
T. Smith attended for J. Holt.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Baker, Butler, Gandal, Greene, Hertz, Johnson, Karonis, Kolb, Kowalski, Markowitz, Ridnour, Rose, D. Smith, M. Smith, S. Song, X. Song, Stephen, Stravers, Thu, Tolhurst, Tollerud, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Welcome everybody to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2005-2006 academic year. I can see – this is just like class – nobody likes to sit in the front row. It doesn’t matter how old we get. The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. Can we have a motion to that effect please? Okay, unanimous motion – anybody left to second? Okay, we’ve got two seconds and a third. Any discussion, comments, etc. on the agenda? All in favor of the agenda, as presented, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstained? Okay.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27, 2005 FS MEETING

(Pages 3-8)

P. Stoddard: Next order is approval of the minutes. Those are on pages 3-8. For those of those who are new, usually we just check to make sure our names are there and spelled correctly and then – we have a motion for approval. Do we have a second? Okay. Any additions, corrections, etc. to the minutes? Seeing and hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes, please signify by saying aye. Opposed? Thank you.
The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Next up are my announcements. So again, I’d like to welcome everybody here. I’d like just to take a couple of minutes; especially for the folks who are new or the folks who are very forgetful and remind us why we’re here. Basically, the Faculty Senate used to be something called the Faculty Assembly. When it was the Faculty Assembly, it was made up purely of members of the University Council which is the main policy setting body on campus. It was made up of the faculty members of the University Council and was essentially a caucus – a faculty caucus – wherein faculty members could get together and talk about issues of importance specifically to the faculty; things that they wanted to see raised at the University Council. As that seemed to do well and membership was determined by University Council membership which, in turn, is determined by colleges, it turned out that quite frequently there would be departments that did not have a member on the Senate and they felt left out and so we changed the assembly to the senate and made it a body that would have representatives from all the departments. Since the idea was also to maintain the communication with Council, we kept all the University Council faculty members on the Senate as well as those elected from the individual departments and so that’s the body we have now and so some departments may have one member here; other departments may have several members here due to their University Council membership. Basically, this is a body where the faculty gets together and discusses issues that are important to us and then it’s up to those members who are also on Council to raise those issues in Council, either through me since I also serve as Executive Secretary to the University Council or individually on their own. So basically, if you know of issues that you or people in your department or just acquaintances of yours’ have and concerns, this is the place to raise them and then we generally seen that these are addressed in the Council.

Because there are people here who are on both bodies and there’s a fair chunk of business that we do that’s repeated in University Council the week following, we’ve rearranged the schedule a little bit so that Item X, which is on the second page, Reports from Advisory Committees, that’s the information that’s going to be repeated next week at University Council. So, if you are a University Council member and think that hearing this information once is probably plenty, feel free to leave when we get up to Reports from Advisory Committees. I won’t take it personally and I don’t think anybody else here will either and hopefully we can keep your time commitment to this body at a minimum without hurting your ability to represent the interests of faculty members.

Are there any questions from anybody as to what you’re doing here? How you got elected is up to your department; I have no control over that. You can speak to them about it if you’re not thrilled with this. Actually, I think you’ll find that it is a pretty interesting place to be. You’ll learn a lot about the way the university works and thinks and what other people, besides those in your department, feel about the way things are going; what issues they’ve got.

The final announcement I have today is a sad one. I think most of us are aware that we recently lost a colleague of ours, Gustaaf Van Cromphout. I never had the good fortune of meeting Professor Van Cromphout so if there’s anybody here who would like to share a brief
remembrance or two, I think that would be in order at this point. Otherwise, I think I’d like to let us all remember him in our own way for a moment.

Okay, only one other think I have to tell you or I get in big trouble, is if you have something to say, please make sure you use a microphone. There’s at least one on every table. That helps us record the information because all of this believe it or not is recorded verbatim and posted on line someplace and then gets summarized, of course, for the minutes. Also, when you do say something, please try to remember to identify yourself at first. We have a lot of new faces in here and if you want credit for your pearls of wisdom, please make sure we know who to credit those to. Yes, in the back?

R. Orem: Yes, Paul, Rick Orem from Literacy Ed. I likewise did not have the good fortune to know Professor Van Cromphout but I did hear on the NPR today a wonderful segment, a memorial to him from a former colleague and student of his, Mary Sheldon, and it might be good just to link, you know when the minutes go out, to link to the Northern Public Radio website for that particular – it’s probably going to be archived on the radio. It was really quite moving.

