
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Stoddard: I’d like to call the Faculty Senate meeting of September 1, 2004 to order. I’ll just take this moment to introduce myself. I’m Paul Stoddard. I’m in Geology and Environmental Geosciences. I am President of the Faculty Senate. I also serve as Executive Secretary of the University Council so you may see me next week.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Stoddard: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Can I have a motion to do so? Is there any discussion, additions, changes, complaints, and recommendations? All in favor of adopting the agenda please signify by saying aye. Opposed?

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 28, 2004 FS MEETING

(Pages 3-7)

President Stoddard: Next we need to approve the minutes from the April 28 meeting. They are found on pages 3 through 7. Motion to approve the minutes? Second? Any comments or corrections, etc? If not, all in favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstain?

The minutes were approved as written.
President Stoddard: I would like to welcome you all. I would like to specifically welcome those returning and make mention of the new members of the Senate. I’m going to call you out by name and just wave so we get a feel for who you are. If I mispronounce your name, I greatly apologize. First is Jack Marchewka from Operations Management & Information Systems. Next is Pamela MacFarlane from Kinesiology and Physical Education. Janet Holt who is from Education Technology, Research and Assessment. Brianno Coller from Mechanical Engineering. Then we have Elvia Arriola from Law. John Knapp from English. Sharon Systma from Philosophy and then we have Alan Rosenbaum from Psychology and Greg Barrett who is from Music.

For those whose names I just read and for others of you who may have forgotten since last year, the role of the Faculty Senate is essentially that of an advisory body. We don’t make a lot of policy in here. We don’t set the rules. We do a lot of complaining about stuff that’s happened and we can’t change, but we do make recommendations to the University Council so that things that have happened that we don’t like, don’t happen again or at least we try to see that that happens. So really this is a forum to express concerns about the way things are going in the University, about specific areas that aren’t working as smoothly as you would like, a place to suggest improvements to make things work better and then those improvements get forwarded on to the University Council. This is primarily a faculty body. Most of us are faculty members. We do have representatives from Operating Staff Council and from Supportive and Professional Staff here and usually we have somebody from the Northern Star just so you know that your words may be recorded for posterity. If you’re concerned that they’re recorded correctly, I suggest you figure out who the Northern Star reporter is and let him know, or her know.

I’d also like to take this moment to introduce two people over on my right. We have our parliamentarian, Ferald Bryant, who will let me know when I do something wrong and our secretary, Donna Mathesius, who quite frequently lets me know when I’m doing something wrong and without her things would not operate nearly as smoothly as they do so I’d like to make sure everybody knows about them. A lot of times when you’re trying to get in touch with the Senate, Donna is the first person you’ll end up speaking with.

I would point out that committee assignments are on page 8 and the schedule meeting times for the Faculty Senate is on page 21. Let’s see, page 8. Those are just sort of informational items.

One other thing I wanted to – before we get into the main business of the Senate – is that I’ve been getting some complaints informally about the – complaints – let’s say concerns, ways people have ideas about how things should work better – concerning, this came up last year also, concerning computer operations on campus. A lot of times it seems that computer decisions, computer systems decisions, software decisions, policy decisions are made without any input from the faculty. This was brought up last year. It was found that there is, in fact, a committee that’s supposed to advise and that committee supposedly has faculty representation on it as well as staff representation. That committee – it is not clear when they meet or if they’re actually doing any advising, if they’re asked to do any advising and I don’t think based on the way the Bylaws are written, they have any authority to say no, we don’t think that’s the right way to do it.
So I plan on meeting with I guess Walter Czerniak, the head of ITS, at some point – he doesn’t know that yet – to discuss some of these concerns and what I’m asking from you is if you have specific concerns, if there’s certain things that specifically you had trouble with or you don’t think are right, let our office know. Let me or Donna know as I’d like to be able to go with a list of specific items and say “how can we do this better.” So you can either e-mail me or phone into the office and let me know of any concerns. As your colleagues if they’ve got concerns as well.

I think that’s all I have for announcement.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice president and Secretary of Faculty Senate

President Stoddard: Items for Faculty Senate Consideration. First we have the selection of Vice President and Secretary of the Faculty Senate. The Vice President does what a typical vice president does. If I get into a car accident, he fills in for me. Both of those people I’m going to also ask to sit in on University Council meetings to sort of improve communication between the two bodies and that way, especially for the Vice President, if he does need to step in at some point, he knows what is going on over there as well. I’ve asked, and they have agreed, Buck Stevens from Math to be the Vice President. Buck, wave your hand. Thank you and Radha Balamuralikrishna, who I believe just goes by Bala, to be the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

B. University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees – need to elect two members

President Stoddard: Another consideration is that we need to name two people to be on the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. These are faculty members who sit in on the Board of Trustees’ meetings and report back to us and the University Council what the Board of Trustees are up to and since they make all the real decisions, that we’re okay with the real decisions. It’s a relatively important committee to have people on and we need to replace people. Those two people will need to be voted on by the University Council but since they are faculty members, I would like to call on anybody in this body who is interested to volunteer or to twist a colleague’s arm to volunteer and if I don’t start getting names soon, I’ll be doing the arm twisting and I’m not very good at it so I prefer you do it. If anybody is interested, let me know and I’ll forward your name. You do not have to be a member of the University Council you just need to be a faculty member. Yes?

