
D. Gough attended for N. Castle.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: We’ve got a pretty full agenda today so I’d like to get started. We are in order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. I’d like to make a special addition under President’s Announcements. Whatever letter comes before A, let’s stick that in there and we have a special guest who had some free time and decided he wanted to come and speak with us and I think most of us know who he is and that would be the President so if that’s all right with everybody, I’d like to add that into the agenda at the beginning of President’s Announcements. Do we have any other additions or changes? Seeing none, all in favor of the modified agenda please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Thank you.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2005 FS MEETING (Pages 3-8)

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes of February 9 meeting. Any corrections, deletions, additions?

K. Gallagher: I’ve got a correction.

P. Stoddard: Who’s that?
K. Gallagher: Kent Gallagher.

P. Stoddard: Kent, thank you, okay and that would ---

K. Gallagher: It’s got me down as absent; I was present and it has Larry Gregory as representative for Debbie Robertson and it was I.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Gregory Gallagher. I think I see where the problem came. It’s the signatures that look alike.

P. McFarland: You’ve put me down twice.

P. Stoddard: Well, you would have. Any other suggestions or corrections? Okay, all in favor of approving the minutes as amended please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Thank you.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. President Peters

P. Stoddard: As promised, we have the President of the University, John Peters, who has graciously offered to come over and speak with us for a few minutes. He has a couple of things he would like to say and then he’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have for him.

President Peters: I’m glad to be here. I try to get to visit you at least once a year, once a semester, or something like that and I don’t think I’ve done that yet this year. I just – one of the things on my mind is for the past three years, my life has pretty much been consumed with resources which, you know, I always suspected I was going to do a good bit of that but I didn’t realize my life was going to get consumed, particularly protecting resources. There’s not really a let up of that and it does get frustrating because it makes it difficult to do rational planning. We still have no idea what kind of budget we’re going to have when this is all said and done. The Illinois Board of Higher Education budget has about, you know, about a percent in that budget for us above the ’04 base which we fought hard to protect. That was a major victory and if we get that – we’re working hard to get that because the Governor zeroed that out and then there are some other items that could impact the budget. So, this is the time of year where that’s pretty much what I do a good bit of the time is constantly monitoring what’s happening in Springfield; watching for shell bills that could emerge with bad stuff in them. There must be 30 or 40 shell bills out there and items that could emerge – textbook bills, naming rights bills, pouring rights bills – things that may not be of direct relevance to the Faculty Senate but are. For instance, there’s an attempt on the part of the administration to join together all pouring rights contracts, you know, for Coca-Cola, Pepsi Cola and we happen to have a wonderful, exclusive pouring rights contract that runs through ’08 or ’09 for Pepsi that basically pays for, through concessions and upfront money, pays for the Centennial scholars and USOAR and several other enhancements that are directly academic. I think that the value of that contract was in the
neighborhood of 7.5 million dollars. That’s very valuable to us and the administration is trying to gang all that together for all public entities and, you know, I’m not sure that that’s a good thing for us. Anyway, stuff like that that I’ve been involved in. We had a good hearing before the House Appropriation Committee and that’s a very friendly committee. Bob Pritchard is on it but we have many friends on that committee and one of them asked me what – you know, you’re doing good work at NIU, we like NIU, you really try hard, you’ve accommodated and given access to our citizens – if we gave you some money, what would it take to realize all your dreams. That, you know, is always a question that tests your metal, right, so basically I thought about that and said well, just take us back to our base in FY02 which was 30 to 40 million dollars more than it is today and I said you don’t have to give it to me in one year and we wouldn’t put it back where we took it from. We would reinvest in areas that need it and take care of some new demands and take care of our salaries. I give you that antidote because I do feel that there is – the case is beginning to be made collectively that post-secondary education in Illinois is being hurt. Now saying that, one of the bigger thoughts that dominate my thinking is that I don’t think the funding is every going to come back across this country to public higher education at the level that it was which means we have to continue to do what we’re doing in terms of diversifying our revenue streams, grants, contracts, private fundraising. Public universities, in the next 30 years, will make it or break it based upon their endowments and NIU got a very, very late start in this. We have done an incredible job in the last few years laying the base and we have a tremendous donor base but we have a very small independent NIU Foundation and you know what they always say in private fundraising, you need to invest in it. You need to spend money to make money and we’ve had some great successes and we must continue that. Therefore, my thinking is that I have been heavily involved in fundraising and now we’re kind of shifting gears a little bit and I’m going to be heavily involved in first educating and then trying to get our donor base to contribute to endowments. Endowments are not very well understood among our donor base, our alumnae, and we have to indicate to them how important that is. Unfortunately, that’s a longer term proposition but it’s necessary. Beginning about 10 years ago, after many mature universities had large endowments, they were doing very well on their income from their endowments and so presidents always wanted cash. They wanted expendable dollars. They were not interested in building endowments per se because they wanted to make a huge difference right now – give me 60 million dollars because I want to invest in submarines for the Antarctica. I think we need to build endowments because without endowments we can’t pursue our other goals we need to pursue which is we need – I call it, you know, replenishing the professoriate. That’s one of the things I think about and look at the data. We need to – we’ve got a demographic trend that varies by department and unit but we’ve got to be replacing people and have been and we have not necessarily been replacing every line with a tenure track line number one and number two, when we do replace, we very, very seldom replace at the more advanced level. That is not uncharacteristic of what’s going on around the country but you would like a little better mix so I’m going to devote the next few years to trying to raise money for professorships. I’m going to try to re-conceptualize – there’s no plan, I’m trying to share what I’m thinking about. I’m going to re-conceptualize our chair, distinguished professor categories and see what we can do to reward those professors who are doing outstanding jobs in their fields who are here and then attract some individuals from other places who fit NIU and fit certain programs of distinction and need. So, I think we can do that. I know that the Provost has been working with the deans and I’ve pledged to try to find marginal dollars to expand the number of tenure tract faculty we have. We want to take a small bite out of that. You know, we
have no new program dollars so how are you going to do that and you never want to build budgets on non-recurring dollars. It’s very difficult to build budgets on fees or tuition because you’re not sure what’s going to happen year-to-year. The way I was trained, you never put personnel on anything but general revenue dollars unless they are – I’m talking about non-tenure track situations. So, you know, that dominates a lot of my thinking and a lot of it – some of it’s a lot of fun. We’ve done a tremendous job in federal earmarks as you know, but that won’t last forever. We do need to keep moving on funding research projects and do what we can to garner our share of that.

