grants so that the maximum award is the same whether you are at a private or a public college. It used to be that it was tied to how much the tuition was and so students at private universities were getting more money per student typically than students at public universities were so that will no longer be true and they think that will enable them to fund about a thousand more students with MAP grants. So that’s a good thing. Let’s see. Sorry?

P. Henry: The privates are very upset about that.

President Willis: Yeah, I understand that but it’s good for those thousand students is what I meant.

J. Stephen: The privates are getting more than 50% of the pie for quite awhile.

President Willis: Yeah, anyway. All right then at the federal level there are some laws that are churning around and not really close to being passed yet and we do expect to get some money which I think has since been at least partly announced from various federal programs. All right, then there was a brief audit report. We have the state auditor that comes in once a year and looks to see if we are doing things the way we’re supposed to be doing things. This year there were
four findings, which is a pretty small number. There were times back in the mid-nineties when we had dozens. There were four findings, they were all relatively minor things like you know, the paperwork, you know, everything was done fine but there was one little line on the paperwork that didn’t quite get checked or something like that. They were pretty minor things and most importantly none of them was a repeat finding because if they find something this then they find it again next year then they get all out of shape so that was pretty good. All right, so that was the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee and actually at the full Board, pretty much what they did was took the things that had been referred to them from the committees which you just heard about and passed on those. There was also a By-laws amendment proposed which would allow – because they’ve had a little bit of trouble making quorum in their committees – I can’t imagine how they could have that problem, not in the full Board necessarily but in the committees which have three or four members to begin with and, of course, we’re down one member because Catherine Aducci had to resign given the new ethics law, her husband is a lobbyist, so this new By-law would propose that if this is not a quorum of some committee, some sub-committee of the Board, and there is some trustee around at the meeting who is not on that particular committee, that that trustee could become a temporary member of the committee for the purpose of making a quorum and then could vote during that meeting and which everybody seemed to think was pretty sensible. But it hasn’t been approved yet I don’t think.

All right, so that’s basically what happened at all of those meetings. Does anybody have any questions about the Board of Trustees?

All right, let me move on then and continue to try to be brief with the Council of University Senates. This is for those of you who don’t remember from time to time because we only meet once or twice a year, this is a group of all the Faculty Senate presidents from Illinois public universities of which there are not that many. We met this past Monday at Illinois State. There were representatives there from Illinois State, myself of course, Eastern, Western, U of I at Urbana/Champaign, Chicago State University and SIU at Edwardsville. The issues that we talked about that still, we think, need some work on – the first one would be domestic partner benefits. You may recall that the U of I put in a fairly minimal set of such benefits last year. They have had a fairly minimal set of people taking advantage of those and I know here we’re trying to work on something that’s much, much more comprehensive. Let’s see, the IBHE comes around in the fall typically and has their big picture meetings where they talk about priorities for the university and that kind of thing. At Western, Eastern, Urbana and Illinois State, the faculty always are invited to those and having input and all of that kind of thing. Edwardsville, Chicago State and we, as far as I know, are not. In fact, I recall when this thing first came up and they said on, do you go to your big picture meeting and I said “what?” so I will speak to the Provost and President about that. All right, let’s see, oh – there’s the business of exclusive agreements with commercial vendors like our Pepsi agreement and I double checked on that just this afternoon and indeed we will not be able to renew that contract. No, no there has been a law or something passed that says that universities cannot enter into exclusive agreements with vendors. So, of course, they’re not interested in ponying up any money to make up for what they’re taking away which wasn’t
theirs anyway, but there you go. Then the faculty productivity we are all keeping an eye on. Some people seemed to think that it was a little less urgent than it had been. I am not one of those people but at this point pretty much what we do is watch and see what happens and formulate responses and, you know, got to keep on our toes with that one. Then there were questions about the Patriot Act and what is happening on the various campuses that we don’t know about to comply or not with that and I will look into that. I have not done that for some time now. Let’s see, then there was the bill that was mentioned already about changes in SURNS funding and then finally Western passed a resolution noting the conflict the military’s don’t ask/don’t tell policy for gays and lesbians and the university’s non-discrimination policy which says that you cannot discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation so they passed a resolution as I say, noting this conflict and condemning the don’t ask/don’t tell law essentially. They’re not really expecting anything to come of that certainly anytime soon but they did want to be on the record as saying, you know, we really are not happy.

