
T. Smith attended for R. Butler; J. Koch attended for S. Clayton; T. Heinze attended for D. Munk, M. Cozad attended for W. Tolhurst.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Crisler, Cummings, Engel, Frank-Stromborg, Garcia, Greene, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kang, Kolb, Lin, Loubere, Mehrer, Novak, Powers, S. Song, Spear, Stoddard, Wade, Wickman, Windelborn

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: Do I have a motion to adopt the agenda which is the first couple of pages of your packet? Second? Any changes or amendments or comments? If not, everybody in favor say aye. Opposed?

The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 FS MEETING (Pages 3-7)

President Willis: On pages 3-7 you have the minutes of our last meeting on September 3. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes? Second? Any corrections or additions or whatever to the minutes? Okay, if not, all those in favor of approving the minutes of the last meeting say aye. Opposed? Okay.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Ivan Legg to speak – see memo from Ivan Legg to Sue Willis. (Page 8)

President Willis: First under President’s Announcements, if you look on page 8, there is a proposal from the Provost, Ivan Legg, to change the title of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs to Vice President for Student Affairs. Ivan is here to speak to that. While he’s coming up, let me just point out that this is a – we don’t have to approve these things. The Provost can do it with the approval of I believe, the President and the Board of Trustees so he’s bringing it to use as a courtesy and also because he really wants our feedback on what we think of this proposed change. So I would encourage you to take a look at his memo if you haven’t read it. It’s quite short and then I’ll ask him to speak briefly to the issue.

Provost Legg: In 1996 there was a Vice President for Student Affairs here who reported directly to the President. In 1996 – ’66 is a long time ago – in ’96 there was a major reorganization done at the university where Student Affairs and Academic Affairs were combined into one unit under the Provost and the title of Vice President for Academic Affairs or Student Affairs was changed to Vice Provost for Student Affairs and reported directly and only to the Provost and not to the President. A number of years went by and as things evolved, people do retire from positions and new people come in and, as you know, Bob Wheeler retired from the Vice Provost position which was directly responsible for academic affairs and we replaced him after a search with Gip Seaver. Within a short period of time of that change, there was also the announcement from Gary Greshold that he was stepping down and retiring form the position of Vice Provost for Student Affairs. I considered this a good time to evaluate what had happened during the last five to six years in terms of this marriage between Academic and Student Affairs and I brought in two experts from outside, they came in about three weeks ago, to look at what had evolved during the period that these two units were married as one unit. One of them was a provost with a considerable amount of experience that I knew quite well and a vice-president and vice-provost for student affairs that I also knew very well. They visited our campus for almost two days and came to the conclusion that from all the people that they visited - and they visited some forty plus people from across the university who had to do with Student and Academic Affairs – came to the conclusion that everybody was very happy with the arrangement except they felt that Student Affairs still did not have the kind of recognition that it has on most campuses and have lost to some extent here and recommended that what we do is change the title of Vice Provost for Student Affairs back to Vice President for Student Affairs with one major exception, that that position still would report to me, the Executive Vice President and Provost. The major change thought would be that that person would now have a direct seat on the President’s Cabinet by title and, as a result, would have the opportunity to give more direct input into the functioning of the university at that level about student affairs. I had heard some comments about this even before our visitors came but the visitors found that there was overwhelming support to do this and as a result, before I begin the search to replace the vacancy that Gary Greshold stepped down from, I am proposing that we go back to that title with the reporting line still remaining to me. I believe that this will enable us to conduct a very effective national search and to get hold of a very important person for a very important role by having in part changed the title. Therefore, I am asking for your comment and for your input on that proposed decision.

President Willis: Okay, thank you Ivan. Does anybody have any questions or comments for Ivan? I know there were any questions or comments at the Steering Committee. Yes, Carole?
C. Minor: I think this is a very good idea.

Provost Legg: Thank you. Good start.

President Willis: By the way, I’m the faculty advisor to a couple of student groups and one of the co-presidents of one of them called me up a few weeks ago and said “why is the Provost writing me a letter”? I said “well I don’t know, why don’t you let me look at the letter?” It was an invitation to one of these focus groups and I said “yes, you should go”. He was a little uncertain as to what this was all going to be about and whether he was going to be representing his constituency properly and all this sort of thing, so I said “don’t worry, just go”. So afterwards he came back to me and said that it had been a very good experience. He was very glad that he went. The groups that were there spoke freely and felt that they were listened to and there was overall just a very good experience for him and I assume for the other students that were there so they really did talk to the students. Okay, David?

D. Wagner: This probably reflects my ignorance but what’s the one unit that they’ve been combined into.

Provost Legg: Academic Affairs and Student Affairs which is my unit now that I’m responsible for.