P. Stoddard: That’s an excellent idea. I’ll do that. All right, I mean Donna will.

L. Kamenitsa: I am Lynn Kamenitsa from the Department of Political Science and Women’s’ Studies Program and I did have the good fortune to have hallway relationship with Gustaaf and know he’ll be solely missed but I also wanted to announce something else. I don’t know if this is out yet in the university community generally, but Political Science also just lost a colleague, James Schubert, who has been a professor here a long time. He passed away early Monday morning.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on then, we have some items for Faculty Senate Consideration.

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate

P. Stoddard: First is the selection of Vice President and Secretary for the Faculty Senate. Did we actually get Buck and Rahda as nominees for that? I’m sure Rahda would be okay with it. Okay, Rahda, there you are. Last year, Buck Stephen who unfortunately already had to leave today and Rahda, agreed to act in those capacities unless there are other people who would like to be involved in that. That would essentially mean the Vice President would fill in for me if I couldn’t make a meeting. Those two people also attend Executive Council – the executive committee for this body – those meetings and would also attend University Council meetings. So there’s a bit more time involved. Generally, we try to get people who are already doing some of that but, if there’s anybody else who would be interested or if there are any other nominations or anything like that, we could do those now. Otherwise, we could approve – that’s okay with you, right? We could approve Buck and Rahda and save ourselves a bit of time but I don’t want to rush this. So, can I have either a motion – or nomination – or motion to approve Buck and Rahda? Okay, we have moved to approve; I believe that was Buck and Rahda. Second? Okay,

Kent Gallagher made the motion; David Lonergan seconded. The motion was approved.

B. University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees.

P. Stoddard: Next up is the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. For that essentially we had one non-continuing position left over from last year. That was held by our parliamentarian, Ferald Bryan, who has agreed to continue on in that capacity so if that’s all right with the Senate, we’ll let Ferald continue doing that if it’s okay with him.

F. Bryan: A motion is in order.

P. Stoddard: The parliamentarian tells me a motion would be in order. See, he’s doing his job; I think we should keep him. Okay, can I have a motion to that effect? Thank you Lynn. Second? Okay, thank you. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Okay.

Lynn Kamenitsa made the motion; Kent Gallagher seconded. The motion was approved.

C. Nominations for a representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE.

P. Stoddard: Finally, under consideration issues, we need somebody to act as a representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. This is a group that consists of members from all the Illinois schools. They meet once a month on a Friday. They get together informally the Thursday evening before. The Friday sessions are pretty filled so there’s no chance for informal discussions, so the Thursday evening discussions tend to be pretty important. Like I say, that’s once a month. It’s very important. Pat Henry has been doing this for us, very capably, for the last several years but she can’t continue on. Buck Stephen filled in a bit for Pat last year but he’s got a Friday class. I’ve got a Thursday night class so I can’t do it, at least not this semester. So if anybody would like to volunteer for that, that would be fantastic. We really need somebody. I haven’t been able to twist any arms yet and this really is something very important that we have somebody to represent us with this group and also to let us know what that group is doing in terms of interfacing with the IBHE. Pat?

P. Henry: I’d like to add a little to that. I’ve sort of stayed on their, you know, e-mail list and I know that one of the big concerns this year is, indeed, how to keep faculty involved in shared governance and that the FAC is really one of those things that it may not always feel that you’re getting a lot done, but you are maintaining communication and if you weren’t doing that, who knows what mischief they’d be getting into so I think the IBHE itself has not been as powerful lately as it has been in the past and I think the governor has sort of taken some of the power of it away, but it’s really worthwhile to keep pushing the faculty point of view and the IBHE itself, the staff especially, are very anxious to hear what we have to say. We sort of give them the where-with-all that they then use to argue things at a higher level so it’s a very worthwhile enterprise.
P. Stoddard: Right, and the IBHE – it depends of course, who’s on it and it varies with political winds – but they have done some things that have not been quite in keeping with what we would think, I think, the main mission of the university should be and the FAC has been very good at letting them know when they’ve gone a little far a field and actually has had some influence in pulling them back into the realm of reality as we see it. So, this is an extremely important position and we’ll need to get somebody to fill that.

