
K. Judson attended for G. Gordon; D. Haliczer attended for S. Lowman; K. Gallagher attended for D. Robertson.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business as ever is the adoption of the agenda. Thank you. Thank you again. Any comments, additions, deletions, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera? Seeing none, all in favor of the agenda? Opposed? The agenda has been adopted.

P. Henry made the motion; W. Tolhurst seconded. The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 30, 2005 FS MEETING

(Pages 4-9)

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes. They’re on pages 4 through 9 of your packet. Thank you. Thank you. Any additions or corrections etcetera. Everybody’s name is spelled correctly? Okay, in that case, all in favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye. Opposed? Thank you.

W. Tolhurst made the motion; L. Kamenitsa seconded. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
P. Stoddard: Okay, now the tricky bit. The first order of real business is evaluating this position and the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Since these are personnel matters, we need to go into Executive Session which means only the voting members of the Faculty Senate are to remain. Everybody else will have to step outside and for the first part of this; I will also be stepping outside. I will make a motion that we go into Executive Session. All in favor say aye. Okay, thank you very much. I will turn the gavel over to the vice president, Professor Buck Stephen.

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council (Gregory Barrett, Kent Gallagher, Jack Marchewka, Nick Pappanduros, David Wade)

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty Personnel Advisor (Augden Windelborn, Sharon Sytsma, Scott Wickman)

Adjourned to Executive Session at 3:11 P.M.

P. Stoddard: Did the committee think about whom else they would like to enlist in getting these changes made?

A. Windelborn: I thought the place to start was here.

P. Stoddard: Okay, well we can certainly address those issues if you like. Do you have a specific motion anybody would like to make on this and then we can debate it or do we want to deal with this next year?

W. Tolhurst: On of the things I routinely did when I was chair of the old Grievance Committee, was let potential grievance know about the availability of the Faculty Personnel Advisor because it seems to me that that person is in a very good position to deal with these concerns in a way and could provide appropriate support for those persons and so I think that people who may well need the assistance of a Faculty Personnel Advisor often find him in the course of pursuing other avenues.

P. Stoddard: Okay. I know certainly the ombudsman, if anybody went there, would point them to the FPA and if they come to me, I point them to the FPA. I do think some sort of electronic faculty handbook would be a very good idea and perhaps that’s something that this office can take upon itself to start putting together with the able assistance of any volunteers out there who likewise feel that this is important. I don’t want to dump a whole bunch of stuff on Donna who would make my life miserable if I did.

B. Miller: It might be that you could link some of that but maybe a “frequently asked questions” web page with Faculty Senate or something.

P. Stoddard: Well, certainly – do we have a link from the – well, that we can fix. We can certainly put a link to the FPA or a description of the FPA’s office and function on the University Council and Faculty Senate web page. We could also tie in something, some of these ethic cues
and others might be good. I don’t get asked the same question a lot though but--- go ahead, yeah.

S. Sytsma: I was wondering if there is – I know when I had a tenure track position, there was a meeting the first year for everyone who was tenure track and that was very useful in terms of giving lots of advice about how to get tenure and all the things that you should be doing along the way and if there are still such meetings, that is a good place where it should be announced. Also, I don’t know if you have a list somewhere of everything you have to say at the first meeting when you have new members here but we told it was supposed to be announced here.

P. Stoddard: Right, actually we will have Curt come and visit us the beginning of the next semester. Usually, traditionally, he would come to this meeting but we thought that since we are going to have a bunch of new people coming in in the Fall, it would make more sense to have him come at that time so that’s what we’re going to do. Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I’d like to second what Sharon said because that was what I was going to say but also since every department has a member on the Faculty Senate if, in fact, we were reminded once a year of that, that means that every department would have at least one member who can be supposed to be knowledgeable about this and let other members of the department know about it.

P. Stoddard: Right. Any other comments? Yes, Carole.

C. Minor: I would like to suggest that somehow we follow up with the funding question. I’d recommend that the Provost’s Office take over the funding for that position through the entire year it seems to be, since that person serves the entire faculty of the university, it seems like it ought to come from a central place and not from one college’s budget.

P. Stoddard: Is that a motion?

C. Minor: Sure.

P. Stoddard: We have a second and a motion.

W. Tolhurst: Let’s be clear on the motion. We’re moving to recommend this to the Provost?

P. Stoddard: Yes. This is a recommendation. We have a second. Discussion? Augden?

A. Windelborn: Clarification – he’s only half time in this position so it would only be half his salary – just so everybody understands.

P. Stoddard: Right. So the motion is that the Provost pick up half of the FPA’s position for his tenure – full tenure not just ---

A. Windelborn: No, it’s the full FPA position but it is half time.
P. Stoddard: Right, sorry.

C. Minor: It’s only half of his salary but it’s the whole FPA position – whether than having a college have to fund something that serves the entire university.

W. Tolhurst: So I take it the motion is that the Provost provide the funds to pay the FPA.

P. Stoddard: We recommend the Provost ---

W. Tolhurst: For being Faculty Advisor.

P. Stoddard: Yes. Any further discussion on that? All right, all in favor of the motion vote aye. All opposed? Okay, very good. I will contact the Provost about that. See that I do, huh?

B. Miller: There was one other recommendation about the perspective about the OSP, or the Supportive Professional Staff ---

P. Stoddard: SPS.

B. Miller: SPS, sorry, but we – I think that that is worthy of our continued perspective. They often are left out of this discussion and from our discussions, they often have many issues that ---

P. Stoddard: Well, we have a SPS representative here now.

B. Miller: I just want to make sure that when we talk about – you know, that they’re not left out and we continue to seek ways that they are informed; that they are a part of this and, again, 12 months funding and spreading the word I think is important.

P. Stoddard: Okay. I will confer with Shey too when she gets back in shape. Any other discussion pertaining to the report about the FPA?

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Okay, then moving on, President’s Announcements and first is the real test. We have recognition of the Faculty Senators whose terms will be completed at the end of this meeting essentially. When I mispronounce your name, please excuse. If you want it to be correct on the tape, feel free to speak up and let me know and let the tape know. (Paul read the list of names) So let’s give everybody coming, going, and staying a hand. Those of you who are leaving, thank you very, very much for your service. Those of you who are coming back, I look forward to working with you again next presumably.

