
D. Gaebler attended for E. Arriola.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

**ABSENT:** Baker, Brown, Burch, Butler, Coller, Greene, Hamlet, Hanley, Hansen, Hubbard, Johnson, Kolb, Kowalski, MacFarlane, Miller, Moraga, Mutuku, Pierce, Ridnour, Scherer, S. Song, X. Song, Tolhurst, Tollerud, Wade, Walton

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

**P. Stoddard:** Welcome back everyone to another fun-filled year. This is the first meeting of the Faculty Senate. Consider yourselves called to order.

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

II. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**P. Stoddard:** I guess we should go by the agenda which you should have with you. The first order of business would be the adoption of the agenda. Can I have a motion to adopt the agenda? Thank you. Any comments about the agenda? Seeing none, all in favor of adopting the agenda as written say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 26, 2006 FS MEETING** (P 3-7)

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, next is the approval of the minutes of April 26. If you’re new to the Senate, feel free to abstain on this vote. Otherwise, the minutes are included on pages 3-7. Generally, at this point, we make sure our names are spelled correctly and nothing nasty got attributed to us that we didn’t really say.

**J. Stephen:** Under A, recognition of faculty senators whose terms have expired, I’m listed as Buck Stephen; I should be listed as Joseph “Buck” Stephen.
P. Stoddard: I don’t know how to spell parentheses so ---

J. Stephen: Donna does though.

P. Stoddard: But she wasn’t here. Any other corrections? Yes?

B. Lusk: Under Reports from Standing Committees, half-way down, A on page 4, it’s got “B. Miller and B. Miller” and I don’t know if that’s a typo or if we do, in fact, have two B. Millers.

P. Stoddard: That’s a good point. I strongly suspect that we had only the one B. Miller but that there’s somebody else who should be in there so I’ll check back through the transcripts and fix that. Anybody else?

A. Rosenbaum: I’d like to refer to the language on page 5 with reference to the Faculty Personnel Advisor where it says that “N. Churyk felt that we should not trust the Faculty Personnel Advisor to collect the data” and I’d like to suggest that this is unnecessarily negative language and perhaps we could change it to say “an unbiased method of data collecting should be developed.”

P. Stoddard: Fair enough.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: For those of you who don’t know, Alan Rosenbaum is our Faculty Personnel Advisor whom we do trust.

A. Rosenbaum: I just started ??? to my predecessor.

P. Stoddard: Any other corrections? Okay, can I have a movement to accept the minutes as amended. Thank you. Second? Thank you. Any further discussion? Buck?

J. Stephen: I’d like to point out that points D and E include charges to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and the Rules and Governance Committees. Okay?

P. Stoddard: Right. Any further discussion? All in favor of approving the minutes as amended and noted, please signify by saying aye. Thank you. Any abstentions? Very good. We have minutes.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Next up is President’s announcements. In case my position up here in front of the room and my taking charge of the meeting hasn’t clued you in, I’m the President of the Faculty Senate. My name is Paul Stoddard. I’m from the Department of Geology and Environmental
Geosciences. I have an office over in Davis Hall but more frequently I’m found these days in Altgeld 103. You can find me there and discuss anything that comes up.

A. Welcome/Orientation

1. Committee roles and suggestions (p. 8-9)

P. Stoddard: I’d like to start off by welcoming you all and thanking you for agreeing to serve on this body. We do serve an important function on campus. We basically are the voice of the faculty. This is our one chance or one opportunity really to get together as a faculty in a representative way and express concerns and suggestions and so forth about how the university is being run and make sure that our rights and our concerns are, in fact, heard and our suggestions are forwarded to the appropriate places. A little bit of history for the folks that are new or the folks who don’t remember, the Faculty Senate is actually an outgrowth of the University Council. We have some people here who are on both the Council and the Senate. The Council is a body made up of faculty, students, administration, and staff and they are the ones who really are in charge of making policy changes and changes to the Constitution and By-laws that enact those changes and so forth. Originally, the Senate was the Faculty Assembly and we were a caucus of the Council. All the faculty members on the Council got together to meet and made sure that the faculty concerns were appropriately addressed in Council meetings. So we have people here from the Council and these are people elected by the colleges, not by the departments, and they are essentially the caucus that we used to have. That however, is not fully representative of all the departments. The departments felt that they wanted to be ensured representation on the Senate or the Assembly as it was called at the time, and so the Assembly morphed into the Senate, expanded and so now we have elected members from each individual department in addition to members from Council elected by colleges. So if you’re a Council member, you also have the privilege of serving on the Senate. This is to help ensure that things discussed in the Senate get the appropriate voice in the Council. At some point in the near future, we’re going to get to Faculty Senate Committees. If you’re on the Council, you will note your name is not on that list, most of you. That’s because you have your own committees to serve on with the Council so only those people who are strictly Senate members are going to be listed on that Faculty Senate Committee list. Generally, this is a place where, you know, if things are happening that you’re concerned about or you would like to make suggestions, this is a good place to bring that up. This is also, you know, it works both ways – information from the administration, from Council – comes to the Senate and I or one of your colleagues will report that and then you as the representative for the department are charged with disseminating that information to the department. Occasionally, one of our members brings up interesting little tidbits or financial news – Buck – that members and faculty might find important so again, this is an information place as well.

