I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Okay, I think we’re pretty much all here. Thank you all for coming. We’ll try to have a heated discussion here to keep us all warm.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first thing we need to do is adopt the agenda. If I can get a motion? Thank you, Jim. Thank you. Any comments on the agenda? Seeing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

Giles motioned; Gallagher seconded.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 17, 2007 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (walk-in)

P. Stoddard: You have a walk-in copy of the minutes from last meeting so if you haven’t had a chance yet, if you could take a moment to look over those and at the appropriate time if somebody would like to move to approve the minutes, that will be --- thank you Jim. Any comments or corrections on the minutes? All right. Looks like we don’t have any so all in favor of approving the minutes from January 17 say aye. All opposed? Abstentions? Okay. We have minutes. Thank you.

Giles motioned; Kempton seconded.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t think I have anything to announce so things are proceeding smoothly relatively. Not much happening. I have a meeting with the – or the Computer Facility Advisory Committee meets next week so maybe something interesting will come out of that. I think Dan’s got some input into that when we get there and that’s about it. The Task Force hasn’t done anything since we met on Strategic Planning. We’ve broken up into groups to handle specific topics like teaching, research, etc., and those groups will start meeting next week.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, nothing to consider; nothing to consent to so we’re at reports from standing committees and with that, Dr. Kempton will lead off.

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair – report

**D. Kempton:** Okay, I hope this is a relatively brief item. Last year’s Academic Affairs Committee began at the end of the year looking into the issue of personal response systems. If you don’t know, those are the “clickers” or remote systems students use to take instant quizzes in class. There are about four or five of these now on the market. ITS has said they’re willing to support one for faculty but they don’t think they can support more than one. So last year’s committee began making or collecting information as to which one to support. They concurred that we should support one. They were leaning toward a recommendation for the E-Instruction System but didn’t feel they had enough information at that time. This year’s committee tried to fill in the gaps that were pointed out to us by last year’s committee. We updated the information for the different systems, sort of concluded that all of the systems do seem to work. They are viable. Our students last year did not have a chance to input. We did badger the students a little but eventually the students did pass a motion favoring the E-Instruction System. We went back to the faculty and solicited from the personal response systems user groups at NIU adding more feedback. We did get some limited feedback and all of the feedback we did get seemed to favor the E-Instruction System. So although it was quite complex; I’m not sure I understand it, from a political perspective it was fairly clear all of the groups we consulted favored E-Instruction and toward that end we passed a resolution that we’re making as a motion to the full Senate that we recommend to ITS that they focus their support on the E-Instruction System.

**P. Stoddard:** Would that be a binding resolution or a non-binding resolution?

**D. Kempton:** That would be non-binding.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, so is that a formal motion?
D. Kempton: That is a formal motion. I think it closes the matter for us if adopted.

P. Stoddard: Is there a second for the motion? Thank you Cason. Any discussion? All right, seems like it was a fairly straight-forward choice ???.

D. Kempton: I could not answer any technical questions so I’m glad no one asked any.

P. Stoddard: All in favor of the motion say aye. Opposed? Okay, so the Senate will recommend to IT’S the adoption of E-Instruction and I think that’s the way they’re leaning anyway so everybody is on the same page.

D. Kempton: Faculty can still use another system, it just won’t have the same support.

P. Stoddard: Right and we got into some of the issues last year about why it’s very difficult to try to support two.

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

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on nothing from Economic Status.

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report. (Page 4)

P. Stoddard: Resource, Space and Budget, C. T.

C. T. Lin: ??? by the University Council chair of this committee ??? sit next to me so when you have a question, you can just simply ask her. Anyway, I’m just going to read it, you know.

We have Dr. Bose from the Graduate School and V.P. from Research who came and gave us a description about the resources, space and budget of the Graduate School in terms of research also. He said that about four years ago when he arrived, he inherited about 4.5 million dollar deficit and now by 2006-07, the Graduate School is already debt-free so that’s good news.

Because of this, last year the Graduate School was able to fund 40 – put some money into – 40 research and Artistry Grants to faculty and he would also like to increase the stipend for faculty who got the research funding. In the next two years, he’s going to increase it again because the stipend for the faculty hasn’t been changed since 1980. Then because also, you know, since the funding has become available, he would also be able to put the money into the travel fund for faculty to go to conferences and this would be shared in a 3-way match from the department, college and graduate school. For the graduate students the same thing; they will also be able to allocate certain amounts of money for the graduate students to present their research results at conferences. Furthermore, he also indicated that he was able to put some money for the library for the WebScience.

The other thing is that since last year, he initiated a program, so called ?? investment in research program that is he provides a certain amount of money to a department or unit and then, you know, wherever that unit obtains the funding, be able to use the money for the faculty to release
faculty time to write research proposal so therefore can attract the external funding and last year, you know, eight or nine proposals were submitted and six were chosen for that.

The next initiative he’s proposing is to explore doctoral programs in some departments and colleges. This is based on the assumption that, you know, if he puts into those departments or units to transform from a unit that currently has no PhD program into a PhD program based on the assumption that the PhD program can, you know, in the future attract more external funding see. So that is his next initiated program.

