
L. Porter attended for K. Thu.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Balamuralikrishna, Claschak, Butler, Ceisle, Coller, Docking, Doederlein, Factor, Gandal, Gordon, Gorman, Grall, Johnson, Kolb, Kowalski, Longergan, Markowitz, Morris, Peters, Ridnour, Schoenbachler, D. Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Tatum, Tollerud, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Order, order, order in the room. Professor Baker, you’re telling me I needed to get started. Okay, welcome to our first meeting of the semester; a month late, but I think most of us liked it like that.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business as always is the adoption of the agenda. Can I get a motion? Thank you. Can I get a second? Thank you. All in favor, or any discussion first? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was approved.

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

(Pages 3-5)

P. Stoddard: Second up is approval of the minutes from our last meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you. Can I have a second? Thank you. Any corrections or comments? All right, seeing and hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye. Opposed? The minutes are approved.

The minutes were approved as written.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: This brings us to announcements. I have a few, hopefully none too long. First up, as we are all aware, the Oracle student software package is being implemented. They are putting together sort of a hierarchy to help control the implementers and the implementers, ICS is an implementee, to try to make sure that nothing gets implemented that changes the way we want to do our business. To that end, we’re looking for a couple of faculty who would be willing to sit in on meetings at sort of an upper-level – to sort of – to help our Oracle representative understand what it is we do and how we do it and why what they want to do isn’t going to mesh or will mesh perfectly and so forth. I think I will be one of those people but I would not feel terribly comfortable representing everybody’s interest in this so I would like to have another member or two who’s particularly interested in, especially undergraduate, but also graduate students and how we deal with them on a system-wide computer software basis to sit in with me on these meetings. So if you have any interest in that let me know. It doesn’t have to be today; send me an e-mail or something like that or if you know anybody in your departments who would be interested and good at this, forward their names to me please.

Yes, Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: Do you know when they meet by any chance?

P. Stoddard: I don’t think that’s been decided yet.

J. Newman-Ryan: Okay, thank you.

P. Stoddard: Hopefully, it will be a small enough group that it doesn’t take a major effort and a new software package to figure out what a good time to meet would be. Yes?

$: Could you just explain what aspects of the university are affected by this software? I don’t know what this is going to change.

P. Stoddard: Okay, basically this a student support software so anything that has to do with students and how they get managed – how grades are managed, enrollments, this could effect degree requirements, or at least how they’re listed, how students register for classes – any aspects that the students have to deal with on computer in terms of how we keep track of them. So, this could, I mean, ideally the software is flexible enough that it doesn’t force us into any decisions we don’t want to make. But this is what we want to make sure doesn’t happen and so that’s why we need a few people there to make sure everything goes where we think.

E. Miller: Will $.

P. Stoddard: Oh yeah. John?

J. Wolfskill: I would very modestly like to nominate myself.

P. Stoddard: Okay, I’ll write you down. Okay, any other questions. All right, if not, number two on my list is a request from Herb Rubin who used to be one of our more focal members
before he retired and still likes to keep his hand in. As a lot of us are aware, Herb runs the Tom Paine, what do you call that, list server and he’s stepping down from that effort and so he’s looking for somebody to step up. For those of you who are unaware, Tom Paine is a list serve essentially for the faculty at NIU. A lot of different things go on there; occasionally, issues concerning the university. A lot of times issues concerning retirees from the university. State and national politics get in there quite frequently as well. Essentially, whoever this person is sort of gatekeeper whose main job is to make sure that the discussion stays civil. My understanding is there’s not a lot of technical work; it’s monitoring the e-mails back and forth and making sure things go smoothly and there isn’t any flaming going on. So, if anybody is interested in that, you can either see me or contact Herb via Tom Paine or via his e-mail. I said I would pass that on for anybody who might be interested. Yes, Buck?

