FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2009. 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


R. Blecksmith attended for D. Bowman.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was accepted. C. Snow made the motion; W. Baker was second.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 1, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (sent electronically)

The minutes were approved. C. Snow made the motion; W. Baker was second.

P. Stoddard: ???

C. Snow: ???

J. Stephen: ???

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor
V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements I’d let to start off and let Janet Rintala say a word or two about Athletics at Northern Illinois University. Where is she at?

J. Rintala: Thank you. As many of you might be aware of the NCAA, which is our national governing body, has over the last several years instituted a number of programs designed to either work towards getting student athletes better prepared before we admit them or let them be eligible in athletics as well as provide more structure to student athletes as they’re going on toward graduation and trying to balance the demands of both athletics and academics. One of the things they have instituted is something called an Academic Progress Rate which gives us a sort of real time indicator of students and their progress towards graduation. Every year we get an index of how well they are doing and those are being released this week and next week. Today, probably as we speak, they are announcing what their ??? programs of recognition which would be terms nationally that are ranking in the top 10% of this academic progress rate. We have two teams that are being recognized today; women’s gymnastics and women’s volleyball so the top 10% in the country in academic progress rate. To give you an idea of the company we’re in, there are five other gymnastics teams being recognized. They are the gymnastics teams from Brown, College of William and Mary, Stanford, University of Pittsburg, and Yale. I don’t know how the rest of you think but that seems to be pretty good company academically to be in. Because volleyball programs - there’s a few more of them, there are additional colleges and universities but the same group – many of the same institutions are in there so I think that’s something our student athletes have to be proud of. They’re doing a nice job. Next week they will be announcing the ratings, the scores for everybody. This is also the one, if you notice in the paper, where the penalty for teams that are not doing very well will be noted including potential loss of grants and aid. We will not be on that list. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Very good. Thank you. Any questions for Jan?

A. Recognition of Faculty Senate members

P. Stoddard: All right, moving on. The main thing I wanted to announce today was the recognition of senators whose terms have completed or of senators who have been re-elected or newly elected. I want to thank each and every one of them for their willingness to serve and time and effort that goes into this job for relatively few thanks. Anyway, for those people whose term is expiring as Faculty Senate members, that’s James Johnson from Finance, Paul Brown from Management, Kerry Burch from Leadership Education, Psychological and Foundations, Earl Hansen, Mari Valle – Ear’s from Technology, Mari’s from Nursing & Health Studies – C.T. Lin from Chemistry, Khan Mohabbat from Economics, Brian May from English, Douglas Bowman from Math, Cason Snow from Libraries, Jeff Kowalski from Art. So let’s give all of them a big hand.

Re-elected because they did such a wonderful job obviously are Deb Zahay from Marketing, Nancy Castle from Allied Health and Communicative Disorders, David Goldblum from
Geography, Stephen Martin from Physics, and David Valentiner from Psychology. So congratulations and thank you for your willingness to serve again.

Those who will be joining us – I don’t know if any of them are present – at least one of them is with us today, are Gina Nicolosi from Finance, Abul Azad from Technology, Ayhan Lash from Nursing and Health Sciences, George A. Slotsve from Economics, Richard Blecksmith from Mathematical Sciences, and Jitka Hurych from University Libraries. So welcome all.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Okay, moving on I don’t think we have anything to consider or consent to. Oh, I’m sorry. Okay.

C. Snow: I would like to recognize – the Senate would like to recognize the service of one other person and that would be you for your five year tenure here as our illustrious leader. In recognition of time served and time that you’ll regain, the Senate has acquired a clock that has been nicely engraved.

P. Stoddard: Paul R. Stoddard, Ph.D. and President of Faculty Senate, 2004-2009, Northern Illinois University and it’s 3:27 which is accurate. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. That means an awful lot and I guess before we move on since I am from the Geology Department, I would be remiss in not wishing everybody a happy birthday. This message brought to you by the planet earth. Okay.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Moving on then. We have reports from advisory committees and you’ll notice we’re doing things a little awkwardly but that’s because we want to get votes in and votes counted during the meeting so we’re going to split up Elections and Legislative Oversight into two parts and move them, at least one part, up to the front of the meeting here. So with that, we’re going to turn it back over to Cason. Get used to this.

A. Election and Legislative Oversight (Part 1) – Cason Snow, Chair

Snow: You all have in your packets today, you all have the small ballots for the three elections we’re going to be conducting right now. Mark your x’s. I’ll come around with a box and pick up ballots and then I will leave the room and count them and have results. Do we have all the votes? Anybody still need to cast a ballot? One more. Okay, can I have all the people on the Elections Committee meet me outside to count ballots. I think there’s two of us here today.

