
T. Aurand attended for G. Gordon.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Balamuralikrishna, Bisplinghoff, Blaschak, Booth, Butler, Ceisla, Coller, Docking, Doederlein, Carnahan, Gandal, Gorman, Hamlet, Hanley, Holmes, Johnson, Kamenitsa, Kolb, Kowalski, Lusk, Markowitz, Moraga, Morris, Nord, Orem, Peters, Pierce, Ridnour, Rose, Scherer, Schoenbachler, D. Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Spires, Stravers, Thu, Tollerud, Wade, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Okay, if I can get everybody in order here. Thanks for coming and finding the correct room.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. I will have a couple of announcements during the President’s Announcements that will be made by people other than me but that’s okay. Other than that, may I have a motion to approve the agenda? That’s a move? Okay. Are there any comments? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, we have an agenda.

The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes; those are a walk-in this afternoon. Thank you. We have a second from Professor Baker and a second second from Professor Gallagher. Any comments on the minutes? Yes, David?
David ???: I think “member” not present should be “members.”

P. Stoddard: Yes, that is true. Thank you. That’s a lot of them. Anybody else? Any other corrections or additions? All right, very good. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: For announcements, first up let’s get our guest, Steve Pace who’s get a brief announcement for us.

S. Pace: Just to let you know that we’re having an official campus kick-off for the new student system on April 11, 2:00 to 4:00. President Peters will be making the comments and we’ll have several dignitaries from the Oracle Corporation as well as Cyber, our implementation partner. We’ll talk about the time line for the project and some of the things we expect the new student system to accomplish and we’d enjoy having deans and chairs and faculty attend that meeting to get a sense of what the new student system is going to look like and what it will mean for campus. It’s going to be in Altgeld Auditorium, April 11 from 2:00 to 4:00 and we’ll have a reception after the kick-off.

P. Stoddard: Any questions for Steve? Okay, thanks very much. Next up, one of our own, Professor Castle has a brief announcement she would like to make.

N. Castle: Hi, you got an announcement I’m sure at the last meeting that our last meeting will be at the Barsema Alumni Visitors Center and I would like to, on behalf of the Zars, Jerry and Carole Zar and the donors who founded the Castle Faculty Library, would like to invite you to come to a reception after the Faculty Senate meeting on April 26. We’ll have a reception; a wine and cheese reception in the library and on the terrace. Pray for good weather. We would like to dedicate and do the ceremony to do the bricks that many of you have purchased and many of you are named on which line the Zar Terrace and so we were a little disappointed when we met last November or December, that the library was not open and it is a room that is to honor faculty and so the second announcement is that any of you who have books or things that you have authored that have your name on them, please feel free to donate them to the library because we are showing them. I mean, that is the room that people visiting campus see that we have a very smart faculty and that their kids are in good hands here so please come to the Faculty Senate meeting. Please don’t ask questions so it ends quickly and then please stay for some wine and cheese and vegetables and whatever is done; I pick them out tomorrow morning for the reception. The reception is not hosted by the Foundation; it is not hosted by the university, it is hosted by the Zars and the Castles just so you don’t get all wigged out about tax payer’s money being spent on wine. Thanks.

P. Stoddard: Buck?
**J. Stephen:** If we have books that we’ve authored, should we bring them at that time or should we mail them or what?

**N. Castle:** Mail them to Ging Smith. She is at the Founders Library. She is the Foundation rep for the library and she’s been in charge of outfitting that room.

**J. Stephen:** What was the first name?

**N. Castle:** Ging, G-i-n-g Smith.

**J. Stephen:** Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** I suppose I should point out for those faculty who have not yet turned 21, this will be a cheese reception.

**N. Castle:** Cheese and Coca-Cola – no, Pepsi.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, any other questions for Nancy? All right. Thank you on behalf of the Senate. I’m sure the weather will be nice and that will be very entertaining.

I only have a brief announcement. People had asked me – well, I guess a couple of announcements – last time people had asked about the increment for promotion and there’s a memo, it looks like it went out to this year’s folks who got promoted, it’s dated 10/10/05 and says “the new rate for promotion from assistant to associate is now $400 a month and promotion from associate to professor is now $500 a month”. That represents an increase I think of $100 a month in both cases. This is the first increments or the first adjustment to that since 2001. Before that, the previous increase was back in 1989 and before that it was in the 70’s at some point.

**B. Miller:** That’s when someone new is promoted.

**P. Stoddard:** When someone is promoted to either of the ranks.

**B. Miller:** But if you were promoted somewhere in between those increment times?

**P. Stoddard:** Oh, well you should’ve gotten – if you were promoted between 2001 and last year or 2003 for example, then you should’ve gotten either $300 for promotion to associate or $400 for promotion to full.

