
J. Bentley attended for F. Jaeger; J. Rintala attended for P. MacFarlane; T. Heinze attended for D. Munk; L. Gregory represented D. Robertson.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Consider yourself in order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: First item is to adopt the agenda. We do have a guest here today, Wally Czerniak so I think what we’ll do during President’s Announcements is let Wally field any questions you may have and then we’ll get on with the regular announcements and the rest of the business of the meeting so we don’t keep Wally here any longer than we really need to. Other than that, I think the agenda – I’ve got nothing to add. There are a few walk-in items to be aware of. Can I have a motion to adopt? You need to speak up. There you go. Any additions, comments, complaints? All in favor of the agenda, please say aye. All opposed.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2005 FS MEETING

(Will be a walk-in)

P. Stoddard: Next up is a walk-in item as it turns out which is the Faculty Senate minutes. I’m sure you’ve all looked over these very carefully in the two minutes you’ve had. Well, it’s minutes for minutes. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. Thank you. Anybody, you’ve all had a chance to read and make sure your names are spelled correctly. Yes?
M. Kipperman: Roman IV, page 2, I believe John Knapp is not on sabbatical leave but has a medical problem.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. We’ll make that change. Is there any other corrections or observations? All right, all in favor of approving the minutes, please say aye. All opposed. Okay, thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Wally Czerniak, Associate Vice President, Information Technology Services will attend the Faculty Senate meeting to answer questions.

P. Stoddard: I’ll make one very brief announcement before Wally gets started. For those of you tired of the cold and snow, baseball’s first exhibition game started today. The Washington Nationals won their very first game ever, 5 to 3 over the Mets so it’s a dark day for all of us.

With that, I’d like to welcome Wally Czerniak who’s the Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services, that’s the computer folks. I know we’ve had several discussions in here about computing and so forth and so Wally has graciously agreed to come and talk to us about any concerns or questions we might have with campus computing facilities. So, with that, I don’t know if you have anything you’d like to start with.

W. Czerniak: Just one announcement I guess. From our last Computing Facilities Advisory Committee meeting and from the Registrar’s Office, I know most of you are familiar with Blackboard and e-mail. The Registrar for the last several years really is pushing to go to a paperless society with our students and wants to convince our students to use the NIU provided e-mail address that we provide with their e-mail system. Over the past several years, we’ve made significant investments and changes in the student e-mail system to provide significantly more disk space storage space for all of our students and to make it so they can use this as their main mailbox and actually route other mail messages from other systems. The Registrar has requested that we lock the students’ e-mail address, that we put the NIU e-mail address into Blackboard and lock that address so they cannot change that and, in fact, in the past the students have been allowed to change that address. The problem we had in doing that was that in order to lock the students’ e-mail addresses, we also had to lock the faculty e-mail address. This has been discussed on and off at several committees that meet about Blackboard and with Computing Facilities and the final recommendation that was put in was that it seems it would be okay if we locked these faculty e-mail addresses to whatever it is today without changing it. In the future, we would add their NIU assigned e-mail address, but we would allow the faculty to call in to the customer support desk and they, in fact, then would change the e-mail address to whatever they wanted. So, in fact, we won’t be changing this for the faculty; just changing the process but we will be freezing it for the students. Everybody has agreed to this and it’s our plan to implement this between spring and summer sessions. Beginning in the fall, I believe the Registrar wants to actually stop mailing a lot of, physically mailing, a lot of information to students and e-mailing it to them in their e-mail boxes. Comments or questions or if I didn’t explain that clearly? With that, I’ll take questions.
M. Kipperman: I’m currently using corn to access Groupwise.

P. Stoddard: Excuse me. Would you use a microphone so we can record your words for posterity?

M. Kipperman: My alias is Corn rather than Groupwise. I want to know what the fate of the Corn service is going to be. Are we going to continue to have two, if my e-mail address is locked, the alias would be locked on the Corn.

W. Czerniak: First off, this has nothing to do with Corn. This is just Blackboard.

M. Kipperman: Oh, just Blackboard. Sorry, so erase that part and just leave standing the first inquiry, the fate of the future of the Corn server.

W. Czerniak: The future of Corn server. There are no plans with it. We keep moving things off of it. There’s two primary – there’s multiple uses for Corn. Corn was brought about several years ago to be used as a general purpose Unix machine for faculty/departments that didn’t have their own dedicated Unix machine. That is still being used today. There is e-mail services on Corn. Again, it was for faculty who wanted to use the Unix post office. I think the use of that has dropped below 200 people on it now so all I’ll say is that at some point if it drops really low or if there’s no real need for it, you know, that post office might go away. We continually – if there’s ever discussion brought up about it, it is really brought up as a cost reduction issue but it won’t be a services issue. In other words, if we can provide this same service someplace else, we may ask the users if they want to move but there is no plan right now to eliminate Corn or that post office.

P. Stoddard: Bill?

W. Baker: Yes, I’d like to follow up on your last answer to me colleague. There is a perception that the criteria operating appears to be the convenience or the expedience for the administrators and those running such as yourself, Information Technology Services, as opposed to actually asking what the faculty users want. In fact, it surprised me in your answer that you did actually mention what are the concerns of the faculty. Now, of course Corn is running down because it’s made extremely difficult and increasingly more difficult to access the thing so my general question is, can you please perhaps correct the perception that the criteria operating is to be what is expedient for Information Technology and the central administration rather than seeking the needs and opinions of the faculty?

W. Czerniak: ITS, Information Technology Services, is named that because it is a service. Most of everything we do is paid for by some group or some person. In other words, we don’t get a very large sum of money and hear “go do what you want to do”. We get specific sums of money to do something and then we try to go and do that and like all of the faculty for the last three or four years, our budgets have been cut at the same percentage in all budgets as everybody else’s budgets have been cut. So if there’s something that ITS is trying to do, it’s typically a budget reduction or some way to cut our cuts and still provide the services to the students and faculty. I mean, if you want to understand our priorities, I’ll tell you from the President and from
my boss, it’s to serve the students, serve the faculty and serve the staff, in that order. Students always take priority. We’re here to get them an education. The faculty are here to provide that education so it’s our support to do that. Now, we do try to ask the faculty. We have a committee that meets. The problem is it’s difficult to ask all four or five thousand faculty personally what you want so we do form committees. We keep continuing to try to form committees, but it’s also a funding issue. If nobody provides the funds, for example, nobody ever gave us additional money to bring up the Corn server. Since that was brought up, I’ll bring that up. Nobody said Wally, here’s $50,000 a year; go make Corn work. One of the previous directors was a Unix fan, was a faculty member and he brought that up. He found some money and put it there and now, since he did that, he’s left but we still have to maintain that because it’s a request of the faculty. We continue to try to do that. I will say that it’s difficult to try to do some things without funding and we are very concerned about what the faculty wants and we have various committees and we continue to work with other committees to get faculty input back to what has to be done.