A. Recognition of Faculty Senators whose terms are:

Completed

Pam Smith, Accountancy
Jon Briscoe, Management
Susan L’Allier, Literacy Education
Donald Zinger, Electrical Engineering
Omar Ghrayeb, Industrial Engineering
Rangaswamy Meganathan, Biological Sciences
Robert Zerwekh, Computer Science
Frances Jaeger, Foreign Languages and Literatures
Paul Loubere, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Sharon Sytsma, Philosophy
Augden Windelborn, Physics

Re-elected

Elizabeth Miller, Consumer and Nutrition Science
Kendall Thu, Anthropology
Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Communication
Anne Hanley, History
Fred Markowitz, Sociology

Newly Elected

Natalie Churyk, Accountancy
David Wade, Management
Alfred Tatum, Literacy Education
Reza Hashemian, Electrical Engineering
Nipa Phojanamongkolkij, Industrial Engineering
Christopher Hubbard, Biological Sciences
Nicholas Karonis, Computer Science
Michael Morris, Foreign Languages and Literatures
Reed Scherer, Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Michael Bishop, Philosophy
Steven Martin, Physics

B. Presentation of Bob Lane “Eternal Vigilance Award”

P. Stoddard: The next order of business is the presentation of the Bob Lane “Eternal Vigilance Award.” We talked about this a little while ago. This is basically for the faculty member who does his or her best to keep the administration on their toes and make sure that all the “t’s” are cross and the dots are on the “i’s” and so forth and this year we had a couple of good people I think who might have deserved it. We only have the one frame so this year we’re happy to present the Bob Lane “Eternal Vigilance” faculty spokesman award to Joseph “Buck” Stephen. Come on up Buck.

J. Stephen: The formal recognition for being an annoyance.

P. Stoddard: You know, if you’re good at something, it’s good to be recognized for it.
J. Stephen: Thank you very much.

P. Stoddard: Buck joins a long list of people who have kept administrators up at night so that’s good.

C. Update on Campus Parking and Computer Committees

P. Stoddard: Moving on, I’ve got just a hopefully brief update on the Computing and Campus Parking Committees. At next week’s University Council we’re going to present a motion to add language to the Committees’ Book that makes the Faculty Senate President/Executive Secretary of University Council an *ex officio*, non-voting member on both those committees and requesting that both of those committees submit annual reports to University Council. Again, the idea is to improve communication between faculty and the rest of the university community with those two committees that play so much in the quality of our lives on campus. I did attend my first faculty Campus Parking Committee meeting. They did not have many people there so they had an election of the new chair by e-mail and the new chair is the same as the old chair and that is Norm Jenkins. The only other thing I thought that might be of particular interest to the faculty well, we all know about the new rates for parking – the high increase in the reserved spots was an unabashed attempt to reduce the number of reserved spots on campus. They took an audit and found out that they have way too many so they’re going to go by attrition and try to weed some of those folks out who don’t need them $700 worth. The other bit of news is that they’re continuing to work on Lot 20. That’s the one next to the Evan’s Field House. They’re planning some new traffic flow patterns, essentially making the entrance to the lot of Lucinda, getting rid of at least a portion of that central divider that would get in the way of making a turn into that lot. I don’t think you’ll be able to make a left turn from Lucinda into the lot if I understand their plan correctly and they’re also going to turn the aisles around and make them go north and south which should improve traffic flow patterns in part because you’ll have fewer turns to make and in part because there’ll be fewer cars in there because there will be fewer spots in there.

W. Tolhurst: Why don’t they really improve the traffic flow by eliminating all the spots?

P. Stoddard: Don’t say that too loudly. So anyway, anybody who’s really curious about what the new plan looks like, I’ve got that up here. If you’ve got thoughts or comments that you’d like to share with the Computing Committee, they will be meeting next in the fall – that’s the Parking Committee, sorry. Yes? I’m sorry, Pat?

P. Henry: Is your position on this committee such that we can convey our distress about certain things to them through you or?

P. Stoddard: Yes, I would say if the faculty have serious concerns about a particular plan they come up with, I would be a good conduit as would – each college should have representatives on that committee so multiple channels probably get heard rather than just one.

I also met with the Computing Advisory Committee, Computing Facilities Advisory Committee, their biggest news is that they plan on getting all the university’s paperwork scanned and on line
some place. They also plan on locking in the e-mail address field in Blackboard. They’re currently scheduled to do that on June 13 for faculty. Whatever you’re using now will be locked in and if you want to change it at some point in the future, you can go through the Help Desk and do that. They will be upgrading Blackboard to version 6.2.2 from version 6.0.1. They anticipate that taking place at the end of May through the beginning of June – something like May 27 through June 1 or May 31 through June 3 and they seem confident that this will not affect any summer or fall courses. Bill?

**W. Tolhurst:** About the student e-mails, I use Blackboard a lot and I have to insist that students enter the e-mail that they actually read to make sure that we have effective communication. I am concerned that if we just assume they’re all going to use their “Z” number address, they will not get the mail, they will not know what’s going on and communication will go down. It seems not to be a matter of concern to ITS although I suspect they’re aware of it.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, ITS is doing this at the request of Registration and Records and the university will only be sending things to “Z” mail accounts so if the students want any information from the university anywhere, they’re going to have to have a “Z” account. Also, they will be allowed in the “Z” account to forward it to whatever e-mail address they like so there probably will be a little period of adjustment but right now, the way things stand, Registration and Records have to update their files every time students change e-mail accounts. That is turning out to be a major headache for them and that is what prompted the change. I’m not saying I like it or dislike it, I’m just saying that’s where it came from. It came from Registration and Records, not ITS. Lynne or Buck? Okay. Other comments about Blackboard changes other than change is bad and we don’t like it. That’s not on the record. Some change is good, once it happens and everybody gets used to it. Any other questions about either – yes, Bill?