I got drawn in at the national level too to helping lobby for increasing Pell Grants which I think you all agree is a good thing. Retaining the Perkins Loans, I’ve been drawn into that. Helping save the Upper Bound Programs and TRIO and I’m glad to do that and so at that level, I’ve been a bit involved with that. I am trying to shed some of the things I’ve been doing nationally so that I can devote more time to the things I mentioned, fundraising and some programmatic things for us. I’m trying to shed my responsibilities as President of the Mid-American Conference. I’ve paid my dues during a tough time. I’ve enjoyed it. I’ve gotten to know the Mid-American Conference institutions pretty well and I think that’s helpful to us because I benchmark us against Miami of Ohio and Ohio University and I know those institutions and the presidents very well. I’m fed up with the Bull Championship Series negotiations; I’ve done my job and I’d like to back out of that. I think this year, hopefully, will be the last year I’m the Chair of the Illinois Public Chancellors and Presidents which does take time but also puts me out front and so I’m trying to back away from those things to redirect my energies.

I am in something that you should be interested in and that is I was appointed to the Abraham Lincoln Commission on Study Abroad and we’ve had several meetings in Washington now. It was the inspiration of Paul Simon but it’s bipartisan. Former Governor Edgar is on the Committee. Dick Durbin is on it and Senator Kirk. I was appointed as a university president by the Speaker of the House and it’s kind of fascinating. The plan is a pretty simple one but yet I think very important and that is to try to encourage more of our undergraduates, those who do not traditionally experience a study abroad situation, to do so in huge numbers; half a million a year at about a $7,000 per stipend. That’s a huge amount of money and to go to non-traditional destinations, under-developed, less-developed situations. I’m so out of date I don’t know what the proper term is; less-developed world or under-developed world, but I think that’s pretty noble and we’re moving toward a report in July and then we’ll be doing the lobbying for that. I’ve been tutored and educated by our people; Deb Pierce and her staff, and learned an awful lot. I thought I knew a lot about study abroad but I learned more than I – we can do more here. But, you know, it’s expensive. I mean, so many of our students have to work and many students can’t find time and are not even sure that it’s an experience that will be valuable to them but you talk to some who have gone to Costa Rica or Africa and it changes their life. If you’ve ever had, you know, in my day you went to Paris or London, you know. That changes your life too.

I got a few – just some other things. You can see, I’m not talking about day-to-day things. You know some things that are out there that I’m thinking about because I’m reading about them and everything comes around. I’ve got a growing concern about free speech and academic freedom. I’ve been there before; I can feel it coming. I’ve had to address one issue this year but I feel that it’s coming around. In addition, this is taking – there’s an ideological twist to this too. I see
there’s a report out about the ideology of professors. It came out of George Mason and it’s a study that shows that, I don’t know, well over the majority of professors are liberal in their political philosophy. The study did not try to link that up to whether that somehow has an impact on what happens in the classroom. Well, you know, there are people who’ll make something out of that. So, I kind of see that coming so I think about that. I see an item on your own agenda there’s a debate about what – what is it called – loosening up of tenure rules or so forth – I don’t think about that. I’ve been through that before when I was a dean when the sciences thought that seven years wasn’t enough to produce a published and funded scholar. You know, you had two years of post doc and then you’d come in and then you’d have three years to get major continuation funding from the NSF and at Nebraska, if you didn’t have that, you didn’t get tenure. I mean, that was – period, you know, because you had to have the funding and they were claiming that wasn’t enough time to establish a fundable record. So I know that’s out there. I will say though, I think we are blessed to have a current Board of Trustees that defends tenure, accepts it and sabbaticals. That makes my job pretty easy.

Other things that are just out there, I think the textbook issue – I don’t think that’s going to go away. It’s picking up steam nationally. I see there’s a federal tax credit proposal in the Congress to make expenditures on textbook materials a tax credit. I believe there’s a shell bill in the Legislature, Illinois Legislature, to make text book purchases tax exempt. There’s some growing steam about this and of course, you know, that we’re dealing here with an oligopoly, much as we are in library serials where, you know, we don’t certainly control the total end of the operation. I do think that, you know, if you’ve ever done textbooks you know there’s this constant rush to turn out another edition and, you know, the bundling of materials. I don’t think I used any of those god-awful test files or instructors’ manuals that went with the political science textbook. But, you know, you got to buy them and I think that’s where you can help and I don’t think that’s going to go away. I think the average price now is $853.00 nationally. I just saw that on the internet and this one study out of California, the ??? Study, claims that’s a fourfold increase in ten years. Anyway, I know we have a bunch of committees looking at it and working on it. The IBHE had a good report that I think did not do more than say we’ve got to continue to work on it. There was an attempt in some places to do textbook rental programs and we looked at that and the start-up costs for that are huge; warehousing, purchase the books, students can’t write in them. You’ve got to do the accounting. Academic freedom – yeah, that’s about academic freedom. You know, you’ve have to have unit adoption rules that you’d have to agree to but I think that’s a small one. I think, speaking about bundling, I think academic freedom – all those issues, look at the heart of our profession and what’s driving it – it’s getting harder and harder for the average American citizen to acquire and pay for without reasonable debt a four-year, on-campus degree program at a good place like NIU. So, that’s the other issue.

Hey, listen. I could go on all afternoon. I’m just going to shut up and I’ll take any questions you have for a few minutes and get out of your hair and try to get that fixed.

P. Stoddard: Are there any questions for the President?

F. Bryant: You talked a lot about enrollment management. What are the projections for fall admissions?
President Peters: You know, there’s the continual Enrollment Management Committee that is attempting to keep enrollments flat at where they were last year. You know, we did – they did, that Committee, did a very good job of slowing down the growth so that we could accommodate students and I know it’s still difficult and those are still in place. I can’t tell you the calls I’ve been getting but, as I told appropriation committees, when you increase our base budget by so many dollars per hundred students, so I can give the students faculty members and give them a program, a math course, a science course, a humanities course, an arts course; a full program and then make sure it goes through all four years. We’re going to hold steady. I am really worried about this whole system blowing up. I think it’s why the community colleges, at least one of them, has talked about four year degree authority. We’ve opposed that because that would hurt NIU. You know, 42% of our enrollment has been transfer students and that’s been going down. That’s another place we’ve made an adjustment and it’s a simple adjustment and it’s a smart adjustment. What we’ve said is if you come in before 60 hours, you’ve got to have a higher GPA. That’s a smart thing to do and that has shut the valve off a little bit so we’re using controls. Will we be more selective? Probably not. I think what we need to do is make sure our admission requirements are modern and up to speed so students can be successful here given our programs. One of the great strengths of NIU, at least to the people of the state, is that we have traditionally helped first generation kids. That’s a great strength. I mean, that’s mentioned all the time. You know, as I walk around and I talk to people, people don’t want that to go away. The other thing, whether we want to be more selection and/or insure access, we’re without a major tool and that is a very good endowed scholarship program. If you want to be more selective or give access to kids who have higher academic profiles, you’ve got to give them scholarships and we have very little in the way of endowments. That’s why I see my job, in the next few years, is to get those endowments up and I think we can.

