FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 2009. 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


R. Blecksmith attended for D. Bowman; S. Arnett attended for J. Johnson-Hillery.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I.  CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard:  None of you are getting any younger so we might as well – I on the other hand am. Dr. Baker I take that back; Dr. Baker is getting younger. The rest of us need to get this meeting going. So please come to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 P.M.

II.  ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard:  I’d like a motion if possible to adopt the agenda. Thank you Professor Snow and I saw a hand from Professor Baker. So any comments or additions to the agenda? Seeing none, all in favor say aye. I’m sorry.

D. Jarman:  We have a walk-in.

P. Stoddard:  We have a – part of the agenda is comments from the floor/ new business. Will it fit in that properly? Okay, we’ll add that under new business. All right, I’m sorry, Donna points out we do have a couple of walk-ins; reports of various flavors. So with the additions of the walk-ins, I assume that’s a friendly amendment and the second approves it so all in favor of the agenda say aye. Thank you.

Snow made the motion; Baker was second. The agenda was approved as amended.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 4, 2009 FS MEETING (will be sent to you electronically)

P. Stoddard: Next stop are the minutes which you should have received electronically. Were there any complaints about those? Motion to approve the minutes? That wasn’t right. The minutes? All right, we’ll fix that. Yeah, that’s left over from executive probably. All right, any other corrections? We still need a motion I think. Otherwise Ferald gets mad at me. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes with the correction of the meeting? Thank you and Alan seconded. Thank you. All in favor say aye. All right, thank you.

Kowalski made the motion; Rosenbaum was second. The minutes passed as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements I wanted to announce that Northern is changing the name of the university to Fairmont University and I have the new president of the university with us who would like to say a few words so without further ado, President Tom Krepel.

A. Tom Krepel will attend meeting to discuss the NCAA Recertification

T. Krepel: I’m not gone yet. Actually, my purpose in being here today is something of a person invitation. For the past year I’ve been chairing the Athletic Certification Self Study Process for NIU. All of that is coming to a conclusion and let me give you just a little bit of background because an awfully lot of work has gone into this. We’ve had 50 or 60 people from throughout the campus. We had faculty, staff, students, alumni, community members, several of whom are in the room. Jan Rintala has been involved, Jay’s been involved, Bobbie, Paul; a lot of folks participated and helped us out on this thing and it’s nearing completion where we will be posting the self study document itself and all the supportive documentation on the certification website. Just so that you understand, the athletic certification process is really very, very similar to the institutional accreditation processes we go through with the Higher Learning Commission. The intent behind it is that we have certain kinds of quality standards that we want to hold ourselves to and evaluate ourselves. It’s kind of a continuous improvement process but it also allows us to look at those areas where we want to pay some additional attention. There are three components in this self study; three broad components. They’re known as operating principles. There’s one that deals with rules or, or excuse me, governance and rules compliance. The second deals with academic integrity and the third deals with gender diversity and student athlete well being. Those – we’ve had subcommittees that focused on those three areas. Dr. Stoddard chaired the governance and rules compliance. Dr. Harold Kafer chaired the academic integrity subcommittee and Dr. Matt Streb out of Political Science chaired the gender diversity and student athlete well being subcommittee. We’re helping to have the self study document posted online about the end of this week. Now, here’s where you can find the self study document. If you will go to the NIU Intercollegiate Athletic website and if you scroll down to the bottom of the page you’ll see a little NCAA logo that says NCAA certification and you click on that, you should be able to get access to the self study. One of the things that NCAA is very, very interested in doing at not only NIU but all institutions who go through these certification
processes and it’s part of the intent in the certification process, is to open the affairs of intercollegiate athletics to the campus communities. So the reason I’m here today is to alert you that there are opportunities for you to participate in the review of this self study and there are two means by which you can participate. The first is starting next week, we’re going to hold what we refer to as forums that anybody is free to participate in and let me give you the specifics.

Wednesday, the 8th of April from 11:30 to 1:30 in the Illinois Room in this building will be the first forum. They’re basically going to be open format. We’ll have brief introductory remarks but then it’s going to be time for us to listen to the campus community so you’re invited to participate if that time works. The second forum will be the following day on Thursday, the 9th of April. This one beginning at 4:00pm and running until 5:30pm and this is going to be over in the Barsema Alumni and Visitor Center and then there will be another one that afternoon or that evening starting at 6:00 and running until 7:30 and we’re holding it at that time of day to try to accommodate people who either have work schedules, class schedules – those kinds of things. The third one also will be in the Barsema Alumni and Visitor Center. If your schedule doesn’t accommodate those dates and times, then when you go to the certification website not only will you have access to the self study document but you will notice when you open that up that there is a link that says “feedback” and you will be able to provide any kind of comments, questions, suggestions those sort of things if you’ve taken a look at the self study by way of that medium.

So as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I would issue a personal invitation on behalf of the steering committee and all of the participants in the self study process to either take time to participate in the forums or to provide your feedback by way of the feedback link. Now our deadline for submitting this to the NCAA is Friday the 1st of May. It’s going to take us a little bit of time to do any revisions that come in as well as get it loaded into their system so I would ask that you try to have your responses, any kind of feedback to us by Wednesday, the 22nd of April and that will give us a little bit of time because it is a fairly substantial document and that will give us a little bit of time to make the corrections and revisions and then get that thing uploaded to the NCAA system.

So, those are my comments and I hope that we see all of you participating in one of the forums or providing us feedback by way of the website. If there are questions about this, I’d be happy to try to respond to them.

P. Stoddard: Linda?

L. Sons: Could you just repeat the forum times and places?

T. Krepel: Yeah. The first one is Wednesday the 8th of April beginning at 11:30 and running until 1:30 and that will be in the Illinois Room here in the Student Center. The second and third will be held on Thursday the 9th. The first one on that day begins at 4:00 and runs until 5:30; the second one begins at 6:00 and runs until 7:30 and both of those will be in the Barsema Alumni and Visitor Center. Incidentally, if you look at the calendar of events on campus, these dates, times, locations, meetings are posted there. You’ve probably seen this in the Northern Today because it’s been posted there as an event so we’re trying to get the word out in all of the various media that we have available to us about these activities. Okay? All right. Well, thank you for your time.
**P. Stoddard:** While I have Professor Krepel up here I want to embarrass him a little bit and just say I suspect many of you haven’t had a chance to meet him or to work with him. I have had that opportunity I’m glad to say over the last four years or so and he does an awful lot of hard work for the university. He has shown a good level head most of the time he’s been here; most of the time he’s been here and I think NIU is going to be the worse for his departure. I’m sure Fairmont will be the better for his arrival and personally I think I’m going to miss him quite a bit so good luck and congratulations.

