
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Booth, Briscoe, Clayton, Cummings, Gebo, Ghrayeb, Greene, Johnson, Kang, Kolb, L’Allier, Loubere, B. Peters, Ridnour, Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Swanson, Thu, Tollerud, Wade, Wang, Zerwekh

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: I’d like to call the meeting to order again.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business as always is the adoption of the agenda. May I have a motion to do so? Thank you. Second? Thank you again. Any additions or comments? If not, all in favor of adopting the agenda please signify by saying aye. Any opposition?

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 29 MEETING

(Pages 3-7)

P. Stoddard: The next order of business is approval of the minutes. They’re found on pages 3-7. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Second? Okay, thank you. Any corrections or additions? Yes? Can you use the microphone please?

J. Holt: On #11, page 7, it should be J. Holt noted in the “new revision” not “division.”

P. Stoddard: Actually, it works either way since the revision was to divide them into two.

J. Holt: Oh, okay. I hadn’t thought of that.
P. Stoddard: Any other corrections or comments? All right, all in favor of approving the minutes, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? The motion passes, okay.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under announcements, there are a couple of things I’ve listed and a couple of others briefly that I’m going to add. Hopefully, this all will be brief.

A. Update on Computing Facilities Advisory Committee

Some questions have been raise; some concerns have been raised about feedback between the Computing Finance - Facility, sorry, Advisory Committee and this body among others. To that end, I went to the first such meeting of that body this September and found them to be very concerned about this as well. Wally Czerniak says one of the major things that committee would like to do is improve communications between themselves and the rest of the campus community. I found them very helpful and concerned about these things. They were concerned enough that at that very meeting, to issue an official invitation to the University Council to send a representative to every meeting. The meetings are always open but now the University Council, at least, has an official seat there. I informed them that unless somebody else really wanted to do that, I’d be happy to go and sit in on those meetings. There’s four in a year. They’re on Friday afternoons, but they do have cookies. The same ones we get here, not the ---. A couple of things did come up at that last meeting that I think might be of interest to the community at large, one of which, the main one of which, is the NIUNET that got a lot of press last month. Basically, this is Internet II. Internet II is a consortium of mostly research institutions and people like FermiLab, etc. It’s a faster internet connection, a much faster, much broader band connection and you can only be in it – you can only make use of it if you are part of it. So, we are creating an upper tier of internet and NIU will be part of that. Money has been committed to making a loop, that’s what the NIUNET is, that will include all the campuses, will link us in with FermiLab and also be of use to the general community in northern Illinois. The President is very happy about this and I think we will also be one of, I guess, 206 member institutions. We will have up to at least, I’m sorry; we will have at least a gigabyte per second transfer rate, probably closer to 10 gigabytes. One gigabyte is the minimum we need and they say we’ll be up and running next semester sometime. So, hopefully a lot of the problems we’ve seen with slow internet connections and so forth will get cleared up.

That was the major thing I think. There were some other issues that involved students more. Those I’ll report upon further next week at the University Council meeting. For faculty, I think the NIUNET and the representation issue were the biggest things covered at that meeting. Yes, Augden?

A. Windelborn: Just a quick question. Did they identify if all faculty would have access, what the anticipated costs would be? I mean, currently you can have different rates of access for extremely different costs.
P. Stoddard: We didn’t get into pricing issues at all and I know that’s a whole other bunch of questions that I’d be happy to go into if we can get them a little more specific. My impression is that it’s transparent, in other words, if you’re at your machine and you happen to be trying to download or access information from another Internet II site, boom – that’s automatic. All campus machines, student, faculty, staff, have access to it if they’re going to other Internet II sites. I don’t know that Quansa is on Internet II sites or whatever the latest music downloading site is, however, the other sites should be fast. I don’t know that there’s another tier of pricing. It sounds to me, if my understanding is correct, that that would be a very difficult thing to enforce if this connection is indeed automatic. You just route it through Internet II if that’s where you’re going. I see concern on your face, so I will raise that next time. Any other questions or comments about the computing facilities? Yes?