P. Stoddard: And I believe the Minnesota Supreme Court has cleared their calendar in case of a tie or close ballots.
1. Election of President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council for 2009-2010. See attached letters from Alan Rosenbaum and Kendall Thu (Pages 3 – 6)

Snow: Fresh out of the break room, we have the results for the recent state of elections. For the position of President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council, the candidates were Alan Rosenbaum and Kendall Thu. Alan Rosenbaum garnered 36 votes; Kendall Thu got 10 so congratulations Alan.

2. Election of Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor for 2009-2011. See attached letters from David Valentiner and David Wade (Pages 7 – 9)

Snow: The Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, we had David Valentiner and David Wade. David Wade garnered 24 votes; David Valentiner garnered 21 and there was one abstention. Congratulations David.

3. Election of FAC to the IBHE Representative for 2009-2013. See attached letters from Earl Hansen, H. Joel Jeffrey and Debra Zahay (Pages 10-13)

C. Snow: The FAC to the IBHE Representative, Earl Hansen garnered 22 votes, Joel Jeffrey 16, Debra Zahay 7. There was one abstention. Congratulations Earl.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Cason. Congratulations to Alan, David and Earl. It sounds like you had a pretty good group to lead you next year so I’m going to step down and be happy. Excellent!

B. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report (Pages 13 – 17)

P. Stoddard: Okay, so while they count ballots, we’re all in dire suspense. I’m going to call on Professor Hansen to give his report on the FAC to the IBHE.

Hansen: I don’t really want to bore you ??? what I’ve already given you a memo. I would entertain questions if you have any on anything in there. I was told that ??? that we were going too fast through this that I would be getting a motion from the gentleman that I didn’t know owned a sport coat to prolong this so if there are any questions, please ask them. Are we going too fast for you Paul?

P. Stoddard: You’re going too fast, yeah. Pat?

P. Henry: This isn’t actually a question on the report but one issue that is coming up is a matter that I heard on the news this morning about insurance premiums for state employees getting increased hugely and I think this might be something that the IBHE and FAC might want to bring ---

E. Hansen: It certainly has been discussed and where it’s – everybody is in the same boat. The ones that are probably a little better off than the state university employees are those at
community colleges if the community colleges are located in a good tax base area but it’s still an issue. I don’t know what the answer is to it. A lot of discussions go on that don’t get in here because they’re not formal discussions. They’re off the cuff; they’re over a cup of coffee or whatever and they don’t play into this. But everybody, every faculty representative that I’ve meant has the same concerns as you do as faculty members and as I do as a faculty member. I convey that when I’m down there and I’m no different from the other representatives from the other institutions. The thing that’s different about the makeup of this particular board is that there are representatives from Champaign/Urbana which, I assume, is a retired person that continues to come in and down this and must be a glutton for punishment. But anyway, there is an interest in it but the retirees have a stake in this issue too and so when you go to these things, you have to keep very open minded. You also have to remember that we’re going to be faced or confronted with who is going to want to teach at a state institution in the state of Illinois when it begins they begin to look at some of the things that we have had and no longer have and that’s a reality and that’s a topic of discussion down there too. The question that comes is how do you approach IHBE. We’ve got a very good working relationship with their representatives and have had for about a year and a half. It has gotten extremely better in the last two or three meetings that we’ve had. They’ve been very open with us in giving us guidance in how our executive committee should navigate those avenues here. Before the meeting in Springfield on the 7th, I asked Dr. Peters what role would you want to play. He looked at me and I said I think the goal – this is my own personal opinion – I think that role belongs to the administration of the academic institution. All we can do is convey to them how we feel. We can document that again as faculty rep to the IBHE. That is our role. Our role is caretaker in a sense I suppose. I think the most important thing on this campus is the student. I think the second most important thing on this campus is staff. I really do. I think we’re here for the students. If we don’t have staff supporting what we as faculty and administrators do, we’re not going to do a very good job and sometimes that gets missed I think. I’m included; we forget about that. You know – what you’ve said – I have heard it down there from every corner of the state.