**T. Krepel:** May I also remind Paul that flattery will get him everywhere.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, next up under announcements I had a couple of things folks wanted to announce. One, the benefits choice period will be in May; May 1 through May 31. There will be a benefits fair on April 30. Deb Haliczer informed me of both of these things and also tells me that the biggest change or the biggest thing to keep an eye out for in terms of benefits will be the prescription drug deductible – thank you – which many of you may have noticed was instituted in January, $50 will be going up to $75 effective in July and Deb is not sure – she thinks that you’ll be charged $75 the first time you do something in July but she’s not positive about that so if it turns out to be less, don’t call her up and complain. It should not turn out to be more than that. Any questions for Deb on benefits choice or --- yeah?

**D. Zahay:** I had asked about the flexible spending accounts. Does that mean that we get to change that starting July 1? Last time you said forget it, nothing ---

**D. Haliczer:** Yeah. Every May 1 through May 31 you can make changes to flexible changes so that will happen again during benefits choice.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, anybody else? All right. Jan Mantilla also wanted to say a couple of nice things I think.

**J. Rintala:** I guess this is Athletics introduction at the beginning of the meeting but in my role as Faculty Athletic Representative which is, as you recall, why I am now a member of the Senate I wanted to make a couple of announcements. First of all, the Athletics Department has undergone a review and updating of its strategic plan which deals with the comprehensiveness of the athletics program. It is posted up on the Athletics’ website and if it’s something that interests you, I would suggest you take a moment to look at it.

Secondly, it’s nice to share good news and just in case some of you missed it, at the conclusion of the fall semester the student athletes at NIU completed their 7th semester in a row where their cumulative GPA was over 3.0 which I think is a pretty stunning accomplishment. I think it’s very great. In addition to an accomplishment of its own, the Mid-American Conference which is the athletic conference to which Northern belongs does some comparative data and awarding. This particular year, for the last academic year for the first time, NIU won the MAC Institutional GPA award which means we were the highest cumulative GPA of all of student athletes of the entire Mid-American Conference and I think that’s something of which we can be very proud too. Within that, three of our sports had the highest GPA for their sport. That was women’s basketball, wrestling and football. So I wanted to share that news and I guess on behalf of the
student athletes, thank all of you as faculty for the important role that we all have in their academic success and also to acknowledge your willingness to work with them as they try to balance the two very important roles in their lives as student and athlete. So share the good news and thank you all for your role in that.

**P. Stoddard:** Gee, sort of feels like Harvard here; last on the field but first in the classroom. Very good. Congratulations to the folks in Athletics.

Something to sort of keep an eye out for if you haven’t been paying attention, Illinois is beginning its budget process and this year looks to be uglier in terms of the amount of money that’s available. The President, the university President, has hopes that it won’t drag on forever like has in past years, probably because there’s not as much money to fight over I guess, but we are looking as a state at a deficit of about 12 billion dollars which is I think approximately a quarter of the state budget. So, that’s a fair chunk of change. The Governor has come out with a series of proposals to try to get the budget closer to balance some of which would impact - not so much at the moment the university, the operating and so forth of the university – it looks like some stimulus money might be directed towards the operating costs. Nobody wants to commit to anything yet because it still has to go through the Legislature but where we might see the biggest changes are in the pension benefits and, as most of you are aware I am sure, Illinois is I think the worst in the country by far in terms of under-funding – or best at under-funding – it’s pension obligations and so there’s this big chunk of debt out there with the big red target on it and that’s driving some of the proposals that are running around. One of which is going to be voted on tomorrow I think. At least it gets a hearing in the State Senate tomorrow and that’s the proposal to combine all the state retirement systems of which SURS is one, the teaching retirement system, the judicial and so forth, they’re talking about combining those into one. I don’t want to comment either pro or con to that plan other than to point out that the university retirement system has generally been the best run of the systems and has gotten the best returns on the investments so if you have any concerns, especially for your State Senator, now may be a very good time to voice those. Other concerns that have a much stronger I think potential for really negatively influencing things have to do with the retirement, the annuity program as it stands. One of the - well, they’re talking about raising retirement age and so forth. Most of these – a lot of these at any rate are going toward new hires rather than people currently people in the system although there’s still some need to clarify exactly which proposals would apply only to new hires and which would apply to everybody currently in the system. I think the most troubling and Jay and Bobbie you can back me up on this if you disagree or agree but – is the proposal on the cost of living increase. Right now it’s 3% a year for everybody who’s retired. They’re talking about making it either 3% or half of the cost of living increase whichever is less. There’s also the potential that they might not even be talking about compounding the increase so whatever you retired at, that’s what your percent and a half or whatever would be on. For those of you not – what that means is that you’re guaranteed, you absolutely have to every year unless there is no inflation, lose ground to inflation every year you are retired so that would be a very negative impact I think on anybody whoever planned on retiring which might be a lot of us. Oh, they’re also talking about – no, the maximum you would be able to get is now 80%; you can get 80% of your salary – the best four years as your annuity. They’re talking about knocking that back down to 70% and instead of taking the best four years, which is generally the last four years, they’re talking about taking the best what, 7 or 8 years so this would be a real change in
your retirement portfolio. The university is keeping an eye on this. There is – they’ve just posted a budget update button – is that on the homepage? Yes, so you can go to the homepage when you’re not looking at the NCAA stuff, you can look over at the budget and see what’s going on and again try to be careful not to violate any ethics. The university I think will be providing a lot of information about proposals and about ways you can contact your representatives should you feel the need to do so whether you’re in favor of them or against them, there will be those opportunities I think highlighted and when you should do so if you want to have an influence on the decisions being made. So I would encourage you to keep an eye on that button and what’s behind it throughout the upcoming months. A lot of this process will probably take place after finals, just given the way the Legislature tends to work, so please do keep an eye on that if you’re concerned about these issues one way or another. Yes, Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: To go back to the issue about the combination of the retirement plans, if I’m not mistaken, although you’re saying you don’t want to take a position, that SURS and the teachers part of that have taken very strong positions against the combination of the retirement plans?