D. Wagner: And then there’s the two of them ---

Provost Legg: They’re sub-divisions. Academic Affairs is one division and Student Affairs is the other division.

D. Wagner: Okay, and they’re both then under the provost.

Provost Legg: Correct.

D. Wagner: Okay.

Provost Legg: And it was done in recognition that they really reinforce each other. The student’s success at the university academically is dependent on the support services, the activities provided and advising etcetera that the student gets out of the area of Student Affairs.

President Willis: Okay, any other comments or questions? Okay, well either everybody is asleep or they’re okay with this so --- well, thank you Ivan. You’re welcome to stay as we mentioned before.

Provost Legg: I told you I would stay in case you had other questions that I could – I’m going to move to the back though.

President Willis: Okay, Ivan will be lurking in the back. I’m sorry, David?

D. Wagner: Could I ask one more question?
President Willis: Sure.

D. Wagner: Does the Vice President for Academic Affairs does he also – be a member of your staff, the Deans’ Council and the President’s Cabinet?

Provost Legg: We have a Vice Provost now without anything attached to the name. He’s in effect the Wheeler position that Gip Seaver now occupies?

D. Wagner: Yeah.

Provost Legg: It is viewed as a senior vice-provost position without having the connotation “senior” behind it. It’s traditional in many universities to do that. The main reporting lines that I have come from the deans and from my vice-provosts. So my primary focus, even though Student Affairs is under me, my primary focus is on Academic Affairs with the deans reporting directing to me whereas the Vice-Provost for Student Affairs is the only person from that division that reports to me. This will give better equal-weighted presence to Student Affairs by changing the title.

D. Wagner: Okay, I guess.

President Willis: Okay, any other questions or comments? All right, Ivan will be in the back at least for awhile and so if you have any questions.

Provost Legg: You can shoo me out if you want.

President Willis: No, I don’t care. Somebody else might care; if you care, tell me.

All right, I don’t have too much in the way of announcements. As you know, the budget is still very much in flux, in fact at this point it seems to be pure guesswork on everybody’s part except perhaps a few insiders as to what we might expect both this fiscal year and next. I’ll certainly let you know as soon as there is any hard evidence of something of substance but right now there really is not any information. The only thing I have heard is that the revenues are falling below projections which is basically not good. Exactly how not good it is we don’t know.

All right, other than that I don’t really have any further announcements so let’s go on.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

President Willis: We have no items for Faculty Senate Consideration except for everything else on the agenda. I never did quite understand that agenda item.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Willis: We have nothing under Consent Agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
President Willis:  Let’s move to Reports from Advisory Committees. Pat Henry has a report from the FAC.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 9-13)

P. Henry: Yes, thank you. This is a sort-of rambling report because there is a fair number of informational items that went on at this meeting. This was at Northwestern University on September 12. Very nice, I might add. Lake view, organic coffee. Nothing but the best and we had various items of discussion. The President, Henry Beinen, had a number of comments on public/private partnerships and some concerns that involved both – one thing that he mentioned in response to a question as to whether or not public education is becoming increasingly privatized and from the point of view of the privates, of course, that doesn’t seem like such a bad idea. He agreed that there does seem to be some sort of a continuing trend in that way, in other words, needing to get more and more funds from granting agencies and less and less from the state and it’s a matter that seems to be being followed in a number of places. He mentioned, by the way, that some public universities such as Miami University of Ohio, have adopted the model of private institutions, that is to say having very high tuition and very high financial aid and so far, none of the publics are very keen on that model in Illinois as far as I can tell.

The other things that have happened as I noted there are reports from a number of the IBHE staff. We had Doug Day who reported on this study on improving faculty diversity. There’s a number of points there and on the second page there’s also a couple of websites for those of you who would like to have the entire reports – the summary report and the whole shebang if you want to read it. Among the things that he mentioned were the way in which the IBHE is looking into trying, for example, to meet more masters students who graduate from Illinois – minority master students – to be kept teaching at the community college level. The idea being that if there isn’t a sufficient pool of people with PhD’s to get them in at the university level that a way of sort-of building this into the system would be to get more and more minority students, especially those from Illinois who’ve been helped with the various incentive programs in teaching at the community colleges. The FAC heard this with interest; noted that sometimes this could contribute – master degree holders increasingly being part of community college faculty – could conceivably a problem in terms of leading to loss of tenure track positions at community colleges just as it is in the case of four-year institutions, tenure track positions in community colleges are somewhat under pressure.