In summary, the Graduate School is now debt-free compared to about four years ago with a 4.5 million deficit. He is now able to provide all the different funding for the faculty, students and initiate a new program.

Anybody have any questions?

P. Stoddard: Yeah, Jay?

J. Stravers: Yeah, that’s good news but a lot of that burden has been shouldered, the dead burden, has been shouldered by overhead monies that should have gone to faculty that got major grants and those monies were taken away and I really would like to know what’s at the bottom of all this. Why did that debt develop to begin with and how did it get to be so large and why was it the faculty and the overhead monies that the faculty should have received from the major grants, why did they have to shoulder the burden for that?

C. T. Lin: Well, I really don’t know the answer to that question. Maybe ???, but in any case I think, you know, the faculty ??? because you have indirect costs and in general is channeled to the college and to the department. I don’t believe the indirect costs are a direct channel to the individual faculty. I think it never really, you know, occur like that. Because he answered quite, you know, the research – the indirect costs – in the Graduate School to balance the deficit in the past. Now you say why that deficit become so big. I don’t know. You’ve got to talk to the other previous, you know, dean of the Graduate School who retire already so we really don’t know about that. I think probably the best way would be to invite the Graduate School over here to give us a more suitable explanation or something.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I think Dean Bose did mention recently that he’s never actually been to the Faculty Senate. Somehow he didn’t get invited when he first showed up. So it might be, if the Senate likes, it might be appropriate to invite him to come and visit with us. He can answer that, or try to answer that, question and talk about one or two other things that I know he’s got going so – yes, Professor Giles.

J. Giles: Well, I can give you very tangible for example, of the cost of this. For three years the English Department had a Fulbright Program for scholars from foreign countries in American Lit and it was great. I was sort of second in charge and it was wonderful. We had scholars in American Lit from every continent except Antarctica and it was just a great experience. We lost it the fourth year because the College could only give half the funding they’d given the previous three years so we lost it to the University of Louisville. So that’s a concrete example of how,
you know, the cost of the whole thing. I also never have understood how the data ??? in the first place so ---

P. Stoddard: Would someone like to suggest we invite Dean Bose to meet with the Senate?

C. T. Lin: I move to invite Dean Bose.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have a motion and a second – you’re too late Jim, but good try. One or both of you.

R. Sims: Well, just two comments since I happen to be the Graduate Council representative here. One is my sense is that Dr. Bose would probably be more than happy to come and give whatever information so I don’t think that’s an issue. As long as I’m talking, I’ll just comment on a previous thing that, in fact, on the Research and Artistry Awards there were about forty of them approved again this year and the stipends are being increased to $4,500 from $4,000. The money to do that is actually coming out of the Graduate School Fund; it is not coming out of the university funding for that.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you.

D. Swanson: Diana Swanson from CLAS/English/Women’s Studies. Two comments. One, unfortunately – I think this is a good idea to get this cleared up – unfortunately, it’s about four years too late so we have to kind of realize that, although perhaps there’s some things to reveal about that to make sure it doesn’t happen again. Secondly, I think that a good question to keep in mind to ask is now what will be the policy in terms of research grant funds and will those, you know, overhead costs and indirect costs, etc., be redistributed in a more positive, productive way in terms of continuing to support faculty research and grant programs etc., so we don’t end up losing important accomplishments like the Fulbright Program which was really, I mean, for the humanities that was huge and quite prestigious and it was really disappointing to lose it.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? All in favor of the motion to invite Dean Bose to meet with us at some future date, say aye. Opposed? Okay, thank you. We’ll invite him to come at his convenience. Any other questions or comments on C. T.’s report? Okay, thank you C. T.

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

P. Stoddard: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. I don’t think they have anything yet.

J. Holt: I’d like to remind the committee that we have a meeting bright and early tomorrow at 8:00 to discuss the academic dismissal issue.

P. Stoddard: That will be in Altgeld Hall.

J. Holt: Yeah, I forget what room but it should have been e-mailed to you.
P. Stoddard: One of the conference rooms on the second floor. Okay.

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

P. Stoddard: Rules and Governance doesn’t have anything for us.

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

P. Stoddard: So that brings us to Elections and Legislative Oversight. They don’t have anything for us right?

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Salary Increments – see handout from Steve Cunningham

P. Stoddard: That brings us now to unfinished business and that’s this discussion of salary increments that we started with actually a couple of months ago. We were waiting for some data which has showed up in the form of a chart on page 5. This is from Steve Cunningham’s office. Steve actually brought this with him last time but, he brought it with him so he couldn’t distribute it to everybody. We have been talking about making a recommendation and this recommendation would go to UCPC actually who is the body officially charged with voicing the faculty’s opinion on how any potential increments might be divided up between merit and cost of living or across the board or however you want to describe it. They haven’t been doing that recently although I think the new Provost is pushing them to do it this year but it seems to be that this is as good a body as any to give input on that question and so we have taken it up here. Not only do we get a chance to give our input but by doing so we remind them that they need to be doing this to make sure that the faculty voice is heard in the process. To that end, we had Economic Status look at this. They recommended that any increment be across the board up to whatever the cost of living is. Anything above that could be divided up on the basis of merit. It was asked at that point how the increment actually compared to cost of living and if by adopting such a system we would be essentially eliminating the merit process in this whole overall process. So to that end, we got the table on page 5 which shows the cost of living increases, I believe this is for the Northern Illinois area. I think it’s area specific, as well as what the various increments have been and you can see the comparison there. Some years we’ve done better; some years we’ve done worse and so on.