P. Stoddard: Yes. This is true, those organizations have.

A. Rosenbaum: And the Annuitants Association as well?

P. Stoddard: Correct.

A. Rosenbaum: And so it seems to be a fairly important issue and the concern being that when this happens, the SURS will be sorted of rated by these less successful retirement plans. Is that not correct?

P. Stoddard: That might be an interpretation. Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: That would be the interpretation that SURS has, would it not?

P. Stoddard: I don’t know what – I mean, I know that there’s concern. They feel that they are run very well and that they make smart choices in the investments and that they’re – I could see where they would be afraid that that would no longer be the case; that they would no longer be in charge of the investments. I don’t know that the concern – I honestly don’t know that the concern is that they would look at the pot of money that SURS has and say we need some of that for ours. I mean I would point out that SURS, even though they have done a better job than the others in doing their investments, is a relatively small pot of money compared to the teachers and so, you know, the teachers – although they’re against it as well – so, both of those are relatively small pots of money compared to the rest of the state employees.

A. Rosenbaum: Nevertheless, the has been that we do not want this to go through and we should be encouraging our folks in our departments to join the Annuitants Association.

P. Stoddard: That’s always an encouragement yes.
A. Rosenbaum: And possibly to write our senators and representatives to encourage them to vote against that.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, well yes. It’s two dollars a month to join the Annuitants so if, you know, you can have it taken out of your paycheck. It’s a dollar a paycheck if you’re salaried. You’d never miss it but all that goes for them to help argue the case of the annuitants in Springfield. I’m sure Deb would appreciate it if I encouraged everybody to join the Annuitants Association. I did and I’m glad.

A. Rosenbaum: So, given the urgency of this situation, perhaps we should all be going to our departments and suggesting that they join and notify their senators as well to try to do our bit to try to prevent this from happening?

P. Stoddard: That seems like a reasonable recommendation. Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any other – yes?

L. Yamagala-Lynch: How does this all – does this all affect people in the self management plan equally as well or is that a different bucket?

P. Stoddard: I suspect a lot of this would affect them as well, yes. Again, the real question is how much this affects current – us, the people who already have jobs versus those who we plan on hiring someday and hope to encourage to come here but not so much by virtue of the strong pension benefits that we can offer them. I mean, you know, the state last year I believe did actually institute a two-tier system where the benefits for the incoming people were not as good as for the people already here. There are some issues with constitutionality. In order to change benefits for people you have to have a constitutional amendment and so Ken Zezher who really is the person at the university who keeps an eye on what’s going on in Springfield, still said he needs to do a little more work to figure out what changes can be made towards – for the current people versus what can be made by the Legislature in their eyes relatively painlessly for incoming people. I think the big change for the incoming people last year was the end of the money purchase option which for most faculty generally results in being able to retire at maximum benefit several years before the general formula. So, we do have a two-tiered system already. How much worse it gets remains to be seen. Yes, Rosemary?

Rosemary ???: Somebody told me that there was going to be an effective 2% decrease in the amount that we will be paying into the pension.

P. Stoddard: Right, that’s another of the – none of this is final yet. This is all in the Governor’s proposal so the Legislature gets its crack at it long before anything becomes law. But part of his proposal was indeed to change the ratio of contributions. Right now employees pay 8%; the state is supposed to match that at 8% of your salary. The proposal is that the employees would pay 10% and the state would match 6% so the same amount would be going in; more of it would
be coming out of your take-home pay. As a personal editorial, I kind of felt, at least I know that the 10% is going in. The 8% hasn’t been. So –

Rosemary ???: Would that be mean an effective 2% increase – or decrease in our ---

P. Stoddard: Decrease in your take-home. Yes it would. But it means a stronger guarantee that that money is there when you plan on retiring. Yes? Professor Kostic?

M. Kostic: It is not 2%; it’s 3.5%. There is 1.5% increase in state tax which is less the take-home pay.

P. Stoddard: Right but then there’s an increase in the deduction so that’s going to change the amount of – so it’s all – but the retirement aspect; it very specifically was 2%.

M. Kostic: ???

P. Stoddard: Yeah. So well, you know, 11.6 billion might not be the trillions that our President has to deal with but it’s still a fair chunk of change that we have to make up somehow. All right. Any other concerns about – I won’t phrase it like that – any other comments people want to make about the budget? All right.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – walk-in

P. Stoddard: FAC, I believe there’s no report. Is that correct – no, there’s a walk-in.

E. Hansen: It’s a walk-in that you should have gotten or at least handed out to you. I would ask that you might take a look at page 3, the second full paragraph, 7th or 8th line down, the line starts “a couple of weeks in advance”. We have a question that we keep asking ourselves as representatives of the faculty and we don’t seem to be getting much input so I’m going to ask for input from you. We say “is our directive to be responsive/advisory (reactive) to the IBHE or to funnel our concerns (proactive/independently) to IBHE?” We can try to do either one or both or neither or whatever but I have yet to hear in two years of offering my time to drive all over the state of Illinois, anybody say anything to me about what they would like to have said to the Illinois Board of Higher Education through this particular funnel of doing something and if you’re not going to talk to me about it, I don’t think you’re going to talk to your representative either and, you know, we always seem to react to crises but never do anything preventive so I would ask that you e-mail me with your comments and I will e-mail you back. I’m supposed to service for you; that’s why I volunteered to do this, as a service thing. Yet I’ve heard absolutely squat from anybody so I’m just asking if you want some input to go directly from another
tenicles of which you have representation in, that you contact you and I will pass it on and we will present it to the IBHE or their cattery of people who meet with us.