All right, so that was the large items that we talked about. Does anybody have any questions about that? Yeah?

**D. Wagner:** If there is no contract Pepsi, can there be a contract with both Pepsi and Coke or something?

**President Willis:** I don’t think so.

**D. Wagner:** So they lose all that money.

**President Willis:** What I heard was that down in the southern part of the state there were some smaller bottlers or distribution places or something like that that took umbrage with being left out and that was where this come from so it’s not Coke or Pepsi. It’s all those little ones.

**D. Wagner:** Does that include exclusive contracts with athletic equipment providers?

**President Willis:** I have no idea.

**???:** My question is this fund for faculty development ---

**President Willis:** Can you get a mike?

**???:** Yes, the Pepsi funds the faculty development seminars. Does that mean that we’re losing that?

**President Willis:** Yes. We’re losing that funding. But our contract has two more years to run so we don’t have to drop it immediately, we just – according to this law – will not be able to renew it. Maybe in those two years they’ll change their minds. One could hope. All right, any other questions or comments?

**D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – report**
E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs Committee – William Baker, Chair

President Willis: Let’s move on to Committees. Academic Affairs I believe has no report.

B. Baker: You believe correctly.

President Willis: I always like to think so.

B. Economic Status of the Profession Committee – Jim Lockard, Chair – report – walk-in

President Willis: Economic Status of the Profession, Jim has most of the rest of the walk-in here. I think all of the rest of it.