Anyway, with that I’ll open up discussion to comments from anybody. C. T.?

C. T. Lin: Well, if I recall correctly, recently LA&S actually released a document indicating to the College Council that the average salary for the whole rank of, you know, faculty from assistant professor to full professor, our salary at this institution is relatively low compared to, you know, a comparable institution and, you know, maybe, you know, I think the Faculty Senate should address that kind of problem rather than, you know – I mean, the suggestion of the increment, that’s important, but, you know, our salary is generally lower than a comparable institution so it’s a problem that needs to be discussed or something. I don’t know.
**P. Stoddard:** Okay. I’m not sure, I mean, I agree that we can make a recommendation or say something but I know there’s only a finite amount of money but that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t make a recommendation of course. We’ve got Cason and then Jan.

**C. Snow:** If we don’t like this plan up to cost of living because we don’t make it one year or something, another idea that has been kicked around is to do kind of 50/50. Take the whole pot of money that we get; take 50% of that money and give the same amount to everyone across the board. Take the other 50% of it and then divide that up to be merit however the department determines that so there’s another option and then we don’t have to worry about saying well, if get 3% this year do it this way and if we get 4% this year, do it this way but what if we 3.5%. That wasn’t covered in the little table we made up and that would make life a lot easier.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, thank you. Jan?

**J. Holt:** First of all, I think the grand totals run for FY04 should 3.25 and secondly, I support what Cason just said with the 50/50 split rather than 3% and then the rest going to merit mainly because that gives us more opportunity for merit increases but also the point about our salaries not being as high, well wasn’t there going to be this major development drive starting in May at the end of the Strategic Planning Initiative and wouldn’t that be a really good time to push for salary adjustments.

**P. Stoddard:** Well actually, the best time would probably be before that so yes, this would be a prime time actually. That’s a good point – to address that issue. Yes?

**I. Onyuksel:** I have a concern about – my name is Ibrahim Onyuksel from Computing Science Department. I’m just looking at this table and this table is very discouraging in the following sense. According to this table, you know some faculty members, starting from FY97, every year their salaries are going down and I don’t think that’s really the feasible way. I mean, if you just look across the board increase and for many years, there’s zero and, you know, if you follow this pattern it means that some faculty members will get less money every other year. I mean, I don’t believe this is the way we should discourage certain faculty because in merit, they got low marks. You know, in some way I feel that this person gets points for across the board, should be higher than what we have here. Some people may disagree about that but if you asking all faculty in the whole university, a lot of people will say that this is really a bad idea.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, thank you. Diana?

**D. Swanson:** I just want to support what – I’m sorry, it was Ibrahim ---

**I. Onyuksel:** Yes, that’s right.

**D. Swanson:** --- was just saying. I think a point that I brought up a couple of meetings ago about this was just that given the way that merit evaluations work, somebody can be doing a perfectly satisfactory job but because everybody in the department just about is doing, you know, pretty good, you know, you can get a relatively, you know, a relatively low merit evaluation. There’s various reasons for how merit evaluation is actually assigned, assessed. You can be doing a
good job and still not keep up with the rate of inflation given the system that’s been in place; that it’s all merit and none across the board for most years.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, Dan?

**D. Kempton:** First of all, I’m surprised by the data and I’m in a sort of embarrassing position of being convinced by the facts rather than what might be conceptions and I was one of those who argued last time that if you took cost of living as the floor, in other words, everyone gets a cost of living raise, that would wipe out merit. It doesn’t quite wipe out merit; it does significantly reduce it from what it’s been in the past. Of course we have a philosophical debate about whether that’s appropriate. Two things that strike me is 1) the problem I see by using that sort of formula is everyone gets the cost of living and so many years it appears that the wages are so close to the cost of living that essentially we’re doing the same amount of work and, at least in my department, the merit evaluation process is a very time consuming, laborious effort so to decrease the meaningfulness of that I’m a little bit concerned with. I also wonder, I mean, in most of these years the amount of merit pay being left is no more than one to two to three percent in some years at the best so I do agree to some degree with the argument that most of us are, I mean, it’s not woebegone, we’re not all above average but we all may be satisfactory and therefore should be getting close to cost of living but to say everyone gets cost of living I think denies the fact that academia has a problem in that some of us, most of us, are doing all parts of our job – research, service and teaching – others are not and therefore I don’t think it’s entirely immoral or inappropriate if some people are getting less than cost of living. So I might prefer some formula that said something like 80% of cost of living everyone would receive and that would guarantee that, I think, people who are performing adequately would get it in each cost of living but some may not if they’re truly under-performing and again, that’s a harsh thing to say but that’s how I feel about it.