**W. Baker:** It’s not about those matters, it’s about another matter. I don’t know whether this is the appropriate time but yesterday in the *Northern Star* there was a letter from a former member of the Senate concerning changes – proposed changes – in Zulauf Hall relating to faculty member’s offices and I wonder if this is an appropriate forum either to raise this, a) and b), whether we should ask you to further investigate this matter but as this is the last session of the year that may not be appropriate because they argue that administration is trying to rush great changes through. So perhaps we could have some sort of resolution condemning this sort of activity, in other words, pushing people around and moving their offices around.

**P. Stoddard:** I would suggest that there is already in place a highly under-utilized body that should be dealing with exactly this type of issue and that is the Joint Resource, Space, and Budget Committee of the Faculty Senate and University Council. This, at least by its title, seems to me to be the appropriate place for issues like this to go. I know in recent years, they haven’t taken a very aggressive role in trying to – they’ve been more information gathering than trying to do policy setting or policy influencing. However, I certainly would not be adverse to seeing that body, perhaps with a motivated chair – hint, hint, nudge, nudge – take a closer look at some of these types of moves.
W. Baker: Well thank you Paul, but may I say that there, apparently – I don’t know – there may well be some urgency about this matter because the administrators as I understand, wish to do these things quickly and move people just after the end of the semester when our bodies – we no longer function. So there is some urgency about this. Who’s the chair of that? Could he be asked to convene an emergency meeting of that to actually investigate and perhaps do something?

P. Stoddard: Would you be interested in doing that?

W. Goldenberg: I could try to get things together. Right now, there’s not an available date and time that’s open for everybody necessarily so, that would be the difficulty. Finding a time for a meeting at the end of the year but I can try.

P. Stoddard: Can I get a motion that we ask RSB to try to meet and talk about this.

W. Baker: Yes.

P. Stoddard: Is there a second to that motion? Is there any further discussion? Buck?

J. Stephen: Do we have any power to do anything about it? I don’t thing that’s in their duties.

P. Stoddard: Well, their duties are listed in here.

J. Stephen: I think we’ll probably find it’s worded as “make recommendations concerning”.

W. Goldenberg: If we were to investigate something, wouldn’t it take some kind of action or recommendation by the Senate rather than from us.

P. Stoddard: Ultimately yes, I do believe however, that during the summer the Executive Committee of the Senate is empowered to act for the Senate so something could take place along those lines.

A. Senator: A point of information, what are we exactly asking the committee to investigate and do.

W. Baker: Should I explain this or will you?

P. Stoddard: No, please do – you go ahead.

A. Senator: We’re being asked to ask a committee to do something and I’m not sure what the issue is.

W. Baker: Well, the issue is apparently that the administration in Zulauf Hall has requested various departments there who have office space such as Political Science, Philosophy, and Sociology – those are three I know of – to reconfigure their office space issues so that more room as I understand it – that’s my perception of it – can be made for administrative offices.
A. Senator: LA&S is what you’re talking about.

W. Baker: Yes, indeed. It does effect exactly your department.

P. Stoddard: If you’d like your voice recorded for posterity, please use the microphones. Otherwise, we’re going to miss what’s being said.

W. Baker: I understand that Economics, I’ve just been informed, is affected also. Could you speak more about that?

L. Kamenitsa: No, just that I know that they’re on the floors that are going to have offices rearranged. I don’t know.

A. Hanley: I can speak for History. We’re going to have to give up six office spaces. I’m in the Department of History and we’ve been asked to give up six office spaces and so our Chair has responded to the Dean’s office and explained why that would impose a hardship on our faculty and that we’re using every bit of space we have. The Dean’s office evidently is expanding into the third floor and so it’s reallocating space throughout the building.

W. Goldenberg: Since I’m suppose to convene a meeting and talk about something I want to ask the question is there a particular dean who is in charge of this who asked you to do it because maybe we should invite that person or try to get a meeting. I don’t know about scheduling at this late date but we could try.

A. Hanley: I think it’s Joe Grush but I’m not sure.

W. Baker: Bill Minor.

W. Goldenberg: Oh, okay. Yeah, Sociology, yeah.

W. Goldenberg: I still doubt whether we can do anything about this but.

J. Stephen: Steve in his letter also pointed out the number of faculty that have been lost in those several departments and I guess their response is going to be well, what did you do with their offices.

W. Baker: Yes but Buck, we can make an effort because it does effect faculty members in a serious way.

J. Stephen: Well, I’d hate to have somebody say you’ve got to move your office. I’ve got a lot of dust I’m very fond of in there.

R. Zerwel: I have a point of information about this. Someone I know who is familiar with this move has informed me that the College of LA&S of all of the colleges in the university, have the
worst offices for the deans and I think that the largest revenue generating college in the university is certainly entitled to better offices.

P. Stoddard: Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: I’m not in LA&S so I’m not taking a stand; I just have a question. Is some of the concern sort of along the same lines as the summer graduation in that it was sort of sprung on people with no notice and now you have to move over break? Is that part of the concern or is it that you have to move period?

W. Baker: May I respond by saying there apparently is an unseemly haste involved and these things tend to be done to generalize towards to end of the semester when there is no appropriate time to fully discuss them, especially as they effect faculty, and this seems to be a perfect illustration of this kind of procedure on the part of the administrators.

P. Stoddard: As a point of clarification and I think to help people focus in maybe on where the issue really lies, the duties – the first paragraph of the duties of Resource, Space, and Budget and I quote “to participate with the President and the Executive Vice President and Provost in the development of long-range planning regarding the allocation and re-allocation of resources in both the operating and capital budgets and in the assignment and re-assignment of space."

J. Stephen: And it says participate, not advise.

P. Stoddard: It says to participate and so this clearly seems to be an indication where the proper route was not followed.

J. Stephen: Well, I think we should move ahead with this. I’m in LA&S and I’m certainly happy I’m not in Zulauf. It’s not a pleasant place to have an office and if you’re getting squeezed even more, it’s going to make it more unpleasant so I think we should go ahead and see if they can do something about it.

W. Tolhurst: Question.

P. Stoddard: Yes, Bill.

W. Tolhurst: As to how we are to understand the charge to the committee. So, if a department chair wanted to make changes in the allocation of space within a department, that committee would have to be involved?

W. Goldenberg: Well, I don’t think allocation means office assignments Bill.

W. Tolhurst: Well then if a dean wants to make a change within the college, would the committee have to be involved?

W. Goldenberg: I think it’s allocating space to a division or a department as opposed to a particular individual.
W. Tolhurst: Okay.

