FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2007, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Happy New Year everybody. Welcome back to another fun-filled semester. You’re at the Faculty Senate.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business of course is the adoption of the agenda which is in front of you. I believe we have one item to add under New Business. Dr. Kempton, if you would elaborate on that a little bit. Just say what it is and we’ll get to it.

D. Kempton: Okay, the issue deals with an ad hoc university committee on which there is no faculty representation and since it’s met four or five years consistently and seems to have a growing role, I wanted to raise it as to whether there should be faculty representation.

P. Stoddard: This is an admissions ---

D. Kempton: Ad hoc Committee on Managing Enrollments I believe it’s called.

P. Stoddard: Okay, so that will be item “A” under New Business. Any other additions, deletions, corrections? All right, all in favor of adopting the agenda as amended say aye. Opposed? For the record, Dr. Giles moved that and Dr. Gallagher seconded post facto.

The agenda was approved as amended.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 29, 2006 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-6)

P. Stoddard: Okay, next up is approval of the minutes from last meeting back in November. Have I got a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, thank you. The usual suspects move and approve, move and second. Any corrections or additions, etc. for the minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed? We’ve got minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a guest today who just showed up and disappeared – did he come in? Steve are you --- all right.

In the meantime, the Task Force on Strategic Planning has met a couple of times since the last time we met. I unfortunately, missed one of those meetings. That was the December meeting. Basically what they did there was they took the results of all the interviews – they’d interviewed about fifty-five people on campus – that would be the Task Force members and then members of the President’s Cabinet I believe and a few others, and they essentially took all the information they got from those interviews, tried to boil it down into eight to ten to fifteen individual points. They discussed these points; they tried to distill that into a over-reaching or over-arching I guess, perhaps over-reaching, mission statement for the university. They came up with about two or three of these. They came up with specific goals and then they sort of put all that together. Then this last week, we had what they call a round table meeting. This is with the Task Force and again, that’s about forty-five people and another fifty or sixty people from around the university community to discuss those ideas. We had a dinner meeting over at the Pheasant Room which is not quite big enough to hold 105 people. They just sort of summed up a bit more elaborately what I just summed up for you and then the next day, that was Friday, last Friday, we had three groups of about thirty-five people each, meeting to discuss those individual mission statements and goals in greater detail. Each group came up with its own recommendations. The facilitators were then going to go back and then sort of again put that into a coherent set of talking or discussion points and then the Task Force has its next meeting on next Tuesday and we’ll discuss the results of those round table meetings. This is where we’re beginning to get into how much of a teaching institution is this, how much of a research institution is this, how much of a public service institution is this and so forth. We’re beginning to lay out what the real fundamental priorities for Northern should be. We’re talking about what makes Northern unique. How we can sell Northern as a unique place to come and so forth. So that’s kind of where we’re going.

There are other people in the room who were at these meetings. If they have anything they’d like to add, I’d love to get other peoples’ impressions as to what went on in front of this body as well. So if anybody’s got any additions or questions about any of that, now is a good time to bring them up.

D. Swanson: Thanks. I just want to reinforce what you were just saying and to say that I think that at least in the round table group that I was in, part of what we were able to accomplish was to move away from the either/or competitive model of it’s either a teaching or it’s a research
university and to talk more about how these two can be, you know, synergistic and that we don’t have to approach it as a kind of competition which I think is probably for me the single most important and successful aspect of the that round table and I think that was a very positive development.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, we actually reached sort of a similar conclusion in my group as well. We’re not in the same, right?

**D. Swanson:** No, we weren’t.

**P. Stoddard:** Good. Brigid and then Jan.

**B. Lusk:** Just to include what was going on in my group, a lot of people were very concerned about money and resources for doing anything, all these wonderful ideas and we were told very, very firmly that the charge was to develop the strategic plan, forget about money. Some people said that seems to be going backwards but we were firmly kept on task to develop the dream and we’ll think about money – he said he’ll take our money issues to the President and the Provost.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, I think that part of what we’re doing is to help guide the capital campaign and so if we say this is where we want to be going and yes, we know there’s no money to do this or not enough, then that gives the Foundation and the President some place to go in terms of asking for money from whomever, not Springfield, but alumni and so forth. So, I think yes, I mean the money – let’s see where we want to go and see what we can do about the money later is the current thought.