W. Baker: I think you for that reply, but say practically, for instance, there are other constituencies, such as the annuitants, the retirees, who are in some instances severely inconvenienced by the changes which are forced upon them. Practically, what you do is you say “well, x and y is going to happen”. We got something of this nature this morning from, on a group e-mail, about changes, your password expires, you can do x, y and z. Maybe it’s the tone of the way things are done. Maybe it should be shown demonstrably more that, in fact, consultation has taken place before such changes are being made. For instance, to take one example I do know, that a fundamental radical change may well have been produced by financial reasons, retirees were seriously inconvenienced a year or so ago and that was the running down frankly of Corn or to make it less convenient for them to utilize Corn.

W. Czerniak: I’m going to address your question so I want to talk about retirees. The university has never provided ITS or my organization with any money to provide any support for retirees for anything. Okay? Now, individual departments in the past used to give some faculty members continuing access to e-mail and we received no additional money but they would go to some faculty. A faculty person would come in and say “I’d like to stay on e-mail and work with the department after I retire”. In order for that to happen, the department chair, deans, somebody in control of the budget would have to send a letter to us saying it was okay for professor so-and-so, after he retired, to stay on the machine. It was not okay for anybody else and if you couldn’t get that permission you couldn’t stay on that machine and every year that had to be renewed so those renewals really came about because we took an audit finding from the state where the Auditor General’s office came in, we had given retirees accounts and they had died, they had left town and the accounts weren’t closed. So the auditor then forced us to put some procedures in place for some of these people that were a problem. An attempt to try to solve the problem and to be fair about this because, quite honestly, some faculty asked for an e-mail account and the department chair refused to sign it. I mean, so then again, my predecessor, John Tuecke, started to sign them. He just did this because he felt it wasn’t fair and, you know, we’re either going to do this or not. Now again, he didn’t leave me a budget for this, so we’ve worked out a lot of different ways of providing a service to all retirees and, in fact, we came up with a deal with the Annuitants’ Organization that solved our problems and the fact that everybody who retires now from NIU automatically gets an e-mail account. It’s in Groupwise; it’s not in Corn or anywhere
else, because we put it in a place where we can hide it and we can maintain it at the lowest possible cost and after the year, what happens is you have to be a member of the Annuitants’ Organization to continue that function. The reason we did that was simply because to meet the auditor’s requirements of ensuring that our lists were up to date and that if you retired or died or stopped using the system, your account was deleted. The Annuitant’s provided us with all that information and they have volunteered and paid for the maintaining of the data base which is over half the cost of maintaining retirees. The other cost is actually the disk space so while it may have been done to them and maybe we didn’t do all the procedures the right way, in the end we offered a benefit to every retiree and we did it in a way that raised no cost to my department and to the rest of the campus. We constantly work with our people on our letters to say things nicer and to do things in a nicer way but there’s still people I guess we just haven’t gotten yet. We’ll continue to try to improve.

**W. Baker:** May I have one brief comment and say thank you for that. Thank you for coming. Could this be done on a regular basis? That you come to Senate and deal with our questions?

**W. Czerniak:** Anytime I’m invited or you can call me directly.

**W. Baker:** Thank you.

**S. Sytsma:** I was wondering if there was any future possibility that faculty would be able to decide what kind of computer they wanted so that if a faculty member could benefit from having, you know, a laptop computer that they would have the choice? I know prices have come down a lot on laptop computers.

**W. Czerniak:** Let me start off by saying I am the Vice President for Information Technology. I am not the vice president for the budget and my budgets that I receive, our sales and service, are very small. As a central organization, we do not buy computers or laptops for all the departments. Each college has its own process or procedure so your question really depends on what college you’re in as to what kinds of computers they allow. From a central perspective, we put no limits on what a department can or cannot buy. What we will do is sometimes we’ll say what we support easily and what we don’t support because we just don’t have the budget to support every kind of machine and software out there but it’s really a department/college issue whether you get a laptop or a desktop.

**A. Windelborn:** Could you clarify for me the process by which – the fees that students pay for technology service. How those fees are established and approved, having just gone through trying to have a fee for my course and being turned down, I’m kind of curious as to how you guys do it.

**W. Czerniak:** I have no idea. I understand there is no technology fee that is controlled or directed or approved by ITS. All of the fees that go to the students really go through the_provost’s Office and then through a fee committee. But I’m not part of that process nor is anyone on my staff directly.
A. Windelborn: Then to sort of follow it up again related to students, at the beginning you were talking about changes to Blackboard and how student e-mails and all those types of things were done and you made the comment, I think it was, that no one objected. I’m curious as to how the students were polled in terms of how they viewed those changes.

W. Czerniak: I’m sorry, I don’t know when I said no one objected. To what comment?

A. Windelborn: To changes that were made to procedures made to Blacktop.

W. Czerniak: Blackboard?

A. Windelborn: Blackboard, excuse me – blacktop – it’s late in the day; you’ll have to excuse me.

W. Czerniak: First off, Blackboard was a project started by the provost, our prior provost. I sat in on the original meetings when it was discussed but it was a committee of faculty who actually got together under the direction of Murali and they came up with Blackboard and asked us if we would support that. We volunteered some support and services to do a trail. Lynne, who was he provost at the time, actually then applied for a grant and raised some money and we’ve been acting at the direction of this faculty group and out of Murali’s group to do what was needed in Blackboard. So Blackboard, while we manage it and operate it, there’s a small set of funds that are set aside to do that and we have a committee which Murali chairs and sits on and we bring things up to the CAFC committee before we make any changes to Blackboard and there are quite a few faculty involved.

A. Windelborn: Students?

W. Czerniak: Students sit in on the committee. Not a lot. The students’ requests and demands of Blackboard have been pretty much “we want more and we want more classes of it” but no, the actually process and procedures, the students don’t in general take a huge vote on that or support of that. But there is a student who sits at the committee meetings. We are trying more and more to make sure we have at least one student and one faculty member on almost any major project or system we do. We do get some feedback from students and we try to implement them if we can.

J. Stephen: First of all, thanks for taking time to meet with me the other day on e-mail privacy. I’ve got a couple of other questions for you. One, when you say a student’s e-mail account will be locked on Blackboard, will they still have the ability to forward their e-mails to a private e-mail address?

W. Czerniak: Let me explain that question again. In Blackboard, there’s a field where we’ve allowed people to put in their e-mail address and that’s where we’ll send it to. We are going to lock that field so it can’t be changed.

J. Stephen: Right, but then if the get e-mail say from the Registrar or something, it will be to their z number?
W. Czerniak: Right, and then in their z mailbox account, they can change in the forward – you know, they can forward that on to some other e-mail account of theirs’ or they can take their other e-mail accounts and forward them to the NIU account. It’s big enough now, we’ve made some ----

J. Stephen: So in essence if they use their Comcast or high speed they’ll know when they have e-mail?

W. Czerniak: Yes.

J. Stephen: Second comment or question I have comes from my monitoring of a web log dialogue group on live journal for the NIU community and one thing I can report that I’ve heard nothing negative about Blackboard, all positive comments, but one thing that came up a couple of weeks ago was wondering whether the NIU dorm numbers could be placed on the national do not call list. Whether you can do that through ITS so they don’t have to move into their dorm, call up, change rooms and then start all over again.

W. Czerniak: I am past president of a national group called ACUTA and spent several weeks and months over the last two years in Washington with the FCC asking to do that. They won’t – by bylaw we cannot touch that. Now the student in the individual dorm room can actually go – he can do that.