The way this works is we have an agenda as you see. We’ll go through it. When you have something to say, we ask – and the main person doing the asking is Donna Mathesius who is the, yeah, Lynne’s got it right, bow down and give homage - Donna is the person who keeps the office running. She was out the last couple of weeks; the sling has something to do with that and so when everything is messed up this week it’s because I was in charge which is why we don’t let that happen very often. Anyway, Donna is the secretary for both the Senate and the Council.
She keeps everything running smoothly and nine times out of ten when you call up with something that needs to be done, she’s the one who ends up making sure that it gets done. Her one request of you is, because we have a lot of new faces this year, first off, use the microphone when you speak. These meetings are transcribed and then that’s how we get the minutes. If you don’t speak up or speak into the microphone your words are lost and obviously you didn’t speak them just to see them disappear. So please use the microphone. Also, so that we can give due credit where credit is due, identify yourself especially if you have not served on the Senate recently. So, everybody should do that and now I think I’m okay with Donna. Sitting next to Donna is our parliamentarian, Ferald Bryan, who lets me know when I’m doing something I’m not supposed to do, more often than not, we consult him to find out how we’re supposed to do something. Sitting next to Ferald is Donna’s assistant, her daughter Stephanie, who has been filling in a little bit while Donna was out so I want to thank all of them for all of their help. We have a few other guests around the room. We have the Ombudsman, Tim Griffith, sitting up front. We have a representative from HR, Deb Haliczer, perhaps the most important person on campus in terms of our well, our quality of life issues and things along those lines. We have Bobby, and I never say your name right, Cesarek, and Rachel Turner who are representatives from Supportive Professional Staff and Operating Staff respectively and I don’t see anybody else I recognize as a guest so anyway – Northern Star hiding back there in the corner and I’m told yes, the press is here. Not usually an issue. Anyway, like I said, we do deal with issues of import to the faculty. We have several committees who deal with specific issues. You do have as a walk-in item so it was on your desk as you came in, a list of those committees and we also have on pages 8 and 9 a description of what each of those committees does. I’ll go over them very briefly. The Executive Committee is generally the chairs of the other committees and we set the agenda. Academic Affairs, the names are pretty self-explanatory, these deal with academic issues, classrooms, etc., programs and so on. Economic Status, we had a lot of dealings recently about pension reform and so forth so Economic Status helps keep an eye on that for us. Elections and Legislative Oversight is really more elections than anything else. If you’re on that, your main job is to pass out ballots later this meeting and at the last meeting and collect them and you may be asked to keep an eye on the dealings in Springfield or Washington if anything unusual seems to be coming down the road. We have a lot of people at the university who do that but if the faculty feels a specific need to do so, that’s were the representation for that comes from. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities is going to get a little airing later this meeting so I’ll let that go for now. There is one joint committee with the University Council and that’s the committee on Resources, Space, and Budget. They’re meant to be advisory on how resources are allocated and that includes money and space as well and so they will meet with the Provost during the year to get an update on the budget and find out how things are going. Then Rules and Governance which is in charge of changing the By-laws for the Faculty Senate whenever we deem that necessary and we will be referring something to them in a couple of minutes as well.

So those are basically the various committees. You should find yourself on at least one of those. One thing this body works best when we have things to do and so I’m going to ask for you, as representatives of your departments and colleges, to think about things the Senate ought to be interested in. If there are issues of faculty rights or teaching loads or merit evaluations or so forth, you know, these are things we need to be talking about as a group and so I gave you a list of the committees and what they do so we can help direct them and you should feel free at any
time of the year to bring them up with me, bring them up with the chair of the appropriate committee, whomever, so that we can talk about these issues.

Any questions on the Senate and its mission and our role in it? Okay.

B. Update on NIU Connect.

P. Stoddard: My next announcement is a brief update on the NIU Connect. That’s the PeopleSoft software for the students. The large software package that we’re implementing. I and Professor Wolfskill sit on a couple of the committees that are charged with overseeing that implementation. I sat in on a meeting a couple weeks ago where we talked about where we were going. Basically, the first thing they wanted to do was see what the new software does in detail. Ideally, they had a pretty good idea before they bought it what it’s supposed to do – ideally, and figure out what the software can do, what we need it to do, where the two overlap and, more importantly, where there are gaps where our policies do not fit neatly into what the software package can do. This was called the Fit-gap Study. They have identified several areas that needed to be addressed. We are working – some those areas were easily addressed; other areas might actually involve us considering policy. This will all go through faculty committees, Undergraduate Coordinating Council, GenEd Committee, Graduate Council, as appropriate and the committees will be asked, you know, if this is a problem we can fix in the software – it’s going to cost us a million dollars to do it now and every time they upgrade the software we’re going to have to fix it and it’s going to cost another $150,000 each time there’s an upgrade. Is this a policy we really need to keep? If the answer is yes, the university will, I am sure, find the money. If the answer is well, gee, we don’t know why that’s in there in the first place then maybe this is something we’re not going to spend a lot of time and money worrying about. So this is an area the faculty are going to have, I am assured, going to have full voice on how policies are changed if they need to be changed and so forth. Then the software package will be coming on-line in modules and I believe – I forgot a left the sheet of paper back in the office – but I believe the goal is to have everything on-line by the fall of 2008 and people who seem to know are nodding their heads so I’m going to go with that. Any questions on NIU Connect? Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: I never received an invitation for anything since the preliminary meeting last winter. Did I miss anything?

P. Stoddard: Not that I’m aware of. The initial phases were really this Fit-gap analysis and I don’t think there’s a role yet for us in that. Yes?

D. Swanson: Can you clarify, can you please clarify ---

P. Stoddard: Can you say your name?

D. Swanson: I’m sorry, Diana Swanson. Could you please clarify who did this Fit-gap study?

P. Stoddard: This was done in the Provost’s Office. Gip Seaver was the lead from the Provost’s Office with representation from ITS and Steve Pace was the main person involved
from them. We have a consultant and I think somebody else from the – who is it now – it’s Oracle now I guess – representatives from the people who developed the software are on campus so there’s actually a large group of people but I believe Gip is probably the one most in charge of that group.

D. Swanson: Were there faculty on that?

P. Stoddard: I think Gip is considered faculty.

D. Swanson: I mean other than ---

P. Stoddard: Other than the Associate Provost? I don’t believe so no, but again this was just identifying policy and – this was not making any policy, this was just identifying where the software works easily, where it will need to be adjusted. The next step, figuring out how that adjustment is to be made – is it a software problem, is it a policy problem – that’s where the faculty are going to be involved and I honestly feel that’s where we need to be involved. Most of this happened over the summer and last spring. Other questions about that? Okay.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate.

P. Stoddard: Moving on then we have a couple of things we need to take care of. One is the selection of a vice president for the Faculty Senate and a secretary for the Faculty Senate. The vice president is somebody who sits up here after I get hit by a bus or otherwise can’t make a meeting. It could happen! I mean that Huskie bus whips around, you never know. Anyway, other than that well Buck, why don’t you explain the duties – Buck is our outgoing vice president. He’s on Council now so ---

J. Stephen: I’m going to be doing this for UAC and FAC too right? The vice president’s duties – it sounds great; very little responsibilities. You have to go to the Executive Committee meeting the week before the Faculty Senate. That runs 1:30 to 2:30 on a Wednesday. You fill in when Paul is not here. That happened once in two years with me and you chair the committee or the Faculty Senate when you go into Executive session when Paul is being evaluated. When Paul needs somebody to fill in for some odious task occasionally he’s ask for that. In general, it’s not a very demanding responsibility.

P. Stoddard: Okay. Do we have any nominations; they can be self-nominations for vice president for the Faculty Senate? Buck?