P. Henry: I don’t have the luxury of having a TA that I could use for taking my Friday classes, so that was sort of a gift of – actually the Center for Southeast Asian Studies – was funding the TA, but I think it is sort of incumbent on the university to try and facilitate things with departments to maybe get people time off from their Friday classes if that would assist things. I know that was a real luxury for me to be able to do that. I think they’re very interesting people to work with and it’s nice to visit all those places but it does take time. The university has to help out sometimes with that.

P. Stoddard: Okay, if nobody is willing to step up right now, I would also point out that this person need not be a member of the Senate or the Council. This can be any faculty member on campus so even if you don’t think you yourself can do this, if you know anybody who might be interested, please have them get in touch with me as soon as you can. As it turns out, the first meeting of this body is on Friday. So, it would be great to be able to get somebody to go to that and we can worry about the rest of it as we go. Even if you can only do it this semester, that would be a great help.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Committee chairs and composition for 2005-2006 (Page 9)

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on under the Consent Agenda, usually we just put items here we think will be non-controversial so they don’t merit discussion. We need to approve the Faculty Senate Committee chairs and Faculty Senate committee composition. This is on page 9. I think people who have a problem with where they were assigned have already let me know so, hopefully, there should be no problems. Can I get a motion to approve the committee assignments? Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, you’re all locked in now; no changing.

David Lonergan made the motion; there was a second. The motion was approved.

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Okay, today this is going to be the fast part of the meeting. Reports from Standing Committees – Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu is not here but they have no report. First meeting of the year, there’s never any reports. Economic Status of the Profession – I’ll just point out people so the members of the committees know who the chairs are – that’s Radha Balamuralikrishna. You’ve got no report?
R. Balamuralikrishna: No, except I will be contacting the members.

P. Stoddard: Right, okay. Benefits Committee meets tomorrow and that’s something that falls under that purview. Resource, Space and Budget – C.T. Lin, no report? No report; I just want to be sure. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Buck Stephen from Mathematics had to leave, tall thin guy, blondish hair. He had no report. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle has no report. Elections and Legislative Oversight, well not so much a report but some action we’ve got to take. So this is Stephen Nord who’s chairing that.

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report
B. Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – no report
C. Resource, Space, and Budget C.T. Lin, Chair – no report
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – no report
E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair

1. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee (Page 10)

S. Nord: There’s quite a few reports from the Advisory Committee so I’ll try to make this kind of quick. We have three things to try to accomplish. The first thing is to select fifteen members of the Faculty Senate to serve on the Faculty Grievance Committee. By tradition, what we do is simply draw out fifteen names out of an envelope box. So, forgive me if I mispronounce your name.

D. Mathesius: And five alternates.

S. Nord: And five alternates.


Now I’m drawing for five alternates so if you didn’t get your name drawn, you can still be miserable. David Gorman, English – William Tolhurst, Philosophy – Colin Booth, Geology – Christopher Hubbard, Biological Science – Nancy Castle, Communication Disorders.

P. Stoddard: Congratulations to all of you who are not named. Those of you who were named, there’s a good chance you won’t have to do anything anyway. This represents a pool of people
in case a grievance comes up involving a faculty member on either side or both sides of the
grievance. We will select a panel to hear that grievance out of this pool. Typically, we don’t get
very many grievances; we might get one or two a semester that go all the way as far as requiring
a panel being named so there’s a very good chance you won’t have to do anything but obviously
I can’t promise that. Okay?

2. Election of University Council alternates – see sample ballots – ballots will be
distributed at FS meeting (Pages 11-16)

S. Nord: The second thing to do is to elect – each college needs to elect alternates to the
University Council. If you’re on the Elections Committee, would you help me hand out ballots
by college. They’re color coded. If you don’t know if you’re on the committee or not, it’s on
page 9. Yeah, on page 9 of our agenda. White ballots are for Engineering. The yellow are for
Health and Human Sciences. So, if you’re in Health and Human Sciences if you will hold your
hand up. The orange ones are for Visual and Performing Arts. So if you’re in Visual and
Performing Arts, you should be getting an orange ballot. Pink ones are for Liberal Arts and
Sciences. Raise your hand for a pink ballot. College of Business is green, like mine. If you’re
in Business, you should have a green one. Raise your hand. Education blue. If you’re in
Education.

3. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible
Conduct of Scholarship Committee. Vice President for Research and
Dean of the Graduate School will choose one member from the two
nominations to serve on the committee.

S. Nord: Our last order of business from this committee is to open the floor for nominations for
two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Research Committee.
What we’re supposed to collect is two – or a minimum of two – just two – at least two and then
we submit these names to the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice President for Research
and they select one to serve on this committee known as the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship
Committee. I open the floor for nominations. Any nominations?

P. Stoddard: You can nominate yourself if you’d like.

S. Nord: No.

N. Churyk: I’m already on that committee so what if I double? Do I collect a bonus here?

S. Nord: Why not. Paul?

P. Stoddard: I think that’s probably not appropriate if you’re already on it.

N. Churyk: Oh well,

S. Nord: Paul, could you talk a little bit about what this ---
P. Stoddard: Okay, yeah, the purpose is provide awareness of complex, ethical and related dilemmas that can occur in the scholarship process and to suggest ways to address them. The goal – I’m reading from the Committees’ Book here – the goal is to create a shared culture of responsible scholarship. The program will not develop explicit rules that restrict intellectual activity. The Responsible Conduct of Scholarship program at NIU will make the university aware of changing governmental and instructional laws, rules, regulations, policies, and ethical professional standards that guide scholarship and will illustrate the normative issues that cut across scholarly disciplines. Awareness of ethical and responsible conduct of scholarship includes – we all knew these – maintaining an awareness of professional responsibilities creating a shared culture of responsible scholarship, identifying and responding to potential ethical problems, recognizing and understanding cross disciplinary issues and standards and communicating to the NIU community the content of applicable internal and external policies. I don’t see a meeting schedule here.

N. Churyk: ---e-mailed me and said our first meeting is going to be the week of the 19th – somewhere in that week and that’s it so far. There’s no set meetings; there’s no anything yet. I just found out I’m on it.

P. Stoddard: I sat in on this last year and it does not meet all that frequently; it’s not a big time demand. Do you remember what time of the week it was?

N. Churyk: They haven’t set up a meeting – she just asked my schedule for the week of the 19th and --- Sorry – they just asked me schedule for the week of the 19th and that’s as far as they’ve gotten so far. The dates are not available. So that’s all I know. That will be our first meeting.

P. Stoddard: And what’s your name again?

N. Churyk: Natalie Churyk, Accountancy.

B. Lusk: Brigid Lusk, Nursing and I can self-nominate myself.

P. Stoddard: Okay, excellent.

S. Nord: We can accept that nomination I guess. Does anyone else want to self-nominate or medicate?

P. Stoddard: Or if you know anyone who’s not here, feel free to nominate them.

S. Nord: Someone you want to get even with, yes.

R. Orem: I will nominate Joyce Lieberman from Education.

S. Nord: Is Joyce here? Are you willing to accept that?

J. Lieberman: Yes.
S. Nord: Very good

J. Lieberman: I’ll take the medication.

P. Stoddard: See Stephen about that; I know nothing.

S. Nord: Okay, any further nominations?

K. Gallagher: I move the nominations be closed.

S. Nord: Do I hear a second? Okay, nominations are closed and we got our two.

P. Stoddard: Okay, very good. Thank you two volunteers; we greatly appreciate it.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Under Unfinished Business we have nothing.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Under New Business, this would be the time if there are any concerns that have not been addressed in the agenda – you haven’t had a chance to talk to me to get them on the agenda – the New Business section would be a good time to bring those up. Any new business?

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Seeing none, next up is reports from Advisory Committees which means if you’re on the University Council and don’t need to hear this more than once, thank you for coming. We’ll see you next week. Those of you who are leaving, I trust you’re going back to your departments to try to get somebody to sit in on the FAC.

A. FAC to IBHE – Joseph “Buck” Stephen - report

P. Stoddard: First up was to have been a report from the Faculty Advisory Committee by Buck Stephen. Informally, he will have something written up certainly by next meeting for this report. Basically, he told me that the committee did meet twice over the summer but they didn’t discuss any policy issues; it was more logistics and other such things so it would have been a short report. Now it will be a very short report.


P. Stoddard: Next up is the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. Again, Buck Stephen and Ferald Bryan and I believe Ferald has a brief oral summary. Again, we’ll have something written to you by next time.
F. Bryan: Yes, thank you Paul. It was Buck’s turn to do the written report but he and I were both present at this meeting and, as a committee meeting, the items were all forwarded to the Board which will meet, as I understand, next week Paul?