J. Stephen: Right, but it takes three months to activate it fully.

W. Czerniak: Well, there’s another problem with that. Once he does it, it will stay there. He’s the only person that can undo that so we haven’t exactly advertised that because if the next student didn’t want to be there, it’s difficult to get that number unblocked. It’s a terrible law and I and the rest of the universities and anybody who runs a dorm on this campus and in the state continues to petition and argue and fight with the FCC about the way they’ve done that.

J. Stephen: Okay.

W. Czerniak: We have no control over that but an individual student in their room can, in fact, take that number and put it on the do not call list and it will stay there for I think it’s six years unless someone comes and unblocks it but it has to be a person living at that number and once he blocks it, technically, he’s supposed to unlock it which is absolutely bizarre. We’ve said this is never going to work.

J. Pierce: The College of Education uses Live Text and what I’m wondering is, is there any inclination or movement towards having a common platform for the colleges so that we don’t have ---

W. Czerniak: For Live Text?
J. Pierce: So that other colleges – so that all of us are using the same platform rather than College of Ed using Live Text and others using something else.

W. Czerniak: The only college supported communications – the only campus-wide program ITS supports today is Blackboard and that is because the Provost has paid us and asked us to do that. If there’s another system somebody wants – the way we do things, a lot of people seem to think that ITS just goes off by itself, has this bucket of money, and goes and does something. That isn’t the way it works. A department, whether it be an administrative department, a college, an organization, comes to us and says we would like you to do this, what’s it going to cost? We tell them what the cost is, they supply some of the money and we try to go do it for them. As far as Live Text goes, if that isn’t a feature of Blackboard and that’s a separate product and somebody would like us to support that for the campus, we would sit down with them, try to work out a budget, try to help them find funding and then we would go do it. Did I answer your question?

R. Orem: First of all, I think the Help Desk has been very well received. My students find it very helpful so that’s great. I question about the process regarding the change to the z number for students and does this mean they have to go on to Web Connect to access or to change and to forward? How do they – will there be any message coming out that gives students instructions about what’s happening and how they can access e-mail and have it forwarded?

W. Czerniak: Yes, that’s why we’re going to make the change ---

R. Orem: I suppose it will go to their z number then?

W. Czerniak: We’re going to make the change after this semester but before summer starts out and so we’ll try to do a lot of publicity along with the Registrar with their packets along with Registration and we see a lot of them in our labs so we’ll post announcements in our labs and we’ll do a big advertising campaign. We’ll find out what the problems are during the summer session so that, you know, our big problem will be the fall when the freshmen hit and that’s really when we’ll do our big campaign and we’ll learn about it during the summer so we’ll try a bunch of different advertising programs to get to all of our students and faculty and then try to prepare ourselves for the fall. Yes, we will advertise to them in various ways.

B. Miller: That brings up one issue that I’d like to address first but I have some more questions for you. When you do things after spring but before summer, that affects those of us who teach during intersession like me. I’m teaching an intersession course using Blackboard for three weeks. How will that affect my students and my department?

W. Czerniak: I don’t know, I mean, at some point all that’s going to happen is that the address that e-mail forwards to in there, the students won’t be able to change anymore. For the students – for the faculty it won’t affect them because it will still be the old address. On the day we make the change, the student address in that box will change to their z ID so the students that have something in there, those are the ones who are going to be effected.

B. Miller: Will there still be a little log-on with the z ID?
W. Czerniak: Yes, and so what we’ll probably try to do, we’ll probably ---

B. Miller: You’re just talking about e-mail, not logging in?

W. Czerniak: E-mail address, after log-in.

B. Miller: All right.

W. Czerniak: So what we’ll probably try to do is actually put something in Blackboard on the date we make the change to tell them we’ve done this.

B. Miller: Okay, fine. I just need to tell my entire department that teachers during the intercession.

W. Czerniak: So once they log-in, that will be the time to get them.

B. Miller: Okay. My more specific questions and they may seem a little trivial but they aren’t to my department in particular, things that have come up in my department that I think are the purview of ITS, although I’m not entirely sure, have to do with changes that happened in the past that significantly effect our day-to-day operations. For example, when the university made the shift for upgrading Microsoft windows a year ago last fall, it actually made all of the remote mice in my entire college obsolete. Yeah. This happened also the week before fall semester started and I believe that also happened that Blackboard was upgraded a week before fall semester started. That was I know a national upgrade because I know that happened at many other campuses. I think those are the kind of things that effect faculty in ways in which we don’t know that they’re going to affect us until after the fact. Those are the kinds of things that absolutely drive us nutty. You know, I’m teaching a class of 100 students and suddenly I don’t have a remote mouse, I can’t get access to my Blackboard. It’s the week before classes begin. I can’t load, I can’t change my syllabus, I can’t do anything. I didn’t know it was going to happen, you know, I was gone the week before. I can’t do anything and I don’t know who to talk to about that.

W. Czerniak: I want to make it clear ---

B. Miller: I’m still having a little posttraumatic stuff about that.

W. Czerniak: First let me answer that and then you can ask your follow-up questions but as relates to the labs, we do not control all of the labs on this campus. There’s only a small subset, the GA and a few of those. We have meetings at least twice a year with all of the lab attendants from all of the colleges. In other words, each college has their own IT staff and they have their own labs they run in support and they’ll either want something to do with us or don’t want anything to do with us so when we talk about labs, it may or may not be a lab we have control of but before we actually make any changes in the labs, we sit down with all of these folks and say these are our plan changes, what are your plan changes and how do we do this together and how do we keep this the simplest for both the students and the faculty and when’s the best time to
make the change. Now some changes come in late because we just had to get them in and we had a mistake. We do try to get them in earlier and always with your college, to make sure you know who your college IT person and what his response is. He should have known and he should’ve been working with them now. In all of their defense, some changes we make we don’t know. Even though we test it, we have labs, we test these changes before we roll out, we just don’t know what impact it will have so I would apologize. It maybe something we tested; maybe it isn’t something we tested but typically we do try to test it. We do try to give pre-notice and we do try to work with each college.

B. Miller: Right, these issues are, I mean, you know, the Blackboard thing that, you know, I mean I don’t know who didn’t know that it was going to be the week before class starts and I think that those kinds of things again make faculty feel very disenfranchised. I do appreciate the fact that we did get, I don’t know, twenty notices that it was going to be down one day before class started this time and I have to admit I appreciate that notice and also the extended hours of ITS Help Desk I think has made a lot of difference with both students and faculty now that you’re open in the evenings. That has made a difference but I do think that those issues tend to make us feel less disenfranchised and I also think that the issues when we do go to the people who are supposed to be helping and they continue to say, I’m not talking about the labs, I’m talking about the classes, dedicated teaching classrooms, there is not parody across campus.

W. Czerniak: No.

B. Miller: And I know that some are owned by different colleges but there are also ones that are, I have been told, are owned by the university and there’s not parody across campus on those and I think that that, you know, I don’t know who we speak to about that but I do think that that makes a difference in the quality of teaching.

