I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Welcome everybody to another year. For those of you who don’t know me, I’m P. Stoddard. I’m the one who gets to sit up here every month as president of the Faculty Senate. This is the Faculty Senate if you thought this was Geology 103 or something you’re probably normal.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08pm

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: We’ll go into some of the introductory comments in a little but before we do I think we need to follow form here and adopt the agenda. So you should have a copy of that in front of you someplace. Thank you, thank you. Any comments on the agenda? Seeing none, all in favor of the agenda say aye. All opposed? Thank you. Well, as we go through and move and second things, especially those of you who are new to the Senate and even those of us who have been on the Senate for a little while – it’s been a long summer, not long enough I suppose – but nonetheless, please always use a microphone when you’re speaking even if you have a nice loud clear voice. We need to be able to record this and also give your name and department when you have something to say. Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 23, 2008 FS MEETING

(The minutes will be sent electronically on Tuesday, please look them over and a vote will be taken at Faculty Senate to approve/change)

P. Stoddard: Moving on, approval of the minutes, we’re trying something new this year to
save a tree or two and that is we will send you electronically a copy of the minutes, ask you to look them over. We will have some hard copies here in case something comes up we need to address but you should have all received these by e-mail earlier this week and we’d like to approve those at this time so if I could get a motion to approve the minutes you saw electronically? Thank you Professor Novak from Music and second? Linda. Okay, thank you. So were there any comments or concerns about the minutes? It was a long time ago. All right. All in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed? Thank you.

Novak moved and Derscheid seconded.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: All right, announcements. That’s me here. First off again, welcome. To those of you new to the Senate or returning after a long absence, I thought I’d give you a few words about what the Senate is all about. The Senate started off as actually a caucus, a faculty caucus of the University Council. After a brief stint in that form, several departments – well, since Council representation is by college and not department – a lot of departments were not represented on what was then the Academic Assembly and that created some concern so that body was expanded to include all the faculty members of the University Council plus a representative from each department and it was renamed the Faculty Senate and so that is us today. As such, we are a body that essentially talks about issues primarily of concern to the faculty, albeit not necessarily exclusively. There are obviously student concerns and other concerns related to the university and things we care about and therefore feel free to talk about. The Senate has several standing committees. You should have all gotten an assignment about that along with a description of what each committee does or what its purview is. Everybody – all the Senate members, the representatives of departments rather than the Council members who have their own committees to worry about – all the Senate people have been assigned a Faculty Senate committee. Those of you from smaller colleges or colleges with fewer departments, you generally are assigned, or at least one person is assigned, to the Executive Committee which sets the agenda and that person is free to sit in on any committee meeting if there is material of interest to them or their college or their department. But rather than trying to assign one person to two or three different committees just because you happen to come from a small college, we didn’t think increasing people’s work loads like that was very nice so we try not to do that. Sometimes the Senate gets together in a retreat before the beginning of the year. Obviously, we didn’t do that this year. However, we would like to encourage anybody who has issues that they would like to see the Senate address, perhaps issues that take a bit more than asking a question in here and getting a quick answer, but issues that might take a little investigation or research, we’re instituting a suggestion box which is in the hallway in the back there over on the left side as you leave. I’m told it will look prettier next time it looks okay for now. It’s a box with a hole in the top. So if you have anything you would like the Senate to look at, faculty work loads, compensation issues, whatever, merit, promotion considerations and fates of buildings and whatever, please feel free to either bring it up in here and if you’re a little shy, just put a piece of paper in the suggestion box. I would appreciate thought since we grant you that much anonymously that you put your name and department on there as well so we know who to contact about more specifics of whatever it is you’d like information about. That said, we do meet typically once a month during the academic year. February and March tend to be a little
slow generally and sometimes we cancel a meeting in there. I’ve never heard a complaint from anybody when we’ve done that but the Bylaws do say we’re supposed to meet on average once a month. I think that’s most of what for preparatory remarks for the Senate for new folks. Anybody have any questions about our role in the university? Okay.

Now, as you’ve noticed we didn’t start exactly at 3:00 today; we never do. A lot of people have classes and other things that go pretty much right up to 3:00 so we usually start a few minutes late but hopefully not too late. I would remark thought that the Senate meetings do have a two hour block of time each month. Now I usually like to get us through the agenda somewhat faster than that. I think I’ve been a little too successful in that recently as people have begun to assume that Senate meetings need only last an hour so around 4:00 or so people are beginning to get up and leave which means that if we have business that needs to take place towards the end of the agenda, we run into problems with having a significant representative body. So do, I mean I do try to get you out early because this is not the most important thing in the world to a lot of us, but it is important and I would like you to at least keep that time period open in case we do need to go long and again, until long I mean until 5:00, not later than that.

While we’re here, yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I have a quick question. Patricia Henry, Foreign Languages. Can we have an e-version of the suggestion box in terms of just e-mailing to you directly if we have something we want brought up or would you rather not?