P. Stoddard: Yes.

F. Bryan: In summary, the meeting occurred on September 1. It was called to order by Chairman Boey and I don’t know how many of you have ever been to a Board of Trustees’ meeting – they meet in that beautiful new meeting room – and if you’ve know Bob Boey from this community, I think it’s important to note that he expressed in sincere terms his concern for what’s going on in the aftermath of the Hurricane Katrina on the Gulf Coast and, in fact, during the meeting he did direct – and President Peters directed Provost Legg – to make whatever arrangements we could to accept potential transfers of students from schools that may have been effected by the aftermath of the hurricane. I know at least in one case in my department, we did in fact have a transfer. The items listed on the agenda included a university report that was presented by Ivan Legg and then a report that was also presented by the Dean of the Graduate School. In the university report, Provost Legg presented his programmatic budget requests for the year and these were presented in priority order and I think it’s important for me to announce here that Ivan Legg remained constant in his belief that the school needs more faculty and that, in fact, admission/critical faculty is first priority. He repeated that orally and stressed the need to replenish the professorial on this campus. The other important items, many of which you probably have heard before, are available in the report and those will be presented to the Board of Trustees. There was also recognition of faculty emeriti and there was also recognition of professional excellence awards. There was even a nice luncheon which also served to recognize those people. Then Associate Provost Virginia Cassidy presented a FY05 university performance report. Many of you may know that programs reviewed by the Academic Policy Council – or Planning Council, excuse me – included those in curriculum instruction, early childhood and elementary, special Education, Psychology, Public Administration and Political Science. These departments were reviewed and the full report, she says, on these are not yet available. She’s reviewing national performance standards coming at the national and federal level – yes, that’s the result of no-child-left-behind – there will eventually be Department of Education reports eventually on line as the result of new federal laws that, in fact, will be setting some kind of benchmarks comparing community college, four-year public institutions, four-year private institutions and, yes, even for-profit institutions and it was a very useful report. In terms of the extended funding report presented by Graduate Dean Bose, the university now receives 60 million dollars in total external funding which is a 20% increase from last year. That was all broken down by individual colleges or units and he seemed very pleased as did the Board of Trustees with the number of grants received and, indeed, those are broken down by federal agency as well as state awards and even those from corporate donors and that was the efficient meeting. There will be a more formal written report from Buck Stephen hopefully later. If not, I’ll do it. Any questions? I may be able to answer questions you may have about the meeting. Thank you.

P. MacFarland: How many students transferred from the Gulf area. How are they getting put in classes or are we involved in that or will they just be added into the classroom?
F. Bryan: The one example that I can speak to was literally an advisor from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences office came to the department with the student and I mean, this was done hands-on and this was only the one example. I don’t know how many other examples but there were some numbers that were at least discussed but I only know that one example. Gretchen, yes?

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes Ferald, I had a student call me this morning who was a – evidently they’re signed up as visiting students and he is being added into my class through a late schedule update and they go over to Registration and Records and get that form and then the instructor signs off, they get the department to sign off on it as well and then, of course, they’re responsible for catching up with whatever work – he contacted me directly and he said, you know, he had talked to Registration and Records and he knew about the late schedule update and so he had already started the process, being a visiting student and he was going through that and he’s going to see me tomorrow about getting signed off on the class.

F. Bryan: This is only the second one I’ve heard of and this was obviously handled differently than the other one because, as I said, I think this was a representative – literally an advisor from our college office – who brought the student over to our department and this is now a second student who obviously had been advised about late schedule update procedures. I don’t think there are going to be very many of these but at the same time I think Ivan Legg and John Peters wanted to, you know, wanted to make a gesture but they also knew there certainly were a lot of students effected by this and if they were natives of the state of Illinois, they certainly wanted to demonstrate to the Board of Trustees their willingness to try to be helpful.

P. MacFarland: Is it possible to get word out to faculty that this may be happening. I have grad students who teach for me and one got a call this morning from a student saying that she’d been added to a class, she was in her class now and she’d be turning up today. It was added without the student knowing or – you know, I think it’s fine – it was just a bit of a surprise.