**J. Holt:** I just want to add the time line. The time line that they had laid out for this was that the Strategic Planning Group would be working primarily through February and March and then in April we were going to be meeting again with the larger group and start using them, I think, as a sounding board for what we came up with before it’s presented to the university. So most of the work will be going on fairly quickly in February and March so if you have any ideas or any input it would probably be a good time to bring it to our attention.

**P. Stoddard:** Very good, right. Any other comments about Strategic Planning? Beth?

**B. Miller:** Is any of this information yet published on the web, any discussions, any outlines of the group’s ---

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t know. Do you guys have a feel for that yet? Okay, so the answer for the microphone was yes, but not the most recent stuff. The most recent stuff was Friday so it will probably take a little while to get that written up but I imagine that means the December 13 or 14 meeting, whatever day that was, should be ---

**B. Miller:** Human Resources probably.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, they’re taking charge of this but --- Dan?
**D. Kempton:** I was also in a working group too and I just want to sort of affirm and develop a little bit what Dianna was saying. I think it was a very – I went into this process very dubious whether it was going to be worth the time let alone worth doing and I really thought there was some nice thinking going on about who NIU was a trying to relate it to our own past and our own development. I mean, the argument was sort of we’re not going to be U of I; we can’t be research only and turn over the teaching to our graduate students. That’s not us. We can’t compete with liberal arts colleges and do only teaching and the sort of synergy that Dianna was talking about where we are a place where research involves our students. That’s a Carnegie call that’s out there already and it sort of takes what we’re already doing and sort of pushes us to affirm that and pushes us in the right direction. So if at least the results coming out of the working groups are what’s followed, I think it’s a much more exciting, positive process than I believe it going into Friday’s meeting. I’m just in the working group so I’m not part of the permanent planning commission.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I think that’s a fair statement. I mean, that’s what we saw as well.

**J. Holt:** I guess the three goal statements aren’t up there yet but they’ll probably be up soon but they came up with three goal statements that we really discussed and the one that seemed to be the one we were focusing on the most was using Ernest Boyer’s model of scholarship so I don’t want to state it because I don’t remember the goal statement verbatim but it mentioned the excellent use of scholarship in terms of discovering integration, application and teaching and then we had like these 18 words that when they did the interviews, that everyone had mentioned to describe NIU and the 18 words were, I think, at least 10% did they say of the people mentioned those 18 words and so that was sort of our framework. The number one was friendly, caring and nurturing but there were words that were negative as well as words that were positive.

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, I don’t know that those goal statements will survive the discussion process. They didn’t in our group so it will be an interesting session next week. But yeah, this is all a very fluid process still so just because something shows up on the website doesn’t mean that’s anything that’s going to be seen in April. Okay, seeing no other indications for discussion, I’d like to move on.

A. Steve Cunningham will discuss Pension Updates.

**P. Stoddard:** We have a guest with us. Steve Cunningham – I never get his title right, but it’s a VP, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and something else and whatever, who’s here to talk to us about pensions.

**S. Cunningham:** Good afternoon. I think you have a handout which is a copy off the SURS website that got distributed. Paul asked me to comment and sort of report on recent developments with respect to the SURS system and, as you know from listening and reading updates and listening to the media, there have been a lot of events in relation to the SURS in recent years. I’ll briefly, perhaps by way of context, go back to 2005 which was when Public Act 94-4 was enacted by the General Assembly. That followed an extensive deliberation process by a Governor’s Pension Commission and we attended most of those meetings. Those were interesting meetings. One thing I will tell you that was a common denominator throughout the
meetings was there may be some tough political decisions to make about benefits and taxes and funding but by all means don’t disrupt the funding plan. That was a common denominator that existed in conclusion throughout all of the Pension Commission Hearings so as we talk a little bit about the outcome since then, just keep that in mind, that that’s always been very key to anyone who has looked at the public pension system situation in the state of Illinois. As sort of a guide to go through this, and this depends on how much or how little information you want, and I’m always available if any of you have questions or want to talk about something further, please feel free to give me a call or give Deborah a call.