The second report was from Deb Smitley who also spoke about various issues. The master plan policy which, I guess, is something that goes on periodically – I guess the last one was done in 1997 – they’re, essentially the IBHE is looking it over again and making sure that things are in accordance with the situation as it is now. The document as they say, is a copulation of existing policy so it’s not really a new policy issue. The FAC will however look over certain aspects of it in our committees and have input to the IBHE as we see necessary. So that too is on view on the web in a couple of places. Deb Smitley also addressed various legislative affairs many of which I think we’ve already discussed – truth in tuition, line item veto and so forth. As Susan was just saying – Sue was just saying, the budget question is still very up in the air and nobody is really sure what’s going on. They also note that the veto session begins November 4 and there are some issues that will impact on higher education that we need to keep an eye on.
There were several questions that FAC members asked. In particular, of course, asking if she thought there was going to be a rescission again this year. She said that we’re pretty cautious for 2004. It’s possible but they’re not sure. Fiscal year 2005 will probably be at current year levels and there’s a strong possibility of the 2% or 5% cut, I think either mid-term or next year or both, who knows. One thing also – and I forwarded a couple of websites to Sue which for those of you who are interested, I can pass on as well, I didn’t have time to include them in this report – the whole question of higher education funding and the – whatever it is – the higher education act – is under consideration in Congress and to some extent some aspects of it are getting closer scrutiny and it’s important I think to keep track of that as well. Those of you who are interested, e-mail me and I can e-mail you the articles in question.

The next report was from Gary Alexander who’s the Interim Deputy Director for Academic Affairs. One of the things that he mentioned was a case of a nursing program that had been offered at Lakeland College apparently not being to continue and that Danville area community college was going to try and take up the slack basically and wanting to offer a bachelor’s – a BSN – what is a BSN? Bachelor of Science in Nursing. This was seen as a kind of way of opening the door to another situation which is increasing pressure of some community colleges to offer four-year degree programs for the baccalaureate degree. At this point, the law I think does not allow it but there are some members of the legislature who are interested in doing this so, at this point, it isn’t going to happen but it might. Harper College in particular has been looking into the possibilities of this. I think it’s something that you need to be aware of because I think as financial pressure increases, it becomes more and more attractive to offer the baccalaureate at the community college level as opposed to the present situation which is sort of the 2+2 degree completion program that we generally offer with community colleges. The IBHE really does not having community colleges offer baccalaureate degrees but I think there is some activity in the legislature and other places to possible bring this up.

Finally the last item, FAC Chair, Allan Karnes, reported on the August IBHE meeting. We continue to have concerns about especially this matter of defining administrative costs. There is a study that has still not been made public and the FAC continues to ask for it, but it does not get it. There does seem to be a disconnect between the notion of having administrative cuts and then requiring more administrative reporting. We’ve mentioned this before but it seems to be continuing.

We will meet with the Board actually next week and this is the one time a year – the FAC usually meets on its own after or before Board meetings – but with the October one we will meet together with the Board. We will sort-of sit back and observe their meeting during the morning and then they will have lunch with us and we will ask them questions and we’re developing questions to ask them. The question that the committee I’m part of, the Public Policy Committee, is formulating something along the lines of how should the Board or the FAC communicate to the public about the effects of cutting higher education. This is sort-of in line with what I had mentioned previously about trying to get across just sort-of what is being lost here with these cuts and we are thinking that there might be better way so doing this other than having New York Time’s articles and Chicago Tribune articles about how terrible things are in higher education.
Finally, the fourth draft of the seventh goal – I just bring back to you as the final thing that has been now voted on by the FAC. It will be brought to the attention of the October IBHE meeting, but it may not be acted upon immediately. They’re still considering when they will rewrite the Illinois Commitment and whether or not they’ll add this remains to be seen. That’s all.

**President Willis:** Okay, thank you Pat. Does anybody have any questions for Pat? Yes, Carole?

C. **Minor:** I hate to bring this up but has anybody thought about, in your questions for this meeting that you have, the Governor – there’s less money available for higher education in the State, we can only raise tuition for incoming students – how long is going to be before we have to downsize higher education and the access will be limiting – that’s a real question.

**P. Henry:** I – that has been brought up and we’re trying to formulate ways of expressing that that is really what’s happening and that we’re not just whining. Yes, I think that’s a very good point. I’ll make sure it gets asked.

**President Willis:** Okay, other questions? If not, then thank you Pat.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tollhurst – report (Page 14)

**President Willis:** Let’s move on then to the various Board of Trustee’s Committees whatnot. The Board of Trustee’s Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Bill Tolhurst could not be here but Paul Loubere is here. They have a written report on page 14. Paul, did you want to elaborate on that at all? Good to go?

**P. Loubere:** Not really, it was a very routine meeting.

**President Willis:** Okay, does anyone have any questions for Paul? I’ll cover most of the – well, I will cover the action issues in the Board of Trustee’s Report anyway because what the sub committees do is they forward any action items they have, they forward on to the full Board.

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

**President Willis:** If not, the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee also met. I propose again to just include that in the full Board Report because it’s essentially the same items.

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

**President Willis:** Let’s see, the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee I believe did not meet, is that correct?