P. Stoddard: Okay, and I would add to that, I mean, right now nothing has been decided on anything yet of course. The Governor’s proposal includes a lot of changes in the pension plan none of which seems particularly favorable people participating in it. But among those changes they’re talking about going with the top 8 years as a basis for your annuity and taking 70% of the top 8. Right now we do 80% of the top 4. Since there’s generally an increment every year, that would make your average less over that 8 year period. They’re talking about reducing the increase in annuity which is now 3% a year to 3% or half of the cost of living essentially whichever is less. We’re guaranteed to lose money every single year against inflation. They are talking about, and we mentioned this last time I believe, our contributing 10% of our salary towards the retirement plan and the state presumably contributing 6% whereas now it’s 8% and 8% so that would effectively be a 2% pay cut. They’re also talking an income tax increase of 1 and a half percent and that’s all on the pension side. Now most of that if not all of that would not apply to anybody currently employed. As I think you all know, our pension benefits are constitutionally guaranteed so assuming there’s money at all for this, we get our pensions but as the under-funded plan continues, there is a state-wide issue, not just SURS. That’s a bit of a problem; it could develop into a big problem. The other thing they’re talking about which is not constitutionally protected is the insurance premium that Professor Henry alluded to and right now the current understanding is that for people with the Quality Care program, you would see
an increase in your monthly premium for a single person or $100 and some odd dollars - $116 or something like that. For a family, it would be more than twice that, an increase every month of $200 and some dollars. So that’s a significant amount of money I think. But again, this is just the Governor’s proposal. Nobody is sure how serious the Governor is about any of these changes. He might be very serious; he might be using them as bargaining chips for whatever so it obviously bears careful watching. I know Kathy Buettner, our V.P. for Public Affairs is keeping a close eye on this. Ken Zehnder is keeping a close eye on this. They have recruited me and Bobbie and Jay among others to help keep an eye and be available should lobbying efforts or whatever be needed. I would advise you to keep an eye the next few months on e-mails. You may be called on to write letters to your local representatives to express your views on issues whatever those views might be. The university obviously won’t ?? those views should be. Not in so many words.

**M. Vali:** Just a point of clarification. Is the 8% to 10% constitutionally protected as well?

**P. Stoddard:** I’ve talked to a couple of different people about that and got a couple of different answers. The person most likely to know – well, I don’t know – I talked with Ken Zehnder a couple of weeks ago. He was not clear yet in his own mind as to whether that would be protected against or not. Steve Cunningham I spoke to yesterday seems to thinks that would be a tough sell to make that change under the current constitution but nobody says anything. Bobbie you and then Rosemary.

**B. Cesarek:** We just had our SPS luncheon today. Judy Burgess from Operating staff was kind enough to come. She’s one of the university representatives to the SURS Advisory Committee and she indicated that – her topic was SURS – because she just attended a meeting recently and a couple of things that were mentioned – the 3% cost of living increase. At this point in time, the general counsel for SURS has indicated that that’s constitutionally bound and would be illegal to change. It doesn’t mean that it couldn’t be certainly and the same thing with regards to the 8% contribution now jumping up to 10% that that also is constitutionally bound and would be illegal. Again, from the SURS general counsel – point of information.

**P. Stoddard:** And that’s for current employees. New employees, all bets are off.

**Rosemary ???:** That kind of answered my question in part but I understood from the ??? summary I got that the Governor is proposing to actually not sign anything for the next two years – to not put anything in. So in other words, if we are being asked to increase – that difference is unconstitutional, people should know that at least from the information I got that, that doesn’t mean that this is more secure. In fact, they are proposing to increase or to put money in as we are being asked to put money in.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, they haven’t been putting money in for the last year or two, I mean, and they’ve always put in - ?? where they weren’t putting enough money in and they had a meeting of the mind to figure out what to do about that and they came up with a plan whereby they would continue to increase their contribution until they got this under-funding under control. Of course, with any of these plans they seem to want to make it easy now so we’ll increase our contribution a little today, a little bit more tomorrow and five years down the road we’ll really start sinking
some serious money in there. Well, for the first two or three years they did exactly what they want, then when the start sinking some serious money comes in there – this was I think two years ago – the legislature said we don’t have serious money so we’re just going to take a pension holiday and not put any money in. Never mind what we should be putting in anyway, plus – you know. I think I said last time that if we’re putting in 10%, then at least that’s 2% more that’s going in than if we required the state to put in anything. But we are putting in – no, because it’s our money and it is going in. The money, that 8% perhaps 10%, does go into the plan. That’s money out of our paycheck that goes not into the state coffers but into the SURS account for us. The state is supposed to match that 8% and that’s where they’ve been not living up to their part of the bargain. Yes?

M. Kostic: ?? say something. My understanding is that education is a national priority that lots of money is going into it and I don’t quite understand how come now we talking about less of everything. We need to have more - ?? is important ??? pretty much, you know, smiling at me saying what’s your salary. My son-in-law has 5 times more salary ??? and I’m not joking. Basically, I don’t quite understand what’s going on out there and how are we going to get out of this mess? Are we to educate better with – I understand institution ??? our professors here and staff and do better job ??? and pay everybody – were we overpaid before? I mean, did we do something wrong?