F. Bryant: Thank you.

President Peters: All right.

P. Stoddard: Any others? Okay, thanks very much.

President Peters: One month to grading.

B. Steve Cunningham will be attending to discuss pension proposals.

P. Stoddard: Okay, our next guest who is here to speak to us about the joys of the upcoming pension debate, is Steven Cunningham who is the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. Am I close?

S. Cunningham: Close. Thank you, Paul. I remember coming here about ten years, it would have been around 1996 and then we were talking about the work we were doing to get the 2.2 provision and modifications passed. NIU along with U of I was very active in that initiative and we had a pretty thorough report about new accounting standards being adopted, going from book to market. At that time, I think SURS was about at 88% in terms of its funding ratio and what we came out with was right after the 1995 funding plan which stabilized at least, in theory, the future with respect to state contributions. We then were able to bring about some really positive
reforms to the retirement system. Pat Delaney was sitting around over here sort of helping me through some of the accounting talk because he was nodding his head so I was saying some of the right things and, you know, that helped but those were the good days. Now, we’re into a different cycle and it’s not really caused by anything that is excessive or over-generous about SURS or state retirement benefits. It is a situation caused exclusively by the failure of the state of Illinois over the years to make the contributions to the retirement systems that are required by the Illinois Pension Code. It’s not the fault of the current administration or current employees who have made their contributions in full. It is sort of an accruing issue that has occurred over many years. I didn’t try to bring any handouts because you probably have all received President Peter’s message a few weeks ago that described what the pension reform proposals were as they existed in the Governor’s FY06 budget proposal and I’m also going to give – and Paul has a copy – of the report we did for the Board of Trustees. We talked about this and I think he’s probably going to distribute that to you too. It has a little more detail in it about the SURS and the background of the crisis and the proposals and so on. Basically, and all of this is prefaced - we’re going to talk a little bit about what was in the Governor’s budget proposal but that is just a proposal. There has yet to be legislation introduced that would be necessary to enact these proposed changes and until we actually see the legislation, we really don’t have anything concrete to respond to and to address and furthermore, the legislative process itself will substantially modify whatever the proposals are in the initial legislation.

It’s good to begin with sort of the scope of the problem and this unfunded liability crisis was partly addressed in the 1995 Funding Plan and right now, due to the failure of previous state administrations to make the required contributions, there’s a 45 to 50 billion dollar debt that is the direct result of that. Current contributions are being made currently as required and also the issuance of pension obligation bonds last year helped moderate the growth of the debt somewhat. The 1995 Funding Plan along with the annual contributions has a ramp-up process and, for example, in FY06, total state contributions to retirement systems are going to be on the order of 2.4 billion dollars. Five hundred million of that is debt service that is being paid as part of the 1995 Funding Plan. Every year for the next forty years, there will be a growing debt service to pay that off so that by the end of the forty year cycle, state contributions will fall dramatically and so it’s sort of a contained lump in the actuarial stream that is being dealt with and it’s a very severe crisis for the state of Illinois so it’s important to acknowledge the severity of the crisis. It has to be dealt with. The question is whether the proposals that we’ve seen are the best way to deal with it or even effective in dealing with it. I think you’re all pretty familiar with the proposals that the Governor had in the budget proposal. There are proposals to change the – and I won’t try to go through them specifically – but some of the ones of greatest concern are the ones that change the cost of living updates to the pension. SURS participants do not have Social Security as a base benefit program; SURS is the base benefit plan and SURS participants do not participate in Social Security and the administration did some benchmarking to come up with these proposals and what they studied were private section 401K plans and they tended to compare SURS provisions involving cost of living adjustments as well as the money purchase offers with private sector plans. Well, of course, private sector employees participate in Social Security as their base plan and they’d have a 401K plan as an add-on to that plan and so that’s part of what we’re going to be working with is making some distinctions in the legislative process. Social Security, by the way, does have a cost of living adjustment; it’s CPI related. Over the last twenty years, that has averaged 3.1%, very close to what the SURS 3% adjustment
Furthermore, the normal cost of paying Social Security benefits, operating funds, is about 11% of the payroll and the SURS normal operating costs are between 10% and 11% so that almost any benchmark, whether we look at Social Security or we look at public pension plans in other states, the SURS is a decent plan but it’s not excessive. It’s not probably in the fourth quartile when all factors are considered and yet the SURS is very emphasized in the Governor’s proposals. Two of the provisions, the elimination of money purchase for future employees and placing some limitation on the amount of interest credited to current employee money purchase accounts in the future are both solely related to the SURS and when we look at the financial weighting that the Bureau of the Budget placed upon the amendments to the SURS plan as compared to the other pension plans, the SURS participants would carry 40 to 50% of the weight of the total reduction, actuarial reduction of benefits, yet SURS really probably, based upon other data, probably has contributed about 4 or 5% to the growth in unfunded liabilities in recent years because the state employee systems, the teacher systems have all had fairly generous early retirement programs which have done nothing but massively contribute to the unfunded liabilities that are borne by the entire state. So these are some of the factors that we’re going to focus upon. There are sort of three dimensions and that’s the first one and that is the qualitative aspects of the benefits; what do the proposals do to the competitive status of compensation in Illinois public higher education? What does this mean for current employees and future employees; mostly future employees. The state does recognize the Constitutional guarantee of benefits. None of the proposals in the budget as written would affect currently employees. They would only affect future employees. So benefits that current employees have and will continue to get are not affected by the proposals as they are written except for the money purchase limitation on interest applied to future years of contributions in the money purchase program and the SURS has stated that they believe that is unconstitutional so that too will be subject to challenge so universities and employees have a big role to play together as this goes through the legislative process in dealing with the qualitative dimension of what this does to benefits and ability to recruit and retain quality faculty especially in the future because higher ed participates in the national market unlike most other – to a far greater extent – than most other factors in state government.