F. Bryan: I know I received an e-mail letter from Ivan Legg indicating that this was possible; that this was an option and if you didn’t receive it, I’m not sure why but I know it seemed to me it was addressed to the university community and, as I say, I know of at least two examples and you’re now the third I’ve heard of.

P. Stoddard: I will bring it up with the Provost tomorrow when I meet with him.

F. Bryan: You might ask him – he sent this letter out just a few days ago I think – following this meeting and if it didn’t go to all the faculty, there may have been a glitch in e-mail and in Groupwise I think in particular. This was an e-mail from Ivan Legg basically saying this.

P. MacFarland: I saw it but just how is the process working is what I wanted ---

F. Bryan: They did not specify that.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions for Ferald?
P. Stoddard: Next is a report on BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee by me. You have a walk-in item. Again, this committee met September 1. They did also acknowledge the problems in Louisiana as was appropriate. On their agenda they had a lot of approval of various budgets. Those are listed for you in items 1 and 2, budgets and other action items. This is all pretty boilerplate stuff. The capital budget is the same that it’s been for the last several years because there’s been no money to do any capital projects and so we submit list year after year and should any money become available, the Stevens’ renovation would be first on the list and then the Computer Science and Technology Center and electrical infrastructure in Wirtz Hall — those are two different projects and they’re considered equal on the list. We also had approval of the non-appropriated budget. This is money not from the state but from bond sales and other things on campus and this is money that then goes in to bond supported facilities which are non-academic facilities so parking lots, dormitories, the student center, in other years the Convocation Center and so forth would be paid for out of these types of monies. Approved was also federal money for remodeling the Monsanto property which will be the Family Health, Wellness and Literacy Center — it’s literate — and for the west campus roads project, that’s our little slice of the transportation bill, courtesy of the Speaker of the House. We also approved two collective bargaining agreements covering about 57 employees on campus.

Out of the routine, Jim Phillips, the Athletic Director, announced that Huskie Sports can now be heard on WSER, AM670 out of Chicago. We’ll have all our football games and twenty of the men’s basketball games will be covered so if you’re traveling around the Midwest — I think they’re a bit optimistic in their projection of reaching 38 states but, if the atmosphere is right, you might be able to — you can pick them up. More importantly, NIU will get great exposure regionally from this. There’ll be pre-game shows, post-game shows and all sorts of changes to highlight NIU on these broadcasts.

Fourth, an issue that has been around for a little while now has been the student services software system. This is what used to be known as PeopleSoft. We were all set to go with PeopleSoft for the student services and that would have been the third and last piece of the PeopleSoft packages. But then Oracle got in the way and staged a hostile takeover of PeopleSoft and that threw everything up in the air. The university now feels that it’s within a month or two of completing negotiations to actually bring a new system on line. They are talking both with Oracle and apparently one other vendor trying to get the best deal they can for the university, keeping in mind all their constraints about compatibility with the existing structure and so forth. Like I say, this could be completed within a month or two and I think everything would be up and on line by next fall if all goes according to plan. That is of particular interest because when this was originally going to happen, it was thought that that would be a good time to look at changing the grading system. Right now, we use A, B, C, D, and F and a lot of people at that time felt that having a bit more flexibility in grades of some nature, and the nature was not determined at that time, would be important and that the change in students’ software systems would be an opportune moment to introduce a change in the grading system. I’m not sure if this is a one-time shot at it now. If was felt that before it was kind of a one-time shot — when we put the new system in let’s get the grades and that’s the only time we have to do it. They may be more
flexible today since is several years later or they may not. So, this is something I think we want
to consider. I know the University Council has a committee that’s going to be taking a look at
this, specifically; I don’t know if the Faculty Senate specifically wants to address the grade
change. Obviously the students will have a say in that but, if so, you want to keep that in mind
and you want to keep in mind what sort of grades the faculty might want to recommend. Things
that were talked about are an A/B, B/C, and C/D to add to the A, B, C, D, and F. Also, of course,
pluses and minuses – that got into a little bit of a discussion way back when as to what we should
do with an A+. Should we have one? Would that mean that an A is no longer a 4.0? How
would that affect our students and so forth. Also, it wasn’t quite so straight forward but the sense
was that more flexibility would be desirable. So some sort of additional grades besides just the
straight A, B, and C’s. Anyway, give some thought to that. That’s something that looks like will
come back and present another opportunity for us.