W. Czerniak: I would agree and we try to support that but as long as the Provost and the colleges want to maintain and control their little piece their way, I don’t get a say in that. I agree with you, I mean, our ---

B. Miller: Well, who has the say?

W. Czerniak: In the end it’s the Provost’s department and the deans, the college deans. I sit in on meetings they have but each college has their own budgets and they have their own IT – every college has their own IT staff. It does not report to me. Okay? I meet with them and we give them advice but we don’t say you must do this.

B. Miller: Right, I understand there are college owned classrooms but there are also university owned classrooms. Who owns those?

W. Czerniak: It depends. Some of them are shared. When you say they’re university owned, all of the classrooms are owned somewhere along the line in the Provost Office or a college.

B. Miller: I see and you don’t have any input into that.
W. Czerniak: Some I do. If you give me a classroom, I could address certain classrooms right off the top.

B. Miller: So what I’m actually to deconstruct here is that there is a real system of ownership for any of the teaching classrooms that is university governed.

W. Czerniak: I don’t think so.

B. Miller: That’s what I really wanted to know.

W. Czerniak: In many cases that is a true statement and we try to get them to do things by cajoling them saying this is going to be good for the faculty, staff and students but in the end, the colleges have quite a bit of independence when they want and some of that’s been good. I mean I’m not ---

B. Miller: In some of the classrooms the process is falling through the cracks.

W. Czerniak: Yes. Absolutely.

B. Miller: Okay.

A. Windelborn: Telecommunications comes in, puts a jack in the wall basically and allows me to connect. Is that part of ITS?

W. Czerniak: Yes.

A. Windelborn: When recently we’ve heard a lot about the new high speed connections up and down 88 up to Rockford, etc., and that’s going to be I was told, coming up fairly soon.

W. Czerniak: Yes.

A. Windelborn: What is the process for determining who will have access to those high speed communications and what the charges will be that are associated with that access?

W. Czerniak: There will be no new charges associated with the NIUNET project we’re working on. That’s really an Internet II project.

A. Windelborn: Okay.

W. Czerniak: We’re working with Boze and the researchers to build this link so we – we are an Internet II member – by the way, that’s been subsidized not be the Graduate School, not by our Research School and not by the Provost but by Telecommunications. In other words, for us to go buy more activity to the internet, costs us a lot of money. If we can get access to Internet II, we get tremendous increase in band width, okay, for the entire campus and hopefully, it will keep us from having to raise costs so NIUTEL is subsidizing access to Internet II, access to the Abilene Network and has taken on the project of building a dedicated fiber link from our campus.
to all of our remote campuses and onto Fermilab, Argonne and Internet II and the Starlight in Chicago, the Rockford will be in that eventually. The first one that we are working on right now is the link from DeKalb to Naperville to Batavia which picks up Fermilab and then from Fermi they’ve agreed to give us access to Starlight in Chicago and Internet II. That will initially be opened up at at least a 1 gigabyte speed, possibly 10 – 10 gigabytes. The contract, we are negotiating our last contract with Naperville with fiber from the toll way to them right now. We’ve got a contract in with the toll way authority to lease the fiber along the toll way. We’ve completed the contract with Batavia to get to Fermi and we’ve to an agreement with Fermi and we’ve actually reached agreement with TBC and DeKalb for finishing our fiber loop in DeKalb. So it is our plan to open that up this summer if all goes well and the contracts are signed and everybody on this campus will have access to that network. You won’t have to do anything special. The way traffic will be routed, consider that we have one public connection which we have today which is with the ICN. The Internet II traffic, the only traffic that can go on that is traffic that goes to other Internet II institutions. We pegged that to be anywhere between 35 to 65% of our traffic so that will immediately leave the public access pipe and open that up.

A. Windelborn: The next question then is what impact will that have on the differing fee structures for internet access for the various faculty users and departments on campus?

W. Czerniak: None.

A. Windelborn: So does that mean those differing fees will still be there?

W. Czerniak: Yes. The fees came about from a meeting of several provosts back about 15 years ago, 20 years ago, when they said we need internet access on campus and nobody had any money and so there was two basic ways to do this. The university could have said well, here’s a million dollars a year, start building internet access on campus. We looked at that and I said I’ll do that if you want, but you’ll have to get a committee who does not report to me to say who goes first. In other words, at a million dollars a year, we needed 10 million dollars right off the bat and we needed at least a million dollars a year in ongoing operational funding. I did not want to sit on the committee that said how are we going to decide who gets a connection so what the provost decided to do instead was come up, use the telephone model and that’s why it’s done through Telecommunications. So basically, it’s a pay as you go. Initially we had a $650 installation fee and a $10 a month rental fee and, by the way, that was being heavily subsidized by Telecom who was paying for all the fiber in the ground and a lot of the other connections. Over time, everybody complained about the $650 installation fee being excessive so we lowered that all the way down to $150 and we raised the fee a buck or something to cover that. So, you know, the fees are there to help pay for the ongoing support and operation of that network. As an FYI, it’s not enough money to pay for it. We lost half a million dollars a year supporting that and it’s becoming more and more difficult to subsidize that account.

A. Windelborn: I guess my ultimate question is if I have a connection that’s the cheap one and I’m looking at the rate at which I can access data versus the rate that somebody with one that’s ten times as fast as my connection can access data, it’s fine that we’re both connected to the same hardware out there, but no matter what, they’re going to be able to access information a lot
faster than I can so what you’re saying in terms of all faculty having access to this is true but not all faculty will have really that same access fee to this information.

**W. Czerniak:** That really is dependent – I mean, you’re basic cheap connection is 10 megabytes per second. We’ve made all of those switched and still most PCs would have difficulty in loading at a lot faster speeds than that, I mean, the best PC you can buy today might be able to sustain about 20 to 25 megabytes per second. So, I mean, having a ten times faster connection to your PC won’t do you a lot of good unless you have a work station and you’re doing heavy research. Again, you know, if you look at the differential cost to upgrade from a 10 megabyte to a 100 megabyte connection on campus is very inexpensive as compared to the cost. It’s still subsidized. So while yes, there’s a little bit higher fee and individually you’ll have to pay for that, I have no other mechanism of recovering my money to provide you that connection. If somebody, you know, if the Provost or the university to decide to take a different model, then that could be done. That isn’t the model we operate under.

**C. Booth:** This is very informative and I wonder if we could make a formal resolution that Wally, or perhaps we should say the Associate Vice President for ITS be invited every spring semester to address the faculty and answer questions?

**P. Stoddard:** I guess we have a motion and a second? Right. Is there any discussion to that point? All right, all in favor? Opposed? Are you in favor?

**W. Czerniak:** Yup.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, terrific. We will make a point of inviting the Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services to a Faculty Senate meeting every spring semester. Are there any other questions for that person at this particular meeting this particular spring semester? Beth?

**B. Miller:** One more follow-up question. Do you have any suggestions for the Faculty Senate and perhaps Paul could help us here, with regard to perhaps considering ways in which the faculty could review the consistent issues that we were just talking about in regards to the classrooms, the structure in the university as a whole and how we could be pro-active in that process knowing it from your structural perspective and ways in which we might look at that.

