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


S. Chen attended for R. Moraga.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Order, order. Welcome to the Faculty Senate Meeting for October. We’ve been called to order so I guess the next order of business is the adoption of the agenda.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Can I have a motion? Thank you Professor Baker. Can I have a second? Thank you. A couple of walk in items on the agenda. One is the FAC report. The other is the BOT Legislative, Audit, and External Affairs report. The other is the full Board of Trustees’ report. Those are all walk ins. Any comments, additions, deletions? All in favor of approving the budget say aye – not the budget – we have approved the budget so that’s good news. All in favor of approving the agenda? Thank you. Any opposed?

Baker made the motion: Smith seconded. The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2007 FS MEETING  
(Pages 3-6)

P. Stoddard: How about the minutes. Anybody want to move for approval of the minutes? Thank you. Cason and Professor Baker seconds. Any comments on the minutes? All right. All in favor of approving the minutes please say aye. Thank you.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
P. Stoddard: Under announcements, I think we’ll let Alan go first. Alan is our Faculty Personnel Advisor and he would like to say a few words about what he does and how he can help anybody who might need some help.

A. Alan Rosenbaum will talk about Faculty Personnel Advisor services.

A. Rosenbaum: I think the purpose of my speaking to you today is two-fold, one if there’s anyone here who doesn’t understand what the Personnel Advisor does, but more importantly, one of the problems that we’ve had with the Faculty Personnel Advisor position is that it’s underutilized and the concern is that people in the university don’t know that it’s available and there are people in different ranks, not just faculty people, but people in SPS and the other groups that perhaps don’t realize that the Faculty Personnel Advisor is there to serve their needs as well. So part of what the Senate last spring decided was that one of the things that needed to be done, and there were several things that needed to be done with respect to the position, but one of the things that needs to be done is we need to somehow better publicize the position and since the Faculty Senate consists of a representative from every department in the university, the notion was that who better than Faculty Senators to go back to their departments and make their departments aware of the services of the Faculty Personnel Advisor which at the moment happens to be me but it’s not a permanent appointment so that is something that changes every several years. So take good notes; I’ll give you a little quiz after this but I do want you to go back to your departments and to hopefully – I don’t know how many departments have regular faculty meetings, but the hope is that you if you do have a regular faculty meeting you will at some point be able to make an announcement and inform the other faculty and staff in your department about the services and if you have a department where the faculty meets separately from the professional staff or from others that might take advantage of the position, that you will somehow let the chair know or circulate something in the department to let people know that this is available.

So that being said, the position of Faculty Personnel Advisor was created by Article 9 of the Bylaws and I’ll read to you exactly what it says so you understand who it serves. The first line is that “the Faculty Personnel Advisor is a resource person who serves as available to any faculty member (that’s either ranked or non-ranked faculty), administrator or personnel body in the university.” So it’s pretty broadly defined. So it’s “any faculty member, administrator or personnel body in the university” so that includes pretty much everybody. I’ve been told that people who are civil service employees have their own grievance procedures and therefore, they wouldn’t necessarily come through the Faculty Personnel Advisor but I also have to tell you that I wouldn’t turn those people away if they came to see me.

The purpose of the Faculty Personnel Advisor as distinguished from the ombudsman as I understand it is that the Faculty Personnel Advisor is not a neutral party so the ombudsman is a more neutral position that serves that is accountable to the university, to the administration, to the faculty and provides essentially information, whereas the Faculty Personnel Advisor only serves the needs of the constituency which are the faculty and the staff as I’ve just outlined. I’ll say faculty from here on in for convenience but please read in all of those other folks that you’re going to tell about the services. So the Faculty Personnel Advisor is not a neutral party and so when people come to see me to discuss their problems, whatever those might be, I do not have to
worry about the interests of the university or anybody else; I’m just interested in serving the interests of my constituency. The Faculty Personnel Advisor has a lot of leeway in how he can function or how she can function and that means that the services that I could provide would range from just providing information and direction. In other words, telling people what their rights are, what procedures are, how to go about getting their rights met or getting their grievances heard but it can also involve being an advocate for the person and trying to help that person deal with whatever problems they’re having. To give you an idea of what some of the problems are, these can involve any personnel problem such as somebody who has been denied tenure or promotion. So tenure/promotion refusals make up a large percentage of disgruntled people at the university level and those would be people who could come to the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Someone who is dissatisfied let’s say with their merit evaluation or with the merit evaluation process in their department; those would be appropriate. People have come to me and it’s appropriate for them to come to me, to discuss interpersonal problems that they’re having either within their department, within their college – problems with their chairs, problems with their deans, difficulty in terms of feelings that they’re being mistreated or harassed – so pretty much anything that a faculty of an SPS person is dissatisfied with or worried about, it would be appropriate for them to come to the Faculty Personnel Advisor. The role as I see it, you know, as I said before, it can range from just providing information to providing advocacy. I think that over the course of the year that I’ve been doing this, I have done both so I tend to provide information but also in certain cases, to offer to be with faculty members as a representatives at meetings with people that they’re having a difficult problem with. So, for example, if someone’s having a problem with a chair and they feel the chair is being unfair to them, they can ask me to come with them to that meeting and I am happy to do that and I have done that in certain circumstances and to serve as kind of an intermediary – sometimes just to serve as an observer to make sure that people are behaving themselves; other times to represent that person to ask questions. So there are situations where I just talk to them, situations where they’ll invite me to come to a meeting. People may or may not know this but if you are being disciplined in some way by the university, you have a right to have a third party present at any meeting where this is going on whether that’s with a dean or a chair and the Faculty Personnel Advisor is one of the people that could be asked to accompany you to a meeting such as that and I would be willing to do that. The major of the time, I am talking to people about what their situation is and helping them sort of work through it, serve as a sounding board to give them an opportunity to sort of get stuff off their chest and then to make some suggestions to them as to what they might be able to do or things that they might try. My objective has always been to help people achieve an informal solution to their problems. We have grievance procedures that are outlined in the Constitution and Bylaws and in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual but very few people want to go to a formal grievance procedure and so the objective is to sort of see if I can help people get some reasonable resolution of their problems without formally pressing charges against somebody or going through a formal grievance process. If they’re unable to do that, then of course I’m available to advise them and to help them make decisions about what they ought to do in terms of a formal process.

So that’s essentially what happens, the types of problems that I deal with. Pretty much anybody can come to me. If I’m not the appropriate person I will try and direct them to the person that is appropriate. A lot of referrals that I get come through Human Resources. Deb Haliczer will sometimes refer people. Tim Griffin will often recommend that people talk to me so some
people come to me through the Ombudsman’s Office, so these are some of the routes.