B. Miller: Can you say a little bit more about what that means?

President Stoddard: Oh sure, and Donna has asked me that when we have comments from the floor, questions or whatever, if you can identify yourself so Donna knows who you are for the minutes and also speak into the microphone.

B. Miller: My name is Beth Miller. Can you say a little bit more about what that means?

President Stoddard: I certainly may. When it meets – well, this morning – so you’re off the hook for that one. The first full Board of Trustees’ meeting is September 23. They meet at
different times during the week so I can’t give you a specific meeting time. They generally meet on campus in this room or they’ll start meeting in Altgeld perhaps by their next meeting. I believe you can count on about three or four meetings a year from the Board of Trustees. There’s also I believe three sub-committees. You would be asked to sit on one of them so you might have a couple of extra meetings a year so we’re talking maybe five or six during the course of an academic year. The sub-committee meetings, if this morning is any indication, tend to go pretty quickly and smoothly. I can’t tell you what the full Board meetings are like yet; I haven’t sat in on one of those. Basically, I’m the one who goes to those meetings anyway so you’d be asked primarily to sit in on sub-committees so it’s a few hours a semester then report back to the Senate.

**B. Miller:** And your role is to sit. You don’t talk, right?

**President Stoddard:** They like it that way, yes.

**X. Song:** They give you a chance to talk but probably once per meeting and most of the time, from my observation, more often the advisory committee passed.

**President Stoddard:** They say “do you have anything to say” and you say a couple of sentences and that’s it but no, you’re not taking an active role. All right, moving on – oh, I’m sorry, is there another comment? Yes?

**W. Tolhurst:** As one who’s leaving one of these posts, I know that at least the sub-committee I was on, the members which consisted of Paul Loubere and myself, would routinely meet with Provost Legg before the sub-committee meeting to get a sense of what was going on and we would occasionally be encouraged to say something on a particular topic but it happen very rarely.

**President Stoddard:** Right, and actually in the meetings I sat in on this morning, one of which I’ll report later, was Finance and Facilities and is exactly what happened. I met with Steve Cunningham and Bob Albanese from Eddie Williams’ office and they suggested that I might say something nice about the salary increment which wasn’t too hard to do. Any other questions or comments about any items for consideration of the faculty?

**C. Election of faculty member to the Holmes Student Center Board (1-year term)**

**President Stoddard:** Election of faculty member to the Holmes Student Center Board. We have one person who’s expressed interest in this. This would be Joan Quinn. This is a one-year term. She has done this before without complaints so I think rather than go through the whole procedure, we’ll save Gretchen a little time. Can I have a motion to approve her? Second? Any comments or questions? All in favor please say aye. Opposed? Okay, Joan will be thrilled I’m sure.

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**
President Stoddard: The Consent Agenda – these are items that we generally feel are non-controversial. We just put them there – I skipped – oh, so I did. Okay, if I may. The Consent Agenda is where we put things that we think are non-controversial and that nobody should have a problem with and to save time, we just approve them all at the same time. If anyone does have a problem with one of these things, we can certainly remove it from the consent agenda and put it into Unfinished or New Business depending on where it most likely goes. The two things we have today on the Consent Agenda are the approval of the Faculty Senate chairs – committee chairs, standing committee chairs and the Faculty Senate committee membership. Again, that’s on page 8. Everybody on the Senate who’s not also on the University Council is expected to sit on one of the Senate’s standing committees and so you’ll see those names. I tried to assign memberships to people based on their preferences whenever possible. A couple of schools/departments – schools I guess – are not, well because of their size, are represented by a limited number of people and the Bylaws call for membership on each committee by a representative of each college. When you only have one representative for example, that makes assigning committees a bit of a problem. What I choose to do and this is going to freak a couple of people out, is put representatives from schools with very limited representation here on all the committees. I do not expect that those people will attend every meeting of every committee. I would be really shocked and flabbergasted. You’re on there so that you will get the agenda for each committee’s meetings and you can cherry pick whichever meetings you think will work going to to properly represent your school or name a designated alternate if you can’t make it. This is – it’s really more of a communication device so that those people who are underrepresented or not well-represented schools see everything that’s going on across – I mean, LA&S will see, you know, by their representatives all the agendas for all different committees. School of Law, unless they have somebody on there, won’t so I put your name on there on all these meetings just so you know where it’s going on and you have the opportunity to speak to any issues in the proper meetings that you think are coming your way. So, having said that I think everything else should be fairly self-explanatory. Yes?