**P. Stoddard:** All right. I think that’s an excellent idea. I think individually if you have concerns you can forward them to Earl or if there are any concerns that come up that the Senate would like to forward, that would be entirely appropriate as well. So either of those two avenues I think are excellent ideas. Thank you Earl. Any questions or concerns that you would like to give Earl right now? All right, we’ll ponder that for a little bit.

B. **BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report** (Pages 3-4)

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. I believe Professor Bryan will be reporting on behalf of Professor Stephen.

**F. Bryan:** Hello, yes. Buck is ill today and he prepared the report even though we were both at the March 5 Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee meeting of the Board of Trustees. The report is before you. There are a few things I would like to highlight because I think they’re important to faculty.

The first item and this really occurred before they moved into the agenda for the meeting, the committee heard from two faculty members about their – results of their sabbatical. Professor Pamela McFarlane from (PHED) talked about mobility and fall prevention in older adults and it’s really a fascinating study that she’s done for many years in South Africa and even specifically talked about having trained some of her students who are now putting into effect some of the findings in places like Oak Crest here locally. It was a fascinating report; well received, good questions. Then President Leslie Rigg talked about sugar maples and climate change primarily focusing in Canada. Very interesting report; heard good questions. About three of four years ago, the Board of Trustees committee specifically asked to hear reports of sabbaticals. They want to be supportive. They are supportive. They ask good questions. They’re generally interested. This means then that later in the first action item when they approve the 52 sabbatical recommendations for sabbatical for next year, I think we can all take that as a very strong support from this committee that they understand the value of sabbaticals and are very supportive of it so I would emphasize that. They also approved the recommendation of the new Dean for the Law School. New programs – Doctoral in Physical Therapy was approved, new emphases, specializations and minor were approved. They’re listed there for you. Some other interesting information items were received including some nice kudos for Northern and you may read those at your leisure and, again, I have the report. I attended the meeting. I’d be happy to answer any questions that you have about the meeting and, again, Dr. Stephen sends his regrets that he couldn’t be here but he did prepare this report. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** Any questions? Okay, seeing none, moving on. Board of Trustees Finance, Facilities, and Operations, is --- oh, go ahead, I’m sorry.
Barabra ???: Question. I had heard this report at University Council and had asked at the time how these faculty were selected to present the results of their sabbaticals and at that time we were told that someone in the Provost’s Office does that? I mean, I’m just curious. Is this something that we as faculty might want to take an interest in to ensure there’s a kind of representation of sabbaticals?

P. Stoddard: I think the points of having these presentations made is to reinforce the value of the sabbatical program. As we were just discussing in the Steering Committee earlier this afternoon, the Board of Trustees, as Ferald mentioned as well, is very supportive of the sabbatical program and these days that’s a very important support to have. A lot of institutions around the country – legislators whatever – are really attacking sabbatical programs. They see them as an unnecessary cost and so like I said, we’re very fortunate that our Trustees really do understand the importance and value of this program and so what I think they’re doing in selecting the way they select these is to try to get people who are going to make the strongest case indirectly for maintaining the program; picking out the most interesting things that are going to have the most significant impact either locally or nationally or globally even in the case of Professor Rigg’s presentation. Personally, I’m happy to let the Provost figure that out. However, if we as a Senate would prefer to have more of a voice in that, I think that’s entirely appropriate as well so we can refer that to a Senate group to talk about it if you like.

J. Kowalski: I think if I hear Barbara’s question and perhaps the concern she raises correctly it would simply be to try to find some way to ensure that there’s not an automatic assumption that only a few specific disciplinary areas, you know, are considered to be the best sabbatical – types of sabbaticals – to present and that, you know, a diverse range of sabbaticals are presented from different colleges, different departments, assuming that, and I do assume this, that some very good outcomes emerge from a number of different colleges and departments.

P. Stoddard: Do you have a feel – my memory is like a steel sieve – do you have a feel for the diversity of sabbatical reports they’ve received over the past several years?

F. Bryan: To answer your question, I think the question came up about how they selected them at the University Council and I think Ray Alden, our Provost, reiterated is that you’re right. It’s someone in his office who makes that selection based generally on the criteria that Paul just annunciated. I know last year I’m recalling that a faculty member from the College of Education talked about a reading program for students that he had been involved in. I can’t remember the name but I mean, I recall that that was from the College of Ed. There was also another one I think from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the topic I can’t remember but I do think that various colleges have been represented at least in the last two years that I recall. I think the year before that someone from history and earlier – so I do think there is consideration for diversity of colleges and I can personally report that they ask good questions. They are attentive and seemed genuinely impressed that this research has not only global but also local impact so I think that in that regard, the two chosen this year seem to fit that bill, fit that criteria.

P. Stoddard: Would you like to investigate a more formal voice for the Senate or the faculty in general in this process or ---
Barbara ???: Well, I would which is why I asked the question but I’m not assuming. I don’t know how other people feel about it.

P. Stoddard: Well, we can refer this. If you like you can move to refer this to one of the standing committees and have them discuss it for a little bit and see if that’s something—a direction we’d like to go in.

Barbara ???: Do you have a recommendation about which committee would be appropriate?

P. Stoddard: Well, I suspect just by reading names of committees ---

Barbara ???: Resource, Space and Budget? No.

P. Stoddard: No, that wouldn’t be it. I’m kind of hoping the chair stands up and says we’ll do it, we’ll do it. Professor Kostic?

M. Kostic: I was actually paying attention to this and am still confused. What is the proposal of the issue here or ---

P. Stoddard: We’re considering whether or not to refer to a subcommittee the question of trying to get a stronger faculty voice in the selection of the people who speak to the Board of Trustees about sabbaticals—who reports directly to the Board regarding their sabbatical activities.

M. Kostic: Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, all right, go ahead.

L. Yamagala-Lynch: Has there been a history of misrepresentation—I mean, like what eschewed representation that we should worry about.

P. Stoddard: Jeff?

J. Kowalski: What about beginning the process by asking you as the representative of the Faculty Senate to contact the Provost’s Office and see if you can simply put together a list of those sabbatical projects that have been chosen as representative for the past five years, you know, so we get some sense of whether or not there is some diversity.