I guess that’s pretty much all I have to say other than to address questions that people might have. So if anyone wants to know anything that I haven’t told you or wants me to qualify something, I’d be happy to do that. Yes?

K. Thu: Maybe it would be useful if you could outline what kinds of confidentiality provisions there might be in sharing information with you.

A. Rosenbaum: Absolutely. I maintain complete confidentiality of the information and so anything that’s said to me is completely confidential. I keep records that are only available to the Faculty Personnel Advisor; they’re not available to any other resource. When people come to see me, I explain to them that they have complete control over the information that they give me. So if they tell me something is going on, but they don’t want me to do anything about it, I don’t do anything about it. I will not even contact them as a follow-up so I always tell people I’d really like to know what happened, but I will not call you, you have to call me. So if there’s something you want me to know, you call me, otherwise I don’t talk to you about it. So everything is completely confidential and well – completely confidential. I will meet with people in any location that they want to meet me. I invite people to come to my office if they would like to do that but I’m also willing to go to their office or meet at a neutral site. We can put on disguises and go to McDonalds or something but I’m happy to meet people in any way that makes them comfortable. Most of the time, people are comfortable coming to my office but not always and so I do whatever it takes to make people feel comfortable and that they’re protected. My background is clinical psychology so I’m fairly used to maintaining confidentiality of information so that’s something that’s really second nature to me. I think I do a reasonable job of that. Good question though. Yeah?

N. Churyk: You said you’re from the Psychology Department but yet you’re advising people about their rights regarding merit and grievances so how does this protect them if they’re – you’re representing when they’re allowed a third party if they may need legal – so you’re giving them advice so does this affect their legal – if they need – hurt them in any way if they had to have actually a legal counsel – and you’re giving them advice?

A. Rosenbaum: I can’t imagine how it would, I mean, I’m very straightforward about the fact that if I suggest the need for legal advice, I suggest that they might want to confer with an attorney so I don’t give any legal advice. The closest I would come to that is to suggest that they might have some legal options and in order to find that out, they would have to speak to an attorney. So no matter what, the Faculty Personnel Advisor typically comes from a department so we have had Faculty Personnel Advisors that have come from the law school. My predecessor was from the business school. I’m from LA&S but I don’t certainly pretend to give legal advice and basically refer people who seem to need that to the appropriate source. Yeah?

D. Swanson: How do people contact you?

A. Rosenbaum: There’s a link on the Faculty Senate website and so if just to the Faculty Senate website I’m listed there. They can also – I would be happy to give you my phone number if
anyone wants it. It’s 753-7084 and my NIU e-mail address is, as you might expect, arosenbaum@niu.edu. But all that I believe is on the Faculty Senate website, is it not Paul?

P. Stoddard: Should be.

A. Rosenbaum: Donna?

D. Mathesius: I don’t know ----

A. Rosenbaum: I’m think it is; I’m pretty sure there’s a link on that so – yes. Okay. Yes? Question in the back?

W. Baker: If I may I’d like to make three observations which aren’t necessarily related to one another. First of all that there’s confidentiality involved. In the past few years, very serious problems have arisen which in fact have led faculty members to actually resign after many years from the university. Now if it comes to that point that faculty members in the plural go down that route, it seems that something really is wrong with what we offer in terms of assistance. Secondly, am I right in assuming that the Faculty Advisor has in fact, no real teeth? All the Faculty Advisor can do is essentially to advise and thirdly, it all depends on the Faculty Advisor. I mean, I can remember and I will name him, the late Arnold Fox who’s been dead for many years who, in fact, to put it simply, the administration were rather afraid of because he did exercise some teeth, some gloat and he defended faculty to the hilt so I think we have to aware of how each Faculty Advisor sees the role as they wish to before me. That’s not very English but it all depends on the individual Faculty Advisor. So it’s just three different points. One that there have been recent cases, where very serious problems have arisen in which faculty after many, many years have resigned from the university and that seems to me to be a terrible situation and somehow we failed them if it comes to that.

A. Rosenbaum: Can I address that point first? My first comment there is that nobody, Faculty Personnel Advisor or otherwise whether or not you have teeth, can help people who don’t come to you for help. So if somebody is concerned about something, they need to first come to the Faculty Personnel Advisor before that person can either represent them or advocate for them or give them advise and so in the cases that – I can think of no case where anyone that I’ve helped – well, maybe I shouldn’t say that – at any rate many times people will not come and exercise their rights for whatever reason and so many of the people that come, when you advise them of the grievance procedures and what they might do, they decline to do that because they do not want to be dragged through a grievance process so typically if someone is being fired or being abuse – not abuse, but somebody’s being asked to resign or whatever, there are very often things which have been done which they may or may not want to have discussed in an open forum so we can only advise people as to what their rights are and what the procedures are but we can’t force them to take advantage of them and that’s only predicated on the fact that they actually come in the first place. Second of all, your statement is actually correct when you say that the Faculty Personnel Advisor has no power and that’s really the first thing I tell people is that we have no real power. So someone can come to me and I can say this is a serious problem or I agree with you, but I can’t do anything about it because I do not have the authority and so that’s not what this position is all about. Now does that mean that the Faculty Personnel Advisor is powerless, it
doesn’t because I think what happens is by offering to participate in meetings where people are being disciplined in some way, the powers that are doing the disciplining, very often do not want to do that in front of a neutral party who can then sort of say they have been unfair or they’ve haven’t been evenhanded so simply calling up a dean and saying, you know, I’ve been asked by so and so to attend this meeting, is that okay with you – very often will get their attention and I’ve been surprised that starting out I felt that really the position has no power but I’ve been surprised at the kinds of reactions I get from deans and chairs and things like that when I call them up and make an inquiry and so they don’t want to be thought of by somebody who is representative of the faculty as a whole as somebody who is engaging in shady activities and as a result, I think that my presence or my involvement tends to keep people above board. I think a number of the people that I’ve dealt with have gotten some positive impact simply by bringing me into the situation and having either a chair or a dean who doesn’t want really to be exposed as engaging in some kind of underhanded activity so – I don’t know that toothless is the word I would use. I hope not. Yes, Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I wanted to speak to Professor Baker’s concern because I know our department had an occasion to disagree with our then dean who was proposing to reappoint a chair who had completely lost the competence and trust of the department. The dean was of the opinion he could do this but, having read the bylaws, our reading suggested that if the faculty did not approve of this, the dean must look for a new chair. The dean was surprised at this and consulted the Faculty Advisor, we had already consulted the Faculty Advisor to determine this, and so when the dean had occasion to talk to the Faculty Advisor he made it clear to the dean that he could not do what he proposed to do and it was not done. On other occasions, when I was department chair, I was party a disagreement about tenure and the Faculty Personnel Advisor, then Carl ???, came to the meeting of the UCPC and did a very good job of advocating for the faculty member who then, in my view appropriately, received tenure.