It started with Public Act 94-4 and that Public Act was, pardon me, was very well publicized. It appeared in the Governor’s speech, the State of the State Speech in 2005 where he focused a lot on the SERS and the outcome of that Public Act was, first of all, to eliminate the SERS Money Purchase formula for any individual employed in the SERS system after July 1, 2005. So that was a significant reduction in the competitive status of our pension system for higher education. The SERS was the only system that lost a fundamental retirement formula. The teacher system also lost the money purchase formula but that only affected about 4% of teachers whereas presently 70% of employees in higher education retire under the money purchase formula because it results in a higher benefit calculation. So that’s very significant for higher education.

The second aspect was to move the calculation of what’s called the effective rate of interest which is the amount of interest that is posted annually to employee money purchase accounts or the money purchase calculation. SERS has always, that has averaged 8% over the years for the SERS and instead of having that interest rate determined by the SERS Board, it is now determined by the state’s Comptroller’s Office and for the first year, they held it the same but currently the Comptroller’s Office has issued a rate that is a .5% less than the SERS rate and the SERS is currently 8%. It’s not a big differentiation, but obviously over time, especially if there’s a greater differentiation, that difference in rate of return will begin to affect the outcome for money purchase calculations for current employees which is an important issue. So far, it’s not a big effect.

Probably the most significant aspect of Public Act 94-4 was the curtailment of funding, basically cutting contributions to the public pension systems, especially the SERS and the SERS, the State Employee Retirement System, by approximately 50% for FY06 and the currently fiscal year, FY07. Now this after extensive testimony and deliberation by commissions, committees, economists, given the fact that Illinois has, by a significant amount, the worst aggregate pension, unfunded public pension liability problem in the United States to again pass public policy that reduced funding, was a significant issue. You know, no matter how many bonds were passed two fiscal years past which was a very good, bright strategic move but the funding reduction is not fully recovered back into the normal formula that it should be until the year 2011 and so at that time, the crisis in terms of the required funding on the budget will even be greater than it would have been otherwise and so it’s a deferred issue; something that will have to be dealt with approximately FY11, around 2010.

Finally, this is something we’re going to talk about more today, is the public act created new employer liabilities for pension contributions directly to the universities for general formula retirements, for any year in that high four-year average, that’s the baseline for the general
formula, where the total increments for the year are over 6%. If they’re over 6%, then at the time of retirement, an actuarial calculation is made with the present value of those differences and that’s billed to the employer. Of course, that calculation will differ for a person that retires depending on their age, depending upon the amount of their annuity, their years of service; several factors play into that but these bills will be significant. We’ve not received one yet.

We’re going to talk more about the billing process in a few minutes but that was another aspect of Public Act 94-4 and there were other provisions about limitations on new benefits without dedicated funding plans and so forth. So, 94-4 was sort of the baseline. There were no exceptions to this 6% and, for example, FTE changes, promotions, things like that. A lot of things happen in an employee’s service that can cause total increases to go beyond 6%. That’s merit increases, across the board increases, promotions in rank, PRPs, PTPs, overloads, summer appointments, all of that would have factored into these FTE changes into the 6% calculations.

So last legislative session last spring, we in higher education worked very hard to attempt to implement some exceptions to the 6% rule and most of those are – what was attained resulted in Public Act 94-1057 and basically those exceptions are as follows and they’re all on your sheet which came off the SURS website.