J. Stephen: Will Sociology continue to host it?

P. Stoddard: What he says, this is – let me see – there is a new, there’s a new machine. I don’t know if that’s going to be a Sociology machine or not, but certainly it doesn’t have to be somebody from Sociology who will be acting as gatekeeper or whatever that’s called – list master, supreme wizard, I don’t know.

Third, is an e-mail I got from Tom Paine actually, from Rachel Turner regarding an informational pension seminar with Senator Burzynski that will held Monday, February 13, at 6:00 in the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center and this is basically, or at least primarily about the pension holiday that the legislature took last year and is taking again this year, whereby they just decide not to meet their obligations to the pension fund. Senator Burzynski obviously is not in favor of such holidays and this will be sort of a summary of what they’re up to in Springfield and hopefully what we may do to help them in their efforts and so forth. Sherry looks like she has something to add.

S. Lowman: Debbie Haliczer and I attended this seminar at Rock College a couple of years ago and it really is an opportunity to ask questions and to make statements and express concerns. That’s really why – the purpose these is to gather information so I highly encourage people to attend.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I think this is an excellent opportunity to let people know exactly what this means to us. Okay? Just before the meeting, speaking of Debbie, she gave me a whole bunch of stuff that sounded interested and it all – did one of those numbers – so I’m thinking we might prevail on her to give us a quick summary of what she just told me regarding SURS meetings and things like that.

D. Haliczer: Is this on. You recall months ago I came and talked to you about this Medicare election that those of you who’ve worked here since prior to April 1, 1986, will have a one-time opportunity to think about joining Medicare. The meeting that SURS and Social Security are sponsoring will be on Monday, March 27 at 10:00. I believe it’s in the Sandburg Auditorium. I’m trying to arrange to tape that as well for those who unfortunately might have to work or teach during that time but that’s when the meetings going to be and if you’re in doubt whether you’re one of the people who are on this list, call me and I’ll let you know. What else? I talked about
the Burzynski meeting. I really think it’s a good idea that you tell your friends and relations to come to this meeting and ask questions about all kinds of things about pensions. While it certainly is not my place as a Human Resource person to be making political statements because it might be, heavens, a violation of the Ethics Act, listen to your colleagues and do think about coming to that and adding your voice. What else did I --- oh, the Wellness Fair on March 29. Come for a massage – it’s one of the free things I give you every year.

**P. Stoddard:** Buck?

**J. Stephen:** One question Deb. If I recall right, even if you never paid into Medicare, you are covered if you are or at one time were married to someone who – if you’re divorced now – married to them for at least ten years – to somebody who is covered under Medicare, you’re covered under spousal, right?

**D. Haliczer:** Yeah, and there may be some other requirements. If you are remarried afterwards, you’re going to have to ask the question of Social Security whether you’re still covered. This is so arcane even I can’t answer questions in great detail about it.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, so when I send out the note, I’ll tell them this is arcane and go to the meeting.

**D. Haliczer:** You can quote me on that one but it is arcane.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, that’s all I have for announcements.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, we’ve got nothing to consider or consent to.

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report


**P. Stoddard:** We do not have a report from Academic Affairs at this point. We do have a report from Radha. Is he here? Radha, unfortunately, from the Economic Status of the Profession will not be able to be with us so he said please look over the report, page 2 and 3 of the walk-in handout. Thank you. This has to do with the domestic partner benefit program. Radha had jumped the gun a little bit last time and said that that was in effect. It’s actually gotten hung up so that’s not quite in effect yet. Then he’s got some more information about pension benefits. SURS is doing a good job despite the change in the way they do things and are keeping the interest rate about where it usually is. Other than that, Don Slack will be the new Executive Director of SURS replacing Jim Hacking and I think the general feel on that is that’s as good as
we can hope. Don’s a good person and Jim was great. Don’s got big shoes to fill but if anybody can, the feeling is he probably is the person to do it. That seem fair?