P. Stoddard: I’d be happy to do that, sure. In back? Yeah?

J. Jeffrey: ?? put in a contrarian opinion. This being the university, of course, we mustn’t say anything against diversity, but I will anyway. I don’t think diversity matters here. I think this is a matter of doing exactly what was stated which is making sure that the IBHE sees that the sabbatical program is important and significant and I don’t think it matters much rather a diverse range of sabbatical reports is presented. No one would want to see someone unfairly—credit unfairly taken away from a faculty member but by far, the most important thing I think is the
IBHE not succumb to what must be a temptation in these economic times which is to say, ah – these academics. The sabbatical is a time to play. That’s the unfair prejudice we’re working against and I’m happy to have the Provost pick the ones that they think, from their office, they think would be the ones that would best defend that program whether it’s diverse or not. Thanks.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, Bobbie.

**B. Cesarek:** I do believe that in addition to looking at a wide range of programs they also want to make sure that for the Board of Trustees that it’s not such complicated and scientific if I can unfortunately use that – or in the engineering field – something that is so abstract that it may be difficult for the Board of Trustee members to actually understand. They’re looking for something that’s a little bit accessible I guess. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, any other comments? All right. Thank you.


**P. Stoddard:** Next up is Finance, Facilities, and Operations. Clersida Garcia is not here. The report is in the walk-in and most of the things that are in there I’ll end up summarizing anyway in the full report since all these were just recommendations to the full board. So with that, I’ll turn it over to Jay and Bobbie.

D. BOT Legislative, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – Stoddard – report (Pages 5-7)

**P. Stoddard:** Jay will report on Legislative, Audit and External Affairs.

**J. Monteiro:** The report is in your packet but I’m going to touch on a few things of interest for you. If you go to Section II, Steve Cunningham reported on the updates to the Board Regulations regarding FMLA. The first amendment provides up to 26 weeks for an eligible spouse, son, daughter, parent or next of kin to care for a service member injured in the line of active duty.

The next amendment provides a total of 12 weeks leave for a certain circumstance if it occurs as the result of an employee’s spouse, son, daughter, or parent being called to active duty status.

The third amendment will change the period of work to be eligible for FMLA. The employee must now be employed for at least 12 months and have worked at least 1250 (or an equivalent full-time rate) during the previous 12 months as opposed to it used to be a cumulative 12 months.

Then Ken Zehnder highlighted a number of House and Senate Bills that if passed could affect NIU. If you skip down to D, which is Senate Bill 244 Harper College – Bachelor Degree. That amends the Public Community College Act which would provide Harper College Board of Trustees to offer a pilot program offering bachelor’s degrees in two fields of study.
If you skip down to F, Senate Bill 1883 and Senate Bill 2013, the Board of Higher Education – Collaborative Baccalaureate Degree Development Grant amends the Board of Higher Education Act which would require the IBHE to implement and administer the grant program that would help deliver upper division courses or bachelor degree programs at a location that’s convenient to the community college populations.

If we skip down to VI, Veterans Educational Assistance Act, there’s some benefit changes for veterans. The Chapter 33 benefits are available to veterans who served from 90 days to 36 months. These benefits include tuition and fees, a housing allowance and up to a $1000 of books and supplies. These can also be transferred to other family members.

If we skip down to VIII – Paul already covered this extensively but that is something to keep watching for information on the combination of the retirement systems.

That’s my report.

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I’m having a problem understanding the SB1883 *(tape turned to side 2)*

**J. Monteiro:** It’s actually referring a lot to the Harper issue where they’re wanting to grant those degrees but I think this is bringing it maybe to a different location, not to that college. I don’t know if that makes sense to you – physical location.

**P. Stoddard:** Michael?

**Michael ???:** Question. Did they mention what the two majors that Harper proposes to offer are?

**J. Monteiro:** They did and I don’t remember what they are. Homeland Security was one of them and I can’t remember the other one. Yeah, I just honestly – I don’t remember.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, any other questions for Jay? Yeah, okay.

**E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report**

**P. Stoddard:** The full Board met last Thursday. I don’t have a written report yet so comments will be brief but basically they approved everything that Ferald and Jay and Cleridea submitted a report about. Before the meeting got started on their regular agenda, there was a public comment from Adam Andrzejewski who is a Republican running for Governor of Illinois. After giving – you get five minutes to speak before the Board of Trustees assuming you follow all the rules correctly – which he did. He took the first two or three minutes to give the beginning of his stump speech, introducing himself, his background and lots of good stuff like that and then he said he was a big fan of the Proton Therapy Center that Northern is developing and that he was, on the other hand, very upset that a lot of money was being approved for the Center in non-transparent ways according to his reading of the situation. The Trustees thanked him for his
concern and then got on with their meeting. They very seldom actually address any responses or questions to people who speak publicly to them. This was no exception. The President gave a lot of remarks regarding budget issues most of which we’ve already touched on and I don’t think we really need to rehash. One of the things he did say is that again in the Governor’s budget that he’s proposing, he’s proposing taking – in the stimulus – in the federal stimulus package there’s money specifically for states to apply to higher education and then it’s left to the discretion of the state how they want to apply that. Governor Quinn has decided to apply that to operating costs rather than to capital costs so it doesn’t look like Cole Hall funding, for example, will come, at least not at this moment, from the stimulus package which was I think something that they were hoping might happen. They still have hope that they could direct some money that way. They are talking again about a capital bill that would include 22.5 million for Stephens renovation and 2.8 for the planning of a technology building and, according to the President, getting the planning money is tantamount to actually getting the ultimate funding to build the building. You don’t want to spend 3 million dollars for plans that will never be enacted. So Stephens is still high on the list. The list hasn’t changed in five years but we’re still there and if they ever figure out how to fund a capital budget, money will be provided for Stephens. Cole Hall again was not ever included as part of the capital budget for fear that if it were and we got stuck down at the bottom or if we got stuck up at the top, other campuses would see that as grossly unfair so they have been searching for other revenue streams for Cole Hall. They still very much want to get that project under way and completed and so they’re still working on it.