**W. Czerniak:** One of the ways I get to look at that is through a committee called the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee. We meet twice a semester and we do try to address issues like that. I’m an invited guest to the Deans Council and so when I get recommendations from the faculty across multi-colleges, I can take that to the Deans Council and ask them to look at it and so that’s one mechanism where I can help the faculty if they help me. As you know, Sue Willis, the previous president opened up this issue about the CFAC does or doesn’t do. Paul has been attending meetings as a guest. Those meetings are open. We’ve created a webpage form. We’re going to put a brighter link on the ITS webpage so you can find it but the minutes are published. Going to those meetings, you can get some help. We’re going to be looking for some volunteers. At the suggestion of the CFAC and Paul, we’re going to start opening up – whenever we start a major project, there’s usually some sub-committee that runs for at least one to two years while
that project goes on. We’ve now made a decision that we will find at least one faculty member to volunteer to sit in on those committees and help them. So there are ways faculty can get involved. Clearly through their chairs and their own department meetings they can help. It is not our intent to control the group but to help the group and the less – the more we make things look the same for the general faculty and the general students, the easier it’s going to be as technology intrudes upon us. Quite honestly, the students know more about technology than we do and that’s difficult for us. It’s difficult for my staff. We hire 250 students every semester and so they’re a lot brighter than even some of our employees at time. They grew up with it, you know, we had to learn it after the fact so. Any help or advice I can give or do, I appreciate.

B. Miller: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Anyone else? All right, well then I’d certainly like to extend the thanks of the body and look forward to seeing you again next year.

W. Czerniak: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Donna has just provided me with a little follow-up information. The Computer Facilities Advisory Committee, that’s the CFAC that Wally referred to that I attend on a guest basis, does have openings for all the colleges. One of the things we’ve talked about is LA&S getting – well, it doesn’t matter – it does have openings for all the colleges of which apparently three of the colleges are taking advantage of that. The four which are not are Business, Education, Health and Human Services, and University Libraries. Their terms are expiring so we need to get people renewed on that so that’s something you want to consider. Also Operating Staff, I guess it’s the same. The term is expiring so you’ll need to name someone new for that. Obviously, we all have an interest in being represented so we want to make sure we have people on that committee as much as possible.

In terms of other announcements, I really don’t have an awful lot. The pension business is continuing. The Governor has made his recommendations. The President pretty much summarized all of those in an e-mail to the community in the last day or two so I don’t think I need to cover that anymore. I think basically, his e-mail said anything I might be able to tell you especially since I get most of my information from him in the first place. It’s not quite yet gotten into the legislature. When it does, that’s when the real fun is going to begin and it’s not at all clear how the legislature is going to respond to the Governor’s proposals for modifying the pension.

I think really, that’s all I have for announcements so are there any questions on issues along those lines? Yes, Beth.

B. Miller: It was a little unclear to me last time when we were talking about it what appropriate roles we could take either as a body or as individuals with regard to the issue regarding the pension. Could you clarify that for me?

P. Stoddard: Well, it was especially difficult back then when the things were just recommendations made by a commission that nobody had officially proposed anything so at that
point, it probably really wasn’t appropriate for us to do anything. Obviously as individuals, we are always free and encouraged to contact our state representatives who are Bob Pritchard in the House and Brad Burzynski, at least in the DeKalb/Sycamore area, Brad Burzynski in the Senate. Now it’s typical the representatives from university districts are rather sympathetic and probably going to vote with our interests at heart to begin with, although it never hurts to make sure and contact them about that, but if you happen to live in a district that’s not NIU’s district or one of the other schools, then your input to the elected officials is extremely important. They may not be getting much useful information from anybody else. So, I always would encourage you to take part in the process by contacting your representatives. We have not spoken of any role for the Faculty Senate. I think there could be a role. We’d have to be careful about that. We’d like to point out probably a lot of what’s being proposed is part of this two tier system where incoming faculty, new hires, incoming faculty and staff are going to see reduced benefits with what we are privileged already here to get and we might want to be considering making the case that that is inherently unfair but also, perhaps more important for the people making the rules, that this is going to severely cripple our ability to recruit top flight new faculty state-wide. So I could see a role for the Senate in that regard. I’m still a little hesitant about getting too far into it without seeing how it looks like the legislature is going to deal with it but, we’re always welcome to start considering this at any point. You don’t want to wait until the last minute obviously. Does that help?

B. Miller: Yeah, I would encourage us not to wait until too late. Can we write a letter and also I was wondering what our roles were as representatives back to our department and I felt I – I didn’t know, you know, with this ethics rule, can we, you know, omit rebellion within our department. Then when I saw the letter from the President, I thought well if he can, then we can too, you know, I was unclear about whether we could encourage our colleagues to take an active and particular stance in opposition to this as Faculty Senate representatives or if that was seen as a political stance.

P. Stoddard: You’re certainly - I would say it’s certainly not an ethical violation to inform other members of your department what is being considered. It certainly would not be unethical to, like I just did, I didn’t specifically say how you should write these folks and you guys all wanted to get together at a local drinking or eating establishment after hours and discuss armed insurrection – no, not armed insurrection – but want to discuss appropriate actions you could take politically, that would be okay but yeah, I think we do have to be a little careful about getting overly political during office hours on university property.

B. Miller: What exactly would be the difference between my department writing such a letter and the Faculty Senate writing a letter similar to what you described?

P. Stoddard: If it’s a similar letter, I don’t think that would be different. I mean I think we’re pointing out; we’re not favoring anybody’s specific plan perhaps. I think that’s why I say we have to be careful how we write it but we would point out the possible negative consequences to the state of Illinois as we see them in an informed position. Buck?

J. Stephen: This matter came up at the FAC meeting last Friday. As a group, if we take a particular stand we count as lobbyists and we’re not registered lobbyists. As individuals, it’s part
of our responsibilities under our shared governance system to acquaint our constituents in our departments and colleges of possible changes and where they can get information on these changes and how they can communicate their concerns and any communication that you make representing yourself as a university employee is not considered lobbying. If you say that you’re speaking on behalf of your department, your college or the University Council or the Faculty Senate, then it is considered lobbying and we shouldn’t do that.

**P. Stoddard:** Suppose you – well, actually I think everybody I’ve ever talked to says you shouldn’t do it this way but if you wrote a letter and fifteen people from your department signed it.

**J. Stephen:** There’s no problem with that. There’s a link on the FAC meeting minutes that I’ve supplied to a form letter on the UPI4100.org that’s essentially a form letter that you can print out. It’s not union specific. However, in meeting with John Sullivan, he says that individually worded and written letters have a greater impact than massive amounts of duplicate form letters do.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, that’s why I say I wouldn’t recommend a letter with fifteen signatures. Fifteen letters is better. Any other – yes?

**R. Meganathan:** This letter writing business, is there a difference between state of Illinois and the federal government? Like today, I received an e-mail from the *Science Magazine*. There were 758 professors from different universities protesting the federal government dipping into the NIH (National Institute of Health) funds to fund the so-called bioterrorism initiative saying that that is o.k. so they protested it because 40% of the health grants are going to be cut and all this was done by e-mail so if that’s legal, why is it illegal for us to make the e-mail to the government or whoever?