P. Stoddard: And if I may add, okay, one second, the role that the Personnel Advisor takes is dependent on the Personnel Advisor himself or herself and we get some folks who feel that their role is to advise and advise only; others who feel that their roll is to advocate. I will say that this body – it’s this body, right? – picks the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Usually we are picking from a pool of one, if that, which limits our choices but if we as a body want a Personnel Advisor is more of an advocate than an advisor the, assuming we get enough names, the people could then offer that they would advise or they would advocate and then we would select based on what we wanted. So, I mean, in part if you’re worried that we don’t have advocates or that we don’t have strong advocates, that is because those folks are not coming forward to volunteer for this position. So, I mean – you know, we have to look to ourselves to see, you know, to get the people who would like to get in these positions. Yeah, go ahead?

C. Garcia: Clerisida Garcia from the Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education. I just think that it’s good to have a Faculty Advisor and the faculty should be aware that these services are there, even in the role of advisor or the role of advocate because when faculty is going through these difficulties, they don’t know who to trust, who to go to, who to talk to and sometimes just listening to yourself talking to someone that have heard of these cases or know about these cases – it just help you in your own mind, just listening to what’s going on. Even if nothing gets done, to be able to talk to someone ??? to listen to us is a good thing at those times.
B. Miller: I have two very different questions here. One, to follow-up on something Alan was saying with regard to the teeth issue, I’m curious to know – and this is something we might need to explore a bit more within, dare I say, one of our subcommittees that I’m on – with regard to the issue of the difference between faculty being disciplined having a right to an observer and faculty being called in because I think that’s a fine line and I think your experience may be broader and you may be able to speak to that, but I know that you can also be told no you can’t come to a meeting if the faculty has asked you to come if they are not being disciplined. Is that correct?

A. Rosenbaum: Right, that’s correct.

B. Miller: I’m wondering how broad that experience has been.

A. Rosenbaum: That has not been broad. In other words, that has happened in only a limited number of cases but the Bylaws are somewhat specific about that and it basically says that if somebody is being somehow censored or disciplined – or what?

B. Miller: But harassment doesn’t count?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, the problem is that the harassment is being charged by the faculty member; it’s not being charged against the faculty member so if the faculty member was being charged with harassment, then that would be something where they would have the right to have the Faculty Personnel Advisor present. But if the faculty member was charging harassment that would not be something that they would automatically be entitled to and then there would be, you know, the question of whether the other party was willing to have another party present.

B. Miller: Right.

A. Rosenbaum: So ---

B. Miller: But in a public institution, most ??? activities are seen as something where you have a right to have an observer present. We have a right to observers in our classrooms, we have a right to observers in our faculty meetings, rights to observers you would think, in a dialogue with administrators and it seems odd that you could say no, we don’t have the right to someone when we feel that we need someone there and I just ----

A. Rosenbaum: This is something we spoke about last year and whether we wanted to take this on and say that we want to change the rules.

B. Miller: Right.

A. Rosenbaum: And that’s what it would take. We’d have to sort of get a change in the rules in order to make that possible.

B. Miller: Right.
A. Rosenbaum: Which is perfectly reasonable.

B. Miller: My second point – so I’m bringing that up to air it with the faculty. The second point is that I think that one of the things that might make this position a little stronger in terms of both publicity and also in terms of the person who gains credibility on the campus is to also look structurally at both – and these are issues we brought up in the spring when we talked about the position – is the funding of this position which is, as I recall, half-time – well part-time – that you work in this position part-time and you teach part-time and I’m not sure everybody always remembers that and the position is not a line item from the Provost’s Office so your department has to subsidize it which I think undermines its credibility as a university position and I think we should still position ourselves as saying that that’s important. Also, when I was looking at the Bylaws, this is a term limited position; you can’t be reappointed. I’m not saying you would want to, but, you know, there may be a reason for sanity’s sake that that’s a problem but I think that if you were interested in it, the Bylaws shouldn’t necessarily restrict a person who is interested and committed and has already learned all the information about the rules and regulations, the Bylaws might not be the place to restrict that position.

P. Stoddard: We do have University Council – I believe it’s the University Affairs Committee – is actually looking at the question now of funding and how that’s accomplished for the FPA, actually for the Ombudsman Office and my position as well because all of these sort of are funded in the ether almost. There are reasons for that and good reasons but it may not be the best way to do things. I mean, if one particular place has the power of the purse, then there’s always the fear or the impression that they might have undue influence on a position that’s supposed to be independent. But anyway, we are looking at that. This is a recommendation that came up last year as you say. It’s come up before and we are investigating if there’s a better way of doing that and we are also taking a look at the Bylaws governing the Faculty Personnel Advisor both to changing the name to Faculty and SPS Advisor.

A. Rosenbaum: University Personnel Advisor.

P. Stoddard: University Personnel Advisor – I like it. You know, Alan has been sitting in on those meetings if I am correct.


P. Stoddard: Not those meetings? Okay. Fair enough. They should be contacting you but this concern about term limits is certainly something that could be looked at when that committee looks at the Bylaws governing the FPA position.

A. Rosenbaum: The only thing I would add to that is when they do that, I think those two have to go together; the funding for the position and the term limits because otherwise it becomes too much of a strain on a department or a college to have to sort of do without those courses or provide funding so you have to do both of those things, not just one or the other.

P. Stoddard: I think we had Professor Swanson?
D. Swanson: Yeah, maybe I didn’t hear you but did you say what committee is working on this, you know, is considering these possible changes and stuff?

P. Stoddard: I believe it’s the University Affairs Committee of the University Council.

D. Swanson: Oh, okay thanks.

P. Stoddard: And Professor Lusk?

B. Lusk: I just wanted to say that ---

P. Stoddard: Microphone please.

B. Lusk: I’ve got it.

P. Stoddard: Oh, okay.

B. Lusk: I just wanted to say that from the other perspective, several years ago I did have to approach personally the Faculty Personnel Advisor and far from saying that that position was not powerful, from the terms of shedding light in darkened corners of offices in this university, it was very, very powerful because it brought an outside influence which was unbelievably healthy and helpful so I really appreciated the support and – not the support – but the fact that the university has someone who looks on departmental concerns that shouldn’t stay buried. So it was very helpful and powerful.