The Trustees themselves as part of the business – the major things that they did were vote on the student fee recommendations for next year. Fees will go up depending on how you calculate it about 5% if you don’t include the health insurance coverage. Then they play their little games but basically, if you don’t include student health fees – so you never partook of the student health insurance program at Northern, you stayed on your parents or whatever, your fees will go up about 5%; 4.95%. The student health fees will increase – I forget how much, generally it goes up about 7% or so it’s more than 5%. Then they say well if you take out that then the amount that the average fee goes up is 3.37% but that’s not really true but the students have all voted on it through their representatives and they’ve approved it so I’ve tried to point out these things to them. It doesn’t really matter it’s just that they like to claim that the fees aren’t going up very much but they really are stuck on a lot of the fees that are out of their control. Health insurance fees is the major one that is out of their control. Another large increase comes from the bus system and fuel costs and so forth so that the two major drivers for the increases in fees. They voted on room and board rates for next year. The room rates will go up about 8.5/8.67% on average and the board – oh, I’m sorry – the room rates will go up about 12% on average the board rates will go up 0% so the average for the room and board is 8.67%. A lot of that increase in the room rates has to do with the sprinkler systems that they have to put in to meet safety codes and to keep our students safe and also to start the renovation process on some of the older residence halls and to that end I think – which one is it – Grant Towers – Phase I being the renovation of that is going to start. They approved a lot of money for that.

They’re doing more of their energy infrastructure improvements. These are real nice things where a company will make our buildings more energy efficient and we pay for the improvements out of the savings in our energy bills so that’s a win/win situation.
There are lot of routine measures that they did that are listed in Clersida’s report and then something that most of us will notice at some point will be Item 7.s in her report which is they approved the renovation to the commons downstairs, outside, to the MLK Commons. That’s been like that for a long time apparently. I remember when they put that in and it didn’t seem that long ago but apparently it is. So they need to fix the drainage and other issues associated with that area.

So that was the Board of Trustees. Any questions on what they’ve been up to? They did approve all our sabbatical requests. They did approve a bunch of new programs. I’ll enumerate all those in the written report which you’ll see next meeting and again, they did stress their support for the sabbatical program in the full Board meeting so that was very encouraging to see.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: All right, moving on to the standing committees. I’ll read off the ones just to make sure there are no reports. Academic Affairs has no report. Economic Status has no report. Resource, Space and Budget I believe does have a report as part of the walk-in.

A. Academic Affairs – Mari Valle, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – C. T. Lin, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – report

M. Morris: Yes, I’m already wearing my helmet in case people throw things at me.

P. Stoddard: He’s just the messenger.

M. Morris: Yes, thank you. The Resource, Space and Budget Subcommittee did meet with Eddie Williams on the 17th of March to discuss the situation regarding parking for faculty on campus. Several members of the subcommittee shared their frustrations that they have experienced this year at being unable to find any parking near their offices and classes and the lengths to which they have had to go to find places to park. How they have used metered spaces and then have come out after teaching only to find that there are tickets on their windshields because the meters have expired while they were teaching or to park at such distances from their offices that they have turned into blocks of ice walking from their parking spaces to their offices or classes when the wind chills are below zero. Eddie Williams communicated quite a bit of information to the subcommittee. Of course, I think the issue that really precipitated this whole parking issue is the shortage behind and near the Campus Life Building and how those spaces disappeared with the construction of the chiller plant in part of the lot behind the Campus Life Building. Eddie and his deputy explained to us that there really were no other viable places in which to build the chiller plant due to the location of that lot near the confluence of the campus pipe and tunnel system so there really wasn’t any other place to put that. He assured us that every effort is being made to return those places to circulation as quickly as possible including working with the contractor to persuade him to reopen the spaces in the lot as soon as he no longer needs them which, in fact, is not part of the contract that the university originally made
with the contractor. According to the contract, the contractor has the right to keep those spaces until such time as the construction of the chiller plant is complete. In addition, the Speech and Hearing Clinic and ITS have moved from central campus to the former Monsanto site which theoretically anyway should release some – release some of the demand near the Campus Life Building. However, as everyone knows, if you go into the Campus Life Building even at 8:10 am, you find that all of those spaces are already filled. In general the number of parking spaces near and on central campus has declined in recent years and this has been intentional in order to create more of a campus-like atmosphere in the vicinity of places like the student center with trees and sidewalks and bike paths and so forth rather than large stretches of land that have paved to facilitate parking and something that was communicated to us of which I was unaware, an example of how the number of spaces has declined on central campus is the fact that MLK campus used to be a parking lot. I did not know that and I’ve been here almost 13 years. In the master plan for campus there originally were two additional parking decks included. One on Annie Glidden Road and one near Anderson Hall but the cost of this construction has really increased dramatically since the time of the master plans and, as a result, this construction has become very problematic. Construction $14,000 per parking space so if there are 100 spaces, that’s $1,400,000.00 and if a structure were to be constructed, that would mean that the parking rates for faculty would have to be increased to fund the construction of such a structure and I think Eddie rightly questioned whether faculty would be pleased to have to pay for such a structure through increased parking fees.

He did mention that 28 parking spaces were converted from brown to blue as of January 2009. For the next meeting on the 7th of April, he is investigating the possibility of suspending red/blue parking since many of the red/blue spaces sit unused for large stretches of most days anyway which would help alleviate in some small way the shortage of parking spaces. He is also investigating ticketing patterns with regard to many faculty complaints including several that have been made here at Senate of overzealous parking agents who hover over faculty cars when they are parked at meters, waiting for the meters to expire so that they can slap them with a ticket.

Finally, in the interest of fairness, I do have to say something else that Eddie did mention that due to patterns of parking on campus, it’s probably not realistic to expect that everyone is going to be able to find a parking space that is idea for them at all times of day on all days of the week. That having been said, I’m aware that this is a very emotional issue for faculty and we’re trying to work to, you know, alleviate some of these problems.