B. Stevens: B isn’t ---

President Stoddard: B is not. I haven’t gotten to B yet. I mean everything else in terms of the Senate committee memberships and chairs. Before we – oh no, I’ll do that later. Okay.

B is membership in the Faculty Senate University Council. There are some of you here who are members of the University Council and you are here only because you are members of the University Council. This is a historical thing. When the Faculty Assembly was originally developed, that’s the parent body to this body, the thought was that it would be made up of people from University Council, faculty members from the University Council, so that the faculty would have a forum where they would be more free to speak out about issues of particular concerns to faculty. That has since grown to allow for every department to have a representative on the Faculty Senate. What’s happened is that now we have a large duplication. We have every department represented plus all the representatives from the University Council and many of those people know that these meetings tend to be a little redundant. We cover a lot of the same territory. So, the suggestion is that we examine whether or not it’s really necessary to have all the faculty members on the University Council also sit through all the Faculty Senate meetings and there are various ways to address that issue and I felt the best way to do this would
be to refer the matter to the Rules and Governance Committees of both the Faculty Senate and the University Council and so what you are being asked to do here today is refer this issue to the Rules and Governance Committee of the Faculty Senate. Any comments or questions about the Consent Agenda? Okay, if I can have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Thank you. Can I have a second? Once again, any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the Consent Agenda please say aye. All opposed? Okay. Thank you.

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Committee chairs and Faculty Senate Committee composition for 2004-2005 (Page 8)

B. Membership of Faculty Senate and University Council – refer to Rules and Governance.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President Stoddard: Next up are reports from the Advisory Committees and the first is the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education by Patricia Henry.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 9-12)

P. Henry: Thank you. I’d like to prefix just by explaining just a little bit what the Faculty Advisory Council is for those of you are new on the Senate. What we’re basically trying to do is be an interface between faculty of assorted universities and institutes of higher learning and the IBHE. The public universities always have representatives – all the public representatives or all the public universities are represented and I am NIU’s. There’s also membership by the private universities and the community colleges that sort-of takes turns. We meet all over the state once a month at various different institutions which are really very interesting and what I see my is as trying to keep you guys informed – NIU in general informed – as to what’s going on at the IBHE some of which can get extremely exciting and some of which is pretty boring but at least let you know what’s going on and especially try and serve as a means of conveying your concerns through the FAC – through the Faculty Advisory Council – to the IBHE. They don’t always listen to us but at least we have something to say. What happens is when the IHBE meets, there’s a member – the Chair of the Faculty Advisory Council goes to that meeting and tells them what we have decided to tell them at various meetings of ours. I’d also like to just provide you with a very quick overview of the summer meetings and point out some things that are going to be ongoing issues for the fall as well.

In terms of what you have in the packet, actually the first meeting in May is listed on pages 10 and 11 of your packet there so that gives you a sort-of brief overview and I’m not going to touch everything. Some of it had to do with the budget which was very exciting all summer but is now no longer anywhere near as exciting. One point of interest that I’d like to mention in passing is the third bullet point, the control of the SURS’ board that is moving gradually from the old to the new and Jim Hacking who, according to many, done an excellent job of minding the store may well be on his way out.

The fourth bullet point has to do with Priorities, Productivity and Accountability, which will be known as PPA, which has – is going to be an ongoing concern. This is basically set up by the
IBHE to look at issues of priorities, productivity and accountability. For those of you who go way back, there was a committee, PQP, at one point, which stood for Priorities, Quality and Productivity. I’m not even sure what those were but we have actually gotten rid of the “Q” that is to say quality, yes – so it simplifies everything. This is one of the concerns of the FAC. We’ve been sort-of nagging the IBHE to, you know, bring this into account and I’ll have more to say on that later. We do have representative, Ken Andersen, of the University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana and he’s a very able fellow who will keep us posted. One thing that comes up is the question of university’s mission and I specifically asked whether this is going to be the institution’s idea of the mission or the IBHE’s idea of the mission and this is, so far, somewhat in negotiation but it’s something that we’re keeping an eye on.