Another dimension is the financial modeling dimension that is the contribution system through which the retirement system gets its state contributions and that would be considerably changed under the proposed plan. It would redesign the 1995 Funding Plan. It would retain it in terms of the 40 year remaining period and the goal of the 90% funding ratio at the end of that, but it would basically take the projected savings from the benefit cuts that future employees would absorb and it distributes those evening across the 40 year period so that about 800 million of those savings goes into this year’s budget and is a real practical way to resolve the structural deficit problems in the current state budget. Maybe it is - but that is something that’s going to be debated in the legislative process and how real are those projected savings and will the state - it relies upon the pay-as-you-go discipline – that during that entire period the state really won’t enact any further benefit enhancements or early retirement options. Another aspect then for the universities especially is the proposal to have the universities and the employers whether they be school districts, universities, community colleges, be directly responsible for the payment, present value, of liabilities created by salary increases beyond 3% per year in the retirement calculation base. Even looking at an average employee that’s currently in the system, we anticipate that that would result in required new contributions directly out of our budget of
probably well over a million dollars a year. We’re already paying about 3.5 million to CMS as part of funding for the health insurance program so this is another way of again obligating the university budgets directly for unfunded liabilities from the state.

Those are some of the issues that we will be needing to address. I know there are a lot of questions among employees. We’ve had a lot of people come out to the office; Deborah knows this – should I retire now to make sure my benefits are secure? These are some of the problems created these types of proposals and the answer to that is based upon what was in the Governor’s budget, in the Governor’s speech and in the written budget proposal, there are no provisions that would change the benefits that current employees have. One of them could alter somewhat the amount of money credited to accounts in the future but that does not affect what has already been accrued in those accounts.

So, really I’m here to also answer any questions. President Peters asked that I be pretty accessible as we go through this thing. This is probably, no doubt, the storm brewing here, the biggest challenge we’ve seen with respect to the status of our benefits and so that is something we’re going to be very involved with throughout the rest of the session.

P. Stoddard: Okay. I would point out that Steve is without doubt the most informed person on campus about these issues. So if you have any questions – maybe in the state. Go ahead, Carole?

C. Minor: Steve you said that the only benefit change for current employees has to do with the change in the money purchase plan and how that might work. I as someone who is affected by this – I’d like to hear the details of how that might work and what are the limits and what effect is that going to have on my pension?

S. Cunningham: As most of you know, just kind of as background, people can retire under one of two primary formulas and at the time of retirement, both calculations are run and the employee receives the higher of the two calculations. The first of these is the general formula. That’s sort of a base benefit plan; the minimum guarantee which is 2.2% times the years of creditable service, multiplied then by a high four year, consecutive four year salary base and that’s the way that formula works. It used to be a graduated program and that was what we worked on in 1997 to make an even 2.2% for all years of service. The second one, as you mentioned, is the money purchase plan. What that is it takes the value of the employee contributions attributable to the retirement system which is close to about I think 6.7% and those who’ve been in the system, every year the SURS has credited a certain interest rate to those account and it’s averaged 8% over the last twenty years. SURS is unrestricted basically in how they calculate that. Their Board certifies it; it’s based upon the performance of SURS funds and the market and also the projected obligations that the system has in the future and how well those are funded by the employee contribution side. Employee contributions are not responsible for unfunded state contributions so it’s strictly the proportion of benefit obligations that are attributable to the employee contribution component and although at the time of retirement, that account value is matched by the state – this is in the pension code – at a rate of 140% so 1.4 times that amount is added to that in order to create a pool of money and that is then divided by an annuity factor, an annuity table of decimal which is – every five years SURS readjusts its
money purchase annuity tables – and those vary by age basically and they take account of what
the anticipated liabilities are for the system so it’s a different decimal if you’re 55 or 60 versus
65 and that results in an annuity calculation which is compared with the basic general formula
calculation and the employee gets the greater of the two. Presently, 60% of retirements under the
SURS occur under the money purchase formula so it is a very beneficial formula for employees.
I was at a recent meeting where John Filan talked about the Governor’s Office analysis of the
SURS money purchase which is a specific focus in the Governor’s budget and they discovered
obviously, that the obvious employer match for 401K’s national-wide is around 50% whereas the
state was matching employee accounts under money purchase at 140%. Again, those employees
in the private section have a base benefit program of Social Security underlying their 401K so
that has to be taken into account in the analysis. In terms of how these proposals would affect
anyone who currently has a money purchase option, first the proposal would eliminate money
purchase employees, not current employees so that anyone who is making contributions into the
system prior to the effective date of the legislation would – all of this is subject to whatever final
legislative outcome there is – but would maintain their benefits under the current plan and would
maintain the money purchase option which would continue to be matched at the 140% rate. The
Governor did talk about that in his budget message. I listened to it. He talked about I think a
little known formula that only pertained to university employees and it was kind of a secret.
Well, it’s no secret; it’s just a money purchase formula but there’s nothing in the budget book,
nothing in the written FY06 budget proposal that would change that or that even addresses that
1.4% match for current employees but it would eliminate money purchase for future employees.
The other provision that does affect our employees that the SURS has stated clearly is
unconstitutional is the provision that would place more limitations on how the SURS calculates
the annual rate of interest it applies to employee accounts in future years and I think in the
budget book it was the lesser of some percentage. I have it in here but it was a calculation that
took into account the five year recent history of the SURS so that it wouldn’t – it would take
account of what the SURS had posted in recent years on the rate of return on SURS accounts in
recent years which the Governor said in his message had been 5%, not 8%, and that’s true but if
you look at the 10 and 20 year rate of return, it’s much higher. It’s I think 11 and 8 or 8.5%
respectively so that would have some affect on future growth of money purchase accounts but
not have an affect on the current accrual of benefits in employee accounts. It could have an
affect on the annuity table long term when they re-evaluate the annuity table. There are
assumptions in terms of rate of growth of employer accounts could change but that’s probably
not a big factor that we need to be concerned with right now.

C. Minor: I have a follow-up question. So you’re saying that they’re going to possible look at a
5% rather than 8% annual return and that would start from now?

S. Cunningham: I have it here. Let me – I think I have it here.

C. Minor: I’d like to get a sense of the magnitude of this. If you were to do that starting now,
does that mean that benefits are going to go down by 37.5%, the difference between 5% and 8%?