There is another meeting on the 7th of April at 3:30 in the afternoon in the conference room outside of Eddie Williams’ office for anyone who might be interested in attending in order to contribute their own viewpoints about that. If you are not a regular member of Resource, Space and Budget and you would like to attend, I would ask that you simply send me an e-mail in case we need to arrange for a larger room for the meeting. There’s also another meeting on the 8th of April at 11:00am with James Erman to discuss the status of travel funding for faculty for the coming year. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Pat?
P. Henry: Wasn’t there at one point a shuttle bus situation that would take people from remote parking to central campus from like the Convo Center or something like that? Is that still in existence?

M. Morris: Yes, Eddie Williams said that there is a bus that does go from the Convocation Center lot to central campus to allow people to park there. However, given when athletic events and other events are scheduled for the Convocation Center, you know, that parking then becomes unavailable for people who just want to park there and go to class and in addition, I’ve talked to a number of people about that and there seems to be a wide-spread perception that the bus service from the parking lot behind the Convocation Center to central campus does not meet the demand and so people are reluctant to park there because they end up having to walk anyway.

P. Henry: Just to follow up on that, that would be a relative cheap way of increasing usage of that.

P. Stoddard: Is that a dedicated shuttle bus do you know or is that a Huskie bus. I believe that that is just a regular Huskie bus.

P. Stoddard: So a dedicated shuttle bus that just ran back and forth might be an option.

???: I was at that meeting as well. Just to quantify the chiller plant parking lot. I think he said there were 121 spots that were taken out and that 81 of them will come back once that plant is done. There’re be a loss of 60 which he thought would be met with the transfer of people up to Monsanto but I think it’s planned for the end of the fall semester that those 80 would come back.

M. Morris: It’s actually 141 spaces. I have it in my notes.

P. Stoddard: Now the offices that were vacated when people moved out to Monsanto, what happened to those offices?

N. Castle: The Speech and Hearing Clinic is in my department. Those offices are now being converted to Public Safety and we did not move 60 people and 60 cars out to Monsanto.

P. Stoddard: Well, ITS also moved out there.

N. Castle: I don’t think they were parked where we parked thought on that side of campus.

P. Stoddard: And who’s moving into where Public Safety – I guess the point I’m trying to make is, you know ---

N. Castle: I assume Public Safety is staying in Public Safety and expanding into the Speech and Hearing Clinic space.

P. Stoddard: Okay, yeah and they’re increasing their numbers. So just because we move people out, unless we close those offices or don’t let people move into them anymore, it’s not
necessarily true that there’s going to be less demand for those spots. All right. Other questions for Michael? Really? Good. Thank you.

Okay, moving on I believe we have nothing from Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. If I’m wrong, please shout. Nothing from Rules and Governance.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

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

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Cason Snow, Chair

**P. Stoddard:** Elections and Legislative Oversight, I would just point out you should have letters in your packet from Professors Thu and Rosenbaum. They’re nomination acceptance letters. We’ll vote on the Faculty Senate Presidency next time. Please take a look at those letters. We’ll also ask each of them to say a couple of words if they so chose at that meeting and be available for questions if you have any. While we’re on the topic of letters, if you’re interesting or know anybody who is interested in either the FAC position or the Faculty/SPS Personnel Advisor position, we request that you get letters of interest and qualifications I suppose, to the University Council/Senate office by Wednesday, the 15th of April so that’s two weeks from today. Also, just by way of clarification, University Council last week did pass a bylaw change so that the FAC rep need not be a member of the Council. In fact, we hadn’t been following that bylaw until somebody pointed out that there is a bylaw so we changed the bylaw to bring ourselves into compliance. So again if you’ve been considering it and just were afraid that you weren’t a University Council member, that’s no longer a problem. The only condition is that you’re a tenured member of the faculty so you don’t have to be a member of the Council, you don’t have to be a member of the Senate. You are expected to report to both bodies so if you’ve got Wednesday afternoons busy, that’s something to consider. Other than that I’ve got nothing else – you don’t have anything else for elections?

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**P. Stoddard:** There’s no unfinished business.

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Coordination of NIU spring break with local school districts – Giovanni Bennardo

**P. Stoddard:** There is a point of new business however that somebody would like to raise. Please introduce yourself.

**G. Bennardo:** Yes, this is Giovanni Bennardo from Anthropology. Last week I was at the University Council and I wanted to raise this issue with the Council then I thought maybe it’s better I do it in the Faculty Senate first but I talked about it with the President and I didn’t get a good response – the response I expected from him. But anyway, the issue is the coordination of our spring break with the school district spring break. It’s been an issue that I have noticed all
throughout the campus. Faculty, staff, students have had their children in their offices or worse for the university, they had to take leaves to take care of their children in their home. So they have diminished consistently the efficiency of this institution and this is only because the two institutions, school district and university, do not want to talk to each other. Either of them expect the other to ask which I think is really unfair and an inefficient way to deal with the life and the quality of life of members of this community; both the campus and the town at large. So I would like to propose, first of all, what is the reaction of this Senate about it and if there is anything we can do. I know that only six weeks ago the new calendar has been approved and unfortunately I was not present. I was at a conference, I couldn’t be present. I didn’t even know it was on the agenda anyway otherwise maybe I would have moved the conference date. Anyway, this is what I’m going to say so I’ll expect reaction.

**P. Stoddard:** All right, go ahead.

### Our oldest daughter is now a grad student at MIT so this one does effect us directly any more. But I tell you I enthusiasticaly agree with Giovanni. Every single year our, in my opinion, ridiculous spring break disrupted our lives, the lives of all my students, my family. It’s preposterous. We’re the only institution that I know of with this kind of an early spring break. It doesn’t coincide with the spring breaks of anybody’s kids. Why on earth do we do this?

**P. Stoddard:** All right. Any other comments? Cason?

### I’m on the opposite end of things. My daughter is in kindergarten right now so I am wholly in favor of coordinating our spring break as I’m one of those faculty who have to take the week off because I cannot arrange childcare for her. So I, you know, it would be great if we could get somebody to carry an olive branch to these people and either give it as a sign of peace or hit them over the head with it to get them to move some dates around.

**P. Stoddard:** All right. Pat and then ---

### It seems to me that the DeKalb school break had been sort of linked up with Easter but now it’s not so that might be an area where we could have some negotiation. I think the NIU break has always been after the eighth week of the semester so that sort of is a function of when we start the semester.