**P. Stoddard:** I think in general the chairs always have the right to petition for less or more on a case-by-case basis. You know, we tend to think and I think we’re probably right that most people are doing their jobs. There are a few people who probably are shirking some of their duties or just are not fulfilling all aspects of their job and, you know, the chair can always say well, so and so is not and I’d like to be able to give this person less than the normal cost of living that that person should get. I mean, that’s a possibility no matter what we agree on.

**D. Kempton:** But you make it harder if you say the norm is everybody automatically gets the cost of living than you have to point out the non-performers rather than bring them up to level.

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

**G. Barrett:** You could look at that someone who doesn’t get any merit but just gets the cost of living, they’re not getting ahead, they’re just staying where they are so even if they underperform in some way, they’re going to suffer just not as much and I’m in favor of university guaranteeing that cost of living increase.

**P. Stoddard:** Kay?
K. Chapman: I’m a bit concerned about the cost of living when you say it’s 1% across the board. It’s 1% of the person’s salary. Is there no way of equating it saying everybody gets whatever the average cost of living in DeKalb is so those very highly paid people don’t get a greater cost of living compare to someone who’s paying just the same amount in the grocery store?

P. Stoddard: That’s an interesting question. Anybody else? Any other questions or comments? Yeah?

D. Kempton: I’d just like to follow up on the response to my comment. There is a trade-off here. If you’re going to use more of the money to make sure everyone, even low performers, are getting cost of living, what you’re doing is you’re saying I’m not going to use the money focused way to keep my top performers and they’re going to get bought off by other university and you’ve got to think about the net effect of that for NIU over a period of five or ten years if you’re saying we’re not going to be able to give high raises to our top performers because we want to give a cost of living raise to all of our faculty irrespective of performance. I don’t want to be too harsh and say they shouldn’t get some cost of living, I just don’t think that that’s the best use of university resources. I think the merit system is a good one for promoting excellence.

P. Stoddard: Okay, Jeff?

J. Kowolski: Jeff Kowolski from the School of Art. Our representative, Barbara Jaffee, who couldn’t be here today presented this issue to our faculty at the last faculty meeting of the school and the strong consensus of the faculty in the School of Art was that as a general rule, they felt that all of their colleagues do a good job in the three areas of teaching and research and artistry and service and that as a result, I think it’s fair to say that the strong consensus among the people in the School of Art was that we should opt for a system that guarantees, if we have an increment large enough to pay for it, cost of living first followed by any additional increment being applied to merit. So, as one of their representatives here, I’d like to express that on their behalf. Speaking as just a faculty member who’s a member of the body as well, these discussions about some people doing a good job but just based on the process of sort of determining relative merit in the personnel process, strikes me as important to consider too however and if we’re going to give people cost of living as the basic adjustment, then perhaps we should at least think of are they coming in their merit ratings in all three categories with at least – whatever that department’s numerical rating is to indicate that they’re performing at a standard level in those three categories or something of that sort.

P. Stoddard: Thanks. John?

J. Wolfskill: With respect to my colleagues here, I believe that several of you are voicing an opinion that is in error. Our first priority should not be to inflation adjustment of COLA’s, our first priority should be in merit. The first priority in rewarding performance is exactly that; reward performance. We don’t reward students for just being there, we reward performance, so should it be for faculty raises. In my opinion, there could be any of several formulas which would be morally justifiable and I could see a range of ??? diversity on just what percent would go to merit, what percent would go to across the board and so on but I would argue very
strenuously that the first component to be taken off would be let’s reserve this for merit; make sure that the merit process bares its true fruits and then see what you can do about across the board if necessary.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you John. Other comments? Okay, would anybody like to propose a specific motion we can vote on. If that doesn’t pass, we can try something else. Otherwise, I’ll just have to – go ahead Cason.

**C. Snow:** Let’s give the ???.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, so you’d like to propose ---

**C. Snow:** --- 50% of the funds be used as an across the board increase and 50% be devoted to merit.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, is there a second to that motion (Gallagher seconded)? Okay, thank you.

**D. Kempton:** Can I ask a question about the proposal? Does this in years such as FY01, years in which there’s a significant pay raise relative to cost of living, you would be guaranteeing higher than cost of living. What does that do when it’s – I understand when it’s less than cost of living, what does it do when it’s more?

**C. Snow:** I think this would kind of ignore cost of living. It would just be a – we get this amount of money to divide up. The original proposal was to make it equal to 3% or whatever the cost of living was. This 50/50 doesn’t really pay much attention to cost of living any more. It takes the whole pot of money, divides it in half; half of that gets split up evenly among some of the faculty, the other half then gets divvied up by merit.

**D. Kempton:** I like the sentiment but let me just tell you why I’m not going to vote for it because that means in a high pay raise year you could be saying to your worst performing faculty, you’re going to get 50% of the – everyone is going to get 50% of that pay raise. For example, in FY02, maybe I’m misunderstanding, when the pay raise was 6.25% on average, you’re saying to low performing faculty, you’re going to get at 3.125% even though the cost of living is 1.6% in that particular year. Is that what it means or am I misunderstanding?