S. Cunningham: Well, first of all Carole, it would not go retroactive. It would only be effective
for like – let’s say the legislation passed and it was made effective as of FY06. As of that year,
then the rate of interest – the way that was calculated would change a little bit. It wouldn’t
change what has already been posted to the account so in that way, it’s a prospective issue; it’s not retrospective. The proposal in the budget would limit the interest credit and the money purchase to the SURS long-term rate of return which right now – how do you – this is a quote, so we would have to see legislation to see how they define long-term rate of return, 5 year, 10 year, 20 year, those are all different rates of return. But not to exceed either the most recent 5 or 10 year rates of return. So I guess then by long-term rate of return they mean 20 year. So their – the 5 year rate of return is about 5.5% so I think that’s what they’re kind of getting at. There is a money purchase option under the Teachers’ Retirement System now too. Those are the only two. But that one, the amount of interest that can be credited is limited to 6% and the, I guess, the outcomes have shown that hardly any employees retire under money purchase under the TRS because the base benefit plan drives a higher benefit if you look at a 6% rate of return so it has been the 8, 10, 9, 8.5% rate of returns that have really had a compounding effect and then those are matched at the 140% level, that’s been a good benefit for many higher education employees, 60% of them. But then again, this is our only base benefit plan. There’s not another 401K plan sitting out there in excess of that. Does that kind of go far enough to ----

C. Minor: What’s the magnitude of the difference that might make?

S. Cunningham: Year one, it would make very little difference. The rate of increase then of the money purchase accounts for current employees would begin to slow as we go out to the future and probably 10 years from now, maybe only 20% of employees would see a money purchase retirement whereas now it’s 60% of employees so probably if this passed, it would immediately drop the rate for FY06 to about 5.5% and so the compounding effect would be slowed and then each year thereafter it would slow it down.

C. Minor: One more question, when we’re discussion this with members of the legislature and trying to get various of these proposals by the Governor not to be enacted, do we have any priority of those? Are we saying well the main thing is we want to be able to track new employees or do we want to protect those of us who say have given our lives to the state of Illinois and this university and think we have a contract in which we need to be able to get the benefits we were promised when we joined up?

S. Cunningham: Good point. The problem with – the challenge with this situation is that the scope of it is so sweeping it makes it difficult for employees and universities to really respond to it but there are different interests involved here and we summarized those a little bit. There is an interest that’s purely the SURS really, and that is that the sufficiency of the funding formula, is the 1995 Funding Plan retained, do they still have a stable cash flow coming into the retirement system. We’re interested in that as university employees but that battle is mostly the retirement system’s fight. Then there are qualitative issues; the adequacy of benefits for ourselves and for future employees. Are we going to be able to attract and retain talented faculty, especially in an institution of our class in the future if we’re strapped with this funding plan and at the same time have to pay present value liability contributions out of our own budget if we try to supplement that through salary increases. So, the plan as written has the effect of being constrained to the universities in terms of how they manage their compensation. That is certainly university and employee and a faculty issue. Why is the SURS over-emphasized? Why is there so much emphasis on the SURS when, in fact, the SURS is better funded, has had better performance on
assets, lower administrative costs and has not been the beneficiary of generous early retirement incentives that are applied to teachers and other state employees and that’s an issue. That’s an equity issue. That’s an issue certainly for the universities, for the retirement system and for employees. Then there is the issue of the required – again, the present value contributions. That’s mostly university; that’s a budget cut, so that’s really a university issue. It’s an employee issue because it limits – it takes resources that universities would otherwise have to apply to salary increase programs. If we had our health insurance contribution funding back, that’s about 3% salary increase right there so these are real tangible factors to deal with. I think probably right now it appears the major area of emphasis is is this the way to balance the budget first of all, as a threshold condition, you know, cutting benefits for future employees and taking those projected savings and using those in your accounting for the current budget and then making future generations deal with that. After that, if so, then you know, there are maybe other options to solve the funding crisis, then looking what happens to the cost of living and to the adequacy of benefits when this is the base benefit plan for higher education employees that don’t have Social Security so we can kind of run through those things and we will as we go through this. The problem we have – and I know Paul, we’re probably running short of time – is the Governor’s budget has to deal with this crisis. It’s a grave crisis and it’s got to be dealt with in some way and there aren’t any other alternatives to be kicked around out there so if this plan fails, where are the alternatives and if this plan doesn’t pass and probably, we hope, it doesn’t, it would also return us to a period of renewed budget cutting, so all of these things are going to have to be balanced around us. That’s why I found it important to first acknowledge the problem. It’s a big problem; it’s out there. The administration has to deal with it; we all have to deal with it even though it’s too bad the state didn’t make the contributions, it’s something that happened and now we have to deal with it so that’s kind of a good starting point.

C. Minor: I promise this is the last one. Why is it that no one is willing to consider raising taxes to responsibly cover the obligations of the State of Illinois?

S. Cunningham: Well, that’s probably not mine to answer. I guess that one we need to leave to our elected officials. It is a very hard issue to reckon with. That has been proposed and discussed. The Pension Commission did talk a little bit about that but that’s not what’s in the current proposal.

P. Stoddard: Beth?

B. Miller: You didn’t mention anything about – maybe you did and I just didn’t understand – there was an original discussion that Paul mentioned that they were going to consider capping the high number of years that someone could have. Is that what you were talking about when you talked about the recalculation of the formula for the money purchase plan?

S. Cunningham: A little bit. The high four year average relates to the general formula that applies to everyone and what was proposed is not to really cap the amount of growth and salaries during those years. In fact, there are already limits on that that the SURS monitors and they’re really 20% per year. There are certain things that are excluded but what the proposal said is that the employer would become responsible for making supplement contributions to the retirement systems for liabilities created by salary increase histories greater than 3% per year in
any of those high four years so it shifts the burden of liability from, we’re all the state first of all, it shifts the burden of liability from the general state budget to the independent university/community college/school districts budgets and therefore, probably it’s a way of getting money out of those budgets, but it also it is a disincentive for those employers to authorize salary increase beyond 3% per year because they’ve got to start thinking about then contributions they’re going to have to make later to the retirement system.

**B. Miller:** Which is major giving the fact that we were just talking about endowments and special chairs and also if you look at, in particular, the life course of women in higher education. All of these things, I think, are particularly of concern as women come and go in their life course in higher education. They oftentimes come and go and achieve things later in their careers and so the data would suggest that they sometimes would not achieve these senior level positions at all or sometimes later and so they would be shut out under these choices.

**S. Cunningham:** The plan as written is a disincentive for employers, universities to be able to recognize periods of high merit.