Finally, an information item, tying up what went on last year was public act 94-0004, which was
the pension legislation. In brief, issues related to SURS, the state university retirement system –
that’s us – some of the changes that people were worried about did not come to pass so there will
be no change in cost of living investments and there will be no change in the minimal age
requirements to received full pension benefits so that was a little bit of good news. Bad news for
new hires is that the money purchase option was eliminated for employees hired on or after July
1, 2005. So money purchase is alternative calculation depending on how much money you’ve
actually paid into the system and generally, for faculty, that meant they could retire a few years
earlier than they would have under the general formula so, I guess that the idea is for people who
are only 25, it doesn’t matter to them rather they retire at 57 or 62 until they get to be 56 but
that’s far down the road. The effective rate of interest calculation is something that would affect
current employees as well as future employees and that’s essentially the rate of return that SURS
can calculate for their investments and the state decided that if the comptroller’s office did this
rather than SURS, the numbers would come back more favorable to the state, i.e., not as big.
Well, the comptroller has completed his first calculation and apparently came out with exactly
the same number that SURS did, there being very strict rules as to how this can be calculated.
But according to Steve Cunningham, that could change if we got a new state comptroller at some
point in the future. So, something to keep an eye out for.

Perhaps of most concern is that the state will under fund SURS by a total of – well, this year and
next year – or next year and the year after, I’m sorry, by a total of 378 million dollars which is
about 47.5% so they should be paying almost twice that into the pension system. They decided
they couldn’t afford it and took a pension holiday, though gradually – so they say – they will
increase the amount of funding until they reach full funding again in FY11. So, deficit spending
reigns supreme still.

Finally, universities will be responsible for increased annuities resulting in raises over 6% during
the high four-year period. So, as you may or may not be aware, your annuity amount – the
amount you get when you retire – is determined by your highest four consecutive years of salary.
If you get greater than a 6% raise during that, the university is responsible for any additional
annuities that you would get. So if you got a 10% raise, the university would be responsible for
the additional benefits calculated because of that extra 4% so you, as an annuitant, would still get
all the benefits you normally would, but now the university is paying for it out of its budget
rather than the state paying for it and that would, no doubt, lead to some downward pressure from the university not to grant great raises. Now, I don’t think too many of us really worry about getting greater than a 6% raise in any given year, however, as it stands now, if you are to start teaching summer classes in the presumably last four years and you hadn’t been doing so before, that could be, you know, a 10 or 12% raise just by virtue of the fact that you’re teaching and getting paid for an extra month or however much. That would be included. Steve Cunningham and human resources is working to fight that. It’s not clear so far rather that will be successful. So, if you got a promotion, that money would also count towards a raise so there are instances when this will hurt. Apparently, there cases in other systems where this really was being abused – where folks in the last four years were getting 20 or 25% raises just to boost up their benefits so it probably was a needed reform, however, it won’t be without negative effects for us.

So, that’s all I have. Yes, Pam?

**P. MacFarland:** So it’s 6% over four years?

**P. Stoddard:** 6% over a year for each of those four. Other questions? Okay.

**D. Bone:** BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – [report](#) – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** Next up is a report from the Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee by Donna Smith and Shey Lowman and I believe Donna is giving the report today.

**D. Smith:** ??? on the legislation that was available at the General Assembly website so I’m just going to touch on some of the things that were mentioned at the meeting on August 19 that Shey and I attended. First of all, Ken Zehnder reported that the accomplishments in Springfield this year were the bills that did not pass, specifically House Bill 476 which was the naming rights bill. This was of concern especially to the Foundation that they would not be able to name buildings to people who gave 20 million dollars and such so they are very happy this did not pass. He thought there might be some effort at a later time to push this through however, it did not get out of the Senate at this point.

Next was Senate Bill 131 which amends the Public/Community College Act. This would provide for an area community college to be able to offer a baccalaureate program and that was referred to Rules and Ken does not expect to see this bill resurrected.