**P. Stoddard:** Again, what they did though was they signed each one individually. They didn’t claim to represent the national association of microbiologists or whatever. This was 758 concerned individuals and that’s what we just said we could do here, you could sign one letter as 15 or 20 or 4,000 concerned individuals and that would be all right. What Buck was saying is that if I write one as the head of the Faculty Senate, representing this body, that takes on different implications. If I write a letter or if we have a letter and everybody on the Senate signs it that’s different than my signing it for everybody and so that’s, I think, the difference in the two situations.

Okay, if nobody else has anything, Buck has hinted that he might raise this again in his report later on. We can bring it up again if you think of anything else.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

**A. Nominations for The Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award** (Page 3)

**P. Stoddard:** We have one item for Faculty Senate Consideration and that is the Bob Lane Eternal Vigilance Faculty Spokesperson Award, formally known as the Bottom of the Deck
Award because this is a person who always tries to catch the administration dealing from the bottom of the deck. This goes—it’s a certificate. It’s symbolic, honorary whatever. It doesn’t have any cash value other than the paper its printed on. This is basically for the biggest thorn in the side of the administration or the person who is best at keeping the administration on their toes and making sure that they follow through with bylaws and regulations and don’t try to pull any underhanded maneuvers. So we’re just asking for nominations for this. Anybody on campus, I guess it’s faculty, any faculty member is eligible. They don’t necessarily have to be a member of the Senate or Council or anything else. If you have anybody in mind, feel free to forward that to our office and we have a list of past recipients. I’m glad to see one of our own is on there already and I don’t know if we can re-nominate people but anyway, these people have all been very vocal and—I caught myself, old as in previous recipients, not old as in chronological. Anyway, so give that some thought. The Executive Committee votes on that later on so the next Executive Committee meeting is in about three weeks so try to get something in before then.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Once again, we have nothing to consent to so we can move directly to reports from Advisory Committees.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Joseph “Buck” Stephen – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: As promised, we have the FAC Committee from Buck who filled in for Pat.

J. Stephen: First of all, I’d like to take back all the nasty things I’ve said about the length of these reports. She goes through a tremendous amount of work. That’s the packet from the meeting right there. Most of this is self-explanatory. I’ll hit a couple of things. We’ve about HB750 before. That’s the property and income tax reform bill. Passage of that seems very unlikely but Madigan at least has come out and said that the Governor needs to take a leadership role in the state. We already know about the pension reform stuff. There’s the detailed letter from the President we got. Under miscellaneous points, the top three are very interesting. Recent AAUP report places Illinois in the lowest 20% nationwide in relations to salaries paid at public universities. Point 2, Harper College has hired their own lobbyist to represent their interests at the legislature. Point 3, as for MAP grants, last year 16,000 students didn’t get them when they were eligible. This year, 50,000 eligible students did not get them. There’s more information there but a lot of it is stuff we talked about before.

On the next page discussion concerning the financial crisis in the Illinois Higher Education System. Eastern Illinois University has come up with sort of a novel idea. They have students develop a series of what they call I Stories which include a picture of the student and a brief discussion of their college experience and problems now and they send these off to their legislators and to the Governor and stuff and it’s felt that these are very effective and the FAC thought it might also be a thing that professors might want to do and call it A day in the life of a professor. I’d like one of them to visit my Wednesdays for instance.
The middle section there talks about urging our students to contact their legislators with their views about the state of higher education in terms of affordability and such. One thing that I didn’t include in this was that at Northeastern Illinois University, a poll of students actually showed that they favored an increase in tuition because of the decline in resources at the university. However, Northeastern, I believe, has the lowest tuition in the state.

Okay, under Advocacy and Public Relations, the third point. For those wishing to send letters to legislators concerning the possible changes in the pension system, there is more information and a sample letter at that url listed and it’s got a lot more information about things that are of interest to all of us as university employees but there’s a sample letter there that could be used by many of us.

The PPA, Priorities, Productivity and Accountability – nothing new there essentially other than it looks like they might get rid of the Capital Development Board which would save 3% of the cost of building new buildings on campuses and give universities the design and build authority of Capital projects. Sounds too good to be true. Let’s see if it really happens.

There are two interesting articles, one in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Feb. 25, 2005) about the relationship between business and higher education in Virginia and then there’s an article in *Academe* called “Insuring the Nation’s Future: Preserving the Promise of Higher Education which may also be of great interest to some of you.

Can’t think of anything else. Any questions?

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, moving on then. The Board of Trustees meets tomorrow so we won’t have any reports. I have a report? I don’t remember reporting anything. Oh, okay yeah.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

**P. Stoddard:** I’m sure we all know already but there was a special meeting of the Board of Trustees a week ago at which it was announced that the university is buying the Monsanto Campus in town here at a cost of 12.4 million dollars of which 8.4 is coming from the federal government courtesy of our very own Denny Hastert so thank you Denny Hastert. The other 4 million will come from bonds and/or refinancing techniques. Interest rates are going down again so we might be able to get some money by refinancing some old loans. That’s going to become a clinic. Three of our clinics are going to move out there and there are high hopes for turning
that part of town which is already heavy into health care, to increasing that health care out there. So that’s the Board of Trustees report. Any questions? Okay, thank you.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Moving on to Standing Committees. Correct me if I’m wrong as we go but apparently Academic Affairs has no report. Economic Status has no report. RSB has no report but then Faculty Rights and Responsibilities has been keeping Buck busy.

A. Academic Affairs – David Lonergan, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamjuralikrishna, Chair – no report

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

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – report – walk-in

J. Stephen: We were asked to look into the video surveillance after the visit by the numerous politicians last fall. A couple of things to report about that. There were four points listed. One is that there is no expectation of privacy on a university campus. Two, we’re fairly convinced that the tapes of this incident were erased, about as convinced as we can be, fairly convinced. I had a rather long meeting with Chief Grady. I’m very impressed with the man. He’s an excellent choice for a university community. We talked about a lot more than just privacy and surveillance. I’d like to point out that he chose the least intrusive security option offered by the Secret Service for this and he also refused to take aggressive action that the Secret Service requested when the protestors left the designated protest area. I think that was an admirable decision. Then there’s the expectation that when people rent the arena, they should not be disturbed so that’s the reason for the designated protest area.