J. Stephen: I nominate Kendall Thu.

P. Stoddard: Is Kendall Thu willing to serve in that role?

K. Thu: Assuming your health status is quite good.
**P. Stoddard:** I’ll bring a doctor’s note in. Yes?

**J. Holt:** I nominate Daniel ??? if he wants to serve.

???:

**P. Stoddard:** Do we have a second for Kendall’s nomination? Good job. Thank you John. So everybody who didn’t section is eligible to be nominated you know. Are there any other nominations? Can I have a motion to close nominations and accept Kendall by acclamation? I have a motion and second or two motions but we’ll count the second motion as a second. All in favor of closing nominations and accepting Kendall as vice president say aye. Thank you.

Kendall Thu was accepted as vice president of the Faculty Senate.

Okay, next is secretary of the Senate and if you think vice president is an odious task – we have not yet figured out what the secretary does. The vice president? Okay. I don’t know. All right. The secretary’s position – it’s there in the By-laws so we have to have somebody. In my tenure in this job, I’ve never called on the secretary to do anything. The secretary has never come up saying I need something to do. So, if you’re looking to pad a resume as easily as it could be, this is a way to do it. So can we – unless anybody knows of something else the secretary should be doing. I’d be glad to give them something but ---

???:

**P. Stoddard:** The secretary has in the past but that was because the secretary was actually on the Steering Committee so, I mean, I’m the Executive Committee to begin with. Last year and the year before, that person came off the Steering Committee – Executive Committee – sorry. The person could if they wanted. Any nominations for secretary? If not, we’ll pull a name out a hat.

**J. Stephen:** I nominate Nancy Castle. She’s already on the Executive Committee anyway.

**P. Stoddard:** Are you amenable to that? Okay, do we have a second? Thank you. Any further nominations. Nancy, you want to make any nominations?

**N. Castle:** No.

**P. Stoddard:** Can I have a motion to close and accept. Do I have a second? Thank you. All in favor say aye. Okay.

Nancy Castle was accepted as secretary of the Faculty Senate.

**B. University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees.**

**P. Stoddard:** We don’t actually have a list of the people on the UAC do we? I know them but – okay. Next up is the University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees. There’s a group
of people who attend the Board of Trustees meeting and the meetings of their committees – there’s three of those. There’s a Legislative Committee, a Personnel Committee, and a Finance Committee. We have names for those already. We have Bobbie Cesarek and Rachel Turner. We have Ferald Bryan and Joseph “Buck” Stephen, we have myself and Xueshu Song who have agreed to serve in that capacity so we just need a yes or no from this body on those names. Yes? Thank you. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Okay, we have an Advisory Committee for the Board of Trustees.

Bobbie Cesarek, Rachel Turner, Ferald Bryan, Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Paul Stoddard, and Xueshu Song were accepted as members of the University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees.

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

P. Stoddard: This is a very important position. The IBHE, obviously the Illinois Board of Higher Education – the Faculty Advisory Committee is really the faculty voice. This is the one place the IBHE hears from the faculty. We can trust the administration to speak for us occasionally but obviously I think we’re all more comfortable when we speak for ourselves. So this is a group of people from the various universities in the state. They get together, they meet and they set an agenda of concerns they’re going to bring to the IBHE and they’ll have an opportunity to voice those to the IBHE. This person needs to attend those meetings. They’re on Fridays; typically Thursday evenings and Fridays and then they need to report orally and in writing to both the Senate and the University Council. I believe I have one name so far and that would be Jody Newman-Ryan who has agreed to do this. However, we are open for further nominations should anybody else want the job. Hearing no further nominations, move to close and accept. Thank you.

J. Wolfskill: Do we need an official nomination for Jody?

P. Stoddard: I think that’s since she’s the only person I don’t think we need to be that formal. Ferald just gave me a dirty look. All right, let’s get an official nomination.

J. Stephen: I nominate, close and accept.

P. Stoddard: Thank you, thank you. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion say aye. All right. Very good. Thank you Jody.

Jody Newman-Ryan was accepted as Faculty Advisory Committee representative to the ISBE.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Committee chairs and Faculty Senate committee composition for 2005-2006. (p. 10)

B. Reassessment of Faculty Senate Committee Structures – refer to Rules and Governance
**P. Stoddard:** Okay, next up is the Consent Agenda. This is a time saving tool. Things we don’t think are going to be controversial we put on a Consent Agenda all together and approve them all at once. These are generally issues where we refer something to different groups, to different committees and the chance to debate the issue comes up when the committee issues a report back to the full Senate. Today on the Consent Agenda, we have the Senate Committee list and I think before we do that I’ll take this opportunity to ask the Chairs to introduce themselves. So for the Executive Committee I’m the chair. Again, I’m Paul Stoddard from LA&S and the Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences. From Academic Affairs we have ---

**D. Kempton:** Daniel Kempton from the Department of Political Science. We don’t of course have a report yet since we haven’t met but I do see there is a pending issue from last year that we’ll be discussing on that committee and certainly on GroupWise, dkempton@niu.edu if there are issues we should be discussing this year. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Elections and Legislative Oversight is Earl Hanson. Is Earl here? Okay.

**J. Holt:** I’m Janet Holt from the ETRA Department in the College of Education chairing that committee. It looks like we have a holdover issue too from last year so I’ll be calling all of you soon for committee meeting.

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t know if that’s a holdover issue or a new issue.

**J. Stephen:** That was a new issue introduced after the discussion of how ??? position was funded.

**P. Stoddard:** Oh, right, okay so you’re going to have that issue which is a holdover but we have something else coming your way too. Okay. Next up is Economic Status of the Profession.

Before we approve this I need to note a change. Michael Bishop is no longer the representative from Philosophy but Jim Hudson, who’s back there, is the new member for that. The Chair of the committee is Cason Snow.

**C. Snow:** Cason Snow, I’m from the University Libraries down in the Cataloging Department. You can get a hold of me at csnow@niu.edu if you need to and it looks like we don’t have anything pending from last year or new coming up so I look forward to any suggestions.

**P. Stoddard:** Very good. From Rules and Governance.

**N. Castle:** Hi, I’m Nancy Castle. We do have some things pending but they’ll be mentioned in the report later on the agenda.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, and Resource, Space, and Budget and the chair is ---
C. T. Lin: C. T. Lin from the Department of Chemistry. I’ll be co-chair of this committee with UC member Lynn Kamenitsa.

P. Stoddard: Should we have Kendall Thu then do Executive Committee now? Could you use a microphone please and what’s your name?