D. Haliczer: Hi again. This is Debbie Haliczer again. Let me tell you what’s new with domestic partner benefits. I know this is an issue that has been of concern to the academic departments. The Benefits Committee certainly recommended and the policy that we wrote and the procedures that Human Resources developed are at the President’s Office and the President is working with the Board of Trustees. It was determined that the Board of Trustees needs to approve adding domestic partner benefits and so that’s under discussion and I don’t have anything current to report to you about that. July 1 this year, Central Management Services plans to be providing domestic partner benefits for same sex domestic partners of state employees and we’re still waiting for the state to pass some legislation that will allow that to happen. Currently, the insurance code does not cover anyone other than married, opposite sex partners and the children of you and your spouse and so we’ve been trying for several years now to get these domestic partner benefits implemented and we’ve had some delays and it’s frustrating but we’re hoping by July 1 the state’s program for same sex domestic partners will be in effect and we’re hoping that the Board of Trustees will definitively approve that we will also be able to provide benefits for opposite sex domestic partners and for the children of domestic partners which is what we’ve all advocated and I’ll let you know through Paul the minute anything gets approved.

P. Stoddard: Any questions on any of those matters? Okay. Thank you Deb.

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

P. Stoddard: Moving on, I don’t – yes, C.T., anything? No report.

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

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

J. Stephen: Same thing for us, no.

P. Stoddard: Okay.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Rules and Governance, Nancy?

N. Castle: No report but, I need the Rules and Governance Committee to stay after for just a few minutes after today’s meeting because we do have something to discuss and you know who you are if you’ve been getting e-mails from me, David, Gretchen.

J. Stephen: Same thing for Rights and Responsibilities. It will just take about five minutes.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair – no report
P. Stoddard: Elections and Legislative Oversight? I don’t think we have any of those going on at the moment.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. David Wade will be here to answer questions concerning APASC – see memo from Earl Seaver and David Wade

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have no unfinished business. So, at this point I would like to invite David Wade, who’s the chair of APASC to come up. We’ve had some concerns raised in here about grades and other issues that APASC covers so I thought it might be fun to let Dave answer some questions.

D. Wade: I thought it would be fun to do. I’m David Wade, Chair of APASC. You have in your packet there, at least the part that came today, a letter that was sent to all the college curriculum committees I believe in the first week of March last year. An identical letter was also sent to every student advisory committee in which we essentially summarized the activities that we have done during the year regarding the potential grade change; a change in the grading system. It summarized basically the work we did and made a request for, you know, input from those bodies regarding their position. Just to give you a summary of the results we got from that, Engineering and Engineering Technology – no response from students or faculty; College of Visual and Performing Arts – no response from students or faculty; College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – students, retain the current system; faculty, retain the current system. College of Business – faculty, retain the current system; students, either option 1, retain the current system or 3, plus only. CHHS, Health and Human Sciences, faculty – retain the current system; students – equally split between option 1, to retain the current system and plus only. Okay? College of Education, students – retain the current system; faculty – one professor wants option 3, two professors want option 5, the half-step. The Student Association was present with a representative at every meeting throughout the entire year regarding this grade change and were adamantly opposed to any change in the existing system. They were strongly in favor of retaining the current system. Our recommendation at the end of the year based upon that, was not to make any change in the current system. We didn’t see any compelling evidence that would lead us to differ from the opinions expressed by the various constituencies in the university and so the recommendation was simply to retain the system. The most salient of the concerns and it’s summarized in the letter that you have in front of you, is that because the A+ would not turn into a 4.5, anything that would involve a minus system would have a negative effect on the top 10% of the students and particularly on honor students and particularly on those students who strive to attain a 4.0. Any minus would kick them out because there is no plus (4.5) to offset and that was a grave concern. We did a literature review of various universities who have considered this and adopted it and virtually every one of them have expressed that same concern that it has had a downward effect on the top 10% GPA’s. It has a marginal, upward effect on B and C students in those systems that have pluses. All right? So it does seem to fall most onerously upon the top 10% of the student body. That was, you know, of all the various concerns – there are a lot of them as well. Another one that was of some logistical concern was
that at least one university that had adopted a plus/minus system, the number of requests for grade changes doubled. All right? We process approximately 6,000 grade change requests a year here. Now, obviously, that puts a bit of a strain on Registration and Records to process but it also puts an indirect strain on the various instructors and faculty who will have to deal with students requesting such grade changes. There was certainly a position expressed by some of the colleges who are not as likely to use quantitative evaluation methods, but qualitative ones that it’s hard enough to distinguish between A, B, C, and D as it is between A+, B, you know, A, A-, B+, B- where you’re making more subjective or qualitative judgments. Essentially, that’s for all intents and purposes, what we considered and it was on the agenda virtually every meeting all semester long. At the end of the day, that was our recommendation. I’m going to take any questions you may have about our deliberations or process. Yeah?