**C. Snow:** That’s the way I understand it but economics is not my thing so ---

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, in the back corner.

**S. Martin:** I would like to point out that maybe taking a vote on this motion up or down is not the best way to proceed because some people may find that 50% is too high and to some 50% is too low and so maybe what we need to decide is whether each of us thinks that’s too high or too low or the third alternative is that it’s just not appropriate at all.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay.
R. Sims: I was wondering if Cason might consider a friendly amendment whatever the correct procedure to - of the 50% increment limit to 50% of the increment or the cost of living whichever is less or should be whichever is greater – whichever is less I guess.

P. Stoddard: Is that acceptable to the proposer?

C. Snow: That will work for me.

P. Stoddard: Is that acceptable to the seconder? Kent? All right, so we have a friendly amendment that the increment be divided up 50/50 unless the cost of living is less than that 50% in which case the cost of living adjustment would be 50% or the across the board adjustment would be equal to the cost of living and the rest would go to merit. So under no circumstance would less than half be going to merit. Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: I have a technical question. I’m not certain on the exact process but if I understand correctly, in each year there’s a certain amount of the raise money that is reserved for promotional bumps. Is that correct?

P. Stoddard: Yes.

J. Wolfskill: And that’s taken off the top before any consideration of merit or across the board or so on?

P. Stoddard: Right.

J. Wolfskill: And whatever proposal we recommend to the UCPC that would be taken into account?

P. Stoddard: I think that would be the intent. Again, was that your intent?

C. Snow: Yes.

J. Wolfskill: Then let me ask one more technical point that I don’t understand. That is the second column, market equity, what is that, what does it mean instead of across the board – is it something we need to worry about?

P. Stoddard: I think market equity was a one time deal. Yeah. I vaguely remember this.

J. Wolfskill: I remember in LA&S. They did a study of some of the NASULGC schools and looked at people who were extreme outliers in their rank relative to the other faculty in NASULGC schools and those people that year got a bump rather than high performers. It was a different way of looking for outliers but I don’t think it’s been repeated. I think colleges interpret it differently if I can remember Joe’s little lecture on this in LA&S.

???: ???
**J. Wolfskill:** Well, for our purposes here we can regard that as an unusual occurrence that we don’t need to be concerned about?

**P. Stoddard:** I would say so yes.

**J. Wolfskill:** Fair enough.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, any other comments? All right, I believe we have a motion on the floor with a friendly amendment. I’m just going to ask for an up or down vote on it at this point. The motion is that any increment be divided 50% across the board; 50% merit unless the across the board portion would be greater than the cost of living for the area in which case the across the board would be equal to the cost of living or words to that effect. All that would happen after the promotional bump was taken off the top. Can I get a show of hands – everybody in favor of the motion? All right, all opposed? Okay. Thank you. Abstentions? Okay, thank you. Anybody voting present? Okay. The motion passes 23 to 5 with 1 abstention and the minutes will reflect that. We’ll pass that along to University Council Personnel Committee. Again, they get to make their own recommendations so this is really much more of a sense of the Senate type of deal than anything binding of course and even after UCPC makes their recommendation, they make that to the Provost’s Office and the deans have their input as well, so there’s a lot that can happen to this before anybody sees a dime of an increment. And a lot will happen to it but at least we’ve got some sense of a position on it. Yes?

**D. Kempton:** May I ask a procedural question? The University Council Personnel Committee is going to make the final recommendation you’re saying but aren’t wages and pays distributed differently in different sections in the university. I mean, doesn’t SPS have a different formula some years and staff have a different formula?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, Operating Staff is mostly civil service and so they have their own situation. A lot of SPS is collective bargaining I believe so yes, each group makes its recommendations. Essentially what happens is Steve Cunningham and Fred Schwantes get together with the Provost, maybe with the President if he wants to be involved, and they sit down and they figure out how to divide up – and the deans get their input – how they would like to see increments. Operating Staff and correct me if I’m wrong, they typically – they have their own way of doing it and that generally is honored, is that correct? You guys decide how it is and that’s it. SPS gets their say – I know last year where SPS had their say, the deans had a different idea and I think the final result was probably someplace in between.

**B. Cesarek:** The President accepted the SPS recommendation.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you. The President accepted the SPS recommendation.

**D. Kempton:** Is the University Council going to be making separate recommendations?

**P. Stoddard:** The UCPC makes it for us; for the faculty. Yeah. Yes?
**J. Holt:** So what about this second issue that C. T. Lin brought up about our average being low. I guess first of all I’d like to see that data of who we’re being compared to C. T.?

**C. T. Lin:** The College Council member told me about that.

**J. Holt:** Can you get it? Can you a hold of it?

**C. T. Lin:** Probably. I don’t know. I can get it, yeah.

**J. Holt:** And then what can we do with that? Anything we could do in our work group in Strategic Planning or ---

**P. Stoddard:** Why don’t we do this. We might be able to incorporate it into there in which case timing becomes really critical. I was going to suggest that we refer this to Economic Status of the Profession; have them amass what data they can on this. They would not have anything for us until early March, at the March meeting. This is only February, right but that actually would still give us time to incorporate it into Strategic Planning discussions. So if that seems reasonable to you, we could have them try to get the data because any comments we wanted to make on that I think would be much stronger with some numbers behind them.