First of all, earnings are measured on a full-time equivalent basis. So if an employee went from 50% to 100% which happens a lot, not so much with regular faculty but it does with other types of employees, then that would not be considered a spike in earnings for which the 6% billing would apply. We had already established that money purchase retirements were exempt from the billing and the reason for that is that the high four-year average is not an applicable concept to money purchase retirements. It doesn’t matter what the high four-year average is; it’s simply the total amount of earnings in an employee’s retirement account divided by an annuity factor which is based on their age at retirement. Vacation payouts were exempted as well as certain components of collective bargaining agreements. Then with 1057 we also were able to bring in sort of a statute of limitations so if there are earning spikes more than ten years that are in that high four-year average and this is rare but it does happen, more than ten years from the date of retirement eligibility, then those are exempt. Importantly, overloads were exempted. Originally, summer employment, academic overloads, none of that was exempt from the 6% test and this treats summer contracts and overloads specifically related to instruction. So currently, for example, summer research appointments are not exempted but anything that we can contribute to instruction is so we’re going to be working with the Provost Office to implement fairly detailed documentation procedures when we process overloads and summer appointments so that we have that necessary documentation in the system so that when we get a bill, we will then be able to document our exceptions to the bill and that’s the way it will work. We’ll get a bill from the SURS. If we thing exceptions apply we’ll document those back to the SURS. They will actually make a final decision and then we have to pay the bill. Overtime – this is only hourly employees – was exempted and promotions, two types of promotions. Promotions in academic rank and promotionable service promotions, classification promotions. Those two types of promotions were exempted. For example, title changes for supportive professional staff or lateral transfers in civil service are not exempted and certain other exemptions for collective bargaining which quite frankly have very little applicability given the dates that were put into the Public Act that they are effective for.
That’s sort of a very quick synopsize. The bottom line is we’re going to need to organize ourselves; all of the universities are to try to avoid earning spikes for any employees. It’s going to be important and we’ve talked about this with all of the deans and other administrators that – university officials aren’t going to try to guess if an employee is close to retirement. That’s not what anyone should be doing or if an employee is going to be money purchase or if they’re going to be general formula; that’s not the correct way to approach this. Instead, we’re going to organize ourselves and implement policies that maximize our opportunities to take advantage of these exemptions and knowing that we’ll have to start building some of these obligations into our long-term funding process, just like we do the approximately 3% that we contribute now to CMS for health insurance. It’s just another unfunded obligation that is being transferred to employers. This is only in the university context so we’ll be working with the Academic Affairs area to implement these procedures shortly with respect to documentation.

P. Stoddard: Any questions for Steve? Jan?

J. Holt: Just so I’m clear, if you were funded on a grant for three months in the summer, the fifth year before you retired, and then the fourth year before you retired, you could still make 6% beyond what your total twelve month salary was the year before?

S. Cunningham: There’s two good points there actually, the first one is the fifth year before you retired and then that’s a very important aspect of this. If a significant earnings increase is implemented five years before retirement, it won’t result in a bill. If it’s implemented three years before retirement, it will. So one aspect of this is to organize ourselves to do things in five-year cycles instead of four-year cycles or three-year cycles and, where possible or where appropriate, look at the timing of such things. It’s not always possible but we need to start looking at that. Thereafter, yes, anything 6% or less would not result in a bill. This has no effect on the SURS calculation of annuities by the way. This only affects billing going to the universities. But as you can see, it’s easy – let’s say like this year we have close to a 5% increment program on average. Well, that doesn’t leave much headroom for overloads or summer grant appointments and so on so those are the types of things but yes, the answer to that is 6% per year, not in total but per year.

P. Stoddard: Beth?

B. Miller: Who’s responsible for paying this money? Is it the department, the university?

S. Cunningham: That’s another good question. The university is responsible. Very few bills as this is phased in over four years – it started in FY06 – and we’re in the second year where earnings are being compared and so there’s been very few bills issued, just simply because there haven’t been that many retirements that this affects and we have not gotten a bill yet. So we’re setting up procedures to process these and the – obviously, the obligation has to be paid and no one has set aside funds at the department level to deal with these. We are going to account for the billings by college, by department, by division so we know what transactions are resulting in the billings but there have been no decisions made at this point in time in terms of any direct obligations down to departments.
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B. Miller: To clarify, when you say account for, does that mean that then possibly department chairs or deans might feel some pressure?

S. Cunningham: I guess the – I think the whole system is going to feel a little bit of pressure about this and it doesn’t mean that we’re going to work at the department level – so and so retired and that resulted in x amount of dollars being billed to the university – but we will be working at least at the college and divisional level on that, just to watch it and monitor it.

B. Miller: Let me be not so obscure, the issue here as I’m seeing it is it’s potentially a risk that a department chair might chose not to give somebody a raise because they don’t want to be in the position of having then to pay later or account for a bill or to try to keep it under even if they qualify or should qualify for a raise.

S. Cunningham: That is the most, probably the most serious public policy conflict that’s created by this statute. It does because individual circumstances vary, it does create a situation where that’s a factor and hence our efforts to get as many exclusions as possible. I think the answer to that is probably three-fold. First of all, here at Northern we’re going to make every effort to avoid that type of thought process. If the transaction is appropriate and should be implemented, then implement it in such a way as to minimize the probability of getting a bill whenever the person is going to retire. We don’t know when someone is going to retire; we don’t want to start guessing about when a person is going to retire and that’s going to be a principle, a standard that I think we have a consensus on. Another aspect of that is generalizing the documentation billing process. There’ll be procedures to follow for any transaction, it doesn’t matter if it’s a new employee or a thirty year employee to respect to how things are documented and approved and once approved, then you know, if the SURS bill comes, that’s just something the university will have to deal with and the third thing is, I do think over time once this is fully implemented four years out, that the average annual obligation will probably vary quite a bit but it will also average out and we’ll know what it means to us, whether it’s 1% of payroll or 1.5% of payroll. I doubt that it will be 3% of payroll which is what we’re currently paying for CMS insurance so it will average out as an institutional cost and we have yet to work with how we handle that in internally. We’ll be doing that.