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report
President Willis: The full Board met on the 18th of September. Well, they had a full agenda as we do so I’m just going to point out some highlights. One thing which I am not sure I fully understand but which sounds ominous did come from the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee that have not met which is that the Governor is saying that between 200 and 400 million dollars of money appropriated for higher education will not be released. So, I don’t know exactly what he means by that but it doesn’t sound very good. I’m not sure how much the university, as a whole knows about that either. My impression is that that’s what he said and exactly which money he’s not going to release nobody is going to know until he doesn’t release it I guess. I don’t think anybody knows now.

The NIU Foundation last year had a goal of raising 9.1 million dollars. They actually raised 10.1 million. So that was good.

Let’s see, the action items before the Board were – there were a couple of routine things – and then they passed our 2005 budget requests. The appropriated budget – well, in particular the capital budget, will go to the IBHE which then takes all the capital budget requests from all the universities and makes a priority ordered list and sends it out to the Governor. Our list this year is the same as it was last year because last year we got nothing so we still have all the same priorities that we had then so we’re sending them back. Maybe sometime there’ll be some money.

Let’s see, there was a description of how the FY04 budget is broken down in the current fiscal year. By broken down I don’t mean malfunctioning, I just mean how the different parts are being allocated.

Let’s see, there was another one of these performance contracts which I have never heard of before I got into this position, but which I think are extraordinarily clever. This is where the university identifies some need that it has that will save energy in one way or another. This particular one was control valve retrofits which – whatever that is. I know what control is and I know what valves are and I know what retrofit is but I’m not real sure what this particular control value is controlling or exactly how we’re retrofitting it but anyway. Apparently this will save energy and the way these performance contracts work is that we ask for bids from companies for doing the work and what they bid on is – they do the work at no cost to us. So we won’t pay anything. They agree to be paid out of the energy savings for a period of ten years. Okay, so for the first ten years we pay more than it actually costs; we pay what we would have paid if we hadn’t had the change and the difference goes to the company that put the thing in and, as you can imagine, there’s a substantial amount of ongoing negotiations about exactly how much the cost would have been. Anyway, there are people who do that and then at the end of the ten years, the company is paid off and they go away and we have energy savings at no cost to us. So, we’ve done a number of projects that way and this is another one of those. I feel I have to describe it because I think it’s so clever. Anyone, there’s another one of those.

Let’s see. Oh yeah, there’s renaming of the athletic field which you may have noticed or not.

There were a number of information items some of which were live and audio/visual. There was an update on the Convocation Center which interestingly the first year of operation, which was last year, made enough money to cover all its expenses, make the first payment on the revenue
bonds which were voted to fund it and they had $900,000.00 left over which they’ve put into a reserve fund. So the thing actually made a profit. What they tell me is that places like this usually are in the red for the first couple of years. They were hoping to break even and they surpassed that. So that was good.

There was also a report on external funding grants and what have you.

Finally, there’s a memorial resolution for Rhoten Smith who had passed away just a few days before that.

Any questions about the Board of Trustees? Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: I probably shouldn’t ask this but I have to be curious. You mentioned that the Convo Center made a profit so what did they do with the money?

President Willis: They put it in a reserve fund so if in future years they don’t make a profit, they can draw on that to meet expenses and to make their payments on the bonds. Yes, Carole?

C. Minor: I have a suggestion of what they can do with the money and it doesn’t have to do with giving us a raise or anything like that. They could get a TV screen for in there that you can actually see like one they have at the stadium. You may have noticed the article in the Northern Star last week or the week about the guy who went to the Convo Center to see the Alabama game and he couldn’t see because it was so fuzzy. That’s a problem with the big TV screen in the Convo Center. So in case you have a chance to mention that somewhere, that’s a suggestion.

President Willis: All right, thank you. Yes.

J. Stephens: Another suggestion. Students are quite interested in ice skating here.

President Willis: Ice skating?

J. Stephens: And we’re kind of mad because it was not included in the original plan.

President Willis: So ice skating would be popular?

J. Stephens: It’s one of my favorite hobbies.

President Willis: They do know about the lagoon, right? I remember last year I think there was at least a day or two where you could skate on it. Okay, I will pass that on. Any other comments or questions about the Board of Trustees?

F. Council of Illinois University Senate – Sue Willis – report

President Willis: If not then let me just go ahead and give you a very brief report on the Council of Illinois University Senates. For those of you who are new to this, this is a group of the Faculty Senate presidents of all the state universities in Illinois. So the U of I and Northern and Eastern and Western and Southern and Northeastern and Governor State and Chicago State –
there’s about twelve. We get together – we have been getting together about three years now, twice a year, and we have found that it’s an excellent networking group because, you know, you sit on one campus and you hear what your campus people are telling you but you don’t necessarily know what’s going on in on other campuses and what their campus people are telling them so this is very handy.