P. Stoddard: Professor Sons:

L. Sons: It seems to me that this half-time, if that’s what it is right now, I’m not sure – but that half-time should be funded in ??? that comes under the Senate and therefore it is independent of the particular college. That should be some monies that go to funding the Faculty Senate and that placing it there keeps any kind of burden from a particular college or particular department in general. The second thing I would say is that talking about the potential of advocate versus advisory, it don’t think it should be an either/or. I think it should be a both/and. There are times when faculty comes to such a person. They don’t really have, if you want to call it, a case and they need somebody to tell them that they don’t have a case; that they’re not really wasting their time trying to push through something or other where at the moment they have some, you know, disgruntlement over some such thing and they need to air it, they need to realize it’s not really something that represents a case and somebody needs to be there to help them realize that. So I think sometimes one is advisory to the extent of saying, you know – really this and you probably shouldn’t do that and have you thought about it hard and the whole big picture and other times you want somebody who’s a real advocate. I don’t think it’s an either/or.

J. Stephen: I agree with Linda Sons about the need for funding this through the Faculty Senate. I think the way that we do it now; it limits potential pool of applicants. But I thought of a
paradox while you were talking. In interpersonal disputes, let’s just stick with the harassment that you talked about, you can be an advisor to both the person pressing charges and the person having charges pressed against them but at present you can only advocate for the person who’s the target of such a thing. But on the other hand, what do you do if both sides of an argument come to you for advice?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think ---

J. Stephen: How can you remain impartial ---

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I would think in that situation, what you would do and again it has happened, is that what you’re doing is just informing both parties of what their respective rights are. I mean, you can do that without advocating for one or the other. So you’d have to be much more careful about providing advice if you were also helping the other person but information I think would be something that you could provide to both sides.

J. Stephen: How about mediation?

A. Rosenbaum: If someone invited the Faculty Personnel Advisor to mediate a dispute that would be fine.

J. Stephen: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: So you could certainly meet with both parties and see if you could help them work it out in a way in which they both felt they had gotten at least something they were looking for so that would be perfectly reasonable.

P. Stoddard: Okay, there are – go ahead Kendall.

K. Thu: I just want to chime in on the idea of having a funding stream come through the Senate. We’re the body that elects the Faculty Advisor and would it not be appropriate for us to having a subcommittee come up with a proposal for the way a funding stream might operate?

P. Stoddard: Personally, I would love to see that. When I suggested it to the powers that be that that would be a good way of doing things – I think the first reaction was laughter; the second reaction was that just is not done anywhere else. That doesn’t mean we shouldn’t be the first to do it but I think it’s an uphill battle. It may very well be a battle worth fighting however.

J. Stephen: I think that’s a battle we should devote our personal attention and personal resources to winning.

P. Stoddard: Personal huh?

J. Stephen: As a body we don’t.

P. Stoddard: Professor Garcia?
C. Garcia: I think that’s why we’re here. We’re here to bring our voice where the faculty voice. I would think that’s something that is important for the faculty. Our job to bring it up to their attention and try to get them to pay attention to it and do something about it. Whatever they do, then we know we don’t have anything else to do but we have to be the voice up there.

P. Stoddard: Okay, I think this has been a very good discussion and I will forward comments and suggestions made here to the UC University Affairs Committee looking at this and unless anybody else has any other questions, maybe we should move on. All right, thank you very much Alan. I thought that was very useful.

Moving on, let’s see, last time we had some elections. The results of those – well, we went through, we announced the results of the Grievance Committee election or selection at the time so I won’t read the names again. UCPC elections, Carol Thompson was elected for LA&S and Bridget Lusk was elected for HHS. Let’s see, also the alternates, University Council alternates are on the last page of the walk-in packet along with the policy for selecting alternates and so forth. So if your name is on the list, you may well be asked at some point to fill in for the Council rep when they can’t make a meeting. I think in the interest of time, that’s all I will have for announcements.

J. Stephen: Is the LA&S rep that was elected a two year term or are we talking about the one year replacement for me?

P. Stoddard: That was the one year replacement for you.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Graduate Student compensation

P. Stoddard: Moving on then, items for faculty senate consideration. In the Executive Committee Meeting last week, the issue of graduate student compensation arose in terms of trying to attract good graduate students and especially our stipends. The question was whether or not the stipends we offer at NIU are competitive with our peer institutions. It was suggested that we would like to refer this to one of the standing committees. We didn’t reach – well, we did reach a conclusion on which standing committee it should go to but the chair wasn’t there at the time so rather than follow typical procedure we decided we would wait until the full meeting when the chair could speak for himself and the committee. Anyway, does anybody have any ideas where they would like to see this issue – well, a) that they would like to see this issue investigated and b) where the appropriate committee would be to handle this?

A. Rosenbaum: Just to clarify, we had sort of decided at the meeting that Cason and I would meet and sort of make a decision between us and whether we would want to collaborate on this or not and we had arranged to meet after this meeting to discuss it so I just want to keep him, you know, informed as to, I had told him what we were doing so if you want to change it that’s fine, but that had been the plan.
P. Stoddard: The reason this becomes of some import is with True North and with other potential new money streams shall we say, there may be money for graduate assistants and we may be asked at some point as a faculty whether we want more graduate assistants or do we want to be able to attract better graduate assistants depending on the type of money we might be seeing. So the first question was where do we stand with regards to how we compensate graduate assistants now relative to other institutions? Are we losing them purely on a financial basis or, you know, is that something we can improve with more money or, you know, would more graduate students be better than the other option. That was kind of what framed our discussion in the Executive Committee and I don’t know that this is terribly time sensitive but the sooner the better I think.

K. Thu: Just to add one addition note that we talked about, I think Alan brought up the issue of the lack of organized representation of graduate students at the university. I don’t know of any body that represents graduate students per se since we’re not unionized and so who is advocating for graduate students in terms of advocacy and other benefits and if fee structures go up, who’s going to be there to be their voice? If anybody knows who we might turn to to help with that, I think we would appreciate knowing that.