P. Stoddard: Buck?

J. Stephen: It seems to me that one of the big wild cards here is the sporadic grant producer. Isn’t that something that can be put under fringe benefits?

S. Cunningham: We’re working with Rathindra Bose and his office on that now.

J. Stephen: Then I have a follow-up, if that is something you can do with fringe benefits is there any way you can keep the money year-to-year to cover upcoming obligations or do you have to dump your accounts every July 1.

S. Cunningham: We’ll have to work on the carry-over aspect that has yet – none of the universities I will tell you have quite figured that out yet. We’re still talking about it and working on how to handle that if we can even do it. It’s hard as you have indicated, it’s difficult
to do especially when a long period of time elapses and, you know, this crosses a number of different transactions.

**J. Stephen:** Yeah, if they find money in your checkbook they’re going to want it.

**S. Cunningham:** Exactly.

**P. Stoddard:** Nancy?

**N. Castle:** From time to time faculty will get a salary compression thing, some faculty will. This would then have to be outside of four years or – I mean, it almost seems unfair that if there’s a faculty person who’s eligible for a salary compression adjustment to be competitive that then it’s going to turn around and hurt them later on.

**S. Cunningham:** Good point. In terms of annual increment procedures like compression adjustments if that’s part of the increment guideline for the college and the Division of Academic Affairs, then those must be processed independent of assumptions about employees’ age, their plans to retire, their length of service, whether or not they might be money purchase or general formula; there are just too many variables and that’s a standard that we will be adopting institutionally. If we have, for example, compression programs and so forth, you know, whenever we can we want to look at longer term cycles of – to smooth out the spikes but as we know, our increment guidelines are so driven, well, not anymore, but they used to be driven by appropriations; now they’re driven by just our capacity to reallocate but that is important that increment guidelines which are annual in nature be administered independently of these billings. That’s very important. Yes?

**J. Giles:** Jim Giles and I’m either the most interested or disinterested person in the room because I’m retiring in May and I’ve already cut my deal but I was wondering will this 6% thing effect the tradition at Northern of say extra summer teaching the year you go out either would that make that less possible from the college perspective or even less desirable from the point of view of the individual?

**S. Cunningham:** There should be no effect on the individual retiree because this program has no – it doesn’t apply to the retirement calculations. It’s completely independent of that fortunately. If it’s summer teaching, and that’s a broad term, credit, non-credit and there are as you know far better than I do, there are a lot of aspects of teaching. We’re going to have to become very good at documenting those when we implement the transactions. But if it’s a teaching assignment, then that is exempt from this rule and shouldn’t be a factor at all.

**J. Stephen:** But only until 2011.

**S. Cunningham:** Good point and I should have said that. All these exemptions do sunset interestingly at the same time that the funding plan is re-established. All this vectors together, it’s going to be a crisis whether it’s by design or default and these would have to be re-authorized as of 2011. That’s correct.
P. Stoddard: Just for clarity, now this only applies to non-money purchase people and as you said, most faculty are money purchase, at least most current faculty are money purchase so I’m guessing most of the people in this room and most of the people that we represent are not going to be effected by this. This is really talking about the new people coming in who don’t have the money purchase option?