B. Miller: One of my concerns was how the computer facilities group was supporting faculty in their teaching. You said they were responsive. Did you get any indication of that or how we might have access other than going to their meetings? Is there a way we can contact them if we have concerns? Part of my issue with this group is that we seem to be, as faculty, there doesn’t seem to be a consistent way that faculty are supported university-wide because computer facilities are handled through colleges, departments so all the technology is filtered through the funding sources and the classrooms are not equitable and it gets kind of complicated knowing who is supporting whom.

P. Stoddard: Okay, yeah, I have spoken to them about increasing faculty representation on the committee. Right now, each college gets one representative. I’ve indicated that we think it might be more appropriate to have representation from different areas so the example I use all the time is LA&S. Liberty Arts might have one set of computer needs; Sciences might have another set, so maybe LA&S needs at least two people on there. They are very amenable to that. Currently, the University Council Rules & Governance Committee is looking into what would be a more appropriate representation. They do have a website that you can check to see what they’re up to. That doesn’t help you immediately. I have found, and I don’t know what it would be like if everybody did this, but I have found when I have called Wally Czerniak about specific problems, he’s been very, very helpful. I don’t know if that’s because of the office I have or he’s just helpful to anybody who has a problem. You know, I could see that going either way. He seems like a genuinely nice guy who really, really wants to help. On the other hand, if you got a thousand calls a week from people who needed help, I could see where that good will might be stretched. So, I guess what I’d say is that you have a couple of avenues through that committee. You can either talk to your rep and that should be in the Committees Book who that committee is, which is now posted. You can get to the Committees Book either through the UC/Faculty Senate homepage or the university’s homepage and find out who your representative is. Or, you know, assuming we don’t all go doing this, I think we could probably try calling Wally personally and see what happens. I know you particularly have had some dealings with him you said and it took a while but, if I don’t misrepresent you, I think it’s been taken care of. Yes, Shey?

S. Lowman: Wally did send out an e-mail this week to the committee specifically asking faculty for feedback on what kind of support they needed and he wanted to hear the good, the bad and the ugly so—-
P. Stoddard: Okay, good. Okay.

S. Lowman: So he has made good on that.

P. Stoddard: So if you have specific concerns or even general concerns about the way things are working, you can either contact me about them or your representative. I don’t know if Shey feels it’s her job to do that as an SPS but, since she’s here and maybe it’s convenient. I don’t know if that answers your question or not. It might not be as direct and quick but I think, I mean I really do get the impression that they feel like they are there to serve the community and not the other way around as is often the case with some of these types of entities. Any other questions or comments about computing facilities?

B. Update on Lecture Series

Okay, Item B is my own little pet project here that I’ve been working on and I think I addressed this body about this in our first meeting of the year. Basically, I’ve got an idea of a community lecture series that would be given by faculty from NIU. This lecture series, to remind people, would be geared towards the community. Faculty should talk about topics that the general community would find interesting but it’s also meant to serve as an aid to our local teachers, middle school and high school probably would find these the most useful. So these would be lectures and perhaps a follow-up workshop for the teachers on topics of interest. So in my field, we might talk about Mt. St. Helene’s and volcanoes and forth and I’m sure everybody has a topic in their own field that they think everybody in the community is dying to hear about. Otherwise, why would we be doing what we’re doing? Anyway, this is meant to serve two different groups of people and, in so doing, promote ourselves and then also really give a hand to the teachers in the high schools and middle schools. I’ve spoken with various people about this, Anne Kaplan over in University Outreach and she’s on board with this. She thinks it’s a good idea. Gip Seaver in his capacity as a member of SITSI thinks this is a good idea and had some ideas on how to make this work better. Talking with people in the Executive Committee last week, they had a lot of good ideas so I think there’s interest in this and I’ll just keep working on it and, again, if anybody has ideas on how they’d like to see this develop, I’d be happy to take all ideas and try to work them into something that’s useful to the whole community. Any questions or thoughts on that?

One of the items I wanted to mention was the Committees Book. Again, that is on line after another Herculean effort by Donna. I don’t know why she does it every year other than it has to be done, so I thank you and I’m sure everybody who ever uses it will thank you as well.