J. Lockard: Thank you. I don’t want to take a lot of time here at this late hour but if you will look in the walk in. Our meeting scheduled for the University Benefits Committee tends to run just ahead of our meetings here and things are never ready quite in time. I’ve given you the main bullet points of what was discussed last week. At that meeting one item relating to the domestic partner policy that is under development which would be a broader based policy than the policy at the U of I which this campus has views as itself being discriminatory because of the way it was written. We were asked to alert you all to the fact that every single year at this point in time the payment schedule of the state to health care providers slows to a crawl and there are increasing number of reports of people being told they have to folk over the money up front or they will not get service from various health care providers. Sadly, there’s little or nothing we can do about it. Our Governor clearly isn’t interested in solving these problems. We are working with the President to put together a letter to CMS outlining some of the more severe cases that we’ve seen here, asking CMS to look at a number of things including trying to hold the line on benefit costs for the next year which are still under negotiations with the unions, trying to assure that if they do once again decide that it’s time to throw, let’s see, who is it this year – Cigna – out and bring back Unicare or God knows what they’ll do next for a service provider, that they might consider expecting that the new one actually pick up all the pieces from the old one without interruption which didn’t happen last time and a few little things like that that could make life easier. We’re quite sure that the President will be willing to forward this on as soon as the language has been refined a little bit from the expletives that are filling it now. The benefits choice period, be alert to this one, it is always legislatively I guess, set for the month of May. However, because of the union negotiations of benefits this time around no one believes it will actually happen then. It cannot be of any value to you. You can’t make a choice before you have a benefits booklet in hand and the odds of that being available on May 1 are somewhere between zero and minus ten from all appearances. So the anticipation from our HR people is that there will be an extension of the period, not a shortening so that you have to make up your mind overnight or anything like that, but rather it will simply get shoved ahead somewhere along the way. No one cares to try to guess when that will actually be available
since its tied up in the union negotiations. A part of the letter that has been drafted for the President includes the request that CMS consider the remote possibility that maybe someone other than AFSCME might be a part of benefits negotiation in the future. That doesn’t happen at this point but it seemed like a fairly reasonable idea. The other two pages of the walk-in for you are a copy of a memorandum from Steven Cunningham that didn’t reach down to the level of faculty to my knowledge so I asked Donna to provide it for us. Some of you may have seen it already. It has to do with some changes that are going to happen in the SURS system for how things are calculated. They’re a little hard to follow particularly the one that relates to the SURS year and how that effects the last four years of learning. It’s on the backside. I’ve read that, I’ve listened to a presentation on it, I’ve looked at it in another source and I still am not sure exactly what it means but the implication seems to be that the nine-month employees may need to have greater counseling as to the effective date of retirement than was true in the past because of some changes in the way the four years can now be calculated. There’s a chance of effectively having to give up the final year as a part of it because the year for SURS runs until the end of August as opposed to the end of May and they can’t calculate it the same way they used to. The best advice is simply if someone’s approaching that point, you need to work closely with HR to figure out what is in your own best interest. Beyond that, let me just continue my usual exhortation to please join the NIU Annuitants Association regardless of how close you are to that. There is strength in numbers. They’re trying to work on our behalf, as is the State’s Annuitants Association. For your $18 or whatever it is a year, it’s the only lobbying help you’re going to get and so that is worth pursuing. If you don’t read the SURS Advocate when it comes to you and you should all get the paper copy. The newest one, which they for some bizarre reason do not date is Volume 13, Number 3. It’s February of ’04 even though there is no such date on it that I can see. If you don’t know where it is or you don’t read it, it’s available on line. Go to SURS.org and look under news and you can see an exact copy of it on the website there. The front page of it includes some things that are a part of the SURS legislative update and the action that SURS is trying to take on our behalf not the least of which as mentioned, I guess by Pat and maybe Sue both, is the strong opposition to the Governor’s playing around with SURS funding once again as this happened far too many times in the history of the state in the last twenty years. It’s shocking in a way if you look at it. We had a law passed a couple of years ago that had a plan in place to bring SURS funding to the 90% level, meaning it would actually have 90% of the money it needs to fulfill its obligations. Right now, because of the last two years or so, and very bad performance in the stock market and so on, we’re sitting at roughly 50%, way below where we ought to be, getting back to historically bad levels. The law that the Governor is not sure he wants to live up to because of the funding situation, would have brought us to 90% by the date of 2045. If he backs that off once again, we’re talking about well, let’s say it’s so far beyond my lifespan that I don’t even care to think about it at that point. So that’s how serious the issue is with that particular one. There’s some other things there that you can also read. I don’t know if any of you might be interested in the purpose of military service credit. For instance, for right now the requirements for that under SURS are so onerous it’s almost impossible to justify it financially. It’s very, very expensive even though it’s legal compared to purchasing prior service at other state universities and that sort of thing and SURS is looking for a way to try and bring military service credit into the same cost structure as other kinds of public service which would be a benefit to anybody who might have that available and who couldn’t hope to afford it at this point in time.
I think those are probably the main points out of the Advocate. To pick it up a little bit beyond that, State Universities Annuitants Association itself has its own legislative agenda which goes beyond simply SURS issues and you won’t have this document unless you are a member of the organization but among the things the SUAA is fighting for on our behalf is to head off possible cuts in current health care benefits for retirees, survivors and current employees. The fear is that the state will try to cut that. If not directly, then certainly indirectly through substantial increases in premiums. They’re trying to fight against that. Another thing that you may not be aware of is that although the state provides free health care to retirees they also require retirees who are eligible to become covered under Medicare at their own cost. You have to pay that Medicare Part B premium yourself. So free health insurance coverage for retirees isn’t quite what it sounds like. They’re looking to try to lobby for the state to cover the Medicare Part B premium since it is, in fact, saving them enormous amounts of money by making the federal program the primary insurance coverage. They’re also looking at the federal level to see if there’s any hope of getting the IRS to change its rule so that premiums paid for long-term care insurance would become standard deductions as opposed to yet another piece of the 7 ½% medical cap that has to be met in order for that to happen to encourage people to take care of their own needs better by purchasing but is relatively expensive insurance without a whole lot of write-off benefit.