We met at the University of Illinois at Springfield. We spent the morning with their lobbyist who was telling us as much as he could about what the situation is in the legislature and the executive portions of the government. We also met with the president and provost of the University of Illinois at Springfield and we had very fruitful discussions all afternoon about what our situations were and what we might do about them although we did not pass any specific proposals at this time. We did agree to meet again in Springfield in the spring, like February or March, when the legislature is in session and we will arrange to do some lobbying at that time.

Any questions about that?

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – William Baker, Chair – report (Page 15)

President Willis: Okay, let’s go on to Reports from Standing Committees. The first one is Academic Affairs, Bill Baker.

B. Baker: We met on September 17. The report for your addition may be found on page 15. We would like to thank Dennis Munk for the minutes. The meeting was attended by Sandy Flood, representing the non-tenure track faculty and instructors. Sandy Floor has presented to us a crafted statement and we will be considering that at our next meeting which will take place on October 15 in Room 303 of the Holmes Study Center at 3:00. Thank you. Any questions?

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

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair – report (Page 16)

President Willis: All right, Economic Status of the Profession, Jim.

J. Lockard: As I indicated last month, our Committee hopes to spend the year helping to educate us all about the economic issues that face us and to that end, there is a report for you on page 16 of the packet for today. I don’t need to go everything that is there. Some of it is strictly informational at this point. I do want to call your attention to three things that I think are the most important of the six that I listed there.

First of all, you may recall from last year the information that the Governor was on a path of seeking to combine all the retirement systems into a single one a move that SURS has not been very favorable toward because they have had the best performance of all of the state systems and we figure it would regression to the mean if we’re thrown in with the rest of them. He lost that effort at the legislative level thus far this year but has not given up and so there is every reason to
expect that he’s going to be continuing that effort this year. Something that we’re going to need to be very vigilant about and potentially mount a lobbying effort to once again defeat if that goes forward. While I’ve thought all along it was highly probable he would continue this, I think it’s even more probable given this week’s announcement from the Attorney General that he can’t steal the money from the toll way fund that he was trying to. So he’s going to continue his efforts to find it wherever he can and SURS and other retirement programs are clearly among those that he’s got his eyes set on so we need to be very, very alert to what’s going on with our retirement system.

The second thing that’s going to make this an interesting year is that every four years, the entire benefits package gets renegotiated and this is the year for that to happen so effective next July 1 a whole new set of benefits may very well be in place. As is true each time this cycle comes around, the only body that really has much to say in the whole thing is the AFSCME union. The universities are not represented at this at all and we basically get whatever is determined by the union representing the state, county and municipal employees. Once again, we will try to be alert to what’s going on with that and to inform you as rapidly as possible of anything that might again call for some lobbying efforts on our part as we have absolutely no way of knowing what may happen during those negotiations but it is basically between Central Management Services and the union. The CMS people have already indicated they expect there to be some changes and, given all else that’s going on with the state budget, I suspect we need not look for improvement. I think the question has much more to do with how much more are we going to pay or how much less are we going to have covered by our various packages than anything else and all we can do really is be vigilant about it at this point in time.

The third point that’s in there is item #4 actually and that is for those who were watching last year’s effort, actually a many year effort, to get the pharmaceuticals benefit to incorporate contraceptives, it now does by state law which surprisingly to me at least, was not written so as to exempt the state from the requirements put onto the private employers and so they will be covered – birth control products will be covered effective next July rather than January 1 when the law takes effect because that’s the cycle on our benefits plan. That is a new benefit that was actually gained surprisingly.

Over and beyond that I want to call your attention to something else I didn’t come across until after I had submitted the report for today. I would hope that everyone is at least a bit attentive to the issue of the Advocate when it comes from SURS each quarter. There’s a lot of good information in there if you take the time to read it and think about what they’re telling you. I want to call your attention to three things that are in the fall issue right now. If anybody needs information about this more quickly, if you’d like the whole thing and have lost your copy, you can go to SURS.org. You have to register but it’s no big deal. They just want to make sure you’re a member and then you can get it on line there as well if you don’t have the print copy.