One other thing, and I don’t know that it actually effects anybody in here or not, but in general, I got a letter this week that raised a concern apparently that some faculty are having about the way something happened or didn’t happen in the university and I’m always happy to try to address any issues people have. That’s what I’m here for. The problem was that this particular letter was anonymous. There were no signatures and it makes it much more difficult for me to do anything and certainly impossible for me to report back to whomever raises the concern if I don’t know who it is. So I would say that I would really prefer to have letters signed but that any letter
I get that there's a complaint about any facet or any other comment about the university is running will be handled in a confidential manner. So there is really no reason to make an anonymous complaint. So if you know of colleagues who have concerns or whatever, please tell them to sign the letter but that it will be treated with the utmost confidentiality.

Okay, that’s all I had.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval for Augden Windelborn to complete Roberta Burk’s term on Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee

P. Stoddard: We have no items to consider so moving on to the Consent Agenda which is very brief, the only item is approval for Augden Windelborn to replace Roberta Burke on the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee. Roberta left and I think we have two years on that term remaining so can I have a motion to accept the consent agenda. Do I have a second? I noticed Augden was silent on both of those. All in favor please say aye. Okay, thank you.

FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 8-9) and Chicago Tribune Op-Ed – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Next up are reports from advisory committees and first, of course, is our friend Pat.

P. Henry: I will be mercifully brief because I have – I’m losing my voice for one thing plus most of you have had a chance to look at this and this is the report on pages 8 and 9 that some of you had a chance to see at the University Council as well. Just a couple of points to highlight. This was the meeting in October – October 6, wasn’t it – year, the 4th I guess, sorry – when we observed the IBHE and we had a couple of points that I sort of highlighted here. One of them in the first paragraph there that there is some concern that Illinois reading is slipping in terms of this national report card where we were once #1, we’re now #8 and there is some, as LaMonte said, this is something to ponder.

In terms of the Illinois Commitment, at the bottom of the page 8, I would just highlight the fact that one of the Board members, Sam ??? is particularly concerned that higher education should be playing a role in preparing students for sort of civic life through civic education and to be participating citizens and this is something that is going to be under consideration further.
Agenda items #10 on the page 9 was an interesting discussion concerning online degree programs which sort of feeds into agenda item #15 as well where there is a concern to assure quality in the time of change as they put it so this is an item under consideration by the IBHE trying to deal with the fact that we are, in fact, moving into different kinds of course offerings online and so forth and that concern is, of course, not block progress but still maintain quality. One issue that I have a concern with and I think the FAC does as well is the – it’s frequently brought up that we need to be concerned with consumer satisfaction and I think there’s some concern that this could be taken rather simplistically and there’s of complexity actually involved in consumer satisfaction of higher education so that it’s not just that students are saying “yeah, I got a degree” but we also would like that they know something.

I would also refer you to the walk-in which is an OpEd piece that we keep promising that we’re going to come out with and we do have something now that the idea is that some of us that are in the Chicago area will sort of jointly sign it and send it to the Chicago Tribune. I may make some minor modifications and submit it as an OpEd piece to the DeKalb Chronicle perhaps cut back some. I think everyone should feel free to take talking points from it. Contact your legislators, etc. The main concern as it’s described here sort of the privatization – they are going privatization of public education and this is something that the FAC, the Faculty Advisory Council, as a whole is pretty much agreed on although those from private institutions would not like to have becoming a private institution sound so bad. We’re trying to reach a sort of balance here where we got it all; we’ve got publics, we’ve got privates, we’ve got community colleges. We need them all and we don’t want publics to turn into privates because we’ve already go privates. So, the concern is I think to maintain this sort of balance. By the way, John Wolfskill put it out and others have too that the second line in this letter “dependent” is misspelled and that will be changed before we send it out any further. I think there are some statistics there that I think are of interest and concern. On the top of the second page, on the overleaf, some politically difficult solutions are suggested in terms of changing the tax system and in the final paragraph, once again, we make reference to the fact that the National Center of Public Policy and Higher Education ranks us as #8 where it used to rank us as #1. So, I think take this for what it’s worth. Again, this will go out – if it goes out from me, it will go out from me as an FAC member or as a representative of NIU. I will not be speaking for NIU per se but just as an FAC member but we’re hoping that since the FAC does, in fact, represent a wide range of institutions that this will make it something to take note of.