The next bullet point also mentions – one of the things we do keep trying to push is that the IBHE should be making the case to the legislature and the governor about what higher education is all about and the IBHE often doesn’t really do that. It does not always see itself as an advocate. They also mentioned that universities by-and-large try and put the best face on everything so even when all these horrible budget cuts were happening, we were all soldiering on and, to some extent, being enablers I think is the argument that could be made. Nobody is quite sure how to deal with this but we did register that concern with the IBHE staff. We only meet, by the way, the FAC only meets with the IBHE once a year in October. Other than that we meet with the IBHE staff, which is a very able body of people. Our next meeting is going to be September 10 and so concerns that you have can be brought forward at that time as well.

On the next page and this is just sort-of a little footnote, speaking of faculty governance, the University of Illinois at Springfield was rather surprised to find that a large grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation was obtained to develop a Campus of the Future from which an on-line “mirror campus” was going to be developed with considerable implications for faculty and teaching on-line courses and so forth. There’s some good stuff; there’s some bad stuff. They felt pretty concerned that they hadn’t been really consulted much about it and the FAC also thought that was rather concerning.

Moving on then to pages 9 and 10 actually – did I say that right – I’m sorry, yeah the main meeting was 11 and 12, excuse me. The June meeting I’m reporting on on pages 9 and 10. What I’ll try and do usually is just sort-of highlight little points and then presumably you will have them ahead of time and ones that concern you we can talk further on.

The budget is obviously mute at this point. One point I would like to point out is that there is a website for the IBHE which is actually pretty valuable and does give you a lot of information about a lot of things and I will make use of it from time to time. One of the things that is on that is a way of talking about the Illinois Commitment and getting some feedback to the IBHE about the Illinois Commitment which, for those of you who do not know, there are six goals. They are actually at the bottom of the page 9 and the top of page 10. In generally, they’re pretty utilitarian, at least the Faculty Advisory Council has felt that they emphasize good solid things like business and industry and so forth and so on. They don’t mention things like research and artistry all that much and the FAC has sort-of been on a little quest to try and get at least some concept of the quality of life and the value of research and other things to sort-of the state as a whole rather than just training people for jobs and we do want to also – one of the other things
that we also found out is that the legislature doesn’t always seem to have a very clear idea of what the Illinois Commitment is either and so this makes all this very practical stuff kind of useless anyway but – we do want to sort-of try and create the concept that building a currency of knowledge through research is a valuable goal of higher education and should be incorporated into this. Moving on to page 10 and – oh – if you want to make comments, you can go to the website that I’ve listed there and there is a place for you to add comments if you’d like to and they do solicit feedback.

Point 3 I’m just going to skip over. The Governor is interested in some sort of taskforce that will look at textbook prices. The FAC was interested in this but there really wasn’t enough information at this point to say much about it. We did point out that the raising costs in general of higher education in Illinois, makes the textbook problem or the high costs of textbook even more acute.

We tried also, in point 4, to meet with the local representatives or Senate members of the General Assembly and had some feedback from them and we did a little with Dale Righter.

Point 5 brings us back to the Priorities, Productivity and Accountability issue. This committee is currently working, although I think it pretty much didn’t meet much over the summer, the prior chair, Tom Lamont, is now Executive Director of the IBHE since the Executive Director went away and Alice Hayes is now the chair. This particular committee – Subcommittee A issued a memo from the Chair, Proshanta Nandi, who is the Chair of this committee which really would be looking the most at faculty productivity and I added three little paragraphs or excerpts of this memo to try and give you some idea of the kinds of things they’re looking at. I personally found it a rather reassuring memo in that it seemed like he was being relatively sensible about this. For example, saying that the IBHE should coordinate and be cooperation with institutions concerning mission and focus statements. There’s a little bit of on-line instruction there as well and finally, the last point, concerning how to evaluate faculty productivity. This is the one that’s going to be a very interesting item for us. Again, I’m encouraged by the fact that he seems to be taking into account the complexity of the faculty task. I would add, however, and I intend to and expect the FAC will as well – at the very end of the paragraph he mentions these responsibilities include course preparation, advising, and governance responsibilities covering virtually every facet of institution’s operation, for example us. Additionally, many faculty at institutions serving adult learners teach days and evenings, weekdays and weekends. No mention of research. I think we need a little mention of research in there and we shall try and do that.

So please feel free to e-mail me or share concerns at the meetings as we get going. There’ll be more stuff and I’ll try and keep it brief.

President Stoddard: Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: Pat, I could be imagining this but didn’t we have some proposal for a seventh commitment last year.

P. Henry: Yes, yes.
**J. Newman-Ryan:** I don’t remember what it was but I liked it better than the other six. That’s all I remember. What happened to that?