P. Stoddard: The University Personnel Advisor. Professor Miller?

B. Miller: I can just say that NIU is one of the few graduate schools in Illinois that doesn’t have a graduate students’ rights and responsibilities act which protects graduate students from potential abuse from their graduate faculty or problems. It also doesn’t have any kind of sick leave if they’re on a graduate assistantship and that also sets us apart from competitive programs and that’s particularly the case with people with Ph.D.s so if a student is sick, becomes pregnant they could potentially lose their graduate assistantship and have to drop out of school. There’s no provision for working that out. If their faculty member decides they don’t want them, they just can lose it and those rights are protected at other institutions in the state. So that may be something that we want to talk to Human Resources about in terms of whether that’s even legal, I don’t know, but I do know that that happens and it was a concern of mine when I was working extensively with graduate students but there is no organized body that advocates.

J. Stephen: Tim reminded me this weekend that I’ve dropped the ball and not followed through on – not his words, my words – in that we haven’t got the student grievance procedure finished but that grievance procedure does not include a student bill of rights nor does it delineate responsibility so this I believe is a separate issue as opposed to how do you – although that is sort of problematic. If you don’t have structured rights and responsibilities, how do you address grievances?

A. Rosenbaum: In sort of looking into this, we do have something called the Graduate Student Advisory Committee to the Graduate School and there are students on that who could possibly be brought in to talk about some of these issues with us but that’s the only organization that I was able to find out about.

P. Stoddard: Okay, that’s a nice way to start.
**D. Haliczer:** Just for information. The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women is likely this year to be looking at issues of absence/leave policy for graduate students so that’s one of the things we’re proposing looking at.

**J. Stephen:** The Status of Women group is addressing this but I’m assuming it’s going to be addressed in such a way that it is a coherent plan that deals with any type of unforeseen illness rather you be male or female? Thank you. I was just afraid that it was a maternity leave clause.

**D. Swanson:** If the question at hand here is how do we go forward with this, I would suggest that the Economic Status of the Profession, you know, that committee would be appropriate to look at the pay issues and unfortunately, since I’m on that committee, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee might be a place to take up the issue of grad student rights and responsibilities since there isn’t another one that seems, you know, because our graduate assistants in fact are researchers are teachers here so ---

**P. Stoddard:** Is that a motion?

**D. Swanson:** If we’re going to discuss it doesn’t it have to be a motion?

**P. Stoddard:** Strictly speaking it should be a motion to discuss it yes.

**D. Swanson:** Okay, I move that the issue of graduate assistant pay be referred to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee and the issue of graduate assistant rights, responsibilities and representation – I was looking for another committee Alan but – be referred to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

**P. Stoddard:** Do I take your action as a second?

**J. Stephen:** Yes.

**P. Stoddard:** Professor Stephen seconds. Any discussion on that? Professor Miller serving on both can act as liaison.

**N. Castle:** I would like to suggest that if the two chairs who already agreed that they would meet after the meeting to talk about how they might talk about this, do that.

**P. Stoddard:** Is that a friendly amendment? Any other discussion? Yes, Professor Chown?

**J. Chown:** Thank you. I would just add that it goes beyond the simple salary of the graduate students. I found in recent years that student fees have gone up I think disproportionate to raises that they’ve gotten and also I’ve had a couple of horror stories about the insurance not picking up claims for students and things like that and recently, in the last two years, it seems like I’ve had five or six graduate students come in and tell me they were taking student loans on top of their assistantships which I think probably speaks to the fact that we are out of line in terms of keeping them paid at a sustainable salary.
P. Stoddard: Well, compensation I think – well anyway, pay and benefits is a good point.

A. Rosenbaum: I just want to clarify, there’s sort of a discrepancy between the motion and the amendment so if we’re going to assign it to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities but also want Cason and I to discuss this afterwards, it would seem like we should discuss it afterwards and then decide whether we’re assigning it to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities or some other committee.

P. Stoddard: You guys just coordinate where the line might be.

D. Swanson: My motion was to assign the compensation issue to Economic Status and rights and representation issue to the Rights and Responsibilities Committee.


P. Stoddard: Right, and that was a seconded motion. Any other discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? All right. Now you guys can get together and figure out if there’s any overlap that you need to worry about.

The motion passed.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we don’t have a Consent Agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Next is Reports from Advisory Committees, FAC to IBHE. FAC is the Faculty Advisory Council to the Illinois Board of Higher Ed. We met last Friday, a week ago Friday, the 21st of September over in Altgeld Hall. We hosted the meeting. Everybody was very impressed with Altgeld Hall. They were very impressed with the food we served them. I guess they got a little better than we usually get at these meetings. We have leftovers – well, most of the stuff is bad – we threw that out but if you like Special K or rice crispies we have extra of those for anybody who wants to stop by the Faculty Senate office.

We met – President Peters came and basically talked about the university a little bit to the group and gave his impressions of where higher education stands in relation to the State Legislature and priorities and so forth. He talked a little bit about the IBHE and so on. We then met with the DeKalb representative to the Illinois State House, Bob Pritchard who talked a lot about higher ed. He talked about his role, not a founding role, but his role in putting together a caucus, bipartisan/bicameral caucus in the Legislature to discuss higher education issues and basically he actually seemed pretty strong in his support. Now he’s playing to an audience of course, but he seems rather strong in his support of higher education and, even though he’s a Republican, the word tax increase did cross his lips as something that we might seriously have to look at in this
We also met with Senator Burzynski from this region who also said that we might have to look at raising the income tax to help pay for tuition. So I’m not sure what’s going on where the Democrats don’t want to raise taxes and the Republicans do. It’s a weird season but it’s an interesting season and, you know, we want to keep the pressure on the Legislature. Now most of us probably live in the district here and Pritchard and Burzynski are out representatives and they are already on our side but those of you who do not, those of you who have friends and relations in other parts of the state, especially parts that don’t have universities in them – even though those districts don’t have universities and don’t have faculty and don’t have to worry about squeezing faculty and administrations of universities – they all have students and they all have families of students and parents of students. And they have parents who are concerned about rising tuition rates because the state is falling further and further behind in its ability to fund or desire to fund higher education so, you know, when we make cases to the Legislature about why we need better funding, why we need better facilities, why we need buildings that aren’t fall apart. It’s not enough to know that right is on your side. You have to be able to say well, what’s in it for the Legislature and one of them, I believe it was Burzynski, said, you know, I could get you guys all a twenty percent raise tomorrow if you all agreed to teach twenty percent more classes and he said you can’t in politics ever get something for nothing and so you have to be able to show them that it’s in their best interest in terms of satisfying their constituents to support higher ed. You might think, we might think as a body, is there anything we can do that would make it easier for people to argue. I don’t know. I’m not suggesting we suddenly all start teaching one or two more courses every year but are there things, you know, that we could be doing. We all yell and moan and sometimes very deservedly so, every time the word assessment gets raised. Take a look at it. Sometimes it’s not a bad thing. Sometimes it can be very helpful. And if we show the willingness perhaps to be more accountable, they might show the willingness to be more supportive. I don’t know; they didn’t say that specifically but these are the types of things that would get more support I think in Springfield than just our going down there and saying higher education is a great thing and we all know it’s good and the moral thing to do is to fund it as much as humanly possible and I believe we all believe that but they don’t. Even if it is the moral and right thing to do, that doesn’t get them re-elected and it doesn’t get them campaign contributions and so forth.