**B. Miller:** Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** I’m not sure what the rates were between ’89 and 2001.

Also, the Provost Search Committee met last night until 10:00 p.m. We went through the list of candidates. We have decided on folks to bring in to an airport interview. That will happen in a week and a half. After that weekend, we will narrow the field down to the four, I believe it’s
four, that we will bring onto campus. As of yet, I don’t think anything has been decided, certainly not by our committee, in terms of the nature of the campus visit interview but a number of you have expressed interest in taking part of that in some way and to my goal is make sure this is as open an interview process as we can make it so that everybody on campus has a chance at some point to meet with the candidates. The pool that we have, obviously I still can’t go into specifics, I will say it’s very representative both in terms of discipline and other diversity type issues. I think most of the colleges, a good number of the colleges, are represented in the pool and so I think it’s very good. We’ve got a lot of really good people. The President seems very happy with the list of names. He thinks that in addition to getting a good provost out of this, people who become aware of the candidates that we have will think that much better of the university for being able to attract the caliber of candidates that we’ve attracted. So, I’m optimistic that we will get someone good out of this; I think we’ve got some very good individuals who we’ll be looking at in the next week and a half. Any questions about the provost search? Okay. Sorry.

B. Miller: So is it your anticipation that this would be resolved before school is out?

P. Stoddard: The goal is to have an offer made I think by mid-May so, yeah, about the time the semester is finishing up and to have somebody signed and sealed if not necessarily delivered by mid-June. So, this has been a very ambitious time schedule. The search firm has done yeoman’s work in this. They were mentioning last night that it was four weeks before they initially presented a bunch of names. We whittled that down to the set we looked at last night and then last night’s. In that intervening time, they actually interviewed all the people we had mentioned we might be interested in. Usually bringing them into their office or going out to meet the people and occasionally when they couldn’t get the logistics to work out, they would do a teleconference or in one instance I think, just a straight phone call interview. So they have been working very hard. There were quite a few names to interview and they spoke to each person for a good hour or so apparently in that time and then they presented their feelings about the fit between individual candidates and NIU. That’s still after they went through and did some of that. I mean, they presented everybody. Actually, there was one name they had said we’re not sure about but we said we still were very interested. Basically – I mean we still have a large list of names that inspired interest by the committee and it was not the easiest thing to whittle that down to the people we’re inviting. Okay?

I think everybody also got the memo on the summer hours so again, we’ll go to a four-day work week. That will start the first week of June, June 5, and run through Friday, August 11 and then we’ll be back to the five-day work week on the 14th. The specifics of that I guess – are they out already – they will be soon if they’re not. Any questions about that?

All right, that’s all I had for announcements this afternoon.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
P. Stoddard: Our first report I believe will be from – well, Buck, you gave it last week right – or last month so Buck’s report is part of the walk-in. It’s just a repeat of the oral report he gave last time. That brings it all the way down to me and the Board of Trustees report. I am looking at the Steering Committee Agenda which is the wrong one. That explains it. That looked weird. Sorry about that. Okay. Never mind.

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

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

P. Stoddard: Moving on, the first report we have from standing committees, let’s see Economic Status of the Profession. Radha and I were at the Benefits Committee; Radha can’t make it here today but basically, not much new was covered. We went over some issues that had been in the works and there’s nothing really new to report on those issues at the moment.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report (Pages 3-4)

P. Stoddard: Next up would be Resource, Space and Budget, C. T.?

C. T. Lin: The report of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee is on pages 3 and 4 and the committee was charged to examine the question regarding the long – so many years of budget cuts and is it having any affect, you know, on this fiscal plan and attendance at the university particularly to the academic mission and that is the question that, you know, we were charged to, you know, investigate and, you know, we have done so many meetings – actually, three Small from the Chemistry Department, Mike Saari from the Building Maintenance, Bob Albanese from Finance and Facilities Operations and also Frederick Schwantes, the Vice Provost for Resource Planning. The committee, after all those meetings and discussions, we found out that it is very difficult for the committee to get all the information that we need to be able to compare the before and after this long year of, you know, budget cuts in terms of, you know, the actual – when the work order is put in and how long or how many of those work orders have been completed, etc. So it’s very complicated, very difficult for us to obtain that. In any case, we all agree that this lack of funding has an actual affect and a very detrimental affect in all areas of the university work. So that is the general answer to that question and then we looked at, in particular, we found out that the staff, as you can see from the second paragraph, currently was understaffed about 27 positions that remain unfilled in maintenance. So that is one of the things that we found out because this understaffing leads to the ??? ??? consequence. The first consequence is that due to the lack of the staff, all work orders put in have to go through a so-called priority of this work order and that mainly is related where a work order will be prioritized by the provost’s office based on the concern of the health and safety of the students. So that is, you know, the budget in any case, the work order according to the provost’s office, you know, or the category of the priory, tend to all take care of it without any problem but due to the prioritization, ??? affect. One of the affects is that some departments started to complain that they put in a work order but it was not prioritized and so the department believes that this work order is important in priority and the department was asked to co-pay or to negotiate to put in a
certain amount of money in an over-time type of payment or whatever case. So that is one of the consequences of this prioritization lead to the department to co-share this work order.