**P. Henry:** Yes, that sort-of is still in the works. What we, the Faculty Advisory Council, indeed tried to put forth the motion since this is part of the evaluation of the Illinois Commitment of getting a seventh commitment that would indeed have something to do with the quality of life and research and so forth. The problem comes in terms of evaluating it in a way that would not be totally burdensome to people who have to create these documents to show to the IBHE. So, there’s sort-of a feeling that it could be either part of the sort-of over-arching statement of what higher education is supposed to do and maybe a kind-of seventh commitment or seventh goal rather that could be evaluated in a fairly loose fashion like best practices or other kinds of fairly antidotal as opposed to quantitative statistics and it’s still very much alive. We’re very much trying to push it but that was the – the FAC wanted to do that and you guys all said yes FAC, tell them to do that and we’ve told them to do that but the question will they – we are an advisory committee and they don’t always take our advice but we’re still trying to push it.

**President Stoddard:** John?

**J. Knapp:** Can you hear me? Is this working? Is this list in the order that the Board of Higher Education put into practice? I’m wondering if I teach “Moby Dick” is that going to help sell automobiles here in Illinois?

**P. Henry:** Exactly! I don’t think the listing is meant to be, you know, that number 1 is the first priority. I think all six are seen as more or less equal and number 6, “Illinois colleges and universities will continually (you can never stop) improve productivity, cost effectiveness, and accountability” – oh wait, that ones not so good. Number 5, that’s the one. “will hold students to even higher expectations for learning and will be accountable for the quality (there’s the one quality word) of academic programs and the assessment of learning. So actual education is in there and we’re trying to get it more in there. The thing is that I think this document was originally conceived as a way to show the legislature that yes, we need money for higher education because it’s good for the economy of the state and that’s a valid point to make but it’s not the only thing it’s good for and we’re trying to get that across.

**President Stoddard:** After I read “Moby Dick” I wanted to run out and buy a white Jeep Cherokee. Any other comments or questions for Pat?

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, I think it speaks for itself but I’d be happy to answer any deep questions anyone might have about it.
**President Stoddard:** That reports on page 13. Basically it was approval of recommendations for promotions, tenure and so forth.

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

**President Stoddard:** Okay, we have an oral report from me about the meeting that was this morning. There was one action item that this subcommittee took and that was your approval of the appointment of Brian Hemphill as the Vice President for Student Affairs. That went through without any comment or, - well, nothing but nice things - without any problems.

The BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations was a somewhat longer report. I left my notes at home. You want to say anything it or do you want me to comment on it?

**X. Song:** I’ll say a few things. I believe there is a long list of items approved by the Board of Trustees and I believe these are in the public record so if you are interested in the detail we can find them somewhere on the website.

I want to make one, actually two comments that I hope will be helpful. One is although Paul is new, he handled it extremely well. What a professional and I’m really proud of him. I was there for about a year with Sue Willis so I observed the process. Following up on the previous question of what you can do as a faculty advisor to the Board of Trustees. Although you don’t have many chances to speak there in the formal meeting which will be recorded, that may or may not have any consequences legally or whatever so it’s uncertain but you do have many chances to talk to the individual members of the Board of Trustees and the higher administration individuals to voice your concerns because they would take it much more seriously with your capacity as the official advisor to the Board of Trustees and I have personally done a few of that. Since it’s not on the record and I can assure you I voiced in the best interest of all the faculty members of the University and occasionally some of the members would invite you to lunch in private and ask you if you have any concerns or anything you need them to know. But those are the things you could do although they are not on official record. They either has or has not any substantial consequences but at least you can voice your concerns, your thoughts and share with them.

**President Stoddard:** Thank you Xueshu. That’s true. There’s a lot of opportunity for more informal conversations.

The BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee approved a bunch of items as Xueshu said. We’ll have a copy of those in the next packet. Of most importance, they approved the faculty increment that the President wrote us about yesterday. They approved the University requests for capital improvement budgets and so forth. All of our budget requests. Their approval doesn’t bring any money, however. It still has to go to the IBHE and then through the Governor and the legislature. That whole process as we know, takes a lot of time and they’re still operating on budget requests from years ago so if you’re waiting for major renovations to your building, keep waiting.
I don’t have many of the specifics with me but I’d be happy to answer any questions or Xueshu can help on anything that they may have gone over and any concerns you might have about what they might have gone over. Okay?

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – report – walk-in

President Stoddard: We should have a report as a walk-in item from Donna Smith and Shey Lowman on the BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee and if one of you would like to summarize what you have written down.