S. Cunningham: On average yes, 70% of employees would include faculty are currently retiring under the money purchase formula. Over a long period of time because it’s not a formula available to new employees, then that number will decline, especially if the interest rate differential between what the Comptroller authorizes versus SURS should also increase which hasn’t been a big factor yet. I might mention something a little bit unrelated that I know a lot of people have been speculating about about the money purchase formula. The SURS every five years, they undertake an actuarial review and they look at all of their assumptions, they look at their experience, their fund performance, the life span of retirees, the number of retirements, economic assumptions, all of these things are taken into account and one outcome of that is every five years they revise the money purchase table so they update it with current actuarial assumptions and over the last few updates anyway, the changes have not been significant to the table. Slightly negative last time, but not enough to make really any difference with respect to employee retirement plans. There has, however, been a lot of speculation about what’s going to happen to the table, the new table, which will come out this July and the SURS last week posted the new table on the website; it’s available in the SURS estimator, in fact, I believe they have the capacity to let an employee compare so that if an employee wanted to retire and they were money purchase prior to July 1 and look at what it would be after July 1, they can do that. That’s a great thing SURS has done; SURS has never done that before. From what I’ve learned from the SURS and also our staff have looked at the table and made some test calculations, it does not appear that the changes are very significant. Not enough so again, to affect employee retirement planning. In other words, I need to retire on money purchase prior to July 1 and get out under the current table before this new table becomes effective. That does not appear to be an issue that should affect employee retirements. Certainly, it won’t result in a differential that would not be made up for in the first 3% cost of living adjustment that would be made under the SURS program. So, that’s the way it looks now and that’s also what SURS is saying so I know there’s been some concern about that so I thought I might mention that while we’re talking about money purchase.

K. Thu: Kendall Thu, Anthropology. One of the issues before us is to consider annual salary increases either as increment across the board to meet of living adjustment standards or whether to take a part of our salary increase up to COLA and then divide the rest of it based on merit. Given this policy, how would our decision about taking one of those strategies for salary increases be effected by this policy?

S. Cunningham: Well, that’s a good question. I think initially it won’t be affected by this policy. Should we ever enter an environment where we’re looking at increases beyond 6% again, obviously we’ll have to think about what this is potentially going to generate in terms of SURS liabilities but I don’t see that happening anytime soon and I think that the annual increment planning is going to continue independent of the billing process. Again, eventually the billing liabilities will simply kind of become averaged in to our cost of operations and it’s
unfortunate really that we have to assume yet another unfunded liability. It’s, you know, a refrain we hear every year; there’s a new one of some sort. I don’t see a big effect on any of our guidelines.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions about the pension? Want to say a couple of words about what you just showed me?

**S. Cunningham:** Sure and we will continue – President Peters has asked that we continue working pretty diligently at the state level on the retirement funding situation especially and we’ll be doing that. It’s not an issue that’s going to go away. The fortunate thing for us as employees and participants in the system is that the language in the Constitution is very strong. In fact, Illinois is sort of a dichotomy because the funding crisis is very large comparatively in the United States and our Constitutional protection and benefits language is also comparatively strong so that’s a – maybe that gave, you know, law makers over the years confidence that they could cut funding and not affect benefits but whatever the case is, that language is fairly strong so for current employees my opinion is that it is unlikely there’ll be a cut in benefits other than future benefits at some point in time, not benefits already accrued and that’s generally what we hear in commission, in testimony and so forth when we go to these pension meetings.

Paul asked for a ten-year synopsis of increments applicable to faculty and I wasn’t able to get this to you before the meeting. I apologize for that. So we put together a summary which I’ll send to Paul electronically so he has it of what the fiscal year increments were for faculty over a ten-year time period and we factored in the components of the increments. Promotional increases are not really part of the increment but we do consider those when we look at total changes to the base and for faculty those average between 25% and 33% every year; it varies some just depending on the nature of how many people were promoted and so on. So I just put in .25 for every year and in Illinois – the Illinois used to be called the EFIS, Economic and Fiscal Commission, has a summary of the cost of living changes for the state which I will also give to Paul. I see you have, it looks like the United States cost of living already and they’re similar but a little bit different. So you’ll have that information. If you want to discuss it more let me know.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. All right, thank you.

**S. Cunningham:** Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Any last questions for Steve before we let him go? All right, well thanks very much for stopping by. Always a pleasure.