P. Henry: Why isn’t it possible to have an A+?

D. Wade: A 4.5?

P. Henry: Yeah.

D. Wade: Well, no one calculates it that way. I mean, best practices just say they don’t do it. I know that the LSDAS, the Law School Data Assembly Service and the one, the AMCAS I think that does it for medical schools, they do not while they will recalculate using their formula, any plus/minus system; they again, offer nothing above 4.0. We did not see a single example of anybody offering any number above 4.0.

P. Henry: I seem to recall that there were systems that used 9 point systems so that you’d have an A+ as a 9 point and then sort of work our way down.

D. Wade: The only thing I can say about that is that there was some concern about transfer students coming in competing for limited admission slots here using any kind of a system that isn’t somewhat interchangeable with systems from those schools that we normally transfer to and transfer from. Within the University of Illinois public school system, only UI Champaign/Urbana uses a plus/minus system. Everybody else is straight A,B,C,D,F. Community colleges as well is my understanding. So, that certainly is an option to go a different way but I think that confusion might just add ---

L. Kamenitsa: I actually have several questions. I’m sorry; I missed the beginning about the methodology when no faculty from LA&S responded?

D. Wade: No, no. LA&S – we got responses from Liberal Arts and Sciences. I’m sorry, if I said that I misspoke.

L. Kamenitsa: Okay, I’m sorry, but I mean I think in this body, when we had talked to our colleagues, people seemed to be overwhelmingly in support of this and so I’m wondering what methodology did you use to solicit that input from faculty?
D. Wade: The letter that’s in the materials that in front of you was sent to the college curriculum committees and the student advisory committees.

L. Kamenitsa: And so that’s the response from college curriculum committees.

D. Wade: Correct.

L. Kamenitsa: Okay.

D. Wade: Now, I know that a number of years ago, two or three years ago, a faculty senate representative came to a faculty meeting in my department and asked for our opinion on a potential grade change and there did seem to be some support in my department as well. Indeed, there’s some support as a personal matter on my part. I asked Paul last year whether you had aggregated this data in any meaningful way and he indicated that you had not so I didn’t know what to do in terms of methodology. Whether I was supposed to devise a methodology to pole the Faculty Senate and University Council or, you know, we deferred from poling the chairs simply because they’re administrators and we were uncertain that they were the appropriate body to be considering at that level. Other than asking or poling individual faculty members, boy I’ll tell you, that seemed unyielding to us.

L. Kamenitsa: I also had a question of the characterization of having – of the systems having a detrimental effect on students and it seems to be more that it’s not the system that has a detrimental effect, it’s their actual performance that has a detrimental effect and what we have now is a lot of people getting 4.0 who perhaps don’t really deserve them.

D. Wade: If you’re saying that there are people who are getting A’s who are at the low end of the A range, I think you’re absolutely correct. Another issue is whether a person at the low range of the A range still deserves a 4.0. I think that’s an open question too but I think there’s support on both sides of that, but I tell you there will be no support for just a minus system.