But here are the things I found fascinating in reading the thing. There’s a full-page editorial from the Executive Director of SURS, Jim Hacking, talking about potential for what he calls “a pension contribution holiday”. This is something that those of you who were here in the early ‘80ss will remember because Illinois has done this before in tight times and what it amounts to very simply is this. Instead of paying into the system what is owed by law, they simply say “we can’t do it, too bad” and let it go by. They have done this; they can do it even though it is against
the law. They have never been challenged on it; never been held accountable for it. That happened in the early ‘80s and, according to Hacking’s editorial, if it had not happened in the early ‘80s, the state would be looking to pay into SURS in the current fiscal year only about half as much as it has to and what it is obligated to for this year is 320 million dollars. That figure would be half if they had only paid the bills when they should have 20 years ago. If they take another holiday, things will obviously only get worse. Another factor I thought was quite interesting, at least I had no feeling for how SURS fit into the whole retirement system here, the total state obligation to all the various state pension funds for fiscal year ’04 is almost 2 billion dollars of which we’re 320 million. Quite interesting. The other part which is even more mind boggling, since these obligations are written into state law and, therefore, ultimately come back to income taxes, if the income from contributions of members don’t pay the bills and so on, they are not currently – the long-term obligation that they’ve calculated through fiscal year ’45 – 2045 – because of poor funding in the past, now stands at over 60 billion dollars compared to 30 billion that it would have been if they’d paid the bills in the ‘80s. So the effect of one of these holidays is quite devastating on long-term financial health of something like the retirement system even though it is a state obligation and there’s not really a particular reason to worry about whether they will pay you if you retire, they must, by law. However, not all parts of that are covered and that’s another point that I want to make from that same issue. There’s a lengthy piece near the end of this issue of the Advocate encouraging people to join SUAA, the State University Annuitants Association. Many of you may have ignored that when you’ve heard about it in the past. Every university has a chapter I believe. You may have ignored it because you felt you’re not an annuitant. Well, think of it this way, it’s a little bit like AARP, you don’t have to be retired to belong to AARP. The same thing is true here. It’s really the best thing we have going for us in the preservation of our benefits. In fact, directly quoting from the Advocate, they describe it this way “it’s the only organization whose primary purpose is to protect your retirement or survivor benefits; the closest thing you have to retirement/benefit insurance”. The dues are minimal. I think it’s around twenty dollars a year if I remember right for the chapter here on campus. It’s well worth looking into. They point out in that article that SUAA is about the only group that might be able to help us in these benefits negotiations that are going on this year by pointing out such things as the State Constitution guarantees the state’s obligation for retirement but there are many factors that are not guaranteed such as: retiree’s do not pay for health insurance currently. Such as retirement benefits from SURS are not taxed. There’s no income tax on it in the state of Illinois. None of that stuff is guaranteed and it’s all subject to change and we couldn’t have a better climate for change than we do right now. So do look it up. They have a web page at SUAA.org. Check it out. I think it’s a good investment in our future to belong. It’s a good lobbying point. I think they said there are about 10,000 members currently out of about 30,000 eligible so you might want to consider if you want to add to that.

Finally, to give you a little more insight into the way things operate in Springfield these days; you may have heard the name of John Filan, Director of the Office of Management and Budget. This is the guy who flunked Business 101 I think that our Governor installed down there after he was elected. He called a meeting of the directors of the various retirement systems and made a variety of suggestions to them as to what ought to be done with the large amount of money they got in this year from bond sales. That was one of the ways the state tried to overcome some of the pension funding problems. We’re talking about several billion dollars here and among the options that were put forth – all of which were rejected by every one of the state retirement systems – was that we ought to start doing market timing or playing the hedge markets. At the
moment, the university invests all of its money in some of the most conservative things imaginable because that’s all we’re allowed to do by state and now the Director of the Budget is saying the retirement systems ought to be gambling in hedge money and things like that. It also seemed to be quite telling in – let’s see if I can find it in here, in the report of this meeting from SURS – talking about the meeting that went on in June, they noted that Director Filan asked for a response to four points he made during his presentation. I’m reading this directly from the Advocate. “Although it was not exactly clear to the meeting attendees what those four points were and although an effort from SURS to obtain clarification from OMB was unsuccessful, we did respond to four issues we thought we understood”. Questions?

President Willis: Okay, any questions for Jim? Yes, Beth?

B. Miller: I just have one comment about insurance and getting payment from CIGNA. I personally have had to struggle significantly with getting payments and after fighting for about six months, gave up and I just wanted to share – not personal – but you can, and you might want to share with other people if you know that they are personally having trouble getting inconsistent messages from CIGNA, to go to the insurance office here on campus and pass that along to all your colleagues because the insurance office will support and help write letters and send copies to CMS. I don’t know that all the faculty knew that. I’ve used them before but I just wanted to reiterate for other people to know that. They’re a valuable resource.

President Willis: Okay, yes?

J. Stephen: Not only are we having problems with that, I had a pre-approved hospitalization for a family member last spring and then they paid it and then they withdrew the payment and I don’t know what their word for it was, but they had the hospital send them back the money and now Provena Hospital says, you know, $12,800.00 – please pay. Here’s an envelope. So be careful about watching your bills and even if you think they paid because, for some reason, they’re reversing some payments.

President Willis: That strikes me as being the sort-of thing that certainly ought to be brought to the attention of the insurance office. Okay, any other comments or questions?