**B. Miller:** And to recruit in particular?

**S. Cunningham:** Right.

**P. Stoddard:** Bill?

**W. Tolhurst:** I hope I know the answer to this question, but I want to hear it again. This extra liability that accrues to the university, it only results in increases in rate of pay and is not affected by increased income that a faculty member might get by doing say extra summer teaching but that did not impact the rate of pay. Those kinds of increases in salary would not generate additional liability to the university. Is that correct?

**S. Cunningham:** I would like to say it is because that would make sense. The current policies on terms of income limitations of 20% per year do have some exclusions for some appointments, promotions, title changes, things related to extra duties. Those exceptions are not incorporated into the Governor’s budget proposal. There are no exceptions, just any, you know, any increase beyond 3% total compensation applies to the liability would prompt, you know, a new contribution. That may change, we haven’t seen the legislation and once filed if that’s still going to legislation, that’s likely to change as it gets through the process but as written right now, in the budget proposal, that’s what it says.

**W. Tolhurst** So what this means is that the university could have an economic reason not to allow people to allow to do this extra teaching and have the newer people do it just so it won’t incur that liability?

**S. Cunningham:** If that played out theoretically, yes, I think what would happen in reality is colleges and the university would have to begin thinking about what, you know, what we’re looking at in terms of this new contribution when we make those decisions and how we would do that, you know, that’s out there a ways but it’s something we have to start thinking about.
**P. Stoddard:** Another scenario that comes to mind is someone who at the end of their career, writes a nice grant, gets a lot of money, there would be a disincentive for the university to actually follow through on that and award this person, to support this person and summer salary from the grant because the university would then become liable for that extra benefit.

**S. Cunningham:** Exactly. Again, if this happens and this provision especially is going to be one that is very open to challenge if it’s introduced, if it comes to the legislative process because school districts and community colleges to some extent, where they go to get that money is the tax base and that has some fairly obvious implications I think in the legislative process. So I don’t know that that provision is going to survive but certainly if it did, we would need to have a good modeling system to take account of – let’s say we’re paying, you know, enhanced compensation on the basis of the grant and then that might then need to begin to be considered as part of the, you know, overhead costs and so on. But all that has to be taken – we don’t know of another state doing this so that’s another factor.

**P. Stoddard:** So they were innovative.

**S. Cunningham:** They’re innovative when it comes to tax dollars. They thought about this. We’ll give them credit for that.

**W. Tolhurst:** Not long enough.

**P. Stoddard:** Do you have any other questions for Steve? All right, well thank you very much.

**S. Cunningham:** We’ll keep you informed as we move on. Appreciate it.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Any other announcements I have – I will just announce that the Presidential Teaching Professorships were selected. They go to Jeff Chown from the Department of Communication; William Koehler from the School of Music, and Parviz Payvar from the Department of Mechanical Engineering and I thought that, just from this body, it would be nice to send our congratulations along to those folks for a job well done.

I’ve been asked about summer budget and summer hours and if I can get this in quickly before he runs out of the room – the summer hours issue has not yet been decided. My understanding is that it will be decided purely on the basis of financial merit. In other words, if the university thinks they can realize savings by going to a 4-day, 10-hour work week over the summer, they will do so. If they don’t think the financial savings are there despite the good wishes from a lot of people on campus to see that happen, it won’t. Would that be correct?

**S. Cunningham:** That’s correct. We’re not far enough along yet in the cycle to determine.

**P. Stoddard:** Do you have – so people can begin to plan – an idea when we might expect a decision.
S. Cunningham:  Well, I think last year we announced the decision in mid-April/early-April. I know that President Peters talked to me earlier today and we need to be on a similar track.

P. Stoddard:  Okay, thank you. You can go now. In terms of the summer budget, the Provost tells me that the budget itself is kind of set. I don’t have any details on it but if you have questions, I suppose you can ask the Provost’s Office about that.

W. Baker:  I’m sorry what did you just say.

P. Stoddard:  The summer budget in terms of courses to be offered and whatever else we spend money on in the summer. The Provost says that that has been set now.

W. Baker:  Set. Thank you.

P. Stoddard:  As opposed to what? Sad. They didn’t seem sad at the time. Okay, let’s see.

V.  ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Faculty Personnel Advisor

P. Stoddard:  Next up for Faculty Senate consideration. I announced at an earlier meeting that the current Faculty Personnel Advisor, Curt Behrens, had agreed to continue on in that position. He’s eligible for one more year’s term. I have gotten no other indications from anyone else that they would like to challenge him for that position. Therefore, I think we can just go ahead and appoint Curt to another year as Faculty Personnel Advisor. He would like to come meet with us. I suggested that the beginning of next year, next academic year, would be a good time so that the Faculty Senate members at that time could get to meet him and see what he’s all about. So –

F. Bryan:  We should probably vote.

P. Stoddard:  Yes, Beth? Beth moves to reappoint Kurt. Do we have a second? We have a second from the back row belying the term backbencher. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed? Congratulations Curt.

The motion passed.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

P. Stoddard:  We have nothing to consent to. I will move on to Reports from Advisory Committees. In view of the hour, I try to ask people to be as succinct as possible. Yes, I’m sorry, Larry?
L. Gregory: On the next page we had an action item. In light of voting numbers required, we should move to that and then come back for our reports. I have a personal interest in this and I just wondered ---

W. Tolhurst: Do we need a motion to amend the agenda?

P. Stoddard: I think we would at this point.

W. Tolhurst: So moved.

P. Stoddard: All in favor? Opposed? Okay, let’s take the action item so I’ll throw the floor open to Augden Windelborn, Rules and Governance.

The motion passed.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair – report (Page 13)

1. Change in Order of Business. ACTION ITEM

A. Windelborn: Okay, last week we had submitted for a first reading a change to the Bylaws related to the operating procedures. There was a friendly amendment to that which has been incorporated into the materials you have received so this is being brought forward for a second reading and, therefore, hopefully a vote to amend the Bylaws as submitted. I don’t know what else I need to say other than that. I make a motion that we ---

P. Stoddard: We have a second from Professor Stephen. Okay, this is again a second reading so we presumably we’ve all seen this once before. The only corrections made were actually made on what was originally in the Bylaws as opposed ---

A. Windelborn: It was not incorrect except it was incorrect in the Bylaws so now we are – yes.

P. Stoddard: Again, the rationale is to put all the things that tend to be competitive with the University Council as close to the end of the meeting as possible so that people on both bodies could leave earlier and not feel that they were missing anything. Any discussion on this? All right? Beth?

B. Miller: Sorry. Comments and Questions from the Floor? There’s no place for Comments and Questions from the Floor after the reports or Unfinished Business before the --- is that all right?