The second one is mainly related to morale. People who put in a work order but the work was not done so they started wondering what happened, you know, if a light bulb in the ??? floor needs to be fixed and the work order has been put in for a long time but nobody comes to fix it so it’s a morale type of situation.

The third affect on that is related to deferred maintenance is actually occurring at a time when the buildings at NIU are aging. Now, in addition to this action, this consequence here, we actually had a certain action. As you know, President Peters had recently indicated that, you know, that it dedicated funds to aid in an effort to have a quick response to repair requests for all those things and recently I talked to Andy Small from Chemistry ??? 27 unfilled positions have been reduced to 6 positions for each division in the maintenance. Each category has one position already filled so that is due to President Peters’ action already taking care of some of this for the understaffed situation.

The committee made their final recommendation and the committee believed that all the work orders put in and nobody knows if, you know, the work has been done is probably due to communication, you know, is related to communication. So the committee recommended the following two items:

One is to set up a website where the status of work orders can be monitored with a tracking number, just like Federal Express or UPS with a tracking number. You put it in and you know what’s going on with that order. On the other hand, the committee also recommended that we need to have a so-called newsletter – the university would develop a newsletter or quarterly publication to update the university community on maintenance-related issues. So I think that’s what we did.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you C. T. Any questions? Yes?

**P. Henry:** Would this require more resources in order to make such a website? It sounds like a great idea actually but, I mean, if you don’t have the resources to change a light bulb, do we have the resources to make a website?

**C. T. Lin:** I think that during the meeting Eddie Williams said that the website is possible. I think he mentioned about that, you know.

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

???: It’s a good point. If there’s not enough money to fix things, how can you get enough money to report things and the answer is we off-loaded onto student labor. Students are a lot cheaper so the Computer Science Department could stand up with a modest amount of funding could support a student to set that thing up.

**P. Henry:** I think the newsletter could also be part of the website.
P. Stoddard: We could just post things on there instead of – yes?

Natalie Churyk: Our tech resources in the business school already has one of those. Anytime we ask them to do something they post and give us a little number and let us track our updates so it’s not too difficult and I’m sure they could model it after the way our tech department does. Maybe it is difficult but they do it. I shouldn’t say that; I’m not a tech person.

P. Stoddard: So, who would be – you’re saying Eddie Williams office would be responsible for trying to find somebody to set this up and keep it going or?

????: I can’t tell you that Eddie committed his office but when the idea was floated he said this is a great idea and this is something to be looked into and then I said look at Computer Science; we can help you out. Having a working model is an enormous leg up.

P. Stoddard: Okay, terrific. Sounds like a good idea. Any other questions for C. T.?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Next up the, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

J. Stephen: We ended up having to work on that report a little bit longer. I’d like to see anybody on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities sometime this year, other than Jan, so if you’re here and you’re Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, would you please see me after the meeting?

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

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on then, Elections and Legislative Oversight, we need to select committees to evaluate myself and the Faculty Personnel Advisor and since I’m mentioning the FTA, once again, Curt’s term is up and non-renewable at this point so we will need somebody to fill in or take over that slot. If you’re interested or know of anybody who’s interested or know of anybody whose arm you can twist to get them interested, this is an important position. It is somebody who is there to offer advice or at least information to people usually in tenure situations, other promotion situations and occasionally merit evaluation time. These seem to be the instances most often coming up. Of course, if there are any other conditions relating to the workplace environment, those issues might also come up to the Faculty Personnel Advisor. So it is very important that the faculty have someone obviously to go to here to help them navigate the channels of the university when something is not going to way they feel it should be. So, once again, this is open to tenured faculty who do have experience with the personnel process. Theoretically, it carries a course reduction although that is something that in fact, doesn’t always happen to be honest but it should. It’s an eleven month appointment so you do get two summer months for doing this. So, if you are interested or know of anybody who’s interested, please get your name or that person’s name to me as soon as you can. We need to decide this before the end of the year, which will be our next meeting.
???: It also has to do with the ability to evaluate the person who is currently in the position. Is this role an advocacy position beyond working as a mediator for the persons who come to that role and do they serve on committees on the campus or do they work primarily with individuals?