Now on to some other things that I discovered. There’s some estimates that placed the number of video surveillance devices on campus at over 100, but none of these are actively hooked up to the police department and the police rely on videos supplied by the controlling parties or on legally placed surveillance devices when they’re actively pursuing criminal cases. However, this leaves some unanswered questions. What’s the actual number of surveillance devices on campus and who controls them. There are lots of them. In a more positive step, should we as a university community attempt to find a real time surveillance system to monitor those areas of campus that we know to be of high risk. That would take money. The third thing that came up was does the student judicial code have a policy for acceptable use of cell phones with imaging capabilities? We’ll leave that there. We move on to privacy and e-mail. Contrary to some rumors, our e-mail, if we don’t keep it on our own private system, does not hang around for years. Once its mailed or downloaded its typically overwritten in about three days. Website use is monitored though. This is typical for a service provider. They do this to look for high volumes of traffic to particular sites because a university is subject to cease and desist orders if we allow our users to download protected material. Within the Groupwise system, your e-mail is encrypted. You’d probably know if somebody goofed with it. If you mail outside of Groupwise it’s not necessarily encrypted but it’s permissible to send encrypted e-mail.
Okay, now on to PickAPProf. Basically, this has taken me months to follow up on and find out about and I’ve been told one thing after another and different things and contradictory things but the plan and simple truth is that PickAPProf.com did get the grade distributions for spring, 2004. I’ve seen copies of the e-mail that supplied them to them. The General Counsel informs me that this is the Freedom of Information Act issue and they asked for course numbers, section numbers, reference numbers, grade distributions, drop rates, and student evaluations of instructors. The only thing there that meets the criteria for exclusion is student evaluation of instructors because we use those for merit evaluation. However, even though I’ve seen the e-mail about this, it’s not generally agreed between Ken Davidson, Gip Seaver and Don Larson that this actually happened but it did. I believe that those three will be working on how we might be able to protect this information because as a faculty and as administrators, I find it pretty universal that we don’t think release of this information is appropriate.

Any questions on any of this stuff? Lynne?

**J. Stephen:** I don’t know. Some of them do release them. I don’t know how other schools have managed not to release them. I believe that’s something Ken Davidson is going to work on to see if there’s someway that the Freedom of Information Act exclusions can be applied to this. Now Lynne.

**L. Kamenitsa:** I’ve got lots of questions but I’ll just stick to PickAPProf for now. If grade distributions were used as part of merit evaluations would they then be excluded? Because they are at times used partially for that purpose. If that’s really the criteria by which they’re excluded.

**J. Stephen:** Anything that’s used for your merit evaluation can be excluded. So that’s a good point.

**P. Stoddard:** That’s one then we should inform the University Counsel, the General Counsel for the university about.

**J. Stephen:** However, that brings up another question. Does that mean you get paid better for better students?

**L. Kamenitsa:** It is one of many criteria that is sometimes considered in the process.

**J. Stephen:** Right, thank you. Bill?

**W. Baker:** Did you not say Paul and I know we’ve had an individual discussion about this and could you please clarify it to Senate, concerning the whole business of student evaluation of instructors and whether it’s admissible.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, there, yeah, the question of the student evaluations, there’s two parts of it. There’s the scantron multiple choice questions which are generally aggregated and you get a number and you got a 2.3 or something like that for each of several categories. The aggregate information like that is – there’s no privacy issues associated with that as far as the university is
concerned. That information is fair game for merit evaluations. My understanding and this is something we’re still looking into, but my understanding at the moment is that the written comments students make are actually really the property of the instructor only and that you cannot be compelled to share that with anybody you don’t want to which means the department can’t demand to see that for your merit evaluations. If you chose to share them, that’s your choice. Which raises an interesting issue on what Buck said. If I choose not to let the department see those, it doesn’t become part of my merit evaluation, which means it can be released to PickAProf.

**J. Stephen:** I have people who have them taped to the back of their doors.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, but I think that the key issue is as Lynne says, these can sometimes be used and therefore, as a category, these are things the university would try to exempt from public viewing on a website like PickAProf. So right now and I know I’ve suggested to one administrative type that they check with the General Counsel of the university about the ability to demand the written comments that students make regarding the evaluations and being used in the merit process. I would feel much more comfortable if anybody got that directly from Ken Davidson rather than my understanding of what I think Ken said.

**W. Baker:** Could you get back to us on that please?

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, I certainly will. Okay, I think Jody and then ---

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Buck did you see the e-mails legally? I have a serious question. In your impression of dealing with these three people, if this body and I don’t know whether we would or not, but if this body were to take a stand one way or the other as to whether support this or don’t support this, would it make any difference to these three people or are they just going to do what they please with this or maybe even what each pleases against the other. I don’t know. I mean, would it make any difference if this body takes a stand in your opinion?

**J. Stephen:** Actually, I don’t think it would make a difference because without a reason for exclusion, it’s a Freedom of Information Act thing and in that case, Ken Davidson is legally compelled to release it unless it meets a category for exclusion.

**P. Stoddard:** I would say though, Ken called me yesterday and said he had a request and he was about to release it and did the faculty know of any reason not to. I wish I had known Lynne’s comment when he asked. So, I mean, it’s not that they’re doing it just because they think this is the right thing to do. They’re doing it because they feel they legally have no option but to do this.

**J. Stephen:** All three of these individuals are personally against this but they’re still doing what’s legal.

**B. Miller:** Then what do we need to give them in order to stop it?
P. Stoddard: Well I would mention to Ken certainly that the grade distributions and these other things are, well the grade distributions at any rate, are sometimes used and I’m sure Ken will have all sorts of ideas about how we need to document that. That’s his job.

J. Pierce: I just wanted to note on the first point about the protestors and the filming that the concern was expressed by a faculty member who was being filmed and certainly not one of the protestors who had run.

P. Stoddard: Right, and this all stemmed from that. Carole?

C. Minor: I have a question for Buck about your committee and the unanswered questions. Do you plan to continue to follow-up on the unanswered questions because I think a couple of them are particularly important and I don’t see that they’re really the purview of anybody else that might be doing it? Should we have a surveillance system to monitor areas of campus that are known to be at risk might be something that you could transfer to the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee or something like that but the other two, I don’t know who would be looking into that and I think they’re important questions that we really need to find out about or somebody needs to be working on a policy for acceptable use of cell phones with imaging capabilities.

J. Stephen: I think that yeah, the second question Campus Security would be the best place to send that to. The third question I plan addressing to Larry Boyles office. The first question, provided I have enough stamina, I’ll certainly try to find out. Chasing down this stuff is incredibly difficult. You can find a camera but still not know who owns it.

P. Stoddard: You could always stick some gum over the front and see who comes out to ---

J. Stephen: Isn’t there a song about coming to pay my bail or something?

P. Stoddard: We’ll take up a collection. Are there any other questions for Buck? Okay, thank you very much. Very informative.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Augden.

A. Windelborn: On the next page of the walk-in document you will find a proposed rewording or change in the order of business and parliamentary authority and I would be submitting this to the body for a first reading today. This is to accomplish what I had talked about at our last meeting which is to move those items that University Council members would be hearing twice if they stayed for the whole meeting to the end of the meeting so they could leave if they wished.

P. Stoddard: This schedule that we follow every month is actually laid out in the bylaws surprisingly enough. Therefore, in order to change it, it requires a bylaw change which is exactly what Augden was trying to avoid.
A. Windelborn: It’s a lot smaller.

P. Stoddard: It’s a lot smaller so therefore it requires two readings and this would be the first reading this month and have a second reading and vote on it next month.

A. Windelborn: I believe we need a formal motion to submit this for a first reading. Am I not correct?

P. Stoddard: I believe you as chair of the committee ---

A. Windelborn: Then I would be making a motion that this be accepted for a first reading. Popular item.

P. Stoddard: Yes, Carole?

C. Minor: I have a question because the language that’s used in the wording in the bylaw is not the same as the language used on the agenda. On the agenda we have advisory committees and standing committees and on this one it has standing and special committees. I believe it’s the advisory committees that we hear reports from on two occasions, not the standing committees of the Faculty Senate so it would be the advisory committees that would need to be at the end to avoid that duplication. Is that correct? But I don’t see where they’re listed in the bylaws.