B. Jaffe: Hi, I’m Barbara Jaffee from the School of Art and I am also replacing the person listed from the College of Visual and Performing Arts. Kathryn Kahn is no longer the representative here. I’m wondering if that means that I’m now in her committee assignments?

P. Stoddard: Yeah.

B. Jaffe: Assignments too!

P. Stoddard: I should say a couple of words about this and one of the issues that we’re going to refer to in Rules and Governance is, what does it say, reassessment of Faculty Senate committee structures. According to the By-laws, I need to get representatives from each college on these various committees. Unfortunately, some of the colleges only have one or two or three departments or one or two or three representatives on this body. A quick bit of math, and I’m sure Professor Wolfskill and Professor Stephen will back me up on this, tells us that when we have one person with six committees, that’s a very busy person and if we have – in your college there’s only three departments and so to get full representation, we need to ask you to do double service. Now basically, the way this works though, I really don’t expect the representative from Libraries or the representative from Law to go to every committee meeting of every committee that takes place this year. Generally, you are on these committees so you have the ability, privilege, the right to go to any meetings that you feel fit, where you see an item that is going to be of interest to you, your department or your college. You’re on more committees but I don’t really mean for that to mean twice as much work. Take the opportunity to go to those meetings you think are important. That’s true for anybody whom I’ve asked to be on more than one with the exception of chairs who are on the Executive Committee. I really do need for your folks to take both those jobs to hear, seriously. With that, anyway Item B on the Consent Agenda is to have Rules and Governance take a look at that structure and see if that’s really the best way to do things with an eye towards easing the workload for people from under-represented colleges. I shouldn’t say under-represented but with limited representation from various colleges. So those are the two items on the Consent Agenda. One is to approve the list. The new list that was walked in is a bit more accurate than the one that’s in your packet and with the two new, three new, changes it should be – knock on wood – up to date. Go ahead.

L. Derscheid: I’m Linda Derscheid and I’m from HHS but from FCNS, not nursing.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. C. T.?

C. T. Lin: I think in the Executive Committee, the column here on where is Space and Resource, my name is the same name but under a different department; one’s Chemistry and one’s Biology so if you could make a change, that would be nice.
P. Stoddard: We just got you an extra paycheck. He is Chemistry, yeah. Sorry about that – I forgot that there are two of you there. Okay, any other corrections? All right, seeing none can I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended? Thank you. All in favor. Okay, thank you.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on, this is the part of the show where we get reports from advisory committees. This being the first meeting of the year, we’re usually a little light on these. We have no report from FAC although we do have a report from the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, etc. committee. Is that true? The correct one is the walk-in item.

A. FAC to IBHE – no report


F. Bryan: All of this information is perhaps under the category of old news. Hi, I’m Ferald Bryan. I think Paul introduced me as the parliamentarian. Normally, I’m to be more seen and not heard unless it’s my turn to report on this committee as your representative. Since you do have both reports from both 2005 and 2006, you can see that this committee at that time of the year deals primarily with personnel matters. One caveat was new this year. When the meeting convened on the 25th, they had received a request for public comment from Professor Virginia Naples of the Biological Sciences Department to make a five minute presentation. She did on the topic listed, salary differentials between male and female professors in the Department of Biological Sciences. It was a five minute presentation and to summarize her report, suggests that she certainly sees inequities in that department and Vice-Chair Muer assured her that these findings would be given consideration through proper administrative channels. I understand she’s made this presentation before to other forums on campus and I think we’ll hear more about that.

The personnel items I think most of us probably are already aware of. Recommendations for faculty promotions, tenure and promotions with tenure for the academic year were approved. This was, as you’ll hear me say later, Provost Ivan Legg’s last class. This was a very large number in fact, former Provost Legg suggests that this might be one of the largest in recent memory because of the budget bulge from the past. It probably won’t be repeated in the future. We all know we have a new provost, a new associate dean of the Graduate School, a new chair of the Department of Computer Science, and a new interim dean of the library. There were also some academic program reviews that you’ll hear me talk about in a few minutes but there was a recommendation for a new PhD program in Art Education, a new specialization in Sport and Exercise Psychology within the M.S. Ed. in Physical Education and a new specialization or series of specializations with the M.S. degree program in Nursing and it lists them for you.

Under Information Items there were certain program reviews that were required in the cycle of reviews and I listed those and the summaries are there for your consideration.
I’ll certainly be glad to answer any questions about that and about this report. I do have the full minutes here and also, of course, this committee will meet again tomorrow morning so there will be another report you will hear probably from Professor Stephen next time but I’ll be happy to answer any questions about that.

P. Stoddard: Any questions for Ferald? Okay, thank you very much.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on to Finance, Facilities, and Operations. We don’t actually have a written report here. That was me and I dropped the ball on that one. However, when we get to the full – actually both of these, the Personnel Committee and the Finance Committee, they make recommendations to the full Board and then the full Board has the final word on those. Very seldom does anything that gets through one of these committees not get approval from the full Board. Very seldom do they get much discussion other than boy, everybody did a great job and that’s a really nice report and that sort of thing. We have a Board that’s been actually very helpful towards the university who I truly think have the university’s best interests at heart and so very little controversial ever takes place at these Board meetings but it’s always good to keep an eye on what’s going on there anyway.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Ferald Bryan – report (p. 11-12)

P. Stoddard: Moving on to the report from the full Board. It’s you again; boy, you’re popular today. For the full Board report we’ll go back to Professor Bryan.

F. Bryan: Yes, I was very busy this summer and as Paul reported, a lot of the work is done in committees and it may seem routine but I would also point out that we do have a very inquisitive Board. They ask good questions. They often ask for comments from us as representatives of the faculty and of this and other bodies on campus and, as you can see, the full Board met on June 15 and there was a very lengthy two hour Executive Session. I wish I knew what was going on there but I can’t tell you but I suspect it had a lot to do with budget and salaries and those kinds of things but it was somewhat unique in almost all the Board was, in fact, present rather than phoning it in and they approved their officers’ reports and essentially looked at the major budget items. So the chair and vice-chair were re-elected.