D. Smith: This report I believe also speaks for itself. The reports were made – the General Assembly report was made by Ken Zehnder and as far as I know these bills have actually passed: House Bill 3877, 4361, 4491 and Senate bills 3107 and 3340. Kathy Buettner made the federal report from the Department of Defense which gives the ??? program an additional 3.5 million to give a total for the last two fiscal years of 5.75 million dollars. John Lewis gave the report on the Belvidere/Boone County New Uses Agricultural Technology Partnership with the city of Belvidere, Boone County among other corporations up that way and NIU. He also announced new staff for that partnership. Sharon Dowden reported on NIU procedural audit revisions that would make campus departments accountable for complying with previous findings. Lastly, President Peters announced that House Speaker Dennis Hastert has designated him to the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program Commission. That was by congressional action. I’d be happy to try to answer any questions if there are any.

J. Knapp: Could you repeat the list of which ones of the bills passed?

D. Smith: These are to the best of my knowledge. The ones that passed are House Bills 3877, 4361 which is a fairly important one. As far as I know it does not come with any fiscal responsibility. House Bill 4491 also passed and Senate Bills 3107 and 3340.

P. Henry: One note – I think the one that was very attention grabbing last year was the third one down, House Bill 4073, which I believe, was pretty much tabled. This would do something rather drastic in terms of inter – putting another level of deciding tenure criteria for tenure but as far as you know that one’s still dead but not terribly buried?

D. Smith: That was tabled by the sponsor.

President Stoddard: Any other questions or comments?

R. Meganathan: The sheet that was given, the last line says “appropriates $2.00 for general revenue fund. What does that mean?

D. Smith: I’m not sure. I just took that straight out of the Board of Trustees packet.

R. Meganathan: There’s something - $2.00 doesn’t mean anything.
D. Smith: We’d have to leave that to Kathy Buettner’s office to try to explain that.

R. Meganathan: Maybe 2 million.

President Stoddard: Any other questions? Yes, Kendall.

K. Thu: Could you tell us who is on the Higher Education Commission? Who is intended to be on the Higher Education Commission?

P. Henry: I don’t know that either but I do know that if you go to the General Assembly web page you can find all the committees and you can find all the people who are on those committees and then you can write to them.

President Stoddard: Anybody else?

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

President Stoddard: At this point we usually do Reports from Standing Committees but since is the first meeting and the standing committees have not yet have a chance to meet, I suspect we won’t get many reports. However, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the chairs of the committees and let them wave their hand so that the members can see who they are. If the chairs want to say anything, they have the chance. Maybe stand up and let people see who you are.

A. Academic Affairs – John V. Knapp, Chair

President Stoddard: Academic Affairs is John Knapp.

J. Knapp: I think this is a jazzy committee. If you have any affairs you’d like to report, please pass them on to me.

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

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

President Stoddard: Resource, Space and Budget. This is actually a joint committee with the University Council and the faculty chair for this committee is C.T. Lin.

C.T. Lin: C.T. Lin from Chemistry. I’m chair of this particular committee ??? but you see, ???.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair

President Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Ngoyi Bukonda.
E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair

President Stoddard: Rules and Governance, Augden Windelborn.

A. Windelborn: Donna – not on mike.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Stoddard: And then finally, the committee, which does have some work today, is Gretchen Bisplinghoff in for Elections and Legislative Oversight.

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes, we actually have a couple of tasks to do today so I will go ahead and get started.

President Stoddard: Please do.

1. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee – Colin Booth, Chair (Page 14)

G. Bisplinghoff: All right, the first thing we need today is the election of the members of the Faculty Grievance Committee and an election will take place by lot. It’s not actually an election so much as a drawing and unfortunately the grand prize is that you’re on a committee. The first name is Catherine ??? I believe we need fifteen? Fourteen. Oh that’s right, fourteen plus our chair and then some alternates. David Wade. That’s two. Corina Cummings. Please hold your applause until the end. Nancy Castle. Rangaswamy Meganathan. I got two that time. Kent Gallagher. Patricia Fox. Debra Smith-Shank. I’ll mix these up a little bit more. Richard Orem. Jack Marchewka. Patricia Henry, you don’t have enough to do. Three more. William Goldenberg. Two more. John Wolfskill and William Tolhurst. Another person who doesn’t need anything more to do. Okay, now I need five alternates. Yes, yes I know he was. Okay, five alternates. Elizabeth Miller. Amy Rose. Jitka Hurych. Paul Loubere. Janet Holt and that’s it. Okay.

President Stoddard: Amy is on sabbatical all year.

G. Bisplinghoff: Amy is on sabbatical all year. We’ll draw another name. Okay, she got lucky. William Baker. Yes?

???: Patricia Fox is no longer ???.

G. Bisplinghoff: Excuse me? Patricia?

???: Fox. Her name was drawn and she is no longer ???
President Stoddard: She’s no longer on Faculty Senate?

G. Bisplinghoff: Okay, so another name.

D. Mathesius: Is she no longer at the University or – she’s a University Council member. Not representing Nursing, she’s a University Council representative.

???: She’s not ???