P. Stoddard: Okay, John?

J. Knapp: Could I suggest an addition to the letter? One of the problems with a tuition-driven university is that what becomes popular is what gets taught and we see it now with more money flowing into – pardon me folks for those who are in it – but more money flowing into Business, more money flowing into Engineering and very little money flowing into English for example or History or Philosophy and if we are a public university then it is, at least in part, dedicated to pursuit of knowledge, then clearly a highly tuition-driven university cuts back on things that most of us think are, you know, reasonably important in some form of balance. So in that sense, then this document doesn’t address a very major issue which is balance among the various disciplines and what we think a university ought to be just generally.
P. Henry: Okay.

P. Stoddard: Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I’m a bit confused about the word “privatization”. It seems to me that when an enterprise is privatized, it passes from state ownership to private ownership and this is not a process whereby the state is gradually ceasing to own the university. It’s quite the contrary. They’re ceasing to pay the bills while maintaining the kind of ownership that enables them to control the universities. If it were genuinely privatization it might not look as bad as it does so I’m worried that this sets an image that may make things look better than they in fact are.

P. Henry: Would it be better to put privatization in quotation marks?

W. Tolhurst: I mean, what’s happening is that private citizens are paying more and more and more of the bill, but they do not thereby become owners of the institution.

B. Goldenberg: You can say it’s becoming commercialized.

J. Stephen: How about being neglected instead of privatized?

P. Henry: I would urge all of you to sort of make these suggestions and send things in. I cannot single-handedly do a lot of editing. I can submit some of these suggestions to the FAC but this is the letter that was approved by the FAC so if I send it out as a member of the FAC, I can fiddle with it a little bit and I will but I can’t sign myself as the FAC.

P. Stoddard: Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: Again, I realize you didn’t write this but when I went to school in the dark ages, we were told that – at a large public university in another state – we were told that the state paid for a third, the federal government paid for a third and our tuition paid for a third and that was drummed into us all the way and that was sort of our, I don’t know, impetus that we were supposed to pay back when we were finished and all of that. This says that “Illinois universities receive state support for a third”. It doesn’t make clear where the other two-thirds come from. If you’re going to make the argument that the federal government is not paying a third which I assume is probably at the heart of this, it doesn’t say that because that third hasn’t changed for many, many years that I know of. I think it’s the third from the federal government that’s probably not here but this doesn’t say that. So, are they really saying that two-thirds is now tuition? If so, it doesn’t make that clear, you know, because I don’t think that third has probably changed all that much. It’s the two-thirds that we have to question. Where’s the other two-thirds?

P. Henry: For the two-thirds – I mean, the third from the federal government has gone down drastically and I think that’s the source of it. My impression and I have not really gone through all of the statistics, was that indeed the state used to do more than a third, at least in Illinois and they have done others in other places, but the place where the big increase is coming, at least as far as the point of this letter is concerned, is in increased tuition and I think it’s having the
increased tuition that is having this, in some ways, look more like a private university without at least some of the elements and other things that make private more affordable. I will bring that up.

**P. Stoddard:** Buck?

**J. Stephen:** I’ve argued before, I think there was something on Tom Paine a couple of years ago about this, that starting with the Land Grant institutions, the unifying feature of American culture has been access to education and opportunity isn’t there for lower class people, single people or anything without the state’s help and study after study shows the money you get in terms of the tuition coming in and the help from the state gets paid back with increased taxation of our students. I don’t know, I think we’re abandoning a portion of our culture here.

**P. Henry:** Yeah and I think this is trying to make some of that point but that’s a very good point that – I mean, it is an investment and that’s the point we’re trying to make.