**P. Stoddard:** That’s a hardware issue; actually it’s a software issue. We’ll try to do that, yes. It’s a good idea.

**P. Henry:** ???

**P. Stoddard:** It’s low tech I know and this is the 21st Center but we’ll look into an electric suggestion box. While I’m here, I should also introduce the two people up front. This is Donna Jarman who many of you used to know as Donna Mathesius. She got married over the summer so congratulations to her and she is the secretary for the Faculty Senate and the University Council and she knows what’s going on and tells me what I need to do and then I do it. She’s been very, very helpful in my tenure here. Sitting next to her is Ferald Bryan from Communications who acts as our parliamentarian and so if I ever try to stage a coup or something he’ll tell me I’m not allowed to do that and I’ll go back to doing things the normal way. We also have Tim Griffin who watches us. He’s from the Ombudsman’s Office. Bobbie Cesarek is actually here as a member of the Senate representing SPS folks. We have someone from ??? and therefore, she represents them here. I don’t see any other, of course there’s a lot of new faces so I could very well be missing somebody. I don’t see any other normal guests, routine guests. The *Northern Star* does frequently show up. Is the *Northern Star* here today? All right. So feel free to dish the students; I’m just kidding. Then Deb Haliczer, you’re here actually as a guest, that’s right, you’re on the Council now so you’re not a guest there, you’re a member, but you are a guest here. Everybody, if you don’t know Deb Haliczer, you certainly should but I think most of you probably do already. Deb is from HR and helps us with a lot of those types of issues which many of us have to deal with. Also we have as a member, also a
potential guest I suppose, is Alan Rosenbaum who is the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Raise your hand Alan. I’m sorry, that’s right, there was a recent change. The Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – not as easy to say FPA/SPS Advisor as it was FPA but nevertheless, it’s an important title change because he does represent some SPS folks. If you do have any personnel issues, tenure or promotion issues, that you don’t feel went quite the way they should have, issues with what’s going on in your department or anything else that has to do with the personnel side of things, Alan is there as a reference and, in this case, also as an advocate for you if you feel you need to go that route and I think Alan probably has a word or two he’d like to say on his own behalf.

A. Rosenbaum: Am I accused of something? I see a lot of familiar faces as I look around so many of you have heard this before but I think it’s important to make at least one point and that is as the Faculty Personnel Advisor, one of the biggest problems I’ve had and one of the things that still surprises me is how few faculty members of my availability despite the fact that we have Tim who sends people to me regularly and Deb also and we also have links on the Faculty Senate web and I think there are others as well on the faculty part of the NIU website and yet invariably, as happened this morning, someone says “I didn’t know you even existed” and so we’ve been worried about this for a couple of years and, in fact, what we asked was that since every department in the university is, at least in principle, represented here that people go back to their departments and at faculty meetings, and I know there’s a lot of variability in terms of which departments have faculty meetings and how often, but that you please try to inform the faculty within your departments about the availability of these services. So I’m available both to faculty and SPS. The services are completely confidential so there’s no question that someone can come to me and talk about whatever they want and I will maintain the confidentiality of that. If people are wondering whether or not what they are concerned about is the domain of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor, all they have to do is call and ask. I’ll talk to anyone. So if they call me up I’m happy to discuss it with them and if I’m not the right person, to try to find out who the right person for them might be. This can involve any number of issues. It can involve tenure and promotion as Paul said, it can involve concerns about merit evaluations, it can involve interpersonal problems with people in the department, those could be chairpersons. It can, although I really dread it when it does, involve deans and associate deans and so the problems can be very broad. They can involve any number of administrative problems or even problems between faculty members. I have been involved in problems where one faculty member is having problems with another faculty member even though they are both at the same level in terms of administrative responsibilities. So my hope is that people will publicize my office and my availability so I can increase the amount of business that I do but really people know about my availability and I don’t hear them telling me “well gee, I didn’t know you existed”. So, I hope you will help us out and do that. Does anybody have any questions? I’m sorry? Oh, Alan Rosenbaum. Rosenbaum, yes. You know, I’m in the directory first initial, last name of course at the usual address. Okay? Thanks.

P. Stoddard: Moving on, a couple of brief announcements. Well one, I lost the other one but Deb will help me out with that. This is from, well, LA&S but I think it’s true for all departments; for the entire campus. Just a reminder that there are these sessions going on on campus for LA&S at least. One is tomorrow, September 4, at 1:00 downstairs in Rm 505; another one Monday, September 8 at 1:00 in Rm 505. These are counseling sessions dealing
with the emotionally troubled student. These are sessions essentially that come out of the tragedy from last semester and so if you’re concerned about how to deal with students who look like they are at risk in some way or another, sessions like this, I know in LA&S and I’m sure across the campus, are things to be looking into. Then the other note that Deb gave me is right here. It’s about the Benefits Choice option. So we’ll have one of those coming up October 27 to November 14. I understand the final details are still being worked out and then that information will all be coming to you shortly, as shortly as possible. So October 27 to November 14 so if you have any changes you want to make to your benefits plans, that’s when you can do it and then of course, HR will be more than happy to guide you through that process and give you whatever information you need. At least certain members of HR will be more than happy and others maybe not as much.