L. Kamenitsa: Among students.

D. Wade: I didn’t see any among faculty either, at least the faculty we talked to.

J. Stephen: I heard input from one person in my college who stated that a change in our policy would make it more difficult for those students in the top 10% to get into the better quality graduate schools.

D. Wade: There certainly has been expressed concern and the universities that have adopted that system have expressed concern about that as well, that transferability is not as consistent with inconsistent system and sometimes a B+ is 3.5; sometimes a B+ is 3.3. Sometimes an A- is 3.7; sometimes an A- is 3.5. It depends on who the calculation service is. So if you’re applying to medical school or if you’re applying to law school, they’re going to use whatever calculations they use and they recalculate students GPA’s based upon their scale on the reported grade and the GPA. So, regardless of what we would characterize as a B+ or an A-, those professional bodies that assemble and recalculate that data will do it according to their scale.
J. Stephen: Thank you.

L. Kamenitsa: Did you look at the possibility and I’ve seen this somewhere; I can’t remember which institution, where faculty actually recorded pluses and minuses on – what went on the transcript was a plus and minus indication but it was calculated on the whole numbers scale which would allow graduate schools to do exactly that.

D. Wade: Okay, if you report the A- or the B+ and you don’t calculate it in your GPA, LSDAS will calculate it at 3.3. So in other words, the GPA that the student walks out of NIU believing he has or she has, may not be the GPA that will be calculated by LSDAS or AMCAS. Even though we don’t calculate it as 3.3 or 3.7, they will. If we report it as a B-, they’re going to use that calculation. So, for the purposes of establishing GPA it would having nothing to do here and for those people who are just perusing the letter grades, they could make a judgment of, you know, a more precise judgment of student ability but in terms of using a calculated GPA, it’s not going to make any difference whether we calculate it or don’t. By and large, the bodies that will calculate it will use it the way they want. It just makes it unpredictable. If I’m a student thinking I have this GPA, I now have to recalculate every grade in the GPA to determine what the LSDAS is going to do for the purpose of admission. I mean, I guess that’s no problem unless you’re a student.

???: Do you have any idea off-hand, approximately anyway, what is the university-wide percentage of 4.0?

D. Wade: Boy, I don’t know. I’m sorry.

J. Wolfskill: I wanted to ask a somewhat broader question along those lines which is, is there a sense that the number of people graduating with honors based on GPA is at an appropriate level or is it inflated or deflated in some manner that’s not desirable.

D. Wade: John, I’m sorry. I don’t understand exactly what you’re asking me.

J. Wolfskill: Well, let me – I’ll plead ignorance first of while in what happens here. I’ve read on occasion alarming reports at certain elite institutions where, for example, half the senior class graduates cum laude because of severe compression at the top end of the scale. So I’m trying to ask are we seeing that kind of phenomena here? Are the people graduating with high GPA’s to merit honors status or whatever kind of citation at an appropriate level or is that known?

D. Wade: I don’t know it. I can give you a general sense of grade inflation university-wide but I can’t do it in the upper quadrant or 10%.

J. Wolfskill: But it’s just the upper tier that seems to be the real concern about a possible grade change system?

D. Wade: I don’t know.
J. Wolfskill: Fair enough.
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arts education. So, that’s one thing I could speak against it. I could speak for it on other topics too but, the committee’s looked at this and discussed it for quite a whole now – your committee – your committee has investigated this for quite a while.

**D. Wade:** Yeah, well I mean, we’re charged with making a recommendation to the UCC. Based on the research that we did, we made a recommendation. It is not a recommendation that – I would prefer the plus system if I’m being asked as an individual faculty member. I’d make much the same argument that David Wagner made but, you know, there didn’t seem to be any support for it and any change is not cost free and if it doubles the number of grade changes, there just were enough negatives to sway me to not go against the flow of sentiment that seemed to be in favor of retaining the present system. We are very concerned about transferability and, indeed, transfer students and native students competing on the same basis for admission to limited – entry into limited admission programs here in the junior year.