Anyway, that was basically what I got out of the meeting with the two representatives. The notes in front of you are actually by Jody Newman-Ryan who was there for her last meeting with the group. I have identified somebody, Earl Hansen, who’s not here today but he is a member of the Senate and he has offered to take over the role of Faculty Advisory Council representative for NIU. We should probably vote on that at some point as a body but anyway, he will be – assuming everybody is all right with that – he will be taking over that role and giving these reports in the future.

The other thing that’s in this packet is a position paper that the FAC has come up with and this
has to do with college students’ mental health. This is actually a position paper that they were looking into before the events of last April in Virginia so they were able to come up with something and put in Virginia Tech references where appropriate to help stress the nature of the problem. Anyway, this is something that they would like to forward to the full Board of Higher Ed so you might want to take a look at this and see if you have any major issues with it.

**J. Stephen:** I just read it and I have several comments that I think people should be aware of.

**P. Stoddard:** All right.

**J. Stephen:** You ready?

**P. Stoddard:** Go ahead.

**J. Stephen:** On page 2, the last paragraph what’s strange here is that it says even – they’re talking about the number of confidants that students have and the most commonly reported number is zero even though we live in a culture where our students tell us they have lots of virtual friends, that doesn’t turn into real friendship or confidants, you know, having a confidant. But addressing two things that came up here, under conclusions, the third page, paragraph two, addresses campus counseling centers and that’s also recommendation one and I just bring that to your attention because of the turnover in the psychiatric services for the NIU students last year caused by essentially the reduction of time of exposure that the psychiatrist could pay to the student.

Also on the third page is a nice point if we’re going to talk to the Legislature about paying more and it says that part of the problem with mental health with students is worrying about debt.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, any questions or comments – other comments about the FAC?

**B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report (Pages 7-8)**

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on then Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. We have a report. Professor Bryan?

**F. Bryan:** Thank you Paul. Some of this is in fact old news since this was on September 6 but I think as Paul was just reporting, sometimes it’s not what they formally voted on that’s of interest as other things that are said. For example, Chair Vella welcomed everyone back at the start of the semester and then acknowledged that we live in unsettled times, making lots of references to the then ongoing budget mess in Springfield. But this particular meeting of this committee always focusing on the progress of teaching, research, and also this year awards to faculty and staff. The major action item was the formal recognition for the Northern Illinois Center for Accelerator Detector Development or NICADD and that was formally approved. It has over $900,000.00 a year in annual external funding, supports twenty researchers and eighteen grad students. It’s a great facility and Professor Sue Mini of the Physics Department was there to answer questions about it.
Under information items, I would direct your attention to the performance report which was abbreviated this year as Professor Virginia Cassidy pointed out in her role as Vice-Provost, that because of the Strategic Planning process, there was limited information that they wanted but law and nursing and undergraduates meeting initial certification requirements was quite high.

In terms of the progress report and Paul mentioned assessment, please note that we in fact have been reaccredited through 2014 and in the June 28, 2007 progress report that Cassidy reported that the university was specifically commended for its design and implementation of a ???.

Provost Alden recognized twenty-seven individuals who received faculty emeritus designation and he also honored the recipients of the various teaching awards, research professors, teaching professors and excellence in undergraduate teaching awards. Also operating staff and presidential supportive professional staff awards for excellence were received.

Then the committee heard a PowerPoint presentation from Dean Bose concerning the total number of external funding. He was pleased that in lean times we received a 1% increase over the previous year. He was particularly excited when he compared Northern to other MAC schools, including his previous school at Kent State. The fact that we were doing better pleased him and Dean Bose answered questions about funding and outlined new sources that are also emerging.

Finally, President Peters and Provost Alden gave a further overview of the 16 page draft of the new university Strategic Plan. Peters was excited about introducing that, of course, at his State of the University Address and we received an early draft of that.

This concludes my report but I’ll be happy to answer questions and share any information that I might have.

P. Stoddard: Any questions? All right, thank you Ferald.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Nancy Castle – report (Page 9)

P. Stoddard: Next is the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committees of the BOT. Nancy Castle has a report.

N. Castle: The report is in the packet which you received for this meeting. It’s pretty short. It was my first time at the BOT FFO Committee meetings. It took me twenty minutes to get all the abbreviations down. First we met with Eddie Williams to go over the packet of information and then the meeting was held a week later and it’s pretty much what you would expect. They reviewed capital improvement, budget requests. They discussed how much money they didn’t get in previous years but that, you know, undaunted they will continue to ask the state for money. They had a huge list of buildings that they need to be making safety repairs to and energy repairs and accessibility issues and so on. They also looked at the internal budget. The one thing of
interest was the renewal of the Academic Program Enhancement and Structural Technology Surcharge that the Board of Trustees first adopted in 2003. It had a five year renewal clause and so they had to revisit that and ultimately approval was recommended and I think ultimately was approved by the Board of Trustees to implement the previously established rate of $250 starting in the fall. Currently, we are charging $100 a semester. However, in 2003 the Board of Trustees approved $100 with the flexibility of going up to $250 a semester and apparently determined that they may need to go up to $250 by fall of 2008.

D. Swanson: Pardon me, just a clarification. Is that a charge that is made to the students in their fees?

N. Castle: Yes.

D. Swanson: So the students again are paying for what the Legislature won’t do.

P. Stoddard: Correct. Any other questions or comments? All right, thank you.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: Then we have BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee.

B. Cesarek: Thank you. You have the report in front of you. It was a very quick report – a very quick meeting rather. Usually this meeting takes place at Hoffman Estates where we transport everyone or a large number of the institutional staff members and executives up to Hoffman Estates for the meeting. Fortunately this year I think they’ve made a transition and they’ve tapped this meeting on as the third of three of the BOT committee meetings so the first two as you can imagine ran long so with the noon hour approaching we flew through this one and while I wanted to take even better notes, it was difficult to do so with the speed of everyone’s presentation.