P. Stoddard: Well, it’s a very difficult question obviously. I don’t – we always don’t have the best reputation among our representatives – well, our representatives know us but, you know, the state legislatures in generals, I know we don’t always have the best reputation. They feel we’re a bunch of elite people who teach two classes a week which means we spend six hours in the classroom and what are we doing with the rest of the time to earn that outrageous salary when there are real people out there breaking their backs for half of what we make. That much is true but --- Pat?

P. Henry: Just to sort of tie this back with the FAC report – I mean the – it seems like one of the central points with this public agenda ??? Republic agenda which is – is it sort of the new thing that everybody is going to be working on next year as far as ??? or whatever and other things be damned. At any rate, it’s certainly something that I think we need to have input on and I just would encourage you to pass on to the IBHE that for the quality of faculty recruiting and retention, it would be a very key part in a lot of the stuff that we’ve just been talking about. It’s going to have an impact on that anyway.

E. Hansen: That has been discussed in detail quite often. For your information one of the poorer ideas came out of this particular group that I represent. Someone floated a balloon that everybody shot down. They wanted to educate the community as a whole – the state – and the legislatures on what academicians do and then they were trying to find out how they could do that. They were going to video a day in the life of an academician and that didn’t go over very well. But the reality of it is that a lot of us work at home and people don’t see that. Some of us work until 2:00 in the morning sometimes. I mean it just depends on what you’re – we’re all different and we’re all the same and if you haven’t done this, you don’t understand. I have a note from one of my students who works for a federal agency and he’s been put on four different committees. He wrote me and said I don’t know how they expect me to do my job. I serve on
these four committees ???. It is a reality that people don’t know and the other point that needs to be made here and we, as the faculty reps, this body want you to talk to your individual representatives and that was the word that went back out of Springfield and that was what was taken down to Springfield because you have more of an impact that way than you do with a group of us running around saying we represent all professionals in the state of Illinois and such and such. I think that’s we’re all going to have to get off our ??? maximums and minimums and do something about.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Earl. I believe we have some long-awaited results? The BOT did not meet so we do not have any reports from any of the trustee people which means we can go right back over to Cason who can handle the second half of the elections we need to do.


F. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report.

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Elections and Legislative Oversight (Part II) – Cason Snow, Chair

Snow: Fortunately this is the end of my term so you won’t have to look at me any more.

1. Election of UCPC representatives for 2009-2011 – ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – voting will be by college – votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified.

Snow: All right, we will now have elections for the UCPC representatives which will be voted on by college. I have nifty color-coded ballots for people. We’ll start out with the College of Education. People from the College of Ed please raise your hand so you can get a ballot. Now is the College of Health and Human Sciences. Please raise your hand so you can get a ballot. The last group is ??? . Yes, LA&S. What did I say? Sorry. It’s been a week.

P. Stoddard: Since Professor Rosenbaum was elected to this position it would probably be in appropriate to vote for him for UCPC.

Jarman: I will be contacting the winners.
2. Committees of the University 2009 – 2010 vacancies for Faculty Senate to approve or select – packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate Meeting.

C. Snow: All right, now we’re going to move on to part the 21st or something. We’re looking at Committees of the University for 2009-2010. That is this packet that came in your handouts and we’ll do this by show of hands. All right, so the first committee is APASC and we have ??? nominated. Let’s see a show of hands. Does anyone want to stump for one of the candidates? All of them? Any of them? All right, seeing none, then we’ll move on to the election. First candidate then is Wayne Finley. If you want to vote please raise your hand for him. All right, thank you. Augden Windelborn. I’m sorry if I butchered any name. Thank you. Then Donald Zinger. Are we announcing results? The winner then is Donald Zinger. Congratulations.

We move on to the Campus Parking Committee. Does anyone wish to speak on behalf of any of the candidates? All right, let’s get to it. First candidate, Andrew Otieno. Please raise your hands. Thank you. The second is Steven ???. Thank you. Congratulations Steve, I guess.

Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee. Anyone wish of one of the candidates. All right, we’ll vote. There are four candidates. Kerry Ferris. Please raise your hands. Luis Garcia. Mary Grosch. Thank you. And Liping Guo. All right and Mary Grosch, congratulations.

Moving on to Intellectual Property Committee. Anyone wish to speak on behalf of the candidates? This committee is just a bit different. We’re replacing three people so you all get to vote three times so vote early and vote often.

D. Jarman: Last time I tried that you guys objected. You want to take a vote on it, go ahead and vote if you want to vote for three or not.