**J. Stephen:** The one thing you didn’t verbally mention is your last paragraph, that this is almost exclusively standard practice in the Illinois state system.

**D. Wade:** Indeed, nation wide only about one third, at least according to a 1992 study, have any sort of a plus/minus system. Two-third of all 1300 and some four-year universities have a straight A,B,C,D,F system, so certainly the dominant practice is the system we currently use.

**P. Stoddard:** Beth?

**E. Miller:** Can I just have a clarification? How many faculty responses you had through the college curriculum committees?

**D. Wade:** Individual faculty responses?

**E. Miller:** Yes.

**D. Wade:** They were an aggregated response. The only colleges that separated it out by individuals was the College of Education in which they had one professor that wanted option 3 and two professors that wanted option 5. Otherwise, they just reported it as a body.

**E. Miller:** I see. Okay.

**D. Wade:** So they must have taken a majority vote of some sort and opted that way. I’m not sure what their deliberation process was.

**E. Miller:** That is different and that may explain why our committee results were somewhat different a couple of years ago.

**D. Wade:** Could be. Bill?

**W. Tolhurst:** If the only problem with the plus/minus system is that you can’t have a 4.0 if you get an A-, why not adopt the plus/minus system but not allow A-.
D. Wade: Gee whiz Bill, where were you when we were doing our deliberations?

P. Henry: As far as LA&S is concerned, again I should have ??? this, because I don’t recall any sort of word going out to comment on this. These are through the college curriculum committees; presumably they were just discussing this among themselves or were departments polled or what?

D. Wade: I would suspect the college curriculum committee uses whatever processes and policies it chooses. I’m not sure what your college did.

P. Henry: I’m just not sure why – I mean, I think certainly should be taken into consideration but I did go back to my department and did sort of issue an e-mail to everybody and came up with a number of responses which I sort of then took into consideration when I cast my vote.

D. Wade: Certainly, the option existed to poll every individual faculty member and try to pull those, you know, set those results but we opted to go for representative bodies instead. If there are no more questions, I have another issue that I’m sure you’d all like to hear about and that is the Academic Advising Center that we’ve been considering as well.

As per your Faculty Senate request, there were grave concerns on two fronts. One, that the AAC may indeed initiate and/or approve exemptions to curriculum requirements and waivers of graduation requirements, a bona fide concern. We had made recommendations a number of months ago that the organic document constituted in the ACC should contain a provision to that effect. It became quite clear after a short period of time that there was no such organic document constituting the AAC and therefore at our last meeting, in our review of catalog language pertaining to the AAC, we added the following statement in the area which described the Academic Advising Center. This is a quote on page 41 of the new undergraduate catalog.

“The Academic Advising Center will not, under any circumstances, initiate or approve exemptions to curriculum requirements or requests for waivers to university graduation requirements.”

The second issue was that there seemed to be an abandonment of the faculty role in those undeclared, no college students who would be advised through the ACC. Toward that end, APASC recommended the AAC that a faculty oversight body be constituted and we recommended that it constituted of one faculty member from each undergraduate degree granting college and one representative identified by the advising body, the group that does the advising which is composed of, I think, both supportive professional staff as well as faculty. That would be a seven member body, an odd number, and those were the two recommendations we made ???. I think those were both of the Faculty Senate concerns that were expressed to us through the UCC or directly to us and that’s how we responded. I hope that that adequately addresses your concerns.

J. Wolfskill: Can you tell us then what is the status of those two recommendations at the present time?
D. Wade: They will be forwarded to the university Undergraduate Coordinating Council via our minutes at their next meeting and they’re either accept those minutes or choose not to and refer them back. We’ve boomeranged a few items this year so.

P. Stoddard: Any more questions or concerns you’d like to raise with David?

J. Holt: Can you speak a little bit about what the budget of the Academic Advising Center is going to be.

D. Wade: I cannot. I don’t know a thing about budget. We are just making recommendations without any oversight of the advising function. We’re not involved in constituting the AAC or budgeting. I don’t believe anybody has that data. Do you have that data Buck?