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

President Willis: Okay, Resource, Space and Budget. C. T. Lin is not here but Bill Goldenberg is. Do you have a report?

B. Goldenberg: Yeah, sure. Professor Lin had to be away for professional reasons so I’ll serve as his substitute today. We did meet and it was mainly a planning meeting to decide what issues and guests we wanted to invite for the future but some questions were asked and points were made which may be of interest and I’ll briefly summarize them. I just decided not to – nothing earthshaking happened so I decided to save a little bit of our money and trees by not printing a report.

First of all, as you may all wander around campus, you see lots of projects being done and you may wonder “where the heck is all that money coming from for that when we’re thinking of
letting faculty go” and that question came up and all of us – our brains work the same way – we all wonder that and probably most of you know the answer but anyway. Dr. Williams did explain to us again that money for capital projects which you see being done around the campus – buildings and repairing roads – is a completely different source of funding than personnel lines and money cannot be shifted from one to another. Just as an example, some of the capital projects are funded by sales of bonds and, of course, there’s a specific prospectus that goes out with the bonds. The investors expect it to be spent in a certain way and the money cannot be shifted to personnel lines so I hope people understand that. We’re not rolling in dough just because you see some buildings being repaired and roads being repaired. Also, as Sue explained to us the happy result that the Convocation Center was profitable in its first year which is unusual came up at our meeting as well and so we’re pleased to see that. It was also reported – you may not be aware that possibly Altgeld Hall may be finished by December. It’s nearing completion. It’s a long project. We all walk by and wonder when will this finally be open. But maybe this December, somewhere around there was an optimistic estimate.

As far as funding goes, whatever funds are available, the number one priority is for health and safety repairs and needs such as fixing elevators. (end of tape) – department units and so on to find out what the needs are and then needs are prioritized based on requests from lower units.

Finally, just to let you know what’s coming up for our meetings and most likely I will print a report for these meetings because they’re probably going to have more content – on October 15, Provost Legg has kindly agreed to meet with us and we will get some communication going back and forth about what are the priorities for the university in this difficult budget situation. I know that our Committee members are very concerned about the bulging enrollment and yet the very low budget to support it and so there will be questions along those lines I’m sure. That’s October 15. For November 12, we’ve invited Chief Grady to speak with us about security and safety issues. So, are there any questions?

**President Willis:** Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I just wondered what the status is of the escalators in the library?

**B. Goldenberg:** I don’t know but I thought – certainly I smile when I see that they’re turned off. I assume they’re not broken; they’re just saving money I assume on powering them.

**President Willis:** I actually had asked Art Young about that relatively recently and he did tell me that they were not functioning and that it was just too expensive to repair them.

**B. Goldenberg:** Oh, I see. Okay.

**President Willis:** So I suggested – you know, it’s the only building on campus that has escalators.

**B. Goldenberg:** Well, there are elevators for people who can’t walk the stairs.
**President Willis:** Right, yeah, it’s not like you can’t get up and down. I suggested maybe they could tear them out and just make an atrium or something but, of course, that also costs money so --- for now they’re sitting.

**B. Goldenberg:** Good question.

**President Willis:** Yes, Beth?

**B. Miller:** Several of my faculty have concerns about classrooms and we raised it at our first meeting about whether we’re going to have a computer committee that would forward it on but it goes to classrooms as well. I hate to use the word comfort, but some classrooms, for example, where we have to stand for three hours to lecture and we don’t have a place lean or sit, prop ourselves. You know, the classrooms are not conducive for moving around if we’re stuck because we don’t have a remote mouse. These kinds of things are not exactly – they cost a lot of money to have a remote mouse, but they are also don’t get us into the classrooms next to the students if we’re tucked way away from our students. It is not engaged learning which is what we’re supposed to be doing with our classes. I’m wondering the connection between space, teaching, the move toward, you know, from utilizing space from 8:00 in the morning until 9:00 at night which many of us do in our classrooms because our classes – the need for the classrooms are bulging. I know in my building our classrooms are used from 8 to 9 at night. If that has been discussed or could be discussed in your Committee and integrated into this if we are going to have a committee or anybody is having a committee to talk about this. It think that was a question.

**B. Goldenberg:** I do remember very clearly that there were issues about technology and classrooms and those sorts of questions brought up at our earlier meeting and I’m not sure – we certainly could deal with it – but I’m not sure if Sue was going to appoint some kind of committee. Could you clarify what you would like us to do? Are you going to refer it to us?

**President Willis:** For technology in particular, we do – there is an existing committee which is apparently not doing its job as well as it could do and so Rick Orem actually is the chair of the committee in the University Council to which this issue was referred and they will be coming back to the Council meeting with some recommendations – not for a new committee because we really do already have a committee – but for getting the existing committee up to speed and doing what it really needs to do. That is specifically for technology and really more focused towards – well, maybe not – but I’m thinking it’s a bit more on the software side than mouse or mice – whatever you call them. Yes?