P. Stoddard: You have to use the microphone.

C. Snow: Do we just want to fill each position separately than – run the vote three times? All right, then let’s get to it. Joseph ??? for position 1. All right, thank you. I think we’re going to run three separate positions. We’ll vote for the first position now, we’ll vote for the second position then we’ll vote for the third position. If you just voted for Joseph, don’t vote for him again for a few minutes.

P. Stoddard: ??? It will go pretty quickly. Let’s just vote three times.


???: Am I doing this wrong?

P. Stoddard: Yeah, at this point the first time through, we’re going to vote for each of the five people – only vote once.
**P. Stoddard:** Yeah, let’s just start over.

**C. Snow:** All right, let’s clarify this. We’re going to vote for the first position. Everybody votes once. Whoever wins gets crossed off the list for the second position. Everyone vote once for the second position.

**M. Kostic:** ???

**C. Snow:** No.

**P. Stoddard:** We have a method and I appreciate the thought but ---

**M. Kostic:** Why don’t we vote five people once and ???

[Many talking at once]

**P. Stoddard:** All in favor of voting once, taking the top three people raise your hands.

**D. Jarman:** You’ve got two hands up!

**P. Stoddard:** All those in favor of voting for each of the three positions individually raise your hands. All right. One vote. Vote up to three times; we take the top three.

**C. Snow:** There we go. All right.

**D. Jarman:** There are five people; you can vote three times.

**P. Stoddard:** We’re going to go through the list once. You can vote up to three times.

**C. Snow:** Yes, you can pick up to three people. I’m going to go through the list once. All right, here we go. Hold on to your hats. Joseph ???. Thank you. Gary Chen. Thank you. Sarah ???. Thank you. Jessica Raymond. Thank you. ???. All right, the results are. ??? Gary Chen, Jessica Raymond and Tom Sims. Congratulations? And that brings us – no, yes no – we have more.

University Benefits Committee. We’re replacing one person this time so this should be easy. Does anyone want to speak out on behalf of one candidate? No, all right, let’s get to it. ??? Carter. Thank you. Amy Levin. Thank you. Rebecca Martin. Thank you. Sim-Min Song. Thank you. All right, Amy Levin, congratulations.

All right, University Press Board. We’re electing two people. Do we want to do the top two? All right. So you vote twice. Joseph ???. All hands up please. Thank you. David Gorman. Thank you. David ???. Thank you. Orayb Naijar. Thank you. All right, the two Davis win; David Gorman and David ???. Congratulations.
And this time we’re done.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you Cason. Well done.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, moving on then. Academic Affairs, I believe they have no report. Would that be correct?


**P. Stoddard:** Economic Status I believe has no report. Are you waving that you’re there or are you waving there’s no report? No report. Thank you.

D. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – report (Page 18)

**P. Stoddard:** Resource, Space and Budget. I believe Pat Henry will be giving that report.

**P. Henry:** I’m sitting in for Michael Morris but I was at this meeting and I would urge whoever is on the Parking Committee to put their shoulder to the wheel because there’s a lot of stuff doing on with that. What Dr. Williams basically conveyed was that really the Parking Committee has representation from students as well as faculty and so there needs to be consensus to make some of these decisions and ???. One of the things we discussed was the possibility of switching some of the yellow spaces to blue or at least during the duration of the time that so many spots are being used up by the chiller plant construction. Dr. Williams said he’d look into that. The question of the removed parking which is a viable alternative except that there aren’t enough shuttle buses to get people back and forth was also brought up. It didn’t seem like an obvious solution to that in terms of, again, the number of buses that I think are a function of the student led bus system or whatever so that has to go through some other procedure. Finally, we did start talking about the question of making the campus more bicycle-friendly. It is complicated I guess and several constituencies will have to weigh in. I personally thank I would be willing to pursue this next fall because I think there are some simple, relative inexpensive steps that could be taken and that pretty well was the consensus of the meeting as well. Nothing has happened yet.

**P. Stoddard:** ??? the second part. I would mention, Alan are you still here – that we, you as (tape turned over here) – the Parking Committee and/or well, doesn’t have to be the same person but if someone could go to all the Parking Committee meetings on behalf of the Senate and someone could go to all the Computer Facility and whatever that – Advisory Committee. Computer Facility Advisory Committee (CFAC) on behalf of the Senate. So we might have somebody. Barb?

**Barb ???:** I have a question about the report. I was not able to attend the meeting on April 7 but I was at the previous meeting and I wondered what happened to the discussion about the ration of red spots to blue spots?
**P. Henry:** I think that was discussed briefly but, again, it was in the character of the whole total mix. The Parking Committee ??? with regard to that so ??? of the x number of red versus blue stickers. I don’t think it was ???.