J. Stephen: No, not completely.

D. Wade: I know there have been people who have pursued that data but have been unable to get it, although I am not one of the pursuers.

J. Stephen: I have tried pursuing that data and had a very hard time finding complete data but just by drawing from salaries alone and the fact that there were 692 students in the classification that the Academic Advising Center covers, my estimate is that it’s costing a minimum of $200 per student in that category to serve them through the Academic Advising Center. So this is a considerable expenditure of money for what my studies showed to be a retention of that particular body of approximately 1% to 2%, which is maybe five students. However, it is centralized advising with centralized referral services. It’s standard practice and they have mechanisms in place to help students identify majors where, you know, they’re just going to college because they’re supposed to but they don’t know what they want to do but it’s not cheap.

J. Holt: Related to that, will the ??? will the Advising Center be – will they have any advisors and that being a replacement of some of the existing advisors that exist within the colleges?

D. Wade: Well, those students are currently advised by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. I mean, just as a first impression, I would suspect that if the number of students advised by CLA&S declines due to the transfer or shift to the AAC, either personnel would shift from LA&S to AAC or be lost I would think. I mean, I’m just telling you as a matter of first what I would suspect would occur. If you take 600 and some students out of the mix, you’re going to need less advisors I would think. I don’t know whether they intend to transfer those over to the ACC or have some sort of reciprocity in that respect or whether that will just have a negative effect on personnel in CLA&S. I don’t know.

J. Holt: Okay, thank you.

P. Stoddard: Anything else? All right, thank you very much. I hope you had fun.

D. Wade: I couldn’t have had more fun.
X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes –

1. December 2, 2005 report (Pages 6-14)
2. January 20, 2006 report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: The next order of business is a report from the FAC to be delivered by Sharon Holmes, our representative.

S. Holmes: As you can see, the majority of the January meeting was about organizational issues of the FAC, however, we did talk about what we felt our relationship and role was to the IBHE in these two areas that are highlighted here. Some of the members felt that we were too dependent on them in making our agendas and suggested that we come up with our own areas of concern and participate in having them set on their, the IBHE, agenda. So we talked about very briefly, the on-line degrees offered by proprietary institutions and others; the lack of rigor that some felt IHBE’s review of degrees offered by the private proprietary institutions were an over-dependence on adjunct faculty; the profiting of K-12 education as a result of the no child left behind criteria; issues related to articulation and transferability and the implication that schools might be forced to honor weak degrees; a state-wide policy for matriculation and tuition options for non-traditional students which some said was in place in areas of Chicago but not down-state Illinois; the centrally of teaching in higher education; faculty diversity, privacy issues related to the Patriot Act and academic freedom. The things that came up most often were certainly faculty diversity, academic freedom, and the Patriot Act. If you had anything particularly that you’d like me to take back to the group when we meet at the end of the month, feel free to send me an e-mail or, you know, raise them now and I can take them back. That concludes my report.

P. Stoddard: Any questions or comments for Sharon?

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 – Rachel Turner and Shey Lowman - no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Okay, if not, I’ll just point out that, as always, there’s a list of informational items that are available on-line. These are minutes from various committees where various things that
maybe we don’t like to see happen, are happening. If you want to keep track of what’s going on in the university, those are the places to look.

**P. Stoddard:** Having said that, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn? Hold on, sorry, sorry, I skipped over one. There’s an opportunity here for comments and we have one.

**J. Stephen:** I have talked four different representatives from departments in three different colleges, none of which are my own department, who have all expressed that they’re having a great deal of difficulty in recruiting this year because of our inability to offer what one might consider a competitive salary and I know two departments where they’re basically starting to bleed at the seams from faculty loss and I’m wondering if that’s the sense of the Faculty Senate that this is a systemic problem that we’re having. Is everybody here having great ease in recruiting people?