### I have no children but I totally agree that spring break is too early. It’s not even in spring.

**P. Stoddard:** Go ahead in the back and then Giovanni.

### You said it wasn’t taken favorably when it was taken elsewhere. I just wanted to know how it wasn’t taken favorably.

**G. Bennardo:** Well, it’s not that it wasn’t taken favorably. The statement that was reported to me was that we have never received a request to change the calendar and I replicated that it’s not
that we are above or below anyone else. If it is our interest and in the interest of our community
to do something, we just contact other bodies locally. That’s my answer but it was not – I don’t
know. Anyway, my other question is about the 8th week, after the 8th week. Well, the difference
between the school district and ours is only two weeks. If we propose to move one week back
which is after the 7th week and not the 8th, they could very easily move it one week so we could
come to a compromise very easily or maybe even them, they could move it two weeks. I don’t
know what the issue is but the point is but are we talking here or are we expecting everybody
else to do what we do because we are the kind of the place. I don’t know.

P. Stoddard: Nancy and then Linda.

N. Castle: Working in a department that has people who live all over the suburbs, I can tell you
that even within the suburbs it’s not consistent so Sycamore and DeKalb may be at the same time
but my brother who lives in Belvidere, their kids were on break not at the same time and so I
don’t know that there’s ever going to be the happy medium. I think compromise might be the
way to do except I don’t know if we’re ever going to be able to get to the point where people
don’t have to take time off to be at home with kids on a different spring break. Remember too
that the K-12 system, they are in school through the month of May and so as we look at our 8th
week, the middle break and so on, if we push ours much later, you know we could be in April
and schools out in May and I mean, just in terms of then how do we coordinate our classes and
students focusing and so on. I think there’s a lot of things to consider about that.

P. Stoddard: Of course, you want to consider Thanksgiving too but – Linda?

L. Sons: I’ll comment from a historical point of view. Historically one of the reasons that the
spring break is the way the spring break is, is not to keep students coped up too many weeks at a
time during the spring semester especially when the weather can be pretty awful and we might
have weeks and weeks and weeks and stuff where nobody can get outside and so this tends to
provide, shall we say, less than ideal learning circumstances for our students. So the idea of
having it in the middle of the semester in that way is to provide a time of break which will
prevent the cabin fever kind of thing that not only students have but faculty as well. The second
is that historically and I’ve been around probably longer than most of you and have worked on
calendars before and the university tried very hard for many years and I’m saying many; not two,
not one – you know, tried for many years to coordinate with the school system. We never could
get any cooperation. Maybe it’s a different time; maybe we could now but historically we’ve
never been able to get the cooperation to set things such that they would abide by a fixed time
that we could agree with them. It has been tried.

P. Stoddard: Thank you.

L. Yamagala-Lynch: I’m from the College of Education and just a suggestion, if we are going
to approach the local – I know that we have relationships with Dekalb school district and I
wonder if as a venue if we could approach the Partnership Office? Dr. Sharon Smaldino is the
endowed chair of the Partnership Office who I do work closely with and she might kill me for
mentioning her here for this purpose but it is – they have a standing relationship and they work
on projects together. They place students, our students, so I just wonder if that may be one person we may want to contact in terms of how to approach our local school districts.

**P. Stoddard:** Giovanni?

**G. Bennardo:** Yeah, I mean that’s exactly what I wanted. I wanted people to think about this issue and come up with other problems that might be there. The history is definitely important. Who can we contact? All these things are very important and that’s why, I don’t know, maybe we need to investigate a bit further in our committee – in our ??? committee or something. At least as far as I understand from the faculty that I’ve talked to and the staff and students, it is an issue and are we doing anything about it? Can we do anything about it? That’s all I really ask.

**D. Zahay:** I don’t have children either but I sympathize with folks. It sounds like an issue I hadn’t even thought about but I was wondering – I thought – doesn’t NIU have a day care or some kind of facility? Would it be possible to have a program where people could leave their kid there for a week or a few days during their spring break? Because it sounds like there’s so many different school districts involved.

**P. Stoddard:** I think they tend to –

**D. Zahay:** Okay, I don’t have children; I’m not aware of all the issues.

**P. Stoddard:** Jeff?

???: $500 a week.

**J. Kowalski:** Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. I have three children and they went through the DeKalb school district and they’re old enough now that this is not an issue for me. But it was a vexing issue for the years that we never really had an opportunity as a family to coordinate these spring breaks so that the family could ever do anything together during them. In a sense they were meaningless and more of a hindrance than a help. On the other hand, not everybody in these communities works at this university and for them, it’s not the same concern. So if we’re going to pursue this, the key I think is to pursue it with an attitude that we’re willing to discuss real compromise. Right now, there is only a two week difference between the breaks. It would require compromise on both sides and if it were entered into in the right spirit, it’s possible that something might be able to happen but it shouldn’t be a question of you’re not accommodating the needs of NIU probably. There are other people in this community who don’t have anything to do with NIU and they also have interests and a voice in what happens with their own children’s’ education and/or time off. So that’s all I’ll say and I hope we listen to that too.

**P. Stoddard:** Anybody else? Anybody want to speak against ---

**K. Freedman:** I’m sympathetic with the faculty parent issue but there’s another issue too that has to do with student learning at the university and that’s for the students in educational programs of which I’m one who have some difficulty scheduling around the two breaks and so consistency would be helpful in terms of educating the education majors as well.
P. Stoddard: Could you e-mail some of the specifics of that. I’ll raise this with the President and Provost.

Lisa ???: Also, some of our students do have children themselves in the community too.

P. Stoddard: I’m sorry, some of our students ---

Lisa ???: Some of our students do have children themselves in the community too.

P. Stoddard: Oh, sure.

Lisa ???: So that is another issue as well.

P. Stoddard: Well, I’ll mention it to the President and Provost and see if we can’t put minds together. Any other issues people would like to raise?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: All right. Any comments or questions from the floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Letters of Acceptance of Nomination from Alan Rosenbaum and Kendall Thu (Pages 8-11)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Anyone want to go home? Any seconds? Get up and go on with the rest of your day.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.