The summary of the major items, I think we all have heard or read about in the news over the summer. These numbers are in great detail in the full Board report which is available to you and I’ll be happy to answer questions about that. Under point d, I’d like to stress that our Board is very sympathetic and always supportive of the tenure process. In fact, Trustee Boey always – there’s a little speech he always makes about how he believes it’s a misunderstood process and that he wishes more people and legislators understood so I think he’s a friend and does seem to understand the tenure process so even though this was somewhat pro forma, he does and did
speak to support of the tenure process. So the tenure and promotion cases were approved. President Peters praised Provost Legg’s “last class”. There was approval of appointments of our new provost, deans and programs were approved. The other materials sounds very familiar to the APASS Committee but under item 3 on the back page, what we did hear at the end – and this came at the specific request of Chair Vella, she wanted to hear representatives make a presentation from the project REAL (Rockford Education Alliance). It was a fascinating presentation. The project is a Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant that we work in partnership with Rock Valley College and Rockford Public School District 205 and I thought it was a fascinating presentation and it seemed the Board was very impressed with the work we’re doing in that area.

Again, if there are any questions you have about any of these items, I will be happy to try to answer them. Yes?

N. Churyk: ; I guess this goes back to your other report and in this one where it says this will be the last budget bulge and likely to be repeated. Has someone going up for tenure and bypass the department and the college and everything is dandy and wonderful and you’re saying that this is a budget thing so is the provost just going to say “geez, sorry, we have no budget?”

F. Bryan: No, what that was in reference to was some substantial hiring we did or that the provost did five or six years ago and included additional lines for departments as I understand it.

N. Churyk: So that’s why there are so many people.

F. Bryan: Yes.

N. Churyk: There are so many people, not that we’re not going to get tenure because there’s no budget.

F. Bryan: No, there was no reference to that.

N. Churyk: The wordings a little bit scary.

P. Stoddard: It’s more in reference to the hiring freeze that we had in 1998, 1999, and 2000.

N. Churyk: Okay, that makes me feel better. Thank you for clarification.

F. Bryan: That’s a good question but there’s nothing you should worry about in that regard.

P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Good.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Since we’ve just approved all those committees I strongly suspect they haven’t had a chance to meet yet unless they’ve been very busy in the last five minutes in the back room. We’ve already had – each chair has had the chance to introduce his or herself so we’ll move
through to the one chair who’s not here who does have something to say — sorry — Nancy — I don’t want to run roughshod here.

A. Academic Affairs – Daniel Kempton, Chair

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Cason Snow, Chair

C. Resource, Space, and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Janet Holt, Chair

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – report.

N. Castle: Nancy Castle and my report for this meeting is that at the end of the last school year I had a note to at this meeting to officially remind you Paul that we need the University Graduate Council, Faculty Senate rep, and the UCC rep so that we can ask them to present at the next meeting and the last meeting and also for this year our committee is being asked to look at our evaluation of the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Specifically, we’ve been charged with looking at the composition of the committee and the procedure, how and where we get the data so those are the two things on my list for my report.

P. Stoddard: Well thank you. That reminds me — go ahead Buck

J. Stephen: What were the specifics we discussed last year about the nature of the UCC rep to the Faculty Senate and the UC because ??? on the UCC this year.

P. Stoddard: What we need we decided based on a couple of issues that came up last year, that we need better communication between the Graduate Council and this body and the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and this body. Now there is already in the structure of these committees a mechanism by which this is supposed to take place. It hasn’t really worked very well recently so we need to formalize this a bit and this is — anybody who is on the Senate who is also on UCC and/or on the Graduate Council should act as sort of a liaison between the two bodies. Basically, what we ask this person to do is, you know, carry out their normal duties on the UCC or the Graduate Council. UCC is Undergraduate Coordinating Council. They oversee all the undergraduate Gen Ed Committee and all those other types of things. We ask that person on the second meeting of the Senate after they’ve had a chance to go to the first meeting of their other council and see what the agenda for the year is going to look like, let is know what the other council has on its docket and then at the last meeting of the Senate to let us know what the council actually did and should anything come up in the middle, let us know about that as well. We will have actual slots on the agenda for that person to make a brief report about what’s going on, one at the UCC and the other at the Graduate Council.

J. Stephen: Should we find out whether we have those people here now?

P. Stoddard: Yes, that’s what Nancy was prompting me to do.
J. Stephen: Well, I’m on the UCC, is anybody else?

P. Stoddard: Okay, so we have one, two, I think four people on UCC. Any or all of you, well, one of you. I need to name one person who is willing to act as that representative. Anybody want to raise their hand?

C. Snow: I’ll do it.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Cason. Okay, so the official Faculty Senate rep to UCC will be Cason Snow. Anybody here on the Graduate Council? All we’re asking is for you to tell us what happens. That’s it. Okay, so Brigid, thank you very much. Not that there’s really any choice. You’ve been drafted. I’ll send you a note starting off greetings. Okay, any other issues I need to be aware of before charging ahead. No, thank you.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Earl Hansen, Chair – report

1. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee

P. Stoddard: Okay, next up is elections. We have some elections we need to do and who here is on the Elections Committee? You don’t have to say anything just please, if you’re on – well, I know who’s on the Elections Committee don’t I? Tim and Richard and Kendall and Judith Hertz and Chris Hubbard. Okay, well – this really is not a hard job, trust me. Okay, so right now what we’re doing is we are at random selecting members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. From time to time, believe it or not, issues come up between faculty and other members of the community be they other faculty, administration or staff which cannot be resolved amicably between the two parties. When that happens, someone will generally file a grievance. This is all covered in Articles X and XI of the By-laws. That grievance comes to me and from me it goes to Steve Cunningham who is Vice-President for Human Resources, he’s got a bit more to that but, Executive Vice-President for Human – no, Associate Vice-President for Administration and Human Resources. We will sit down and depending on the nature of the grievance if it’s faculty on faculty or staff on faculty or whatever, select a group of five people who examine the grievance, determine whether there’s merit to it, whether they need more information and so forth. What we are doing now is selecting the faculty pool from whom Dr. Cunningham and I will select the panel that hears the grievance – that looks into the grievance. The Operating Staff and Supportive Professional Staff will also select members and ultimately we’ll have a grievance panel we come up with which will be made up of members of all of these unless it’s faculty on faculty and then it will just be a faculty only committee. So just because your name is called does not mean you will ever be asked to do anything although admittedly your chances are much better if your name is called than if it’s not called. In the past few years we’ve averaged maybe one or two grievances a year. They require two or three meetings of an hour or two so that’s what here. This is purely by chance and so good luck.