**N. Churyk:** Accountancy ???.

**J. Stephen:** Accountancy is something that bothers me because you’re double digits for the first time in years now.

**N. Churyk:** Double digits ???.

**P. Stoddard:** Could you use a microphone please?

**N. Churyk:** We’re down four faculty and yes, we are in double digits and one person did take one of our offers and he left at least $10,000 on the table to come here and we’ve lost other people due to, well, they don’t want to leave that kind of money on the table but I know offers are extremely high in the market. I know a lot of people don’t have sympathy for us because of our salaries but that is a problem especially when we’re down four faculty lines.

**J. Stephen:** Well, you dropped from 8th to 11th in one year.

**N. Churyk:** We did and that’s because we’re down so many faculty right now. We couldn’t hire. We’re down two from last year, or one from last year and then a few from this year and we just – we’re going to be in the market search maybe three or two more for next year. We just can’t get them in. We keep looking but we can’t offer them what we need.

**J. Stephen:** I’d like to move that Paul express our concerns about this to the President at his meeting coming up for the UC.

**P. Stoddard:** In the back?

???: I think there’s also a problem that goes along with that and in our department, the problem is that we’re offering starting salaries to incoming assistant professors that exceeds some of the salaries of not only professors that have been in rank for a long time, but actually associate professors as well and so it’s a combination problem. If we’re bringing in people at high enough salaries to be competitive, we’re also penalizing people for loyalty to the university and who stay
in rank and fall further and further behind in terms of the salaries that they’re getting and I know some of our associates are a little bit upset by the fact that they’re salaries are lower than brand new people who are just coming out of school.

**J. Stephen:** I’ve talked to full professors who say why can’t we even get a cost of living allowance the way you get if you run a driver license bureau.

**P. Stoddard:** Pat?

**P. Henry:** One aspect of this that I think would be interesting to find out about too is the difference that’s happening to new hires in regard to the pension system and if that’s going to have an effect. That’s one concern that I know this two-tiered system was going to have bad results for recruitment.

**P. Stoddard:** Do I get a sense that a motion is forthcoming?

**J. Stephen:** Or a suggestion that you just communicate our concerns to the President.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Well, I can do that with or without a motion so I will do it. All right, any other questions or comments from the floor? I’m sorry, Beth?

**E. Miller:** I was wondering if anyone else is having difficulty funding their intercessions because what we were told was the Provost, who’s not funding intercessions, so intercessions had to be funded by department and also that courses for – and that has a significant impact for us in terms of offering courses like gen ed classes during intercessions which, in my department, were oftentimes filled by people in other departments so I suspect it has a ripple effect. If my department’s not offering a gen ed, that people in Accounting and Engineering used to take, it’s not going to be offered and so it seems to me that that becomes a curricular, university-wide issue. It seems to me that intercession has continued to be sort of a stepchild of summer school. The computer systems all shut down. Tuition isn’t given to students until summer school regularly start and yet students see that three week time as a bonus, a wonderful time to get one class in. I just wondered if anybody else is having that problem or if it’s just something that’s happening in my school?

**J. Holt:** We’re not. We’re offering as many intercession classes as we typically have.

**P. Stoddard:** John?

**J. Wolfskill:** Just to clarify Beth, by intercession you’re referring to between the spring and the summer term?

**N. Churyk:** The time of middle May to ---

**J. Wolfskill:** We don’t offer a great number of classes in that period but in most years we will have one and my understanding is that this is part of the regular summer session budget. I’ve
heard from our dean who handles this sort of things in previous year, that as long as the number of intercession courses is very modest, it’s not a problem. However, if a large number college-wide, are in intercession, then that’s a lot of the summer budget skewed in that results in some pressure from up higher. So, apart from that to the best of my knowledge, in my college there isn’t an issue.

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: Okay, anybody else? Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, for the third time, do I have a motion to adjourn? Second? All in favor. Thank you. See you next month.