A. Windelborn: Actually following up on that, it seems to me the issue was one of productivity. We have certain guidelines I know that are, you know, recommendations for the amount of square footage floor space, etc., for productivity purposes. One of my concerns is that that might not be followed if we are suddenly starting to jam extra faculty into a single office, you know, because that would be a clear violation of faculty rights. If, on the other hand, we’re merely talking about reassignment or relocation of an office, to me that doesn’t seem like a faculty issue. That’s sort of what Bill was talking about in terms of the right to do that.

P. Stoddard: Okay. I believe we have a motion on the floor to ask RSB to take a close look at this, perhaps see what they can put together on it.

W. Goldenberg: Let me ask you then, you want us to communicate whatever we find out to you I suppose because there’s no more Faculty Senate. Is that right?

P. Stoddard: Right, yeah. Send that to me and depending on what you find, I can try to get the Executive Committee to follow up on whatever you propose.

W. Goldenberg: And the complaint, just so I can understand clearly what we’re going to be asking, is the complaint is that this was done – reallocate of space and changing around was done unilaterally by an administrator, I guess Bill Minor, without consultation of faculty or department? Is that correct? I’m not sure what the complaint – exactly what the complaint is.

P. Stoddard: Is that peoples’ understanding of what happened Bill?

W. Tolhurst: It’s my understanding that Bill Minor did the space study to determine how space was allocated and the results of this were then made available to people in the Dean’s office. I have no reason to believe that Bill Minor is the one who decided who gets what and there’s a member of the Faculty Senate who’s shaking her head and probably has more information than I do.

L. Kamenitsa: My understanding of the process from what I heard from my department chair in Political Science, was largely that this was presented to the College Senate and basically they were told “this is what we’re doing if you want to file a complaint about this, we’ll listen to your complaints”. It seems that part of what happens is that it sort of pitted departments against each other – you know, “they already have big offices; they have small offices, they have too many; they have too few” so there was a lot of that response. These impressions are all second and third hand. So departments had a chance to comment on it but after it was presented as this is what’s going to happen unless you can change our minds.

P. Stoddard: So Bill it sounds to me like maybe the first thing RSB would like to do is see whether they feel as a committee that if there was, in fact, something suitable for a complaint and if there is, then we’ll follow up on that or if they think that there was appropriate opportunity for input for the people being effected.
**B. Miller:** Probably not quite as urgent, but it sounds to me that clearly there is an issue of utilization of space for faculty and so perhaps next year, early in the year, the committee could continue to look at the issue of how space is allocated for faculty use. I work in a building that has previously not been called a very happy place, in Wirtz, because, you know, Business built a whole other building because ours wasn’t worthy of being in but that’s where I live, but I do not share an office and I’m glad of that. I find it difficult to imagine doing a lot of what I do in a space where I would have to share and having conversations with students where I would have to keep information private with that student but having to do that in a shared space with other faculty with another student in the room. Those kinds of issues seem to me that would, you know, that becomes more and more complex as we are being held accountable for productivity in a space where our productivity is being encroached upon. So I think it would be a useful thing to review. We’re not mice working in boxes in smaller and smaller spaces despite the fact that we are supposed to be using technology to be more productive. It just means we have more stuff in our offices with more papers and more students who come in. Now I have a folding chair in my office so that I can actually talk to a student because there’s not enough room for me to get people in my space and I’m a privileged person in my office complex. This is, you know, not exactly an ideal work environment for many of us. If we start having to share and get smaller, you know, it becomes I think more problematic.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Yes?

**W. Goldenberg:** We meet for the last time and suddenly we have an emergency kind of thing. The way my head’s working now, I won’t be able to get a meeting together this week I doubt but I’ll try for next week and it occurred to me that reading day is kind of a free day maybe for a lot of people. I don’t know but if anybody has specific complaint or information they would like to provide me with, I’ll invite you now to send me an e-mail or call me up. You’re welcome to do that and then I can bring that information or question that you might have to the committee when we meet next week. So if you want to do that this week, you know, you can find me on Groupwise. Goldenberg is the last name. You can just e-mail me at goldenberg@niu.edu. So --

**R. Butler:** I think that framing this thing in terms of complaint puts us in a position of – in an inadequate position of kind of whining and, you know, they’ve done this thing and now if you’ve got a complaint you can make the effort to try to get yourself heard. I think it’s more a matter of scrutiny and vigilance and I see in many areas where administrators actually do try to do things at inopportune times or times when they think there won’t be much oversight or where they think they can, as you referred to, kind of divide and conquer. We’ve seen that a lot so I think that at the same time that you’re kind of taking a clam view of things and a nice rational view, I think that if you want to be effective, I would certainly support your committee in a kind of aggressive look at this.

**W. Goldenberg:** Please e-mail me your concerns or thoughts and questions, you know, because I wasn’t even aware of the issue until just now and so I need to be educated I guess is what I’m saying.
P. Stoddard: Okay, to clean up business, we have a motion to refer the matter to RSB is the short of it. I think Bill’s got enough input and requests for input so that he can get started to do something meaningful over there. Can I get a – is there any more discussion. Seeing none, all in favor of referring it to RSB say aye. Opposed?

C. Minor: One abstention.

P. Stoddard: One abstention. Shall we note the last name on that?

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Election of representative to the FAC to the IBHE

P. Stoddard: Next up is an item for Faculty Senate consideration and that is we need to get somebody – a new representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Pat Henry has served that role very well for the last four years. Her term is up however and she has indicated that her term is up. What I’m looking for now is somebody who would like to volunteer or be nominated or nominate somebody else you don’t like to fill that role and Pat can give you a bit of a description of what’s actually involved in that.