**G. Barrett:** That number in comparison probably varies by school and college. For instance, if the School of Music was compared to institutions of similar size and were at the bottom of the largest group, so if we had a slightly lower enrollment, we would look really good compared to smaller institutions so I just think that instead of one figure for the entire university, you probably need to look college by college or school by school for meaningful information.

**P. Stoddard:** I mean there are a lot of variables in there. It will be different by rank. It will be different by college I’m sure. It will be – there was something else I was going to say – well, you get the idea. Different by discipline perhaps; different by cohort. There’s ???, there’s Illinois, etc. There are a lot of different comparison groups out there as well but if we could get some sort of sense of this and if we do refer it to Economic Status, I’ll actually put you in touch with Fred Schwantes’ office. I think he probably has most of that and Steve Cunningham also. I think those would be the two that would have that at hand most readily.

**C. Snow:** They would provide you with the numbers or where to go to get the numbers?

**P. Stoddard:** They might.

**C. Snow:** Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** They have – off the record – they have sort of hinted to me some of the things that have come up and I guess if C. T. has seen it I guess it’s not so off the record. They seem reluctant to actually quote numbers but, you know, I think they feel it’s something we ought to know about but are a little scared if we find out. You know, we might make too big a stink. So I think it is a valid point and I think now with the capital campaign coming up, it’s a very opportune time to raise this issue. So I’ll accept a motion to refer the matter to Economic Status
of the Profession with the understanding that they’ll report back to us in March. (Linda D. moved and K. Gallagher seconded.) Any further discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstain? All right, let the record show the chair of the committee abstained. All right, thank you very much. Let me say that for those of you who did not vote in favor of the previous motion as to the increment, if you’ve got strong feelings about that, I’d be happy to include them in whatever we forward to UCPC as descending opinions or some such thing. I would like as many voice to be heard on this as possible. That seems reasonable.

The motion passed to refer to Economic Status of the Profession passed.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Jody Newman-Ryan – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on then, we have a report from Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Education provided by Dr. Newman-Ryan.

J. Newman-Ryan: That’s on page 6 if you’re just interested in that. I’ll just summarize part of it. We met on the 19th of January. We will meet again on February 23 I believe. As is typical, the President of the college or university where the meeting is taking place if possible will address the group and so this was Dr. Salme Harju Steinberg I believe. She talked about a lot of things that she’s concerned about. Briefly here I’ll just mention that she feels that the Illinois Higher Board of Ed is too locked into certain formulas that are detrimental to many colleges and universities including, of course, hers and so one of her complaints is the emphasis on funding and a lot of decisions that are made based on how many of your students finish in four years or even five or six. Six seems to be the limit for most of those kind of data so she would like to see some more research and to know why they’ve picked this and if there really are detrimental effects in students taking longer than that to finish because many of her students do – so.

Following her talk we heard from the Dean of the College of Ed who similarly said they’re in the process of collecting data on those kinds of students to see whether there really are differences if students take longer, certainly there would be in highly technical fields but in some other fields they feel they’re being punished for students who take longer to finish and I know that’s often a concern here in different areas and what we do about that.

Then we had a report from someone who complained that at his university faculty were being told that they were going to be in deep trouble because they took their State of Illinois Ethics Test too quickly and we’ve heard about that here I believe. Sorry there’s an errant apostrophe; it probably replaces the expletive that I usually type when I type the State of Illinois Ethics Test so again, if you got one of those packets telling you that you took it too quickly, I guess we’ve been told to just sign that and take care of that.

Then lastly there was this report from an odd group who didn’t really say we will tell you this but if we do, we’ll kill you but they were very secretive about who they were and who they represented and what they were going to do with this information. Basically, they want to make
a recommendation to the Governor about some very substantive changes in funding that do not involve the toll way or lottery or anything like that but the Governor seems to want to do so they mentioned what they called a variety of achievement gaps and Illinois stands poorly in these areas. For instance, math discrepancy scores and things between certain groups of students and so they had two basic sets of recommendation. Again, I don’t know when these will be public; maybe we’ll find out more in a couple of weeks but basically, they want a very different tax structure and they of course said they would not use the word tax. They’re going to talk about revenue changes, ways to increase revenue, some very substantive changes that they’re going to propose and hope that the Governor adopts. They also mentioned some teacher prep and professional development changes they want to make and so recommendations for those. So if I can find out more and tell you, I will.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Jody. Any questions? All right. If not, thank you. I’m sorry, Kent?