D. Mathesius: Okay, the lucky fifteen are James Johnson, Greg Barrett, Alan Rosenbaum (can he do it?) ---
P. Stoddard: I think that since – Alan, why don’t you stand up and let everybody see who you are. Alan is the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Oftentimes he is one of the people to whom – well, if you come to me and say you’ve got a problem with someone, I’ll refer you to Alan or perhaps to Tim or you might go to Tim and he’ll refer you to Alan or Alan might refer you to me. Between the three of us we usually hear most of these problems before they get to the grievance stage and in that, I’m not sure that Alan would be appropriate for this committee. With the consent of the Faculty Senate and if Professor Rosenbaum agrees that we remove his name and we refer this to Rules and Governance or whoever to make an exclusion from this committee position for this member. Let’s stick to remove his name for the time being. Is that all right with you? We have a motion to remove – and seconded. Any discussion on that keeping in mind that this means somebody else is going to be picked. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, very good. Thank you.

D. Mathesius: Okay, Scott Whitman, Laurie Elish-Piper, William Baker, John Walton, Shin-Min Song, Reza Hashemian, Brigid Lusk, Brian Coller, Jody Newman-Ryan, Judy Hertz, - this says Katherine Kah – I assume it’s Barbara Jaffee, Byron Anderson, and Earl Hanson are the fifteen. The five alternates are going to be Tony Tollerud, Lee ???, Michael Morris, Nancy Castle, and Linda Dersheid. Could you write these names here and then these---

P. Stoddard: Yes. Professor Newman-Ryan?

J. Newman-Ryan: Not that I’m not willing to serve but in my many years of doing this, I thought it was just Senate, is it not, because some of those people are Council.

D. Mathesius: Nope, you just have to be tenured to be eligible.


P. Stoddard: I suspect if anybody really doesn’t want to serve on this you could renounce your tenure. We have one person – yeah?

S. Whitman: I’m not yet tenured. I don’t know if that disqualifies me.

D. Mathesius: Yeah, it does. You were one of the regular members or an alternate. Okay. Tony then moves up to the regular member and we’ll pick another alternate. Paula Brown would be the last alternate then.

P. Stoddard: Again, I see a lot of frowns and moaning about this but really, the job is not that bad. I’ve served on these and you’ve got other people to support you in your decision. You’re making a decision with four other people and it is a vital part of helping to keep the university running as harmoniously as possible. This really does give people a chance to voice their frustrations, let their problems be known to people who are their peers so that they know other folks are hearing them and if you – well, you probably will end up deciding against one side or the other – but at least they know they’ve had a fair hearing and they know that reasonable people have chosen to disagree with them and so this really is a very important thing and so I
thank you for advance for any service you may render towards the grievance process. So thank you.

2. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

**P. Stoddard:** Next we have to select University Council alternates. So, as we said before the University Council is selected by college. Occasionally, somebody might not be able to make a meeting for one reason or another and in that case you’re asked, if you are one of those people, to find somebody else to attend in your place. What we are going to do now is select those people who are eligible to attend in your place. For this body, if you can’t make a meeting and you want to send somebody else we pretty much anybody in the department is eligible but for Council we have to be a bit more strict and so there will be a list of people who are eligible to serve as alternates so if you can’t make a meeting you’ll have to try to find somebody from that list. What we’re doing do is electing people to be on that list. This is done by college. So what we’ll do is hand out ballots, different colors for different colleges. As we get ready to do this, we’ll say everybody in Business raise your hand and we’ll hand you a certain colored ballot and then we’ll go college by college. This takes a little while; please bear with us.

**D. Mathesius:** So anyone in the College of Business raise your hand and Tim will bring – that’s if you’re on Senate or Council – okay.

???: If you’re on Council, can you be an alternate?

**D. Mathesius:** They still vote for the alternate. The next one is College of Education.

**P. Stoddard:** You have one more over here Kendall.

**D. Mathesius:** College of Engineering.

**P. Stoddard:** So much for the secret ballot.

**D. Mathesius:** College of Visual and Performing Arts. This is a big one so you might want to give Kendall half. Liberal Arts and Sciences.

**P. Stoddard:** Kendall – HHS. Donna? Oh.

**D. Mathesius:** I will e-mail Health and Human Sciences with theirs so they can print them out. Sorry, I’m a little disorganized. Then we’ll just have to pick them up and I can count them back at the office. Just pick up any of them, it doesn’t matter. I’ll organize them later on. They’re going to be coming around to pick up all the ballots. Just fold them in half and they’ll pick up all of them.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, John?
J. Wolfskill: If I may I’d like to take this opportunity to remind you of a rule change we made on the Council last year about this matter.

P. Stoddard: Okay, go ahead, why don’t you remind everybody.

J. Wolfskill: So, depending on the results here, you may need to appoint additional alternates.

P. Stoddard: Right, yeah, okay thank you.

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

P. Stoddard: Okay it says here one more thing, actually there are two more things under Elections. First is going to be what is item 3, nominations of two Faculty Senate members to serve on Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. It’s chaired by the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. What we need to do is nominate two people, at least two people, and he will choose one name of those two to actually serve. So if you’re nominated, there’s only a 50/50 chance you’ll actually be asked to serve. We do need to forward two names to him so – Responsible Conduct of Scholarship is basically the ethics committee which has nothing to do with – well, I won’t say nothing, ethics are ethics. Actually, anyway – the duties of that committee is provide awareness of complex ethical and related dilemmas that can occur in the scholarship process and suggest ways to address them. The ??? program at NIU make the university community aware of changing governmental and institutional laws, rules, regulations, etc. and so on. So, anybody interested in serving? Down goes the hand. Yeah, okay can you announce that?

J. Hertz: I would be interested in serving. Judy Hertz.

P. Stoddard: Thank you very much.

???: Could you describe who the other members of the committee are?

P. Stoddard: I could. Okay, the committee automatically consists of Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, so that would be Dean Bose. Assistant to the Graduate Dean for Research Compliance, Chair of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, Chair of the Institutional Bio-Safety Committee, Director of Faculty Development and Instructional Design, Research Development Coordinator of the Office of Sponsored Projects, Executive Secretary of the University Council, that would be me – so if I’m going, I’m taking some of you with me. Then a member of the Faculty Senate, representatives from Business, Education – we have two from Education – Engineering Technology, Health and Human Sciences, Law, three from Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from VPA, one from the Libraries, a graduate student representative and ideally, an undergraduate representative. So all colleges are represented as well as various other constituencies. So we have one name to forward, can we have a second? I’m actually asking for a second name.
N. Churyk: ---meet about twice a semester so he doesn’t like to meet that often and they’re very strict about okay, we can meet now and so, this week period so if you can’t make the meeting, you can’t make the meeting – that’s the way it goes. I’ve been on the committee all last year and usually only about six or seven people show up. That’s a really big list and have not seen that many people there because they’re very strict about his schedule and when he can meet.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any other names?