**Barb:** Well, Dr. Williams had promised in the March meeting to look into that and get back to us. I was the one who raised the issue and I don’t know how other people feel about it. I’m curious. In our own parking lot in front of the School of Arts, the number of red spots have gone up experientially and therefore parking is considerably hard for the rest of us and I don’t ???. Parking Committee to get rid of red spots considering ???. But I’m wondering, how people feel about it.

**P. Henry:** I think and I think I actually did mention this that if there could be some system by which some of these spots would be made maybe half-time so that somebody had them for the morning – or Tuesday/Thursday instead of, you know, that there could be some sharing of the spots but nothing definitive was decided on it. I share your concern.

**P. Stoddard:** Mari?

**Valle:** One thing that because I read this, that he was very slick about avoiding the how many spots to how many permits issue. He didn’t say. I would be interested in knowing what that ratio is for all the various constituencies. How many spots are available and how many permits they get. Because I think that’s an important measure that we just don’t have.

**Henry:** ???

**M. Valle:** Right. How many permits are sold and how many parking spaces there are per that color.

**Henry:** ???

**Stoddard:** Get a microphone.

**L. ???:** I’m the UC Chair of this committee and I wasn’t able to be at the first meeting but I was at this meeting and he did say that they do oversell. He didn’t give us a percentage but he came right out and said they will always oversell spots because there’s a constant turnover that faculty tend not to use spots ??? everyday where staff would and so they do oversell but no, he would not tell us and I don’t know that he necessarily knows what the percentage is so --- I don’t know if anybody does but he did not tell us. But the one thing that he did – we had a follow-up meeting yesterday and said the Faculty Senate will be meeting again. The only thing that he was able to work out with Chief Grady was to bag 18 – starting today in fact – to bag 18 meters by the Campus Life Building to make those available for faculty and staff to relieve some of the congestion over in Anderson.

**P. Stoddard:** Eighteen. Very good. Are those over on the right?
M. Kostic: A thought. Maybe blue tickets for particular lots and then we park and walk from building to building so we save energy and to exercise.

P. Stoddard: I’m not sure how many of us actually drive from building to building unless it’s a really far distance. Well, Convo Center to the main campus is one thing and some of us do have to do that but given the chances of finding a spot wherever it is you’re going, I think so I’m not sure that that would help us a lot. It would cut down flexibility. All thoughts, all ideas should be floated – there’s got to be a better way. So all thoughts are appreciated.

Barb ????: ??? there’s no will to get rid of red spots?

P. Stoddard: There are some people who need red spots. My experience with the Parking Committee has been that they like simple rather than complex and, I mean, we used to have spots that were 7-5 and other spots that were 7-7 and spots that were all the time not that long ago and that was too complicated so I think we’ve got 7-7 and we’ve some that mostly I think for the service people, always reserved. We’ve had, you know, they don’t like lots that are partially yellow and partially blue. They want it to be all one or the other and I guess it’s a fact that when they start assigning Monday, Wednesday, Friday red and Tuesday, Thursday red which might be an excellent idea, the practical implication of that might be . I don’t know. This is something you have to work – any of these ideas, you would have to work with the Parking Committee. So, Alan will be looking for someone if he doesn’t want to do it to participate in those discussions. So if you’re really interested and I know a lot of us are, they meet twice a semester, Thursday afternoon. I think cookies are provided; I’m not sure. They are to the Committee; maybe not to Parking. Any other questions for Pat? All right, thank you very much.

E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on, we have Rosemary Feurer who is the second of the walk-in items she will be addressing. So go ahead.

Feurer: This is a report actually from – it had before the committee because of time constraints but it concerns the basic issue of transparency and the recommendation that whenever a department ranks proposal or sabbatical or research or artistry, the committee that changes the order or changes it but the faculty never would have it explained. That department would have it explained and the rationale – in other words, if a proposal was ranked first in a department or second and was moved down, it would have to be explained to the department and to the faculty member. So it’s pretty simple and the rationale is pretty obvious that we need more transparency at the university. Any questions?

K. Thu: Do you know how wide of a problem this is?

R. Feurer: No I don’t know. I didn’t get a clear answer but it does happen. It happens very seldom at the Graduate Council level .

C. Cappell: Charles Cappell, Sociology. The ranking procedures in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is a fairly complicated one in which produces a rank out of that mix when
you toss all the people in that division so to rationally explain that in each case would be probably a very substantial burden to figure out exactly how ???. as opposed to the ??? department.

**P. Stoddard:** But don’t you think the submitting faculty member, the applicant, has a right to know why he might have been ranked number 1 and not been funded when somebody else in the department was?

**C. Cappell:** I think a rationale with some explanation. I’m certainly in favor of transparency, I’m just thinking the additional burdens of how we can understand that because you’d have to actually look at the rankings and figure out to manually ???.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, I’m sorry, Professor Song?