K. Gallagher: I think it may be possible that the people from what – from Northeastern may misunderstand the requirements that we have developed a number of degree programs, particularly in Visual and Performing Arts that deal with the BFA Program and it’s always been our understanding that a degree that has a bachelor attached to it must be finishable in four years. Now characteristically, a BFA is – everyplace else in the country that I have taught and where I have had these kinds of programs – a BFA has been a five year program and the idea being that it is a professional kind of degree like engineering or architecture or acting or music performance as opposed to a regular BA degree which is a different sort of animal because its got a 30 or 35 hour major. So it seems to me that Dr. Steinberg when she says that the Board requires the degree to be finished in four years is not understanding what happens. Our degrees have to be finishable in four years, our BFA degrees. Most, at least in our program, many students do not finish them in four years because they sign up in time. You have to begin as a freshman and know exactly what you’re going to do and stick precisely through the format in order to finish in four years. Now we all know students; a lot of them don’t do that and so they actually end up taking five years to finish but the degree is finishable in four years.

The other point I want to make is in one of the newspapers I read, there are two faculty members from SIU who are suing the Ethics Board because they have been dinged for finishing too quickly.

M. Morris: Michael Morris, Foreign Languages. A question for Jody. Did you hear anything at the IBHE meeting about the IBHE requiring universities to offer a program whereby students would be able to rent textbooks? That is something about which I got an e-mail, my chair passed on an e-mail to me that she got from our dean last week.

J. Newman-Ryan: As I understand it, that’s an ongoing issue. This group prepared a report last year and another one this year and, again, I have a tentative agenda for the 23rd that will come up again. It’s been an ongoing issue and Paul reported on that I think in the fall as well when he was replacing me. So, I’m not sure what the current status is. They’ve prepared reports on that to the IBHE before and then I’m not sure what will change about that.
**P. Stoddard:** I’m not sure that anything has happened yet. It’s definitely an issue that bears very close watching. It’s one that I believe Northern has looked at it and there’s a lot of startup costs and other costs associated with it to the university. There are various other issues involved – you have to adopt a textbook for a certain number of years and everybody teaching the course has to adopt the same textbook and so forth and so it’s not as simple a solution as it sounds offhand. You know, there’s warehousing the textbooks and so on. These are some serious issues; buying them in the first place, that need to be considered. Northern has done some of the studies on this I believe and decided they would rather not go down that road because of the costs involved but again, the IBHE does seem very interested in it so it’s something we do need to watch very carefully and I think this group, the FAC, has been diligent in that. They are not all of the same mind; some of the schools have gone to textbook rentals already and have liked it but again, depending on campus size and so forth, what’s good for one may not be good for another.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I think I substituted for this one time before I became a part of the real body so I followed part of this last year and I skipped IV today on here but these are one of these issues where apparently the student representative, there’s a student group also that reports to the IBHE or is involved in monitoring activities, and so this is one of those issues where apparently last year they tried to work with the student group to try to find some way to compromise because many of the students are much more pro-rental than certainly the faculty are as you can imagine and so they tried to find some ways to compromise and then, of course, there’s legislature involved on this. This see this as, you know, an issue that got brought up a couple of years ago I think which is where some of this started. So I assume it’s an item on the agenda for the 23rd again so I hope to have more information. If you want – I think, you reported on their current report last fall or should I try to find another copy of that?

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t remember.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I’ll look and see whether I can find a current report and maybe post that again for everybody or see if we can put it on the website for University Council and Faculty Senate.

**M. Morris:** My reaction to the chair was that the IBHE’s actions reflected a fundamental ignorance or misunderstanding of the whole – no, of the issues behind textbooks and that, you know, I had been present at a meeting and maybe it was Paul who said this, I don’t remember for sure – I was present at one meeting where someone made the comment that the IBHE was an organization in search of reason to justify its existence.

**P. Stoddard:** No, I didn’t say – the FAC ???.

**M. Morris:** This initiative made me think of that line.

**P. Stoddard:** I think the FAC is trying, I mean, part of the problem is the FAC can decide whatever they want. The IBHE can ignore whatever they want and they’ve in the past, have shown a great willingness to ignore what the FAC has said. Nevertheless, I think it is an important voice and, you know, when we make these cases it certainly helps to have the faculty
united in a body like the FAC and be able to say this is why we think it is not necessarily an idea that has to be imposed on everybody. Jeff?

Jeff Kowolski: Do we know what the rate that students might be charged to rent a textbook would be at places that do this?

P. Stoddard: I don’t remember the exact numbers but it does, I mean, it would be cheaper to rent the book than it would be to be a used book and sell it back.

Jeff Kowolski: But what are we talking? It would be interesting to know because then you might just wind up figuring that you could close the gap with the differential between what the students now are paid when they return a book versus what they paid for it and wind up achieving the same goal, that is that they’re paying roughly the same amount for the book that they would by renting the book. So that needs to be considered or looked into also. I know that would make less money for the bookstores and that would be a problem for them but it still might mean we’d have greater flexibility in the textbooks we choose. Diana?

D. Swanson: I think the solution misses the cause of the problem and that might be something that the Advisory Council might take some time to look into. Actually, I’m not sure what body should look into it but I don’t think that having students rent textbooks is addressing the cause of the problem that textbooks cost so much and that seems to me to be about the publishing industry and maybe some research into that area could be helpful and provide an alternative solution that wouldn’t limit academic freedom and the ability to keep our courses up to date.