**P. Stoddard:** John?

**J. Knapp:** This is sort of hitting my hobby horse so I have one more thing. One of the very practical effects of the lack of state monies for higher education is the fact that our students are working an awfully lot harder. The students I have, almost all of them part-time jobs; some of them full-time jobs and in my particular case, people who are trying to become teachers, something that the state has needed for a long time, have to work 30 and 40 hours. Therefore, when I give them assignments the amount of reading that they want to do or can do is very severely limited because they have to work so hard to make money. There’s no question that individual students need to bare some financial responsibility for their own education, but I think the tipping point has been pushed in the other direction and it is impacting on our pedagogy, that is there are things that I do in courses now – excuse me, things that I could not do now, that I used to do even 10 or 15 years ago. For example, in courses that I taught in the 1970’s, I would typically assign 8 or 10 novels in a novel course. I’m very fortunate if I get my students to read 5 or 6 at the moment and these are not, you know, *War and Peace* by any stretch. These are simple 200 page novels and when I asked repeatedly why are those individuals having such a problem getting their home work done, they’re working, paying tuition.

**P. Henry:** This does mention that briefly at the bottom of the first page and, I mean, I think these are excellent points and I’m writing them down.

**P. Stoddard:** Buck?

**J. Stephen:** That goes for even some of our best students. If you’ve read any of the lifejournal.com/community/niu stuff, a lot of it’s about work and I go to a party and something like that but they actually talk about substantive things there and there’s one student who was in the top 5% of his class, with a 32 ACT and got a 1-year, non-renewable $1,000 scholarship. Basically, someone with those kinds of grades, that kind of class standing getting textbook money to come here.
P. Stoddard: Anybody else? Okay, thank you Pat. Moving on, the Board of Trustees and their committees did not meet in the last month so there are no reports. Somebody has a little surprise for me. Okay, good. We’ll move on to reports from standing committees.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere – 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

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – John V. Knapp, Chair – no report

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

C. Resource, Space, and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 10)

P. Stoddard: Resource, Space, and Budget has a report. Is C. T. here? Yes, C. T.

C. T. Lin: The Resource, Space, and Budget had a meeting on October 13 and the meeting was quite long so I’ll just make a summary report on page 10. The topic that we were discussing was the campus parking, traffic, and transportation. We were fortunate enough to have a group of three come to us to give us a presentation. One was the Director of Physical Plant, Vice President Bob Albanese and the second one is related to the campus parking, Norman Jenkins, who is Chair of the Parking Committee as well as the Director of Campus Parking and finally, we had our Executive Vice President, Dr. Eddie Williams to give us a presentation.

The first one is related to Mr. Albanese. He started with one of the questions that was raised or complained about the rate of repair of the water leak in Montgomery Hall and he said that happily that problem had been solved right away. In any case, he suggested that in the future, if you send out some kind of a work order, that the unit should follow-up to make sure that the request is not really tied up and make sure the work is done accordingly.

The second thing is related to the traffic program around the DuSable area parking Lot 20 as well as the Stadium Drive. He said that, you know, the problem has already been existed for some time so and he said that in the past year certain modifications have been done and they are really watching out for the improvement and in addition to that, you know, a combination of Campus Parking and the City of DeKalb work together to come up with some sort of future plan. One is that in Lot 20, they will try to widen it up to about 20 feet so under that condition they will be able to increase the traffic flow. Secondly, they are going to do some, you know, landscaping to
modify so they can facilitate the students, the pedestrian flow. The third one is he said to increase the bus shuttle and then finally a speed limit control unit will be added to it by the City of DeKalb to slow down the speeding car. I think it was mentioned about the so-called bicycled friendly campus at NIU and this is a good idea. Actually, when Bob Wheeler was Vice Provost, they already had a discussion in the CUA meeting and that idea has already been actually executed in installing bicycle racks around different buildings on campus. This has already been done and in addition to that, they put some free bicycles for the students to drive from one location to the other but unfortunately, all those free bicycles just disappeared and finally the Police went to the lagoon and going to fish it out – in the lagoon so.