P. Henry: Just to let you know what you’re getting in for. It’s heaps of fun. You do have one meeting a month that’s basically from September to June. They try to have a lot of them in the Chicago-land area and the people from SIU gripe a lot about that but we just shut them down. They try to coordinate with the IBHE meetings. This is the Faculty Advisory Council to the IBHE, usually we try to meet beforehand and if there’s issues we report to our chair to the IBHE meetings. They’re always on Fridays so this involves usually leaving Thursday afternoon to get there so as to have – usually they have a dinner with all of the FAC members who can make it and that’s actually a very good time to sort of get appraised of the issues. The one exception is that the first Tuesday of October, the FAC actually meets with the IBHE and that’s the only non-Friday meeting so your schedule can accommodate that. Basically, it’s involved somewhat since I’ve been on it and while it is primarily an advisory council and tells the IBHE stuff, it also does have a kind of advocacy position and I think, most importantly, tries to keep all the member universities and the faculty advised as to sort of what the IBHE is up to and other state-wide issues effecting the faculty and, as we know, there’s rarely good news but it’s best to know. It’s been a very valuable experience for me. I’ve really enjoyed traveling around Illinois and I think it’s a learning experience that I will now pass on to someone else.

P. Stoddard: Are there any nominations or volunteers at this point. All right. Well if not, think about it. Yes? Right. It does not need to be a member of the Faculty Senate or the University Council, however, that person is expected to report to both bodies so in addition to the Friday commitment, there will also be a Wednesday afternoon commitment twice a month generally. So anybody who’s interested in that should be aware of that as well. Yes, Carole?

C. Minor: I’d like to move that the Faculty Senate commend Pat Henry for her four years of diligent and effective service on the Faculty Advisory Council.
P. Stoddard: Any further discussion? Thank you very much Pat. I’ll take your applause as a vote in the affirmative.

P. Henry: I have a huge selection of little tiny bottles of shampoo if anybody’s interested.

P. Stoddard: Please keep that in mind if anybody is interested, let me know as soon as possible. We do need to forward the name to the FAC actually by next month so I’d greatly appreciate any volunteers.

J. Stephen: Please don’t nominate me. I have usually 270 students on Fridays and I can’t miss them for the next four years.

P. Stoddard: Okay.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

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

P. Stoddard: Academic Affairs, no report.

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

P. Stoddard: Economic Status of the Profession does have a report. There’s a walk-in item from Radha and also there’s a letter that we’ll discuss with Radha is finished with his walk-in item.

R. Balamuralikrishna: Can you hear me okay? Really if you were planning on retiring to a beachfront property in Hawaii or Florida after your retirement with all the big money SURS is going to give you, your dreams were shattered on February 16. Just kidding. Seriously, the Governor, our Governor Blagojevich, he can of course initiate policy but fortunately he can’t break the laws himself. The SURS Executive Director, Jim Hacking, he has done a pretty good job of disseminating information on the Governor’s proposal as pertains to SURS and basically there are three proposals that, in fact, future employees and two that are likely to effect current employees. Let’s take them one by one and I will share with you some of the implications and reaction from SURS as well.

The automatic increase in retirement annuities which is currently 3% compounded annually, would be limited to the lesser of the changes in CPA or 3%. Mind you, the CPA has exceeded 3% only twice in the last ten years so to give you some quantitative idea, a person drawing an annual annuity of $50,000 would receive an increment of $1,500 under the current plan but under the Governor’s proposal, it would be around $583. So in other words, it’s about a two-thirds reduction.
When you look at the second item there, the money purchase option, currently 70% of the folks there benefits are there from the money purchase option as opposed to the traditional general formula. The money purchase option gives the added benefit of anywhere between 10% to 20% so that is significant. So if the Governor wants to limit that all future employees go by the traditional general formula, that would definitely be a great disadvantage. The third item, the retirement age, the employees - not only prolong service for future employees but also hidden in there is the requirement of investment period of eight years as opposed to the current five years. So none of these three are good. They’re not going to help us attract good quality people to the state I guess.

Proposals that effect current employees like me, the interest rate that’s currently credited to each participant is set annually by the SURS Board of Trustees according to set codes and what the administration would like to do is limit that interest rate to the actual SURS current actuarial interest rate of the average return over the period of five or ten years. By the way, people have found out that this would seriously violate the state’s Constitution because they cannot reduce benefits to people who are already in the system. This can be seriously challenged so that’s good news for us I would say.

The second one there is really interesting. It has to do with pay practices and what the administration wants to do is it wants local governments and universities to assume the cost of pension benefits that exceed 3% during the final four years of service. As you all know, that is how the pension benefits are calculated based on the four consecutive highest salaries that you earn over a four year consecutive period. Also the SURS website has several links that will give you more information. Many of those data they’re available as graphs and charts and printed out in color – they are not too easy to read and disseminate, so I would encourage you to check out the website.

In short, you know what the Governor’s proposal is doing is kind of creating a two-tier retirement or pension system across the state and it has several disadvantages and I’ll mention two. First and foremost I would say is morale, you know? If you have people doing the same job and who are going to receive two different sets of benefits or pay in the future. That’s like to hurt employee morale. The other thing is future employees are more likely to switch to the self-managed plan so currently about 10% of SURS participants are in the self-managed plan and if more of them switch to the self-managed plan, then here could be a cash flow crisis and he Governor’s rosy picture may not be that rosy after all because under the self-managed plan, the state has to be very punctual in kicking in their contribution and they can’t postpone that like they do with the traditional or the portable plans.

C. Minor: Could I ask a question?

R. Balamuralikrishna: Any questions at this point.

C. Minor: I have a question about the automatic increase that’s listed under the proposals effecting future employees. Is that specified somewhere that it only effects future employees or does it effect everybody who’s retired or people who retire by a certain date or just future employees?
R. Balamuralikrishna: To the best of my understanding, it’s only future employees.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, it’s only future employees.

R. Balamuralikrishna: Also be aware that this increase will only be applicable to the first $24,000. That’s a serious clause there.

P. Stoddard: Actually Radha, I was speaking with Steve Cunningham earlier this week and in at least one trial balloon that he’s seen, that $24,000 has been increased to about $65,000 which would be an improvement but it’s still an obvious reduction in the benefit but at least it’s not quite as bad.

R. Balamuralikrishna: Thank you for that update. It’s news to me. Any other questions at this time because I have other issues to talk about here and I think this is a serious issue so if you have any questions or comments I think this is a good time to hear them.