**L. Song:** I think we are talking whether departmental rankings have been inverted or some such thing are already in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at least when I served on the College Council is departmental rankings were inverted in some way and explanation went back to the department as to that. So, you know, it’s a practice there. At least it was in my term on the College Council. We’re not talking about the overall rankings which I think is what my colleague over here is talking about and how they’re all put together but we’re talking about whether there’s an inversion rank relative to a particular proposal.

**R. Feurer:** Jim Erman said I could quote him and that is it does happen but it does not always come with an explanation to the department and I can site cases where that did happen where both the chair and the applicant was requesting that and was refused at the college level.

**P. Stoddard:** Barb?

**Barb ???:** I have a question about the rankings that come out of the College Council. We had a case of rankings at our college level that went to Graduate Council and the order was changed there.

**R. Feurer:** According to – some interesting information here – Jim Erman said he is always required to give colleges the explanation for why it was re-ordered at that point and it always has to do, he claims, with some issue of not having complied with a previous grant, something that happened, you know, some procedural issue involved in it. He also said that – I think this is important for everybody to take back – he also said that the process that happens with research and artistry is that the colleges that proposed the most proposals get the most number of research and artistry grants. If any of you were aware of that, congratulations. I haven’t found anybody who is aware of that. So in other words, ???. the college submits, they get the proportion of what he is proposing he told was that he would just give the colleges that. That there is no reason except for these procedural reasons for that to be ???. at that higher level ???. I think it is pretty substantially – substantial lack of transparency that most of us don’t even know how – that this effects. How many proposals our college gets. Basically, it’s based on the number that is proposed within each college or by each college. So that the college who has the most proposal gets the most funds.
K. Thu: Your resolution – the last sentence of the resolution – I’m not sure it jives with what you’re actually proposing. It states that the specific reasons for any placement changes that move the applicant down within the pool – does that mean general pool, the college pool or if you’re talking about the pool specifically in the department?

R. Feurer: No, it assumed – I mean this assumes that the applicant – his department ranking was changed so maybe we need to change something there. In other words it’s from the department. That once it gets past the department, that it – I mean I would be open to an explanation at the departmental level upon request. I was really talking about – we were talking about the idea at the higher levels explaining it to the department with the idea that the people who know the field the best have already vetted this proposal and that there should be a suspicion of why, you know, they were changed at a higher level and that should be justified.

K. Thu: Maybe you could just add in the departmental pool just be justified.

Barb ???: But that certainly doesn’t address my question of where we had a ranked order coming out of the College Council that was apparently ignored by the Graduate Council ??? it was their policy to ??? based on ???.

R. Feurer: Well, apparently it was changed. And that again, that’s something that, you know, it was changed by one individual, by Jim Erman apparently because he did not appreciate that.

P. Stoddard: David?

David ???: As I understand it this is just going to be a recommendation. Right? Okay, you’ve recommended that I give you a letter and I decline. I mean, my suggestion is – if this is a problem sufficient for us a concern we should do something more than a recommendation. We should ??? language, constitution/bylaws language that would indicate that this is a necessity and that they must in fact in such cases offer an explanation to the department and college or leave it as it is.

P. Stoddard: I think what we need to do – we have some choices. We can make the recommendations and ??? it’s not binding on anybody, it’s just think this would be a good idea ????. We can – if we want to do more than that, then we need to refer it over to the University Council which is the body that has the ability to change bylaws, etc.

David ???: And Paul knows that I was on a committee looking at precisely the sabbatical policy this year and it’s likely that we may indeed look at it again next year, I might offer the recommendation that you refer this to that committee at the UC with an end to drafting new or amended language with the bylaws rather than this rather tepid – if this is really a concern and I think it is probably really a concern.

K. Thu: I would actually support the resolution because Faculty Senate is the place where faculty voices are heard. The first step toward making procedural changes. There’s nothing we
do in the Senate at all that has anything binding so ???. So I would support the resolution with the caveat that ???.

**P. Stoddard:** ???

**David ???:** I would move to refer it to University Council for consideration.

**K. Thu:** I’d ?? appropriate.

**P. Stoddard:** Do you take that as a friendly amendment to the resolution?

**Barb ???:** --- to be a broken record here but if the rules were changed in the past year because of one individual, can we count on that change into perpetuity? No. So maybe we shouldn’t insert the word departmental.

**R. Feurer:** It’s still assumed that if it’s changed at that higher level, the department would know. If you look at the third line there. It means that ---

**P. Stoddard:** I think Barb has a concern that the college ranking is changed. So you’re concerned about the departmental ---

**Barb ???:** ?? the departmental level will it change the rank above the department.

**R. Feurer:** Okay, so how would you amend it?

**Barb ???:** I wouldn’t. ?? Something, you know, is going to come out of here in terms of legislation it would cover everything.