Campus Parking also said they have a plan and actually they worked very hard for it. One way to address the campus parking solution is to discourage, actually discourage students to bring their car to the campus. Secondly, they also discouraged – if they want to drive, don’t drive in the center of campus during the daytime and thirdly to encourage the students to effectively use the campus bus system. So, they have a plan to do so and they worked very hard for it. One of our committee asked about, you know, other than the parking fee we pay, where does this money go. We were told that the parking fee that we receive at NIU is almost the lowest in the whole system. The fees are put into the parking service to improve the parking facilities so, nothing else. They don’t divert any of that money to any other projects. It was also reported that on campus we have 8,000 parking space and are distributed among the blue, yellow, brown, green and whatever reserved parking and they said that they constantly interchange the distribution based on the, you know, the requirements and one member here said that this year the blue parking space had decreased. Actually, statistically, they said the blue and yellow spaces have increased this past year. They’re working very hard on it. People questioned, you know, on Normal Road there we have a four-story parking structure and if you drive into the parking structure, you discover that only basically the first row is for reserved parking space. They have discovered that all the time, whether it’s in the morning or in the afternoon, always empty, nobody park there. So, why people occupy the space when they’re not using it. See? The Chair of the Parking Committee said that question is one that they will discuss so they’re going to discuss it in a meeting so we will wait for it.

Finally, Dr. Williams talked about the master plan. In 1988, NIU already established a master plan for the short term as well as long term needs. At the time they had the master plan, they didn’t know where the funding source is going to come from but they have this beautiful plan anyway. In any case, over the years, projects in the master plan have become a reality because certain funding sources appear and then they established Basema Hall for example. That was ideal and was already planned in 1988. Of course, the last one is breaking ground for the new Alumni and Visitor Center on October 16 which already passed and all the construction costs are coming from the gifts and donations and they expect it to be completed within one year. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Yes, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: One of the things that’s become clear to many of us who park in the Field House Lot is that the problem that was solved by the reconstruction has been relocated in that lot. One of the things that’s always puzzled me is that since we have a person on duty for a huge portion
of the day monitoring entrance into the lot, why we allow cars that do not have permits appropriate for that lot to enter the lot. No they don’t. There are no longer any pay meters. The only people who have any reason to be in that lot are people with appropriate permits. There are no lots that a student can any longer use in that lot on a parking meter basis. So there’s no reason why they should be there so I don’t see why the attendant should allow them to enter. Now, I do know they can get in through the other entrance, but it seems to me there’s no reason why you shouldn’t just create a new parking offense being in this lot without an appropriate permit. So when the traffic is jammed up and they can’t go anywhere, a parking attendant can come along and generate more money to solve our parking problems by giving more tickets and that will deter folks from doing things they ought not to be doing anyway.

P. Stoddard: It’s an interesting point. Yeah, Buck?

J. Stephen: The root of the problem is there’s no place to drop off students other than right here by the library and there’s just—like public schools have where you drive in one side and you drive out the other side and you just kick the kid out at 5 miles an hour or whatever’s safe. We need to do that someplace or several places on campus. It works well on Normal Road here because people can pull off on the side of the library and Swen Parsons but for the west side of the campus, there’s no place like that. You either have to pull into the Gable lot or you have to go through the Field House lot.

C. Minor: I really didn’t want to speak to this here but I’m going to because it came up. When I was an undergraduate back in the days of the covered wagon, a large mid-western university, a Big Ten in fact, there were rules about what students could and couldn’t do in terms of parking. One of the rules was, freshmen couldn’t have cars and students were not allowed to drive on campus between 8:00am and 4:30pm. I suggest that that would be an alternative situation to creating places where people can drop off students and I have a personal concern in this because now that students can’t drive up to DuSable and wait for their friends there, they’re stopping in front of my reserved parking space.

C. T. Lin: Actually, during the meeting, the Chair of the Parking Committee had indicated that the, you know, this transportation/parking problem is really complicated. They would really like to have input from the faculty, from the staff, everything. But they say if you’re really interested in it, they would like to include a committee member so today, we have three—these are three respective committee members who would be able to join, actually become a member of the parking committee. Thank you.

C. Minor: I would like to ask for the Faculty Senate’s endorsement as a candidate for the Parking Committee.

W. Tolhurst: I move to endorse Carole.

P. Stoddard: We have a motion. Seconded. All in favor. Okay, we have officially endorsed Carole. Good luck in your campaign.