D. Swanson: Do we know or is anyone keeping track of what kind of protest or letters or whatever people are, you know, in charge of this are getting – the legislature and things like that. I mean is our liaison to Springfield – is she keeping people informed about that. What do we know about the response to these proposals?

R. Balamuralikrishna: All right. I have a couple of comments here. I believe President Peters has been speaking out on our behalf very well and the same may not be said of all university presidents because some of them feel if the pension system is not reformed, the universities will be forced to take a more direct hit on their budgets. The numbers kind of point toward the situation where reform is kind of inevitable according to Steve Cunningham. Everybody knows who Steve Cunningham is, Associate Vice President of Human Resource Services here at NIU. The current system has never faced such a crisis ever before. He can’t think of a time when there was a more serious point. When it comes to legislators, they seem to be very understanding. I think Bob Pritchett have been very supportive of faculty, I mean historically but I think from what I’ve heard through the grapevines, they are now resigned to the thought, you know, changes are inevitable although they seem to be on our side, there is definitely reform in the cards. That’s all I have.

P. Stoddard: All right. To follow up on that, in speaking also – yes, Steve Cunningham, Kathy Buettner and these folks are all keeping a very close eye on this. They’re all working with our representatives. I know that there is a lot of resistance, not just in SURS but also in the other retirement systems, unions and so forth, are expressing their displeasure with this. There’s a lot of politics to be played out with this. Republicans see this as an opportunity to score some points with higher ed at the Governor’s expense and so forth so this is still a very much open process in terms of where it may lead. You asked about letters. Last time I passed around a letter from the Faculty Senate at Eastern Illinois University and I guess this is as good as time as any to introduce the next page. I’ve taken the liberty of formulating a letter to the Governor that we might want to send. I’ve passed this by Steve Cunningham who removed some of the more inflammatory language and – you shouldn’t question people’s motives – but anyway, to make
sure none of the facts are incorrect that I’ve gotten here and he is double checking with Kathy and Ken Zehnder and the Provost and so forth about the ethics of, you know, should we be sending something and under exactly what circumstance should we use university counsel/faculty senate letterhead. Should it be signed by a individual or just, as it is here, the Faculty Senate, so all that we’re going to try to pin down to make sure that we don’t do anything unethical and force me to return my ethic’s certificate. Anyway, just to summarize what’s in this letter, it’s to say we’re not happy about the proposed changes of course even though we do realize that the state has got some problems financially that need to be solved. I talk a bit about trying to spread the solution around the entire state instead of disproportionately on retirees and, you know, within the retirees group, and that they are focusing disproportionately on SURS. The second paragraph talks about the adverse affects this would have on our ability to deliver a quality education to the students of Illinois and I think just from my own standpoint, legislators are much more likely to be sympathetic to doing things to maintain the quality of education rather than maintaining faculty rights and benefits and so forth so I tried to frame the letter more in that light than saying we don’t like what you’re doing to us. So, I think at some point I’m going to ask this body, very soon in two or three minutes, to tell me whether or not you’d like me to send this. The timing would be such as when Steve and Kathy and Ken and the President and Provost and everybody else thinks it would do the most good in terms of the legislative process, where they stand in it and so forth. That’s why the date is still left open and it’s also – other people are taking another look to make sure that they don’t see anything that’s going to upset anyone in the legislature too badly and also go over the – I have a list of other people to copy this to and that includes the leadership of the Senate and the House as well as all the members of the House and Senate Higher Education Committees which includes Bruzynski and Pritchard. So, if there are other points, things people would like to hear and see, things people don’t want to see and hear, I’m open to making changes. I’m not real sure how making a major rewrite would work at this point in time but my most important question I guess is whether or not you feel this is something that, as a body, we should pursue.

D. Smith-Shank: You can talk after I do. One of the things that I noticed in the letter is you spend a lot of time – you mention fairness at least three times – well, I think maybe there’s a better word because life isn’t fair. It’s not fair that the state is going down the tubes when Blagojevich didn’t cause it, although I don’t like him very much, appealing to his sense of fairness is really not appealing to what we – I don’t think it’s as strong as it could be. I think if there’s another way to appeal to his sense of justice would be better than fairness. That’s just my opinion.

P. Stoddard: Okay, you were promised next by the previous speaker.

W. Tolhurst: I think it’s really important that a letter of this sort be sent. I think it’s also really difficult to edit a letter like this at a Faculty Senate meeting. I think that what would be happy to do was move that you be authorized to send the letter and make revisions to it as seems appropriate given input from members of this body as well as any other person whose judgment you trust and I would be willing to move that if it were appropriate.

P. Stoddard: I think that’s an appropriate motion.
W. Tolhurst: I so move.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a second.

F. Markowitz: I would agree that such a letter is warranted but I would suggest that we add a concluding paragraph that’s it’s not only educational opportunities that are threatened but the very economic vitality and well being of the citizens of the state of Illinois that the level of research, teaching, and service that we provide would be compromised by these proposals. I think they may understand the language of economics.

P. Stoddard: That’s true. Very good. Thank you. Pat, you’ve had hand up for ---

P. Henry: Just briefly, I will take this to the FAC meeting because I think they are interested in a similar kind of thing and they have actually started working on something like that so I think they would very much second this.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Go ahead.

A. Hanley: I would just suggest instead of fairness you use the word equity. That’s a word that should frighten them because that would suggest that we might have grounds for serious complaints. It challenges.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Thank you. Yes?

J. Hamlet: I just want some clarification. At this point it’s the Governor’s budget proposal and sometime this summer it may become a bill right?

P. Stoddard: Right and I think there is some legislation that has been written up, the President terms these as trial balloons to see what sort of reaction they’re going to get. He says well, they’re going to launch a bunch of trial balloons, get reaction and then write the bill at midnight, you know, when everybody’s asleep. So, this is a common tool apparently.

J. Hamlet: That’s my concern, you know, the bill’s coming up in the summer when the faculty aren’t, you know, in session – you know, by contract we’re not here. How will we get information about what’s going on and how will that be disseminated and what’s the best way for us to provide a response to these bills. I think someone mentioned an Annuitant Association that we could join that is providing a response to these bills.