**S. Cunningham:** My pleasure too. Thank you.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Review of **procedures** of dismissal with cause – **refer to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.** (Pages 7-9)
**P. Stoddard:** Under the Consent Agenda and this may come as news to somebody. We need to – we’ve been requested by the, well various people on campus, to consider the procedures for dismissal with cause. As I’m sure most of you are aware, there have been a couple of cases recently which might end up going down this road and without referring specifically to either of those cases, the Provost would like to see this – the language currently in the By-laws is very vague and ambiguous and that’s probably intentional but the new Provost would like to see that strengthened and firmed up a bit and the thought is that either we the faculty can take the lead in trying to determine what appropriate cause is and what procedures are for dismissal of tenured faculty or we can let administrative types do that and I can’t speak for all of you but I suspect the former option is better and, as such, I would like to refer this and I’ve got a bunch of additional information to pass along to them as well so they’re not operating in a vacuum, I’d like to give this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities to take under consideration and come back to us sometime this semester with a recommendation. Can I have a motion to that effect? Giles made the motion; Gallagher seconded. Sure we can discuss it a little bit.

**J. Stephen:** ??? is not to take a look at the procedure per se but more closely what an adequate cause for dismissal is?

**P. Stoddard:** I would say basically both; the procedure and/or cause.

**J. Stephen:** 7.313 doesn’t really define what adequate cause is very well.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, like I say the whole thing is very vague and, you know, I can understand why that might be desirable but on the other hand, I can also – and Rights and Responsibilities might decide that they want to leave it vague but I think it’s something that we as a faculty probably have a strong stake in looking at carefully before other people do for us. Any other questions about this? All in favor of referring to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities say aye. Oh, I’m sorry, Beth?

**B. Miller:** I have a question. How does this affect the cases that are now being ---

**P. Stoddard:** This – it really should not. We shouldn’t be deciding this based on things that are actually happening right now.

**B. Miller:** It does not have any bearing on ---

**P. Stoddard:** I think that would be the safest way to approach this.

**J. Stephen:** We have to follow the present 7.2 and 7.3 for the present cases.

**B. Miller:** Okay, just clarifying.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, any other clarification? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, thank you. The motion passed.
VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

**P. Stoddard:** Next up are reports from standing committees. I don’t know if we have any but let’s see what we’ve got.

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** Academic Affairs? No report. Okay.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair – no report

**P. Stoddard:** Economic Status – nothing at this time.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Resource, Space, and Budget – nothing. Boy, it’s amazing what a break will do for you.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Janet Holt, Chair – no report.

**P. Stoddard:** Faculty Rights and Responsibilities? Don’t want to call a meeting or anything? Okay.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Rules and Governance and Elections. We don’t have any. All right, see how quickly this can go?

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Earl Hansen, Chair – no report

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Salary increments (Page 10)

**P. Stoddard:** All right, this brings to Unfinished Business and this is what Steve started to touch on and Kendall brought up. These are salary increments and I’ve go the chart here so you can all see it. Yeah, Steve just gave this to me two minutes ago so obviously we haven’t had a chance to get this out to everybody but this shows the last ten years, the increments and then I guess regional, Northern Illinois cost of living increases over that same time period. Now, we wanted this in order to better able – to be able to discuss better the merit of doing an across the board increment, to match cost of living and then throwing a merit increment above that or if we wanted to reapportion that somehow and whatever. Since we don’t all have this in front of us, I’m thinking it might be more appropriate to bring this up in February. Cason? If you use a microphone we’d be highly – are you sure you want to do this?
C. Snow: Sorry about that. I move that we table this until the February and that we have ---

P. Stoddard: Postpone.

C. Snow: Postpone, not table – postpone. It’s been many years since model UN, sorry.

P. Stoddard: All right we have a motion and a second to postpone. That doesn’t take any discussion. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, so we will get this to you with the next packet and discuss it at that time. In which case this is going to be a very quick – well, not that quick. Quick enough.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Managing Enrollment