C. Minor: Thank you.
**P. Stoddard:** Yes, John?

**J. Wolfskill:** C.T. I’d like to ask you about the item in part “A” about the bicycles. When I heard about this program with the old red bikes to ride around, I thought that was a great idea and now apparently it has come to a very sad end. Is it correct that this idea is now dead?

**C. T. Lin:** No, he didn’t say that. He just said he would regenerate consideration. He didn’t say it’s really dead, no.

**P. Stoddard:** Stuck in the mud perhaps. Any other comments on this report?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** Next up is Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and while they do not have a report; they would like to announce that there will be a very brief meeting at the close of this meeting just to arrange meeting times. There is an issue or two that’s going to come their way; one already, so that committee will need to start meeting so if you could just hang around and meet with Ngoyi that would be great.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair

**P. Stoddard:** Rules and Governance, Professor Windelborn.

**A. Windelborn:** Thank you for making that comment. I will be sending out an additional e-mail to the members about our next meeting.

At the first meeting of the Faculty Senate, Paul asked us to begin consideration or at least explore the issue as to why University Council members attend both Faculty Senate and University Council meetings in which almost an identical agenda is presented and they are hearing the same material twice. Not to say the material isn’t important or whatever, but the question was raised as to why this was happening, should this be happening and are there alternatives for this to be happening. We have started digging into the problem in terms of how far the roots of this extend in terms of University Council Bylaws, Faculty Senate Bylaws, etc. and have considered some alternatives. All I want to ask though today is before the Committee begins to develop some recommendations to determine whether or not this is, in fact, the true desire of the Faculty Senate or merely Paul and his perception of an issue. So what I would like to do is not anything like a motion, but simply get a show of hands for those members of the Faculty Senate who believe that this issue should somehow be addressed so that people or all members of the University Council should not need to show up at both of these meetings. Is that a fair, clear statement? Okay.

**A Senator:** Which way are we voting?

**A. Windelborn:** I didn’t say. I didn’t know if Paul was going to do it. Did you want to phrase that better?
P. Stoddard: If you think this is an issue that merits further work and that this is something you would really like to see addressed, go ahead and raise your hands.

A. Windelborn: It’s a clear majority of the group so---

W. Tolhurst: I’m amongst those who have talked to Paul about this and so it seems to me there are two kinds of reps here. There are department reps who are obliged to be here it seems to me to represent their departments and there are University Council members who are also obliged here so that we have some interaction with the Faculty Senate so that the Faculty Senate has people there who can keep it abreast of what’s going on at the University Council.

P. Stoddard: And vice versa.

W. Tolhurst: It seems to me that there’s not as pressing a need for the University Council reps to attend every Faculty Senate meeting. It does seem to me, however, that it’s important that a sufficient number of University Council reps attend and so what I would like to see that some kind of system that would guarantee the appropriate level of attendance while freeing us from the guilt we might feel if we skip half the meetings and so one of the ways to do this would be to just expect every University Council member to attend at least half the meetings, develop a schedule for when that would occur so you would know there would be a critical mass there and anybody who wants to attend more can attend as many as he or she likes.

A. Windelborn: I was going to say one of the first things we found by examination of the Bylaws of all the various groups was that this was such a tangled web that in order to resolve it, a revision of expectations would be a much more without really changing all Bylaws but, again, understanding exactly what’s desired. We will precede that assignment. That concludes the report.

B. Tolhurst: Cutting the Gordian knot.

P. Stoddard: For the record, I don’t think I came up with the idea. The guilty parties, however, are in the room.

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

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on then I believe there is no report from elections and Legislative Oversight. Perhaps next month they’ll inform us as to who won the presidential election if they know by then.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on we have nothing listed under Unfinished Business.

X. NEW BUSINESS
**P. Stoddard:** Is there any New Business anybody would like to raise or questions or comments from the floor?

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

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

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

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**P. Stoddard:** Seeing or hearing none, the Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment. All in favor? See you next time. Thank you.