P. Stoddard: Yes there is, www.niu.edu/annuitants. You can join them. It’s $21 dollars for the year for the state Annuitant’s Association and another $3 for the local so it’s a total of $24. They are very active in fighting this battle even though they are all – well, it’s the annuitants and they are not being affected directly by this, they are all very conscious of what it means for people following them. Their efforts are funded in part by the $24 that everybody gives them and they will be sending newsletters to the members and so forth so you can go to their website. I’m sure they will have updates there. You can join the annuitants and help in that way and also be kept more up to date in that fashion. We can on the University Council/Faculty Senate website post
any breaking developments that we become aware of so if you want to check that to help keep you involved. Then, of course, e-mail is always an option for keeping in touch. I mean I'll be around all summer so there will be that avenue of communication.

J. Hamlet: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a motion. Any other discussion? Excuse me? It’s been seconded, yes. Any further discussion? All right, all in favor of the motion to go ahead and send the letter, etc., etc. Yes, you have your hand up? No? Okay. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Then Radha you have more of a report?

The motion passed.

R. Balamuralikrishna: Yes indeed. All right, on page 2 I have a short section on the parking fee changes which is old news now. the only point I wish to add here, other than what Paul mentioned, there was an interesting idea from one of our committee members who said currently there’s no incentive for people who don’t make use of any parking privileges and if the idea of the Campus Parking Committee is to enhance or increase the number of parking areas that is available, you could probably provide some incidences of people who choose to walk. There are many people who live in the vicinity of campus and still they have a permit and, perhaps, something can be done. I don’t know how creative we can get here but just a thought.

J. Stephen: I beg to differ, there is an incentive. I don’t have a parking permit. I walk everyday and the incentive is I don’t have to look for a parking space or pay the fee.

R. Balamuralikrishna: So you’re saying there’s no need for anything other than that.

J. Stephen: It’s its own incentive.

R. Balamuralikrishna: Good for health.

A. Windelborn: A quick question, one of the issues I noticed when the information about the new rates came out was related to the fact that they wanted to get this information out because it would affect the budgets of certain departments and the implication is that there are administrative bodies that buy reserved spaces for somebody. I wouldn’t hazard a guess who but I find it inappropriate that the prices of reserved spaces are being raised so much to drive faculty away from these spaces while we are artificially as a university, supporting buying these same spaces for other individuals. It doesn’t again seem appropriate and I would love to know how many reserved spaces are blocked for individuals on this campus.

N. Castle: The comment I was going to make is that there are some entities on campus that buy spaces for consumers who come off campus like our Speech and Hearing Clinic so that it’s not that there are – there may be some departments where department is buying it for the department chair but I would suspect that more likely that there are spaces that get bought to allow, for example, once our Speech and Hearing Clinic is out at Monsanto, we are going to have to have a couple of spaces to allow people to get back and forth quickly. At this point in time, we need
places for customers of our Speech and Hearing Clinic who are not on campus and not walking to campus to be able to park and I believe we pay for those spaces.

**J. Stephen:** I know there’s a dean who has two parking spaces because they were in a split college but I’d hazard a guess after reading the paper that there are lots of coaches with spots that don’t come out of their paychecks.

**D. Swenson:** Yeah, well I also, you know, I think there are probably some reasonable, you know, purchases such as what you mentioned or handicapped individuals. I know we had a secretary in our department ---

**P. Stoddard:** Handicapped actually don’t have to pay for a reserved spot.

**N. Castle:** That’s not right. When I had a handicapped spot, I paid blue sticker and handicapped.

**P. Stoddard:** But not the red and blue, $600. You paid for the blue, sure. Okay.

**D. Swenson:** Well in any case, it seems to me a questionable use of university money particularly at this stage, etc., etc. we’ve been talking about this whole time.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes?

**D. Swenson:** In terms of our budget.

**B. Lusk:** One other small point to address. What about all the sites that have departments off campus, so I’m a mile off campus so every meeting I come in for I need – we have two red parking stickers for myself and all sorts of other people who come on campus for meetings. Otherwise, you have over a mile to walk.

**P. Stoddard:** There are some legitimate reasons. We need to be moving on.

**R. Balamuralikrishna:** The next item is revision to plan changes and just a couple of hours ago we learned that indeed the provider – there is a new provider and the new provider is going to be Eyemed and committee member Beth Miller did some research. She was able to get some information out of CMS and as I was walking to this meeting so also was Debbie Haliczer who gave me similar information. Looks like I’ll explain maybe just as good. They have three different levels of coverage and if NIU has opted out of – CMS has opted for the highest level then we should pretty much be okay I guess. There are several people within the area – within a 30 mile radius, who are currently working with us at this point. However, DeKalb Optometric, 40% of their business is with NIU clinics. They are not currently under the Eyemed plan but – right, they are going to make a real effort to be on there. So that’s not going to be a big deal I guess. Yeah it’s not. Unlike last year when WalMart was the only provider.

A short summary, I’ll be really quick – we think in our past reports we have talked about how our pay raises have kind of been in step with the rise in the standard of living cost but also as one
walks across the campus and listen to stories, you find there are some things that are pretty obvious what has happened over the past few years. You know, travel funds have been cut or they’ve been totally done away with. Library resources are being cut. Our insurance costs, our share, has increased. Okay, you’re going to hear something in the Benefits Choice booklet this year as well. Okay, the dental insurance premiums or rather the – what should I say – it’s the deductible that has increased to $100 per year. Also, the Quality Care Health Plan premium they’ve increased. Okay, out of pocket costs so when you look at all this, you know, it becomes difficult to talk about economic status, you know, whether it has declined or whether it has gone uphill so a short one sentence summary would be there’s a lot of thinking and work to do on this subject for future committees. And, of course, with the Governor’s proposal, there’s even more work to do I guess in terms of pension plans and fighting for our benefits and on a personal note finally, I would like to thank Paul for giving me this opportunity to serve. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Thank you for your service.

R. Zerwekh: While we’re on the economic status of the profession, I just wanted to point out and perhaps ask a question. The American Association of University Professors Academe issue that came out lists all the universities in America and the salaries and the percent of average salary per females, average salary for males. For over 40 years Northern has been included in this list and this year we’re not. It’s the first time and I’m wondering if this was done for a reason or if someone is just not getting the report together in time for inclusion in this. I just thought I would ask this question.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any other questions for Rahda?