The last thing I’ll share with you came out of this most recent issue of the NIU Annuitant, which again members receive. If you don’t see it, that’s why. I’ve talked before about the apparent economic ignorance of the folks in Springfield and you all know from previous reports that Budget Director Filan wants to see SURS and all the other state retirement funds collapsed into one. According to an article in this one written by our own Jerry Zar who did the research behind it, if Filan had succeeded, last year the plan he wanted them all collapsed into, earned a net return of less than 1%. SURS return last year was 13%. There’s what they would like to do to us.

President Willis: Okay, thank you. Questions for Jim? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Just one quick point on the matter of retirement benefits and retirement health benefits, I mean, we’re locked in to paying SURS – it’s by law and in the Constitution – but health benefits I think are the big, big cost increase and that is going to be I think very much in jeopardy as this budget deficit problem continues.

President Willis: Okay, any other questions or comments? All right.

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

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget I believe has not met.

C.T. Lin: No report.

President Willis: Okay.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair.
President Willis: Let’s see, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities has no report.

E. Rules and Governance Committee – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair.

President Willis: Rules and Governance I believe also has no report.

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

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee doesn’t have a report either but I just wanted to point out to you that on page 7 is Paul Stoddard’s letter accepting the nomination for President of the Faculty Senate for next year. Carole Minor has withdrawn, okay, so it’s going to be Paul presumably. I told him he couldn’t withdraw. All right.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: Let’s see, I don’t believe we have any Unfinished Business.

J. Stephen: Yes, we do.

President Willis: Oh, we do. What do we have?

J. Stephen: I now understand Athletic Director Groth’s absence the last several meetings but I still believe she owes us the responsibility and the courtesy of explaining the COIA to us so that we don’t have to wait for a new Athletic Director to get up to speed.

President Willis: Okay, I don’t think she’s going to be around for our next meeting and it was my decision not to invite her to come because I didn’t even know if she was going to be here.

J. Stephen: We’re still paying her aren’t we?

President Willis: I have no idea but I would suggest that perhaps we could get Jan Rintala to come and talk about it because she is our faculty representative to the NCAA and she is familiar with faculty issues surrounding athletics so she might very well be more familiar with those issues.

J. Stephen: I have a short annoying piece of New Business when we come to it.

President Willis: Okay. Do we have any other Unfinished Business?

X. NEW BUSINESS

President Willis: Let’s see, I think John you have a New Business item? No, oh somebody did. That was you. Okay, short and annoying. Okay?
J. Stephen: We’re changing the way we do copy cards again. This old card here has $20 on it and can be used in about five copiers that I’ve found. Calling up Sean Henson, the Director of such things at Document Services for ITS, there’s no way to change it to this card, so a little petty thief off of this count about 500 faculty members and so many students, that seems a little bit ridiculous that I can’t transfer my $20 from this card to this card. And how many people are in the same position with a worthless silver card in their wallet with $10, $20 or $30 on it. Mr. Henson or Hanson will tell you that oh, we can’t change it over.

President Willis: Donna handles all our copying so I don’t – I’m sure she can give me an earful but ---

J. Stephen: They do work at some of the library.

President Willis: All right, I will look into that and see what I can find out.

P. Henry: They should just buy them back.

President Willis: That would be nice. Anyway, I will find out what’s up with that. Is there any other New Business?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Comments and Questions from the Floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Nomination letter from Paul Stoddard for the Executive Secretary of University Council position (Page 7)
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
C. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
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 minutes
I. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
J. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XIII. ADOURNMENT

President Willis: I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Second? Okay, we are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.