**P. Stoddard:** They work primarily with individuals. The role itself, the degree of advocacy seems to be up to the person in the role. We’ve had people who would argue for individuals. I’m not sure about actually appearing before or going to committees and offering a point of view or suggesting a course of action per policy or anything like that. Generally, like if you have somebody who’s appealing a tenure case, this person could act as the advocate for the appellant. We have also had people who felt they were uncomfortable taking an advocacy position and either model is acceptable depending on the person who’s in the role. Yeah, I’ll leave it at that. Buck and then Bill.

**J. Stephen:** Do you have an estimate on the number of cases Curt has dealt with in say the last year or two years? I mean, how much work would somebody be stepping into there?

**P. Stoddard:** It’s a good question. I don’t – that’s an excellent question. I don’t have a number for you. I know he’s consulted with me or asked my advice or referred people to me maybe two or three times a year but that’s not to say that every person who comes to him he feels the need to come to me with.

**J. Stephen:** Tim, do you have a number of references? Can you give us some information about how many times someone has been referred to you?

**T. Griffin:** Curt is the eighth Faculty Advisor I have worked with. Over the years, numbers have varied in their annual report from nine or ten cases at the low end to eighteen to twenty at the upper end. Curt – two individuals who have come to me this year have indicated they were referred to me by Curt. I have referred about ten or twelve to him.

**J. Stephen:** Thank you.

**W. Baker:** I’d just like to remind members of the faculty, probably the majority of you were not here at NIU, but the late, great Arnold Fox, a blessed memory, was the Faculty Advisor for probably more than ten years and if he felt that a case was worthwhile, he would take it on with pugnacious advocacy and fight bureaucrats right up to the president and sometimes beyond and was often successful so there is a great tradition there if only another Arnold Fox were around. He was unique, God rest his soul. I just wanted to say that.

**P. Stoddard:** Professor Tolhurst?

**W. Tolhurst:** Let me point out that not all the Faculty Advisor’s work involves contested situations. The Faculty Advisor has for my department, been a source of information and we didn’t need anything more from him than that and so there are going to be contacts with whoever the Faculty Advisor is, some of which may not show up on the radar must because people know who to go to get the information and that’s it.
P. Stoddard: Right. Anything else on that? If not, then I’m going to call on a member of the Elections Committee, Dave ???, to come up and help us out here.

1. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Executive Secretary of University Council and President of Faculty Senate – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 (Page 5)

D. ???: This is the committee to evaluate the Executive Secretary. We need two University Council members. William Tolhurst. William Baker. Doesn’t pay to speak up. The alternate is Janice Hamlet. Then the Faculty Senate membership. Laurel Jeris. Janet Holt. The alternate is Kendall Thu. Students – Jeffrey Meyer and the alternate is Adam Novotny.

2. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7 (Page 5)

D. ???: This is Faculty Personnel Advisor, three and an alternate. Richard Greene. Judith Mertz. Natalie Churyk. The alternate is Michael Morris. Is that it?

P. Stoddard: It’s really not that bad. Okay, we have no unfinished business or new business.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Now we go to Reports from Advisory Committees which is hardly worth the wait.

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes – no report

P. Stoddard: We don’t have anything from Sharon on the Faculty Advisory Council.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph (Buck) Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: The Board of Trustee Committees you got reports on last time.

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. POT – Paul Stoddard – report
P. Stoddard: I’ll report on the full Board and that’s a short report. We met last Thursday. The Chair of the Board, Chair Vella, started off by congratulating the basketball teams for their efforts this past season and then we went on to, after a lengthy Executive Session, we went on to basically approve the various things that these committees had discussed the previous time. The most important of those I think from the faculty viewpoint were the approval of the sabbatical leaves so that went through with little comment. What little comment there was, was positive which is typically the case. Once again I think we’re very fortunate to have a Board that recognizes the values of sabbatical leaves. That’s not always the case. They also approved the new student fee structure. They approved financing for several projects around campus. Most notable to my mind was the finally, the work on the College Street bridge and that section of roadway. That was really most of the business that they did. What took them so long in Executive Session I think was the transfer of the Alumni Center from the Foundation to NIU and they wanted to make sure all the “I’s” were dotted and the “T’s” were crossed. Other than that, we had a short presentation from a couple of student resident advisors explaining how much the program meant to them as advisors and it sounded very nice and I think it sounds like something that’s working out pretty well. That was it. Any questions? All right.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any comments from the floor for the good of the order? I’ll just mention briefly, we have one – not officially a member – but one guest here who is leaving us after this meeting so we won’t see her anymore. Shey Lowman, thank you for your efforts and enjoy your retirement.

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. Letter of Acceptance of Nomination from Paul Stoddard (Page 6)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: If there’s nothing else, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. All right, I think Bill Baker got it in first. Thank you all. See you next month at the Alumni Center.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.