P. Stoddard: I know that this did come up a couple of years ago; I think it was in Council maybe, not in Senate. Actually, I’m pretty sure it was in Council because I know the President actually talked about it and encouraged people to think of ways of keeping the cost down to the students and one of the things, you know, this practice publishers have of bundling products so when you buy a textbook, you don’t just buy the textbook, you buy the CD, you buy the study guide, you buy the, I don’t know, all sorts of different stuff that goes with it and a lot of the faculty don’t use those. A lot of the students don’t use those so why force everybody to buy something they don’t use and a lot of faculty don’t realize that you have the option to say I don’t want it bundled, I want just the book. So that was one thing. Another was some talk about e-publishing and when things are on line obviously that changes the whole pricing dynamic. There are obviously all sorts of issues associated with that as well. If you’re using your own material, that’s one thing but if it’s somebody else’s, that’s something else. So I know this is something we have talked about in the past; it never hurts to talk about it more I suppose. Kent?

K. Gallagher: I had a couple of publisher’s reps in my office last week and they were offering all kinds of deals on un-bundled things and taking only so many chapters out of one of the big texts that I use and did I really need color. They don’t need the four-color process. If it was black and white for the illustrations of various scene designs in the theatre history, then they would be perfectly willing to do that. All cheaper, cheaper, cheaper, cheaper, cheaper so they’re willing to work with you up to a point.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Jody?
**J. Newman-Ryan:** I’ll see what the latest report on this said and see if I can post that for you and keep you apprised of that. I know there’s been ongoing discussion but that was before I was on this so I’ll see what the latest report says. If I could just very quickly talk about Kent’s comment about the time limit. Again, I’m not Dr. Steinberg but on different committees at this university, I’ve seen the same kind of data where there seems to be some idea that we’re punished for not meeting Illinois Commitment Goals when students take longer and her comment was basically, as I understand it, her complaint or comment was exactly what you said, maybe you don’t disagree with her that again, if students chose to go part time or are financially forced to go part time, we as a university, should not be punished for that so I’m not sure we disagree but that’s basically her point and wanting all of us to work together if we have large numbers of students and my understanding is that we have quite a few here who also fit that category so if students chose or are forced for some other reason to take longer, we should not be punished for “requiring them to take too much” or something which is kind of the IBHE’s idea of why they’re taking longer which it is not.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other questions or comments? If not the Board of Trustees and their committees have not met so there are no reports from any of those groups.

- **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:** Finally, any comments or questions from the floor? John?

**J. Wolfskill:** I have a question if I may about the personal response system. It went by a little fast for me but I understood from Daniel that ITS said they will support this. My question is, what kind of support? How many dollars; exactly what are we talking about here?

**D. Kempton:** I don’t think they’re talking about any financial support. What they’re talking about is if you have problems with the system and by using the E-Instruction one you can call them up and they can help them. If you’re using Quiz Dom and you have problems with it, good luck which is what lack of support means. So ITS says look, we’re overwhelmed doing your computers, your software. We can help with the personal response system but you have to tell us which we’ve got to learn and which one we’ve got to fix problems in. That’s what I think they mean by support.
P. Stoddard: There’s that. I think ITS also operates some of the, not all, but some of the smart classrooms on campus. I think they’ll do so they’ll be able to load E-Instruction on those. There is a problem – I mean, I don’t think they would tell you you can’t use Quiz Dom or something else, nobody has ever suggested that but there is a problem with using multiple systems on the same computer. That presents compatibility problems so if you’re in Cole Hall and you want to use the other systems available, this could present some issues. Hasn’t arisen yet. If there’s enough demand they might make some of the rooms Quiz Dom rooms; others E-Instruction rooms but that’s a bridge to cross when we get there.

D. Kempton: The students were complaining of the costs. Some of them were hitting two or three classes where they were required but they were requiring different ones in each class and that seems to me that was what we were trying to get away from, the costs to students.

P. Stoddard: Right. That was one of the driving things behind this, the costs to students and then the inconvenience of carrying five different remote controls with you every place you go and remembering which one is for which class. Yes?

J. Giles: I’ve already approved the minutes and I just noticed I’m marked absent on them and I was here. This is a moral lesson.

P. Stoddard: Could we have a motion to amend the minutes to reflect the presence, not necessarily the alertness of Professor Giles? I’ll take your silence to mean yes and pass approval of that. Very good. Any other comments or questions? One thing I should have mentioned since we’re going back to the beginning, is I was asked to talk to the President and Provost about this ad hoc committee on enrollment management. The issue is not quite as simple as I was led to believe originally so I’ve invited Vice Provost Seaver to come visit with us next week and he will be happy I am sure, to explain to us in great detail what this committee does and whether or not – next meeting, not next week, right – and what it does and whether or not we want to be involved or if we think the faculty should be involved so we’ll get a clear picture on that next month.

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: If there’s nothing else, I’ll take a motion to adjourn and a second and all in favor say aye. Bye.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.