J. Stephen: I’ll try it.

P. Stoddard: Can I have a motion to accept those two names. Okay, now you can second it, safely.

The motion was approved.

P. Stoddard: Any discussion? All in favor? Okay, thank you both very much for offering.

???: The week of October 5 they’d like to schedule the first meeting.

P. Stoddard: Okay, the second thing, and I already have names for that so this should go a little more quickly, is representatives to the Intellectual Property Committee. We need to name two names. I have two nominations. These do not have to be people from the Senate. I have contacted both of these people and they are both willing and interested to do it and they’re Sarah Marsh and Lynn Neeley to serve on the Intellectual Property Committee so all I need is acceptance from this body of those two names. Sarah Marsh and Lynn Neeley. Business.

J. Stephen: I have one nomination; I nominate Doug Bowman from the Math Department. He’s interested in these things and works with the Gutenberg Project. He’s here; you might ask him if he’s willing to serve.

P. Stoddard: Doug are you here?

D. Bowman: Here.

P. Stoddard: Are you willing to serve?

D. Bowman: Sure.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we have another nomination. Very good. Anybody else? Okay, let me see. Okay, I think the ruling reads that three voting faculty members, well one is carrying over so we only need to name two, appointed by the President for terms of three years each from the recommendations of the Senate. So we can either choose to forward just two of the names or we can choose to forward all three and let the President pick.

D. Kempton: Move that we recommend all three.
P. Stoddard: Okay, any further discussion? All right. Hearing none, all in favor of forwarding all three – you want to forward five names? No, okay. All those in favor of forward three names say aye. All opposed? Okay, we’ll forward those three names and thanks to everybody willing to serve on that.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: I don’t believe we have any unfinished business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Reclassification of Asst. Deans, Assoc. Deans, Directors of Centers as SPS.

P. Stoddard: We do have some new business which came up in the last few weeks that has caused some concern among certain faculty. The question goes to whether or not they are actually faculty and so I thought we should discuss it in the Faculty Senate rather than say they’re not faculty and it should be discussed in the Council. Basically, and we have somebody here who can probably do a bit better job but I’ll try describing what the situation is. We have a group of people on campus, the immediate group is a group of eight, but there is actually a larger group numbering in the forties, of people who are faculty who are hired as faculty by-and-large and then at some point accepted an appointment that made them more administrator and the people most immediately affected are people who are directors of divisions, Director of Women’s Studies, Director of Latin American Studies, Southeast Asian Studies – these are folks whose main job right now is that of an administrator but they still consider themselves and many people on campus still consider them to be faculty. What happened is actually when they took those jobs, they started getting lumped in with Supportive Professional Staff when it came time to do salary increments. Traditionally, both bodies, well this is my understanding and we can put it up to discussion in a minute, but both bodies – increments have been treated the same for both bodies until this past year. This past year SPS Council voted for across-the-board increments and faculty, and this something we might want to bring faculty, what sort of increments we want to see – that’s another story for next meeting – but the faculty were given an increment based on merit. Some of these folks noticed that even though they had gotten above average merit evaluations, they are getting a 3% average increment. The average increment was 3% and that’s what they’re getting so they objected and we’re told that they were really SPS, they were grouped with SPS for the purposes of this increment. This created a lot of concern and people were afraid of losing rank and tenure. That has not happened; nobody has ever suggested that that would happen. The people involved – steps are being taken I am told – to address the increment situation so in the colleges they are through, well not going through the evaluation process, but they are going through the increment process again for those people to assure that the increment actually agrees with the merit evaluation that they got. Nevertheless, there are people who are not at all convinced that they have not been reclassified. Frederick Schwantes, the Associate Provost and Steve Cunningham, Associate Vice President for Administration and Human Resources, would like to get this straightened out. We do have an ambiguous case for
these people. There’s rationale for seeing them one way; there’s rational for seeing them the other way. I strongly suggested to both of them and they agreed that this is an item the faculty should be addressing and so I would like to refer this matter, with any comments to come, to the Faculty Rights and Responsibility Committee. I think that’s the most appropriate place and I definitely want them to consider this. I want them to interview the people; talk to the people who’ve been affected and also talk to Frederick and Steve about the rationale for why things exist the way they do at the moment and any possible implications for changing things. Nothing, I mean again, my understanding is that nobody has really changed in their classification. I mean people are still where they were but my word doesn’t assuage everybody’s fears and that’s fair enough. I mean, I’m not in a position to really know that so I thought that committee and hopefully – well, I’d like to refer this to them and I think it’s very important that this be dealt with at the faculty level. Buck?

J. Stephen: I’ve discussed with Provost Alden and given him a two-page letter on the exact rules it violates. People have been changed. He informed me that forty people were so reclassified. On checking in private correspondence with other people, I know of two people whose letters on incremental raises say they are SPS but if you check the PeopleSoft tool section, you find out they’re still listed as faculty. I’d like to point out that any such unilateral reclassification violates one of two principles. One is the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual which says that only the Board of Trustees can give somebody an SPS classification. I don’t know that they took those actions for some of the people we were talking about. Additionally, if you’re going to treat people who are in administrative positions or supervisory positions who still carry a faculty title but treat them as SPS for reasons for salary increment, that violates charge B to the University Council Personnel Committee which has to review all changes in matters dealing with salary increment, raises, promotions, etc. I found it most particularly disturbing that some of the people I talked to got letters that said you got 3% because you’re SPS and they go I didn’t know I was SPS because the APPM says that you’re raised to a supervisory or administrative post and you have tenure or you’re tenure track faculty in a department, you’re residence of tenure stays in that department and you remain a faculty member and the only way that can change is under the terms of agreement of your appointment and the only people who can approve an SPS ranking is the BOT and additionally we have the problem that if you’re SPS, you’re considered faculty no-rank which is a problem because even if you look at the PeopleSoft software for some of these people who’ve been changed to SPS, it gives them a ranked faculty rating. It’s a serious problem; we need to get to the bottom of it.