**J. Stewart:** Some of the issues that were just brought up are in the standing venue for the Undergraduate Coordinating Committee and for the sub-committees under there and we would certainly be glad if individual issues were sent back to us and we’d put them in the appropriate committee and come up with responses.

**President Willis:** Okay, that sounds like a good idea. So issues having to do with classrooms setups and climate and what have you.
**B. Goldenberg:** You know, I’m on the Undergraduate Coordinating Committee also and I’m sure we’d be happy to deal with it. I just wanted to make the suggestion that maybe the best idea would be for you to put this into an e-mail or into writing exactly what the concerns are so there’s kind-of tangible to deal with and then they can be addressed.

**B. Miller:** I’d be happy to. I just wanted to say that when I brought it up to our person in our college, he basically said, “well none of the other classrooms on campus have a remote mouse – I don’t know why you would want that”. You know, at the same time I know faculty development is trying to teach us to become more engaged and I’m like, you know, this just seems to me to be an oxymoron.

**B. Goldenberg:** Okay, well say it again. We’ll work on it.

**B. Miller:** I’ll emphasize the moron part.

**B. Goldenberg:** Don’t be defeated immediately. We’ll work on it, I think.

**B. Miller:** Okay.

**J. Stewart:** There are other groups who have remote mice. There are other groups that have remote mice on campus.

**President Willis:** Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** As a teacher of foreign language – I felt that often to be the case when I have a smart classroom and you have to zip back and forth between the podium to get out to the classroom. It really, I think – would it be helpful in some capacity for those of us who have this need to communicate this so it’s not seen as just an isolated problem?

**President Willis:** What I would suggest Beth, if you want to write this up as Bill had suggested and send it to me then I can send it out to, you know, like through the Council and the Senate and ask if there are other comments or other issues of similar types that ought to be considered together.

**B. Goldenberg:** I don’t think the inconvenience was done malevolently. I think the people who designed it maybe just didn’t think of the problems that would come up and so if we ask, maybe they can take care of the situation.

**President Willis:** Right, right. Okay, any other questions or comments for Bill?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair

**President Willis:** Okay, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Ngoyi. Do you have a report? No report. Was there more you wanted to say about that?

**N. Bukonda:** Yes, I just wanted to mention that we met just once and we are in the process of surveying various departments regarding student grievance and the answers are coming from the
different departments. We are meeting after this Faculty Senate meeting in this room to go over some of the responses and then we hope that the next meeting we’ll have a report to submit.

President Willis: Okay, very good.

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance, Gretchen.

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes, our Committee did meet on Monday and we’re currently considering the revised grievance procedures. Those were included in your September 3 packet and they’re also available on line. We’re planning on bringing this to the Faculty Senate at the next meeting so while we’re in this process, we’d like to have any feedback or comments. We’d appreciate anything that Faculty Senate members would like to e-mail to me in regard to the revised grievance procedures that are in the packet. As I said, we’ll be bringing it to the Senate at the next meeting.

President Willis: Okay, by the way as I mentioned last time when we handed these out, I really do not want to print them again. I will e-mail them to everybody before the meeting but please see if you can find it if you want a written copy when you come. Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Is everything on line?

G. Bisplinghoff: There was a September 3 ---

President Willis: Yes there was.

G. Bisplinghoff: I think right on it.

President Willis: Usually attachments that come with the packets are on line with the agendas so that’s where it is but I will e-mail it also. Electrons are very recyclable.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair

President Willis: Elections, Stephen?

S. Nord: No report.

President Willis: I did have one request – is this – this is just – University Council – the Hearing Panel? It’s everybody? Oh, okay. I was confused; I’m always confused. For the Hearing Panel you should have gotten a ballot in the mail. They are to be returned by Friday. If not very many vote, it becomes very hard to figure out who has more votes than who else when they all have either one or zero so – which is not the case – but please, do send those back.

I also want to point out to you that on the last page of your packet is the Alternate Policy for Faculty Senate members including those who are University Council members as well. If you can’t come to a Faculty Senate meeting, find somebody else in your department to come. Let me
rephrase that slightly. University Council members can actually ask anybody in their college because Council members represent colleges; Senate members represent departments. If Council members can’t come to Council meetings, that’s why we had all those alternate elections last time and they alternate lists are there so start at the top and go down until you find somebody who can go. This is actually particularly important to Council because that’s where we do much more substantive work in changing bylaws and things like that and also where we tend to have a much bigger problem getting a quorum. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention. We have no Unfinished Business or New Business that I know of.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes
J. Alternate List (Page 17)

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 PM