P. Stoddard: Comments and Questions from the Floor, right before Adjournment.

B. Miller: Yeah, well, if a member of the University Council had a question?

P. Stoddard: They could stay. We’re not kicking them out. Any other discussion or questions or comments from the floor? All right, seeing none, I’ll call a vote. All in favor of the change as
moved please say aye. Opposed? All right, so starting next time we’ll see a different look in the agenda. Might have worked very well for this meeting as it turns out.

**P. Stoddard:** Moving back then to the original agenda format, Reports from Advisory Committees, first up is Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Professor Stephen.

**J. Stephen:** I don’t have a written report on this. I’m trying to glean out a lot of repetitive stuff that appears in it. The highlights of it are a discussion by the President of Illinois Westland that he had from Northwestern – with the President of Northwestern is that there students have been coming to them extremely highly qualified with great GPAs under these very, very rigid curriculums and they’re finding them just flat out boring. Okay, so that I thought was interesting. We met with the Director of Educational Reform which is the Governor’s way of getting around the fact that they wouldn’t let him have a department of education. This director is Elliott Regenstein and no, he’s not one of those Regensteins. I found him a less than overwhelming or understanding person although he dealt with an extremely hostile meeting. Alan Karnes, the Chair of the FAC, was talking about this cap that came up about benefits and he couldn’t get more than so much interest, and Alan Karnes said “damn it, that’s our money; you’re not going to steal it – that’s unconstitutional, I’ll take you to court”. We were extremely hostile about their attack on the SURS pension plan as opposed to the ones where the real abuses occur and the ones where they had the large buyouts. We aggressively attacked him on the PPA issue when there are no similar really reform issues with teeth them going towards the high schools seeing as we all realize that Illinois has one of the highest required Carnegie units to graduate from high school but we increasing see extremely unprepared students coming from all over the state. He was a little obnoxious when he said “well, everybody is feeding a the State’s trough, wants more from this Governor, and we doubt that Governor Blagojevich is suffering in his perception” and I said “well, I come from north of 80 and east of 39 and I can guarantee you it’s not just people feeding at the trough”. He says that they have an understanding that the university wants to be left alone and they need to exercise some restraint, however, no promise of an even approach is made to higher education. The best I can say about it is the guy held up pretty good under an extremely hostile crowd and said very little of substance. That’s about it. We didn’t get to the subcommittee reports, the Subcommittee B thing about PPA. That’s pretty much going to go forward in the form that we’ve been sort of dribbled and drabbed about all semester long and that will be addressed by Alan Karnes, the Chair of the FAC at the IBHE meeting on April 5 and I’m supposed to remind you that April 13 is Lobby Day. Time to go down and make our voices heard. Any questions about the FAC meeting?

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, thank you Buck. Don’t go away.

B. **BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report** (Pages 9-10)

**P. Stoddard:** Board of Trustee Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. That would be Professors Buck Stephen and Ferald Bryan.
**J. Stephen:** Okay, Ferald and I attended this. It was a short meeting. All 48 recommendations for sabbatical leaves were approved. Trustee Boey made a very positive comment about him realizing and coming to better understand the role sabbaticals play in their important to the university. They passed a number of requests for degree authority, Master of Science in Industrial Management in the Naperville area. They updated the Ed.D. program in the way it was requested with a specialization in Art Education and in Science, Social Studies and Environmental Education Integration. The Minor in Computer Science was approved and they deleted the emphasis in Acoustics within Physics because that program can’t be supported because there’s no faculty unit and they deleted the specialization in Elementary Education. Both of those were requested by the departments in questions. They received the Oral English Proficiency Annual Report and were satisfied with the resolutions of these complaints. Then they were notified of the Annual IBHE Report on Underrepresented groups that had been made by the Office of the Provost. That’s it.

**C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song**

- **report** (Page 11)

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, there’s a Board of Trustee Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee meeting attended by me and Xueshu Song. There is a report, I believe, on page 11 instead of the report for the full Board, I believe. Yes, the highlights of this – most of the stuff that is covered is in the report. I’m not going to go through all of it. The major thing was the student fee structure. The university had been trying to keep the total increase in student fees under 3%. With the exception of student health fees, they were able to do that. It was 2.8% without the student health fee increase. The student health fee, however, did go up almost 24% which is really beyond the university’s control in large measure. In fact, the original provider that we’re using right now wanted to raise fees over 50% so the university found a new provider that would raise fees only 25%. That combined with the rest of the fee increases leads to a total increase of about 9% but they really had their hands tied on that. There was a lot of feedback from the Student Association throughout the process in here and as far as I can tell, they were all on board with this. The *Northern Star* apparently is not so much on board with this.

That’s really – everything else in here – you got a submarine, yah – is pretty self-explanatory I think. I’d be happy to answer any questions anyone has that particular subcommittee report.

**D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman**

- **report** – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, moving on we have Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs of the Board of Trustees. That’s Donna Smith and Shey Lowman. Looks like Shey will give it.

**S. Lowman:** Anyway, I’m going to let you read the report. I did make an extra effort to try to highlight what I think was really important to be covered and I wanted to let you know there were 10 pages of substantial legislation that was given to us and if anybody would like to have that, let me know and I will e-mail it to you.
**P. Stoddard:** That’s a walk-in item, yes, it’s us. Any questions for Shey? Thank you for the brevity of that.

E. **BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report**

**P. Stoddard:** And finally the full Board of Trustees – as usual, they pretty much okayed everything that went on in the subcommittees. Once again, Trustee Boey made a nice strong, affirmative statement about the sabbatical program. I really do think we have support on the entire Board for the sabbatical program and so that was very nice. The Board also – how exactly did they phrase this – extended on a one year basis until 2010 President Peter’s contract. They can revisit this; he can opt out but assuming nobody says anything, his contract gets automatically renewed every year until 2010 and then they’ll reconsider things. They also approved retroactively a 3% raise for him in August and a 1% raise for him in January which parallels the raises that the rest of the community got. Finally, the President himself announced the creation in his name and his wife’s of an endowed scholarship. It’s something related to – he wanted to keep it kind of general, but it’s something related to public service so that was a very nice gesture on his part and is sort of putting money where his mouth is in terms of endowments so that was good. Any questions on the Board of Trustees Report?