P. Stoddard: Under New Business then we have Dr. Kempton.

D. Kempton: This really comes out of a faculty meeting that took place among some of the faculty that are in the working groups for the Planning Commission and we got to talking about the enrollment, or I should say the admission standards and how they effect enrollments per year and a number of faculty expressed concern that not all of the issues about how to admit as students go through APASC, that there is another committee that has emerged and developed and I’m not suggesting necessarily there’s anything nefarious here; it sounds like it was a natural development. I’ve heard anywhere from three to five years ago then Provost Ivan Legg created the ad hoc Commission on Enrollment Planning or Enrollment Management, I’m sorry, and that has met at least once a year ever since then, sometimes two or three times a year which is fine but if it is three years or maybe even five years old, that no longer becomes an ad hoc committee and if serious issues about enrollment are being discussed some of the faculty thought there ought to be faculty representation on it. So after that meeting, I did go and meet with a couple of people who are members of that committee to try to figure this out and from what I was able to gather there are indeed some serious issues faculty ought to be involved on discussed at those meetings. Such issues as after we reach a certain bar of admissions, 80% or so, do we want to hold the last 20% of seats for students with ACTs or do we want to admit them by major and where the areas of greatest needs are so there’s some tactical enrollment decisions that really do have some academic implications. So I guess hearing all of this, my thought is that we’re not ready for resolution but maybe if the Senate were to make an inquiry since we have a new Provost coming in saying if this is indeed going to be a permanent part of the enrollment management process, we would like you to consider adding some sort of faculty representation. He may respond to us and say well, no under my tenure it’s not going to be permanent or it’s not going to be an important part of the process. I mean, there’s any number of acceptable answers but I do think after three to five years it is now part of the process and some sort of inquiry because shared governance for me at least would suggest or necessitate there ought to be some faculty representation on it if it is permanent and if it is going to be making these sorts of decisions.

P. Stoddard: Buck?
**J. Stephen:** I think at this point Daniel’s suggestion that we find out Provost Alden’s intentions here are is a good idea. Another thing I think I’d like you to address with Provost Alden is what he feels about continuing the Provost’s role in making exceptions to admission policies. The highest year I can think of, the Provost’s Office made, I think, 600+ exceptions to admissions and so I think I’d like to bundle that question in there too.

???: 600?

**J. Stephen:** I think it was 619 but I’m not positive about the “teen” part.

???: Was that based on categorization or case-by-case? You don’t know.

**J. Stephen:** I have no idea; I just too dumbfounded to ask specific questions.

**P. Stoddard:** I have a meeting scheduled with the President and Provost early next week and I can certainly raise these questions with them at that time. Dianne?

**D. Swanson:** Dianna Swanson. Should we consider at this point or have any kind of a motion to refer this matter to a committee or should we wait for further information?

**P. Stoddard:** I would suggest we chat with the President and Provost and get their feel on this. They might say oh yeah, you’re right we should get faculty on there or they may say we’re not doing this anymore so rather than light a fire here that doesn’t need to be lit yet, let’s see how cold things are.

**D. Kempton:** ??? – I would rather wait to see whether it’s resolved.

**P. Stoddard:** I will report back to the Senate next time their thinking on this.

**K. Thu:** I don’t think we want to lose the point that regardless of the answer to the question concerning the ad hoc committee that the faculty expressed an interest in being involved in the admission decisions. I mean, that’s the essential ingredient here right? So in addition to an inquiry, whatever they come up with, we want to express a desire to be involved in admission policy setting.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay.

**J. Stephen:** I think the interview in the *Northern Star* when they compared SIU to NIU and our enrollment changes made reference to ---

???: I can’t hear.

**J. Stephen:** There was a story today in the *Northern Star* about SIU’s declining enrollment and our well-managed increasing enrollment and there were some quotes in there indicating that somebody is still working on this.
P. Stoddard: Okay. Yes, Dianna?

D. Swanson: Well, in response to Kendall’s saying, you know, that faculty expressed interest I wonder if we might use a stronger word in there and express a conviction that the faculty have a very proper and important and necessary role in admissions policy and practice, however we want to state that.

P. Stoddard: I will convey that.

K. Thu: Actually, Point III in the preamble of the Constitution says “Faculty shall predominate in all policy decisions relating to the faculty personnel system, the university curriculum and policy decisions concerning admissions and academic standards”.

P. Stoddard: The faculty wish to reassert Point III of the Constitution.

D. Kempton: I guess I agree with Kendall’s and Dianna’s modifications to what I was suggesting but I really don’t think it needs to go to committee because what may come back from the Provost may be perfectly acceptable. I do think it needs to come here and we discuss it in February but I think we can trust you to carry the message forward and come back to us. Then if we’re not satisfied I think we send it to committee.

P. Stoddard: Sounds good to me. Any further discussion?

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: I don’t believe we have any reports from any of the advisory committees.

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – no report

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 Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Therefore I’ll entertain any comments or questions from the floor.
XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Seeing none, I will then entertain a motion to adjourn from Buck Stephen. Sorry, he’s fast on the adjournments. We do have a second. All in favor, get up and leave.

The motion to adjourn was made by Buck Stephen; Jim Giles seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 4:11 P.M.