**P. Henry:** It seems to me it would be okay to make it in the departmental/college pool because otherwise I think it does sort of imply that how person A in department X is rated above or below person B in department Y becomes the issue and that’s not really the issue. The issue is once that ranking from whatever level goes to the next higher level, why do they make the change and that’s what we need to make sure it’s being looked at for transparency. ???

**P. Stoddard:** I think first off we will need a motion at some point before too much longer ?? and I think for an internal consistency I’d like to suggest the Senate recommends that any changes in college or departmental or ranking that effects and just leave the rest as is without the second departmental in the last line if that is the sense of the Senate.

**C. Garcia:** I think that maybe ???.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, if that’s all right with everybody. Okay shall be explained in writing to the department/college. If they’re going to change the college rankings then --- Al?

**Rosenbaum:** It sounds like we’re saying though is not necessarily they’re changing the rank but they’re not funding them in the order that the department or college proposed so they could seem
to fund starting at a lower rank without changing the rank. So I think what we’re saying is we want to maintain that rankings that are given by the department or college unless they specific reasons to give.

P. Stoddard: I don’t know. If they rank one and two and ???.

Rosenbaum: Right. In other words they could say we’re funding project three without changing the rankings as opposed to saying they have to respect the departmental or the college ranking.

P. Stoddard: No, they might say – I mean, they might say the department might give you one, two and three and they might reverse that and make three at the top. Their top pick for funding, if they fund number three they would rank that number one by their actions. I don’t know. Just try to keep this – I think the intent of this is known. This is just a recommendation. If you don’t fund the top one we want to know why you didn’t and then let the UC committee next year worry about all the little details to make sure that nobody games the system. ??? or something. In the interest of time and clarity, I’d for somebody to make a motion.

K. Thu: I move to adopt the resolution with the friendly amendment.

P. Stoddard: No, it’s not an amendment since there wasn’t a motion yet. All right, we have a motion from Kendall. So right now the resolution as I read it is that the Senate recommends that any changes in college or departmental rankings that effects funding of research and artistry or sabbatical leaves that the rankings of Grad Council shall be explained in writing to the department or college and to the applicants with specific reasons for any placement ??? this explanation. Is there any more comments on this? All right the understanding is that this is a recommendation and that this will be forwarded as well to the University Council at an appropriate time in the near future. All in favor? Opposed? Okay. Thank you Rosemary.

The motion passed.

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

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Under Unfinished Business I have a couple of things I should have announced before. Last time we talked about spring break and whether or not that could be made to align with local schools. There was a lot of discussion about that. I brought it up with the President and Provost who could see no reason not to try it. They made no guarantees because it involves ??? associated with NIU. They said they would start talking about it and see if they couldn’t make that happen.

On sabbatical reports, the question was asked how they were chosen. They’re chosen by Associate Provost Virginia Cassidy. I’ve got a list if you’re curious as to who specifically ??? for about four years so the list ??? leans heavily towards LA&S, not exclusively however, out of those six or eight presentations, not all seven colleges were represented. So if there’s more
curiosity about the process, I would start with Provost Cassidy and see what her thoughts are on how that comes to be.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Under New Business I think Kendall had something. This is actually rather important I believe.

K. Thu: We have a walk-in document from Irene Rubin. It’s a memo concerning reconstituting the SORS Board. I ran into her yesterday or the day before yesterday, I can’t remember which. She was circulating this particular statement which essentially explains some of the shuffling with the SORS Board and other boards and the punch line here is that she has asked Steve Cunningham to kind of serve on the reconstituted board. Steve is willing to do that. I talked to him a couple of days ago and he said that he couldn’t be here today but he would accept support for membership on that board. So there’s a petition that you can sign. It’s on the back table. Also I’d like to make a motion that the Faculty Senate support Steve Cunningham’s nomination for the reconstituted board.

P. Stoddard: Okay, any discussion? All right. I’d like to say I’ve had the chance to work with Steve for the last five years. He’s a very, very busy person but if he wants to make time in his schedule for this, I think it would be incredibly important for Northern to have a voice on this board for the faculty. Steve is very concerned about all these issues on behalf of the faculty. I personally can’t think of a better choice. He’s very well-respected throughout the state. I think this would be a good move. Any other discussion? All in favor of supporting Steven Cunningham’s nomination to the SORS Board say aye. Opposed? It was unanimous. All right.

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

P. Stoddard: Motion to adjourn? Second?

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 P.M.