P. Stoddard: Did you still have a comment? Dan?

D. Kempton: I agree with most of the comments that Professor Stephen made and would like to add a couple of concerns. First of all the suggestion that these people are primarily administrators is one that both their job description and I think their own perception of the matter would belie. In fact, if you look at the way the university pays these people, they receive – particularly the division directors – fewer extra months pay than does typical department chair. So, as a percentage of their payment, certainly they’re not administrators relative to department chairs and if you are considering moving the line all the way to department chairs, there are some additional concerns. I think there’s also a practical concern to this, that we are walking a very dangerous line with regard to the State Legislature. The State Legislature pays very astute
attention to relatively few things at the university. One of the things they do pay attention to is student/teach ratios and what they’re getting for their money. For that reason, this university has in the past, will subtly classify others as faculty. If we’re going in the other direction now and reclassifying faculty as staff for some accounting purpose, I would argue that in the long term we are seriously undermining our position with the State Legislature by saying we now have more administrators, few faculty and more students. I also think there’s some informational questions that ??? because there’s some tough questions that need to be asked. We need to know when they occurred, why it occurred and I don’t think we’ve received full answers to those sort of issues. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Lynn and then Deb can get a chance to respond.

**L. Kamenitsa:** I just want to remind people that while this also includes some associate deans who we did mention, this also includes directors of several academic units. These are academic units whose primary function is instruction. These aren’t other centers around campus who provide service kinds of capacities. So I want people to keep that in mind during the discussion. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Deb?

**D. Haliczer:** Hi. I’m Deborah Haliczer here and this is an awkward thing that came to my attention recently. What you’re looking at is not a change in peoples’ status but an unintended consequence of another action. This year the SPS Council, in looking at SPS raises and Bobbie’s here as our president, voted to give across the board raises if the raises were no more than 3% and only to do merit if it was above that. The unintended consequences that other people who technically are in an administrator classification also got the 3% raise. That was certainly not the intention of the SPS Council and it’s something that was applied across the board to all people who have administrative positions. Let me a give a little background to actual job classification status. According to the State Universities Civil Service System, all employees in state universities are civil service unless they are exempted from the civil service by reason of being faculty members or by being administrators and so in this kind of situation, all administrators above the apartment chair level are in administrative positions which we at Northern consider Supportive Professional Staff. Other universities call them academic professionals or administrative professionals and so this includes classifications if you want to call them that, ranging from the president to the provost to the deans, assistant and associate deans, directors of research units, directors of administrative academic kinds of units like the Honors Program or the Center for Latino and Latin American Studies. So those are all administrative positions which happen to be held by people who hold tenure. They’re still tenured professors; nothing has changed about that. That always takes precedence. However, for purposes of classification through IBHE kinds of examinations whether people are faculty, staff or administrators, this whole group of people – all the SPS and all of the academic people who hold these administrative positions are classified as those administrators and I don’t believe anyone in the administration really thought how this would be applied in terms of the increment that just happened. All of those individuals received 3% raises unless their college gave them additional increments above and beyond that. Steps are being taken by the administrations, the deans and the provost office, to look at those individual situations and to correct them. I apologize for that.
That’s certainly nothing that we thought about at SPS Council but that’s how it’s applied. So really, nothing has changed in terms of peoples’ status as tenured faculty members. We’re talking about the difference between the person who holds tenure and the position which is an administrative position classified by the IBHE and by state offices in a particular way. Does that clarify that at all for you? There are about 43 people who are in this position and the group of people who were affected by this particular increment are 8 people who hold that kind of administrative appointment and they are taking steps to correct that. In the past this was not an issue because SPS, like faculty, received increments based on merit rather than across the board and so no one thought about this until this year when this happened.

**P. Stoddard:** Buck, then Lynn.

**J. Stephen:** I think it’s more than 8 because I’ve talked to at least 8. I don’t understand why when I look up my associate dean’s name on the PeopleSoft, she’s listed as SPS with her rank as faculty and when I consider another person who brought this complaint to me and their letter says they got 3% in line with SPS standards because they are SPS and I looked them up on PeopleSoft, they’re listed as faculty. Additionally, let me talk about adjusting salaries for those faculty members who accidentally got this 3%. Somehow, I suspect, that those people with lower than average ratings are not going to get that money taken away from them. Now the complaint that came to me from a different direction was this type of way of methodology for salary increment for people in administration or supervisory positions, in particular deans, division heads, chairs, whatever, people who are responsible to their constituent faculty, it reverses the order of evaluation. If they are SPS and they’re given a raise based solely across the board when the faculty that they’re responsible to are arm wrestling over something less than cost of living, some of them resent that. They’re saying no longer are they responsible to us, they’re responsible to somebody up above and what’s the point in even sending in an evaluation if it’s going to be ignored for purposes of salary increment. Lynn?

**L. Kamenitsa:** I just have a question. Since most of these people thought they were faculty, I have a question about shared governance and where their representation lies. Were they represented by this body or only by their SPS Council or both or neither or why they are there and why they were not informed of this previously so there’s a classification question there as well.

**D. Haliczer:** They’re classified as faculty, not as SPS. Their positions are administrative positions. They are tenured faculty represented by faculty bodies.

**J. Stephen:** That’s not allowed under the A.P.P.M. You can – SPS are necessarily faculty no-rank.

**D. Haliczer:** If you look at the fine print in that, they are faculty no-rank unless they hold tenure in an academic department.

**J. Stephen:** No, they are SPS faculty no-rank unless they hold tenure. They’re together; SPS, faculty and no rank.
D. Haliczer: Okay, we regular SPS are faculty no rank. Those academic administrators who have this SPS kind of position are generally exempted from most of the rules of SPS because they hold rank which takes precedence over their position – the person.

J. Stephen: I contend that you can’t be both faculty and SPS.

D. Haliczer: If you look at the state, they are looking at administrative positions held by faculty members and the only faculty administrators who are considered faculty and not administrative positions are department chairs. I think it’s an issue that the committee really needs to examine and have some dialog with the Provost Office because there are some ambiguities in all of the regulations that we have and all of our policies internally and they cause confusion if you look at how the state applies these rules and regulations. I think it’s worth looking at.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, I suggest this is something the committee should take on.

J. Stephen: I suggest we refer it to Rules and Regulations.

P. Stoddard: One more comment and then – people are beginning to leave so ---

D. Swanson: Dianna Swanson. I just think that another issue here is scholarship and the scholarship of such faculty who are now put in SPS positions, how does that figure then in their duties and their merit evaluation, etc.? I think that’s an important consideration to be dealt with.

P. Stoddard: Obviously a lot to think about. So can I have a motion to refer this to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities? Buck Stephen moves. Second? Okay, thank you. Any further discussion? All right, all in favor of referring to the appropriate committee say aye. Thank you. I’ll just point out before you head out the door there are some information items. These are minutes from various committees across campus some of which you may find interesting. These are things that occasionally we would like to talk about and some of them we actually look at. With that, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. Thank you. Any second? All right, get up and leave if you’re in favor.

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

XIII. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.