D. Mathesius: Okay.

G. Bisplinghoff: Pam Smith.

2. Election of University Council alternates – see sample ballots – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting (Pages 15-20)

G. Bisplinghoff: All right, now we need to. I’m sorry, you have a question?

W. Tolhurst: At some point it might be nice to have a little explanation since a lot of us spent a lot of time creating a new grievance system that was supposed to eliminate this committee and I thought I had been delivered from it forever.

President Stoddard: Well, what you guys actually did is we left in place ---

W. Tolhurst: We went through this discussion.

President Stoddard: We left in place the Grievance Committee that handles questions of academic freedom for faculty members. That is still Article X and Article X is what creates this policy. What we have done is Article XI – and Article X is what is given to you on page 14 of your packet – Article XI is all new material that the Committee put together which is a more comprehensive grievance list for staff and faculty concerns and staff with academic freedom issues. In those cases it was asked that each representative body come up with 15 names and this is the same 15 names that we’ve just drawn so you are doing double duty sort-of and then individual hearing panels will be selected from the body as is appropriate. So if we have a faculty/faculty grievance that will be handled strictly by faculty members. If we have a staff/faculty that will be handled by a larger group. Having said all that, the chances are – well, we don’t get a lot of grievances usually so that the changes that anybody will actually have to serve on a grievance committee are relatively small but not negligible.

A Senator: I noticed that it says “The Faculty Grievance Committee shall consist of 15 tenured faculty members who are current members of the Faculty Senate”. Does that include Council members who not really members of the Senate?

President Stoddard: They are really members. They are voting members and they have all the same rights.
A Senator: Not *ex-officio*?

President Stoddard: No, you can be both but they are – yeah, they vote but they just don’t serve on the standing committees since the University Council has its own standing committees that they can serve on. Now if we redefine who’s there, then that will change perhaps but that hasn’t happened yet. Okay?

G. Bisplinghoff: Okay, we’re going to move on to the election of the University Council alternates and this will be done by ballot – different colored ballots that we have. I’d like to ask those members of my committee to help us hand out the ballots if they would come forward and we’ll give this out and collect them back up as quickly as possible. Who’s first?

President Stoddard: If you or a member of the Council cannot make the meeting, they are supposed to contact someone who is listed as an alternate from their College to attend in their place and so we are voting on who should be eligible for that honor.

G. Bisplinghoff: Okay, if you are here from the College of Education, please raise your hand for a blue ballot. Look at all my committee members. Out in force.

President Stoddard: Again, this is for University Council so we’re not necessarily looking for specific department representation; we need college representation so the list of alternates may not include someone from every single department and every single college.

D. Mathesius: On the real ballot, Nursing has been removed because I do not know who the representative is. Okay.

G. Bisplinghoff: Okay, next College of Business you’re going to get a green ballot. Please raise your hand if you’re from the College of Business. There’s only a couple of folks there. College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, white ballots. Health and Human Sciences, yellow ballot. Do we have all the yellows out? College of Visual and Performing Arts, salmon I guess you’d call that. LA&S, everybody from LA&S raise your hands. For those who are voting on the ballot for Health and Human Sciences, there’s a typo. It should say please vote for two (two). Okay, committee members will you collect all the ballots please? We’ll sort them later. Just collect the ballots.

President Stoddard: LA&S needs more time.

G. Bisplinghoff: Has everybody turned in their ballot at this point? Are we all done with the balloting?

3. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School will choose one member from the two nominations to serve on the committee.
G. Bisplinghoff: Okay, the final order of business was the nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. The name of Ken Burns was forwarded to Vice President of Research and the Dean of the Graduate School and was acceptable and so this body simply at this point needs to say that’s okay. All those in favor of Ken Burns serving on this committee signify by saying aye. Anybody opposed? Okay.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Stoddard: Thank you very much. We have no Unfinished Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Community Lecture Series

President Stoddard: One bit of New Business and you can blame me and only me for this is something I’m calling a Community Lecture Series. Last year our department had a speaker in and was talking about something they’re doing down at UT, Austin. University of Texas, not Tennessee in which their faculty members would go out and give a community lecture on Friday evening and essentially it was for schoolteachers in the physical sciences and they would provide the teachers with a CD and ancillary materials and other nice things. The lectures were general enough that the general population would find them enjoyable and apparently a lot of them did and these lectures were fairly well attended and I thought this might be something we would like to look at here in DeKalb with NIU. We have a large faculty. We could give a large series of lectures or series of whatever and again, trying to work more closely with the school teachers around here. A lot of us have said we would like students to come in with better backgrounds, with more training. The best way we can do that is to get their teachers whom we educate here, better able to give our incoming students that background. So I think this would help us by doing it with the community, making it open to the community. This will also help interaction between NIU and the community so I thought this was a nice thing we might want to try. I’m going to start talking myself with External Programming and so forth but I just make this— if this body has a feel for how they would like to proceed or if there are just people here who would like to be involved with this at some level or if people have an idea about them— maybe this just isn’t worth doing. Any input you may have I would greatly appreciate. We don’t need to do anything today on this, this is just a call for input really from the members of this body.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Stoddard: Any comments or questions from the floor about anything?