P. Stoddard: So are you saying we’ve been doing everything wrong for the last twenty years and all these Senate meetings?

C. Minor: I’m only pointing out that there’s an inconsistency.

P. Stoddard: Well, since this would be a bylaw change, whatever we vote on would become the new bylaw so – however, we may since the standing committees – let’s see where special committees ---

A. Windelborn: --- the order of business for the University Council that’s listed, not Faculty Senate.

P. Stoddard: Okay, well, this is why we have two readings of these things. Would I be correct in summarizing the proposed change is to move those items which University Council members are exposed to twice to the very end which would be the advisory committees. Okay, so let’s assume that’s what’s actually being, if that’s all right, moved as a first reading and this will be cleaned up certainly by the time we come around for a second reading.

A. Windelborn: Paul more formally that would be moving agenda item VII. Reports from Advisory Committees to follow agenda item X. New Business.

P. Stoddard: Correct, thank you. Any other discussion on the proposed change? All in favor of counting this as the first reading please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Okay.
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – report.

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

P. Stoddard: Finally, from Elections and Legislative Oversight.

G. Bisplinghoff: Also in your walk-in packet on the last page, you have a list of those faculty who are eligible to serve as the President of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Secretary of University Council and at this time, the floor is now open for nominations for the position of Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary of University Council. Would anybody like to make a nomination?

J. Stephen: I would like to nominate Paul to continue for another year.

G. Bisplinghoff: Would you be willing to serve?

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I’ll do that.

G. Bisplinghoff: Thank you. Thank you. Moved that the nominations be closed. Is there a second? And seconded. Thank you very much. Move that the nominations be closed. Okay. So now we’re going to vote that the nominations be closed I guess. Those in favor? Anyone opposed? Now it’s thank you Paul.

P. Stoddard: I thank you for that vote of confidence. The agenda shows no Unfinished Business or New Business.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Are there any Comments or Questions From the Floor? Yes, Deb?

D. Haliczer: I’m Debbie Haliczer. I’m a guest. As I’ve been looking at the communication from the NIU Annuitants Association, they suggest we all go on line to their website, annuitants@niu.edu and they give guidance on how to write a letter to advocate for some of the pension reforms. They have links to the state universities and annuitant’s association website and I would go there for guidance. I’m also representing the NIU Benefits Committee with my colleagues here. Wally’s nagging everyone to join the NIU Annuitants Association so you get the bulletin that is quite useful. Unlike those of us who are currently employed. They have a lot of freedom to express their opinions and to guide lobbying efforts so I would go to their website, annuitants@niu.edu and check out the information. There’s some wonderful faculty who are in this group who do wonderful research and keep us informed so do check that out.
P. Stoddard: Very good. Yeah.

D. Smith-Shank: What does annuitant mean?

P. Stoddard: They receive annuities. Yeah, retired folks on pensions. Pensioner’s. Okay, any other questions or comments for Deb? Any other questions or comments from the floor? Yes, Beth.

B. Miller: Did you find out any information about the graduation issue that we discussed yesterday?

P. Stoddard: Yes, as we all know, summer graduation this year has been cancelled. I guess the plan is to do away with summer graduation in general. There is a minor – there is some cost cutting associated with that and it does keep us in line with other universities around. Most of the complaints I’ve heard about this is the fact that it took place this summer so quickly with so little warning to the students who planned on graduating this summer. The Provost’s office is not entirely unsympathetic to the concerns of those students and has been working with the advising deans to facilitate as much as possible students participating in the spring ceremony. I mean the people who cannot participate in summer now are being advised to try to get in with the spring ceremony. There is a fee that you have to pay to Registration and Records to participate. The deadline for that was nominally yesterday, however, they are still – they’re accepting fees and will continue to do so as long as somebody shows up, especially someone who was going to graduate in the summer. They’re very, very lenient about that. That really is not an issue. There might be other issues, academic issues, etc. but in terms of fees and paperwork for Registration and Records, that’s not an issue for these folks. Now I did try to get them to change that on the one spot on the web where it says that and they wouldn’t do it without the Provost and the Provost’s Office was saying, no, no, they don’t have to worry about it so I don’t think we’re going to actually see that change made on the website but the change is de facto happening. Whenever these students can get their fees in they will be allowed to take part in the ceremony.

B. Miller: And that’s for all colleges?

P. Stoddard: That’s for all colleges yes. The real question is whether the dean of the college and the advising deans of the colleges and how much they’re willing to work with the students and they’ve all been advised by the Provost to be as lenient as possible in getting students in for May.

J. Stephen: It seems strange to me when this was announced that they said this was not a cost issue.

P. Stoddard: Yes, I know.

J. Stephen: The fact that they actually said that is one of the reasons I think students were especially pissed off by this. If it’s not a cost issue, then why did you stop doing it.
P. Stoddard: Sure, absolutely.

J. Stephen: They’re not happy at all.

P. Stoddard: The cost issue is – I don’t know how big a deal that really is but it is – I mean there are two issues there. One is that the registration fee that the students pay or the commencement fee that the students pay does not cover all the commencement costs. The other issue is that when we book the Convocation Center for commencement that means you can’t book it for something else so there’s lost revenue as well as the loss of etc. So, that’s my understanding. There is some money involved but frankly, I don’t know what the rush was for this summer. Most of the complaints I’ve heard are for this summer. Richard then Lynne.

R. Orem: I thought I heard that there was an event scheduled for the Convocation Center and when the academic calendar was changed, this competed with that so that’s the case for this year.

P. Stoddard: Well, the decision or the debate about whether or not to continue with summer commencement ceremonies has apparently been going on for quite a while and you may be right that this conflict was the straw that broke the camel’s back on summer commencement. This might have been what finally forced the decision to be made one way or the other.

R. Orem: But then it begs the question why wasn’t at least the University Council approached?

P. Stoddard: Well, if they decided they were not going to have commencement this summer, University Council meets next week which means if it was brought to the University Council and they voted on it next week, the delay would have been even that much greater for informing students of the change. I mean, it would have been a delay and I think the thought was that if we’re going to do this, we have to make this decision as quickly as possible. Now I mean, degrees will still be conferred in the summer so nobody’s going to lose out for that. It’s just the ceremony itself and I think you can make a case one way or the other whether or not the University Council has a say in the ceremonies. If the graduation date were changed, that’s something I think the University Council would have a very legitimate claim – jurisdictional claim. Lynne?

L. Kamenitsa: I just wanted to clarify to make sure I heard you correctly. You’re saying because we were going to rent out this for-profit building, that students at a university were not going to be able to have a ceremony. I just wanted to make sure I got that right and I’m pretty agnostic about the summer ceremony. I just wanted to make sure I got our priorities straight there.

P. Stoddard: That’s on the record.

L. Kamenitsa: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Anybody else on that or any other issues.
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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: We have a motion to adjourn. It’s been seconded. I don’t hear any complaints. I see a lot of packing up and coat putting on so I assume we are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 P.M.