Ken Zehnder did go over a number of bills that were presented and passed by the House and Senate. The one I wanted you to take a look at was that there were no textbook bills that made it to the Governor’s desk. I thought that might be of importance to you. Some other language kind of things and they were just going to continue to follow the capital funding bills as they continue to proceed. Ken also talked about the House Budget Bill and the fact that indeed, the Governor had an item reduction veto as you are aware of where NIU was cited with a loss of $123,900 out of the $28,000,000 that was vetoed. Not much more discussion but just a point of information.

Kathy Buettner then proceeded to inform everyone about the Congressional Budget Hearings. The budgets have passed the House but are currently being debated in the Senate. She did point out those four items that I identified for you about the funding that looks really good for NIU because they are tacked on to either Department of Defense budgets or Department of Energy budgets and/or are continuing funding for projects that are already ongoing at NIU so those look very positive and she was happy to present those. With regards to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act, the Senate bill was debated in July; the House version isn’t even up yet or
is just coming to the House at this point. You can see–pardon me?–on the first and second page some of the items that were of importance have been identified for you, things that were of concern that Kathy wanted to point out so I ask you to go ahead and read those. If you have any questions, I’d be more than happy to help but again she did fly through them so I’m not sure I know anymore than what is presented.

Steve Cunningham shared to the BOT Committee the Employee Contact Accountability and Ethics in the Workplace Reference Guide. It is an on-line reference guide and the reason this was being done of course was to facilitate quick revisions. Also, you will not receive anything in writing. It is available. He did not present a url for that right now but we can certainly get that and share it with you in the future but to my knowledge that is up and running and is a good on-line reference guide for faculty and staff.

Ken Davidson took a few minutes to talk about our trademark registration and the fact that we have applications in for both Northern Illinois University and ???IU as federal registered trademarks but discussion ensued further that was really not I don’t believe on the agenda but discussion ensued relative to the copyright infringements and the file sharing of students and the whole issue of downloading of music, etc. so the institution has noted that they are doing the very best job they can, well hopefully so, relative to education to new students to try to ward off any kind of issues in this area.

The final item for discussion was the university report on the Federal Direct Lending Program. that we are indeed moving away from the Federal Family Educational Loan Program and moving to direct lending. They’re going to try to use the Media Services to do a good job and Enrollment Services to notify students of the changes that are going to be necessary changing from one lending program to another. Questions that anyone might have? Okay, thank you very much.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you Bobbie.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** The full Board met last week. Essentially they approved everything that Academic Affairs and Finance and Facilities had recommended. The one addition near and dear to our hearts was the proposed increment, salary increment, for faculty and staff which will average 4%. There is an additional half percent increment envisioned in January. That’s always subject to change as the budget situation continues to flux. I think for staff, I don’t remember–is that across the board–no, it’s merit based?

**B. Cesarek:** The proposal is a little different than the recommendation that was brought forward by the Supportive Professional Staff Council. What was decided ultimately was a 2% across the board; 2% merit of which 1% was for satisfactory performance.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, and the extra half percent in January?

**B. Cesarek:** I don’t know that has yet been determined.
P. Stoddard: For faculty it was similar. 2% for anybody doing satisfactory work and then the remaining 2% or the remaining half of the increment would be merit based again with like a 1% minimum merit I believe and a 3% maximum – or no, maybe it’s 0%. I think the 2%, I’m sorry, was for satisfactory work and then extra merit based, I mean, the extra will be based purely on merit and that could go up to a total increment of as much as 6%. So everybody who’s doing their jobs satisfactorily will get between 2% and 6%. Anybody getting less than 2% has to have a written explanation of why that recommendation would be made. Anybody getting greater than 6%, the same type of recommendation. There is a half percent I know for the faculty in January which is meant to address salary inequity issues and critical retention issues so I suspect most faculty will not see any of that half percent later on.

Other than that, everything else on the BOT agenda was already covered in the previous reports so that’s all I have. Any questions? Yes?

B. Miller: Can you repeat the salary thing again for faculty?

P. Stoddard: For the faculty, it’s going to be an average 4% increment with everybody who’s doing a satisfactory job getting at least 2%. The remaining increment will be based on merit so of the remaining increment, the bracket is 0% to 4% which means everybody doing satisfactory work at Northern, every faculty member, should get between 2% and 6% unless there are extenuating circumstances of some sort. So if you have any – somebody’s got 12 million dollars in grants and published twelve papers, you might get more than 6%. If you’ve got somebody who doesn’t show up to teach their classes, they might get less than 2%. They can go over 6% but the case has to made. I mean, they don’t want to go over 6%. You have to make a very strong case. These are going to be primarily people I think who they would be afraid of losing to other universities. So, there’s always a critical retention issue in there.

B. Miller: This is retroactive?

P. Stoddard: This will be retroactive. For people on nine month contracts which is most faculty, it will be retroactive to August 16. People on twelve month contracts, it will be retroactive from July 1. You won’t see anything until November. They have to go through the paperwork and everything else. The retroactive chunk may be in two pieces. So your first paycheck might not reflect all of the retroactive pay. A lot of that depends on how much money they have in house when they do that. Yeah, get the big goose.

B. Cesarek: I think people can count on it arriving with the November 15 paycheck.

P. Stoddard: Right. I think that was the date. Yes?

C. Garcia: You say that we are going to have – the faculty will be at 2% for satisfactory performance and 0% to 4% for merit based performance?

P. Stoddard: Right.
C. Garcia: ???

**P. Stoddard:** It’s plus. So everybody should get at least 2%, everybody who’s doing satisfactory work gets at least 2%. So that’s kind of, they don’t like to use the phrase across the board because that means there are people doing unsatisfactory work, they don’t want to include them in that. So the 2% is a floor for most of us or I’m going to guess the vast majority of us. So that the increment for virtually everybody is going to be between 2% an 6%. So 2% plus the 0-4 for the merit.

C. Garcia: Thank you. Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** Kendall?

**K. Thu:** Is there he same rate for graduate students as well?

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t know what the rate for graduate students is. I suspect the 4% is probably an average – that’s the average for faculty; it’s the average for staff and for operating staff and so I’m pretty sure it’s for graduate students as well but I wouldn’t swear to it. Contact the Graduate School. Talk to Dean Bose. I don’t have his number but it’s in the book.

**D. Goldblum:** We were told that it would be 4% and that we should count on that starting in January for all the students on grants.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, great. Thank you. Anybody else? Any other questions? All right.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

**P. Stoddard:** Academic Affairs, any report yet?

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

**P. Stoddard:** Economic Status? Next month report. Okay.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Resource, Space, and Budget no report I am told.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Alan Rosenbaum, Chair – no report.