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, Academic Affairs has no report

B. **Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – report.**

**P. Stoddard:** Economic Status of the Profession. Radha unfortunately could not be here today. He asked me to point out that included in our packet is a Chronicle of Higher Ed article about tenure process and what flexible tenure process is. It’s what the President referred to. This is what the American Council on Education and the Sloan Foundation have put together in terms of a recommendation for tenure, extending the process to allow faculty members and especially those in less traditional career paths more time to prove themselves tenurable. This is here – the thought in the Executive Committee was – but actually what we kind of do some of this, maybe not everything by the letter of the article, but in terms of the family medical leave, stopping the tenure clock provision that we just approved in University Council but it sort of mimics a lot of what this article is talking about as well. Yes?

**B. Miller:** I know our time is short but I was with these folks last week at a conference and I do just want to just point out that this research is longitudinal research and one of the things they do talk about is the pipeline for particularly women in higher education and although we do many things that some universities don’t do, some universities don’t have parental leave for example. They don’t have sick leave that they can use for parental leave. There are many, many things that we could do better at NIU and it is the Faculty Senate that oftentimes speaks for faculty that do not because we are tenured, that oftentimes these faculty are new. They came to departments and are not offered opportunities by their department chairs. Their tenure and promotion packets
are at NIU reviewed both by department chairs first and also by faculty and so I would encourage us as faculty to actually review how well a job review we do and to consider that in the upcoming year. We don’t do nearly as good a job as we oftentimes think that we do and the national data, the longitudinal data says this is an issue and if we and all of the work and family data say that when people are happy – men and women are happy at their institutions – they perform better.

P. Stoddard: Sure. I sense a good nomination for chair of the Economic Status of the Profession next year. Lynne?

L. Kamenitsa: I just wanted to follow up on that, I mean, I just got to skim through this article and this is a little report on a larger study and I think that our one step that we’ve taken in this direction does not come anywhere near even mining the depths of what’s in the article much less what’s in the whole study and so I would encourage the committee that puts this out for our consideration to also think about looking into some of this in a more systematic way.

P. Stoddard: Okay, very good. Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: Again, without taking much time, when I scanned through the article it seems to concentrate on a lot of childcare issues and there are other issues. There’s a lot of sandwich generation as we’re called I guess; people who have to take care of elderly parents and again that’s both genders and there are a lot of other issues that are not mentioned here that somebody should be paying attention to on campus if they’re not already. So it’s not just childcare; there are a variety of other issues that we sometimes need leave for and will increasingly as we get older because god knows we can’t hire anybody because we can’t give them any benefits so they’re stuck with us so someone should be paying attention to some other issues that are not mentioned here, at least I didn’t see when I scanned through so.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: It seems to me that the obvious folks to be paying attention to this are the folks on the relative committee and I would hope that whatever the limitations of the policy just adopted might be, it might well serve as a useful framework within which additional things could be inserted. Now that we’ve got something ironed out that seems to be acceptable to the faculty and administration, although not enough, anything we could find a way to fit in would be something that wouldn’t have to reinvent the wheel because procedures there might well be adaptable to other kinds of measures.

P. Stoddard: I get the sense that people certainly want this followed up on and talked about at some much greater depth. The timing in the academic year, I mean, we can certainly refer this to Economic Status of the Profession. What are your thoughts? Do you want to do that now or wait until the beginning of the fall and give them a year to work on this? I’m not sure how much turnover there’s going to be on that committee. I’m happy to do what – take your recommendations on this. Bill?
W. Tolhurst: Well, it strikes me that this particular article limited though it may be, provides a good deal of food for thought and that before we refer it to the committee, it might be well to make the university community aware of this article in this issue so that we could get input from a broader range of faculty members than just those on the committee since if they come up with something on their own, it’s likely to be something that’s going to need further input from the wider community as well.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any other thoughts? All right, so I will bring this up at the University Council and make them aware of that. Obviously, we all represent departments on campus. Feel free, maybe obligated, to share this with your colleagues and we’ll try to set up something a bit more formal in the fall if people are okay with that type of timeframe. Beth?

B. Miller: It might be one other way to consider it is to consider ways in which we might do not just consider it in terms of economic status of the profession but also in terms of education of faculty and department chairs about issues related to tenure/promotion/leave issues as they affect not just in your promotion but they do specifically affect your promotion in ways that make people particularly vulnerable. Again, this article is a part of a study that was looking at childcare but certainly there is data to suggest other aspects. I think that when we do talk about it only in terms of one committee that we don’t talk about it in terms of ways in which it happens on our campus. I might also just say this is not just a faculty issue but it is – I appreciate you bringing it up at the University Council – because it is an issue for staff. It is also an issue for students as we become more sensitized to issues as their kinship networks affect their performance in our classes. Our staff are not supported well as well and our policies as a university, you know, may not be fully supportive.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Any other discussions on this? All right, well obviously this will not end that particular discussion. We’ll keep revisiting this for quite some time I’m sure.


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

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on we’ve got no reports from Resource, Space, and Budget or Faculty Rights and Responsibilities nor Elections and Legislative Oversight.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Under Unfinished Business these are a couple of – well, some testimony that was submitted by Buck and Shey and Donna Smith to Mike Madigan, Tom Cross and Robert Pritchard from the statehouse. Well, Mike Madigan is running a series of field, town hall meetings throughout the state regarding budget processes in general. There was one at
Kishwaukee Community College on March 14. Buck, Shey and Donna attended for the faculty, SPS and operating staff to give their two-cents worth for all of us. Their formal testimony that they’ve written up is included in your packet. I’ll let you take a look at that. If you have any questions for Shey or Buck on that, now would be a good time to ask them. If not, the last thing under Unfinished Business is a letter from the faculty senate of Eastern Illinois University to the Governor regarding some of their concerns about the Governor’s proposals for the pension system. So this is all really related to what Steve was talking to us about and whether this is unfinished business or informational is up to how much you want to discuss it. Any discussion about any of these items? Okay.

A. **Letters** from Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Shey Lowman, Donna Smith to Michael Madigan, Tom Cross, and Robert W. Pritchard (Pages 14-18)

B. **Letter** from The Faculty Senate of Eastern Illinois University discussing state pension system (Page 19-20)

X. **NEW BUSINESS**

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on then, I’ve got no New Business. Nobody else seems to have any New Business.

XI. **COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**P. Stoddard:** Any Comments or Questions from the Floor?

**W. Tolhurst:** Are we done yet?

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

K. **Letter** of Acceptance of Nomination from Paul Stoddard (Page 21)

XIII. **ADJOURNMENT**

**P. Stoddard:** That would take us to item XIII. Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor aye. Opposed? We are adjourned. Thank you for your patience.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 P.M.