Other items Mr. Zehnder reported on were House Bill 715 which was an amendment to the election code requiring each public university and college in Illinois to ask their students who are Illinois registered voters if they wish to change their voter registration address. There was some concern that this would be a financial obligation that the university would have to provide actual paper forms but they are able to do that electronically and Northern Illinois University is complying with this legislation. House Bill 873 amends the Ticket Scalping Act and provides that the Act does not prohibit a ticket holder from selling a ticket for admission to a variety of
games and amusements and obviously, this was positive and the NIU Athletics and Convocation Center areas have supported this. House Bill 2515 amends the Board of Higher Ed Act and requires the Board to implement and administer a state-wide program to assist students, advisors, faculty, and administrators to obtain consistent information about transfer courses and to provide that kind of information to students who might be wanting to transfer. NIU and UIC are already complying with this legislation. Senate Bill 445 creates a Social Security Number Limited Use Act. Overall, it just prohibits the use of Social Security Numbers to identify students in general. This was effective immediately and NIU is compliant.

Ken Zehnder made note of four other bills that were signed by the governor. Just real quickly, House Bill 815 known as the Higher Education Student Assistance Act and House Bill 3724. Both of these deal with either veterans or students who are in active military service to be able to complete their education. Senate Bill 1857 and that’s the Open Meetings Act. Senate Bill 2091 and that’s the Department of Public Health Powers and Duties Laws – I’ll let you all read through those at your leisure later.

One more bill of note is the House Bill 1384 which amends to state university’s Article of the Illinois Pension Code to direct the system to conduct a dividend Medicare coverage referendum open to employees continuously employed by the university since March 31, of 1986. Ken Zehnder reported that there were no vetoes or mandatory vetoes expected in the fall veto session that could affect the university. Kathy Buettner also thanked Senate President Emil Jones for recognizing the C.H.A.N.C.E. program here at NIU and the efforts that they do on behalf of a lot of our students. There was an additional $700,000 allocation to NIU specifically for the C.H.A.N.C.E. program.

The next item was that Steve Cunningham made a report on Public Act 94-0004 which Paul summarized in detail in his report so I won’t go into that.

Ken Davidson reported on the Office of Executive Inspector General and that there will be 2005 Ethics Training forthcoming for all of us who are employed by the university and the Board of Trustees so be looking forward to that.

The 2005 Federal Legislative Report was given by Kathy Buettner. She reported on the Federal Transportation Equity Act Reauthorization which Paul touched on that gave the university a 3.2 million dollars in Federal Transportation funds. This will be used on the west campus to provide roads and thoroughfares. She also noted that the House maintained the funding levels for the fourth year in a row for a variety of grants and programs. She said the TRIO and ??? programs were restored at last year’s level. The Senate funded no increase in the PAL maximum award and the program was level funded at 40/50. She also noted that there is a move in response to negative media attention regarding tax exempt sectors and Congress may draft new tax laws that impact donors to the Foundation as well as anybody receiving a tuition waiver. In addition, she gave a report on the Higher Education Authorization Update and they continue to work on that act and Kathy Buettner and the President continue to work with Congress on the effects it would have on universities.
Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences, Shirley Richmond, reported on the status of the new Family Health, Wellness, and Literacy Center to be house at the new NIU Monsanto facility on Sycamore Road.

John Lewis, Associate Vice President of University Outreach, reported on the status of the NIU Institute for Neutron Therapy at FermiLab.

Sharon Dowen, the Director of NIU Internal Audit, gave a general report on her department.

I will try to answer your questions although a lot of this is Greek to me.

**S. Lowman:** If it’s okay, I’d like to say something going back to Donna’s report on House Bill 1384. This is one of the very few things that will actually impact this campus because SURS is going to conduct this referendum to allow people to opt into Medicare if you were employed before March 31, 1986 since if you were employed after, you’re already paying Medicare so it’s going to be a one-time chance to opt in and I think sometime in the next month or so, eligible employees will be receiving materials from SURS and need to understand this. You still have to pay in for 10 years or 40 quarters in order to qualify for Medicare but I think in the end it’s actually a benefit to have both Medicare and the State provided health care so just a head’s up.

**P. Stoddard:** Any questions for Shey or Donna? Okay, well thank you very much.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report

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

**P. Stoddard:** I will not have a BOT report at this time, so are there any questions or comments from the floor? How about any of the people here instead of just the floor? The floor never says anything – you walk all over it all the time. If there are no questions or comments, there are listed for you several information items, minutes of various committees on campus. Those are all accessible through our web page.

**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. 2004-2005 Annual Report, Faculty Personnel Advisor (Page 17-18)
K. 2005-2006 Meeting Schedule (Page 19)
XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Finally, I’ll entertain any motion for adjournment that might come up. So moved, second? All in favor, get up and go. We are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.