J. Buck: Could you follow up on that Paul?

P. Stoddard: I will do so.

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

P. Stoddard: Moving on then we’ve got no report from RSB.

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

P. Stoddard: No report from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: No report from Rules and Governance.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: We do have some stuff that Gretchen needs to take care of however.

1. Election of President of Faculty Senate for 2005-2006
G. Bisplinghoff: First we need to address the election of the Faculty Senate President/Executive Secretary of the University Council and at this time I would like to move that we accept the nomination of Paul Stoddard, close the nominations and unanimously approve his appointment to this position. Thank you. All in favor? Opposed? Thank you again. We’ll have a victory dance later.

The motion passed.

2. Election of UCPC representative for 2005-2007 – ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – voting will be by college – votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified.

G. Bisplinghoff: Second on the agenda is the election of UCPC representatives and we have three colleges that need to elect representatives and we have those ballots. Will any committee members who are available to do running please come forward. Our first ballot is for the College of Health and Human Sciences. Will you please raise your hand? You need to vote for one. Our next college for the salmon colored is the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Would you please raise your hands for the ballots? Finally, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, everybody raise your hands. Pink. Donna will be tallying up these votes next week and she’ll be getting in touch with the lucky winners at that point so you’ll hear next week who these representatives are.

A. Senator: Gretchen, could you please remind us of what this position is?

G. Bisplinghoff: This is the UCPC representative from the college that is being elected. University Council Personnel Committee. Yeah.

D. Mathesius: Actually, for LA&S there’s two elected from here and one from the college but that’s the only college that has that.

A. Senator: You said vote for one.

D. Mathesius: Right, because we alternate them. They’re two year terms and we alternate them.

3. Committee of the University 2005-2006 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select – packet will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting.

G. Bisplinghoff: Finally in your packet, we have committee vacancies that we have to either vote approval on or do selection. If you look in your packet and you find the yellow sheet, the Library Advisory Committee and the University Class II Judicial Board. In each case here we have one person, one position and we have one person for that position so I would like to again move that we approve the replacement I guess you would call it and that we approve the
selection of that person for that position and do it for all of these folks for each one of these positions en mass so I would like to move that right now. Is there a second? Thank you.

C. Minor: Can you tell us what a Class II of the Judicial Board is?

G. Bisplinghoff: That’s a good point. I just noticed that myself. As opposed to a Class I. We don’t know. It’s always been called Class II so maybe the Class I. I guess they’re all second class.

T. Griffin: The Judicial Board is a judicial board that hears the more serious offenses that are eligible for suspension or expulsion from the university.

G. Bisplinghoff: Thank you. Thank you very much so obviously, this is the more serious cases of misconduct or whatever. Okay, so we’re back to I have moved that we accept these folks in their positions. All in favor? Anybody opposed?

Okay, now we come to the more complicated procedures. Because in the blue portion of your packet we have a number of folks who are willing to serve and it’s good to see so many anxious people, particular on Security and Environmental Quality, I can’t imagine why. Academic Policies and Procedures have three folks who want to serve to replace one position. We have six people for Campus Security and Environmental Quality and I believe we have five for the final one which is Intellectual Property and we’ve all discussed many issues involved in these committees. What we’re going to do is take these one by one. I’m going to ask if anyone wishes to speak to anybody’s candidacy. If there anyone who would like to recommend anyone for first the Academic Policies and Procedures and then we’re going to do a hand count at this point for who you wish to vote for and do a majority win situation. Which means we may have to take more than one vote. To anyone wish to speak to any of the candidates for Academic Policies Committee. Does anyone know any of the three candidates here and would like to – are we ready for a vote then? Okay, would you please raise your hand for Rebecca Martin and we’ll count. For Neil Polans? For Don Zinger? We have elected Don Zinger to that position. For the Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee, do we have any comments or supportive statements?

W. Tolhurst: I’d just like to speak in support of Mylan’s nomination. I know that every since he’s been a faculty member here he’s been concerned with environmental issues. He teaches a course on environmental ethics and I’d think he’d be a good candidate for that position.

G. Bisplinghoff: That was in support of Mylan Engel, Philosophy. Yes and I’ve worked with him also on things like the bike-a-thon for the T.A.I.L.S. animal shelter and other issues and he’s very involved on campus in those issues. Anybody else? Okay, we’re going to do the same process. Dennis Cessaroti, Technology? Milan Engel, Philosophy? We are voting for two correct? There’s only one position open. It says to replace Jennifer Baker so I presume it’s only one. It’s a little confusing on the paper. There’s two positions but only one is being replaced at this point. Mary Grosch, University Libraries? Angela Odoms-Young, Allied Health? Eui-Kyung Shin, Teaching? C. Sheldon Wood? Okay, it’s a landslide for Mylan. We have one
more. This is for Intellectual Property. Does anyone wish to speak to – again, there’s only one opening – we’re voting for one.

**J. Hurych:** I’d like to endorse Leanne VandeCreek from the Library. Leanne has always been interested in copyright and intellectual property and she would be a good candidate.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Okay. Yes?

**A Senator:** I’d like to support Jennifer Schmidt for this. She’s a very dynamic in the College of Education. As her biography there states, she’s a lot of intellectual property issues in previous research. Thank you.

**R. Meganathan:** I’d like to support Jozef Bujarski. He’s a distinguished professor. He already has patents and he’s very well versed in patent law and things like that so I would like to support him.


**P. Stoddard:** Congratulations to all those people.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, moving on, we have no unfinished business.

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**P. Stoddard:** No new business.

**XI. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**P. Stoddard:** No reports from any advisory committees. Very unusual but very nice this time around.

A. **FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – no report**

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 – no report

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any questions or comments from the floor? Seeing none, I’ll just say it’s been a pleasure working with you all this year. I look forward to seeing you returning members next year. Have a good summer.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes
J. Memo from James Hacking – February 18, 2005 –
   http://www.surs.org/news/Features/fy06budget/AdminBudget06.pdf
K. 2005-2006 Meeting Schedule (Page 10)

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: I’ll entertain a motion for adjournment. All in favor? Opposed? See you next year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.