**P. Stoddard:** Faculty Rights and Responsibilities just got their first assignment. Okay.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Rules and Governance, anything to report? Next month.
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Earl Hansen, Chair – no report.

P. Stoddard: We don’t have anything from Elections and Legislative Oversight.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: We have no unfinished business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. True North – Nancy Castle

P. Stoddard: Under new business, Castle, Nancy would like to talk to us about True North. Do we get to tour Castle, Nancy at any point?

N. Castle: You can if you agree to be on my committee that I’ll talk about in a minute you sure do and I’ll feed you too. As most of you know, True North was announced last May as the first ever capital campaign for Northern Illinois University. The first ever being the first campaign to raise funds for the activities at the university. This is not bricks and mortar; this is money for what it is we do and I think today’s meeting brought home again and again that we need to be looking to other sources for that funding. I had in my notes that 27% of our budget comes from the state. I find in the notes today it’s now just under 26% of our budget. We are no longer a state university; we’re a state assisted university and that’s not going to change. I have been involved with John Castle for six years and married for five. For the first year I let him go really easy because we were just dating and I wanted to make a good impression but after we got married, we started having what I would like to call lively discussions about the NIU Foundation and its relationship with the faculty here at Northern. My husband has been very involved with the Foundation. He’s been the chair or the co-chair. He’s still on the Board. For somebody who came out of private school education, he’s very committed to public college education and in fact, several of his kids have degrees from Northern and so he’s very strongly committed to it. So if you complain for five years that the Foundation doesn’t understand faculty and doesn’t use us appropriately and so on, you get to be the chair of a committee and that’s why I am talking to you all today. Clark Nair, who seem of you may know. He’s retired; he was former chair of Political Science; former director of the Southeast Asian Studies Program and Presidential Teaching Profession, he and I are co-chairing what we like to call the faculty involvement part of True North. What we would like to do is to get you to agree to let us contact you; maybe ask some of you to serve on sort of a steering committee with us. We’re not asking for a huge time commitment but we are the people that the alumni remember about Northern Illinois University. They don’t think of themseleves as class of something, they think of themselves in terms of the majors that they had and the people that they made the connection with and that’s us. That’s the faculty. We are in a position where we can help identify faculty. The ones we still in contact with; the ones that are now and being successful. While the Foundation has its programs and its services that it contracts to sort of route through alumni lists to come up with who might be somebody who would have capacity which is what they call people who would have money – I learned a lot in the five years of arguing or lively discussions. We’re the ones that know the
group of ten who might get together who as a group, might have capacity to do something. To make a contribution to Northern you can do it any number of ways and there are currently almost 400 different endowments that people can either contribute to or make a new one. Linda Sons just sent out the Faculty Fund. That’s one of the endowment funds. The Alumni Association is an endowment fund. We all could get together as faculty and try to come up with money to fund a stream of money for Alan’s position or whoever Alan is in the future. We are people who could contribute. We are the people who know others who can. We know corporations that we have relationships with and vendors and so on and I just think if we don’t step up to the plate on this and provide the kind of assistance that we can provide, that really we can uniquely provide, then the university is going to really lose out, we’ll lose out, students will lose out, future students will lose out and so some of you will be getting a call from me. Some of you who over the years have made comments like well I hope the Foundation understand that you can put your name on an endowment. You know, I’ll be calling you to see if you would be willing to serve which would be occasionally come out to my house and really we’ll give you dinner. Mostly we e-mail and contacts that way. Others of you I would like to ask you to consider to volunteer. Get in touch with me on campus. Call me, e-mail me, whatever. We’re going to try to pull together at least a couple of people from each college. At the very least, we can help the Foundation look at the lists that they have. At the most we can come up with ways to put people together. For example, and you are now sworn to secrecy so don’t – I want you to disguise the minutes on this – I am an alumni of Northern. I came here as a junior with an associate’s degree from Harper. I got my bachelor’s degree in psychology, master’s and Ph.D. in psychology. I would not have finished the bachelor’s in psychology, would not have gotten into graduate school, wouldn’t have gotten out of graduate school without the assistance of one particular person who’s now retired on that psychology faculty. About ten of his other alumni who also really considered that person to be the person that helped us to be successful – we are banding together to come up with an endowment that would be for whatever this particular person wants. He doesn’t know it yet so that’s why that part is a secret but we have raised the money. You can do it by pledge. If you want to start an endowment, $25,000 is the minimum. You have to reach that in three years. You can do five year pledges though. So if ten people got together, as long as between ten of you you had $25,000 in three years, you can go on forever contributing money for that. You can do an expendable fund which would be – you don’t want to invest it and have them spend the interest every year – you just want to spend that money down every year. So if you’ve got $3,000 a year that you want to give, you could either try to endow it for something that would work interest or you could spend $3,000 a year on whatever you think or whatever fund that you like. The only thing that you can’t do is give it to yourself because apparently that came up as a question with the Foundation. It wasn’t my question with the Foundation but I thought it was a very good one. Yeah, the only thing you can’t do is give it to yourselves. I have to say that I really – we’ve been working with the Foundation on the faculty thing and they recognize that this is a huge untapped resource and it’s not a group that they really worked very closely with. This is the time to do it and one of their major gift officers said sort of the mantra is for anybody, if you’ve got the willingness, they can work out however you want it to work out to be supportive to the university or to the people we’re trying to work with. So this is just sort of the promo. I’ll probably be sending stuff to you as time goes on or maybe letting you know what’s going on but as we listen to 26% state funding, as we listen to fees going up for, you know, students paying for things the state won’t pay – this campaign is about all of these things that we’ve been talking about today so thank you for letting me take some time on the program.
P. Stoddard: Thank you Nancy. Any questions or comments for Nancy? Yes, Bobbie?

B. Cesarek: I had the opportunity to talk to Nancy about this earlier relative to the Supportive Professional Staff and how we might also be able to assist and I think it’s not just opening your wallets and helping out yourself but really taking the opportunity to identify five students that you may still be in contact with that you know of or know of students who know of other people who are in a position to be of assistance. In addition to maybe helping if you feel like you can and want to, it’s really being a conduit to identifying other people that the Foundation can then go and do their work.

P. Stoddard: Right. Anybody else?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any comments or questions from the floor? Seeing none, I will entertain – all right. All in favor get up and go home.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Alternate List 2007-2008

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 PM