S. Nord: Could you shed any light on the proposed raise particular the part that says “needed retention”?

President Stoddard: Basically the raise—they’re calling it 2+1+1 so 2% merit—this is just based on whatever most recent window your department uses—our department uses a three-year window so whatever we’ve done in the last three years will go towards that 2%. Now because the University has not done a merit increment in recorded memory it seems, they wanted to make
up for that and so this critical retention, long-term merit, however they phrase it is really meant to look at all those merit evaluations that personnel committees have been filling out for the last five years and nobody has looked at. Well, now they will and so the merit you have from 4, 5 or 6 years ago that has never been acknowledged will be acknowledged in that 1% and whatever portion of the second 1% in January that comes through. That’s their plan. For the critical retention assuming that the budget remains – and their word – stable and the Governor doesn’t pull any money back and we don’t have any major economic downturns. The President a signed piece of paper that says the Governor will not pull any money back so he’s very optimistic about that.

**B. Stephen:** So essentially it’s a 1% merit raise.

**President Stoddard:** Basically, yeah.

**B. Stephen:** One comment – the people who are on the student grievance thing, if we could meet very quickly after this.

**President Stoddard:** Okay, the student grievance thing is a different body from the faculty grievance thing that we just elected.

**B. Stephen:** That’s correct, it’s Pam and Bill and Elizabeth.

**P. McFarland:** Pam McFarland from K&P. We had a meeting that related to the increases and it seems as if they want input coming from the – we have to let the Provost know by the 15th how we want that money divided so it has to come through DPC’s and through the college councils by the 15th of September and there’s a very wide choice of how we do that money by the college. Each college has to come up with recommendations. Having to have that information to the Provost by the 15th is pretty much impossible to really give it any thought. Is there any way of getting that deadline delayed?

**President Stoddard:** I can talk to the Provost about that for you. Why don’t you talk to me afterwards or anybody else who has any concerns along those lines so I can get more specifics? The Provost likes as much specificity as possible. I know that they want to get this into our paychecks as soon as possible and that’s what driving these deadlines. Now, I know they’re talking sometime in October for us to actually see that money and the 3% will be retroactive back to the beginning of this academic year which for most of us is August 16 so that first paycheck you see will have that lump sum to make up for the previous.

**P. McFarland:** Just having sat in a meeting where we started deciding what long-term was and things like that it seems like I’d rather wait a month to have some thought go into the process versus rush it through so we can get our nickel sooner.

**President Stoddard:** That seems fair. Bill?

**W. Tolhurst:** My perspective on this is a little different because at least in our college, we’ve been through this kind of exercise many, many times. Our college has all the points banked. As
soon as money becomes available they just send out the relevant information to the chairs who get together with the department and they come up with their recommendation. We’ve been through the thing about long-term merit and so you know, as far as I can tell our college would be able to meet this deadline without much difficulty and so I think – it’s not the first time this has happened.

**B. Miller:** Only if we we’re finished talking about this. I have another issue.

**President Stoddard:** Okay, anybody have any other questions or comments about the merit increment? Okay.

**B. Miller:** I’m just representing my department so please don’t groan, but I have a member who’s very concerned about faculty parking. Thank you. In the lots near our building, faculty parking was significantly restricted in giving students parking and taking away parking from faculty. We contacted parking about that but they said, you know, we have to give preference to yellows and students. My concern about this issue is also my concern about computers, you know, where is the faculty representation and, you know, and I actually looked on the Campus Parking Committee and we don’t have faculty representation. We have slots but there’s no faculty that are actually serving on that committee at the moment and the campus parking person who was contacted by our department chair basically said, you know, we know students are cheating but we have to give them parking space because I think in part because they have the loudest voice when they complain about not having enough slots to park in. I’m not exactly sure the best way to handle it but I’m raising it. I don’t know if other faculty have trouble finding parking spaces but on our side of the campus, which is near Anderson, faculty parking is at a premium. I do know that that’s a continual complaint but I’m doing my duty as a representative in bringing it to the floor.

**President Stoddard:** We will look into that. Anybody else? Okay. If not, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council  
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes  
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality  
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification  
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum  
F. Minutes, Graduate Council  
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes  
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel  
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes  
J. Meeting Schedule for 2004-2005 (Page 21)

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.