All right, I think that’s all I have for announcements. I guess I’ll also mention as long as I’m up here, I do sit in on the Computer Facilities Advisory Committee and the Parking Advisory Committee, basically these are two quality of life issues that tend to effect faculty more than others. So if you have any concerns about the computer system or parking on campus, let me know and I’ll make sure I bring them up with the appropriate people. I do know, well I thought I knew, parking in the area out by Anderson Hall and the Student Life Building, there’s construction going on or supposed to be going on for the new east chiller plant which is going to take up a bunch of parking spaces and so there’s going to be some rearranging or at least I thought that was what was going to happen; it hasn’t happened yet of spots in the Anderson Lot to expand the blue a bit in there and then move some of the yellow spots out into the more distant area and there’s a brown lot which is for students who live in town and could take the bus but choose not to, they’re going to be moved even further out. They don’t pay as much for their parking so the thought was it’s okay to move them out in the relative boonies. So I think from a faculty standpoint, the total number of spots on that part of campus is supposed to stay about the same. The students, I think, the yellow ones might lose a few and the brown ones are the ones that are really going to be decreased but those lots I think are not usually full up anyway so it shouldn’t hurt too badly. Hopefully, knock on wood. I don’t know what’s going on with the east chiller thing so I don’t where we stand with that and I’ll get to that later in a report at some point.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

P. Stoddard: Moving on, items for Faculty Senate consideration I, as I said, am President of the Faculty Senate. Should I get hit by a bus we need a Vice President. The Governor of Alaska has already been tapped so anybody else? Obviously, experience is not an issue. Feel free. The Vice President really, if for some reason I can’t make a meeting, you would have to sit up here and then at the last meeting of the year we go into Executive Session to rate the President of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Personnel Advisor and the President of the Faculty Senate cannot be in the room during that time so the Vice President has to take over and since Donna and Ferald can’t be here either, we need somebody to take the minutes and so for that ten minutes the Secretary of the Faculty Senate has something to do. So anyway, those are what those two jobs are. I’ll entertain nominations for Vice President to start with. Yes? Please use a mike.

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate.
M. Valle: I was supposed to nominate Cason Snow but I don’t see him here.

P. Stoddard: Cason Snow, no. I think we can nominate him in absentia because I know he’s willing to do it. Normally, this is a great way to get people to do things when they don’t show up but we’ll try to avoid that for the first meeting anyway. Cason has previously expressed an interest in doing this so I think we can accept his nomination if there is a second. All right, we have a second. Are there any other nominations? Snow from the Libraries.

C. Garcia: I would like to nominate Rose for Secretary.

P. Stoddard: Okay, one at a time. Let’s just stick with the Vice President then we’ll get to the Secretary. All right. Are there any other nominations for Vice President? Hearing none, the Chair will entertain a motion to close nominations and accept Cason by acclamation. Linda, did I see you second that? All in favor say aye. Congratulations Cason. I’m sure you’ll do a great job assuming you show up. Moving on then, I will now open the floor for nominations for Secretary.

Castle moved; Derscheid seconded.

C. Garcia: Yes, I would like to nominate Mari Valle. I just changed my mind.

P. Stoddard: Last minute things are apparently okay. It looked like there was going to be a flurry of votes so. Mary, is that all right? I do have a second. Any other nominations? Seeing none, I’ll once again entertain a motion to close, acclaim and move on. All in favor? Opposed?

Castle moved; Kowalski seconded.

B. University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees. (Page 3)

P. Stoddard: Okay, University Advisory Committee for the Board of Trustees. This is a body that meets with the trustees, sort of, essentially these are folks who sit in on the trustees meetings and are afforded a brief moment to say something. Generally, it’s nothing too controversial but I suppose it could be if you really felt the importance of doing so. We have typically six people on this, two of whom represent faculty and staff at the Legislative and Oversight Committee of the Board; two who represent us at the Facilities and Finance Committee meeting and two at the Academic Affairs and Personnel Committee and then any or all of them can also be there for the full Board meeting. The Board meetings quarterly. The committees tend to meet two to three weeks before Board so they just had the committee meetings last week. They will have the full Board meeting in a couple of weeks and then again in December and we’ll go through this in March and June. On page 3 you have a list, and that would be the 2008-2009 column, of people who are currently on it. My understanding is that one of those people might be looking to step down from this due to other responsibilities that have fallen on her shoulders and that would be Nancy Castle. So I’ll accept any nominations – this ultimately gets approved by the Council right – so this is merely a recommendation we’re making but we should make the
recommendation and the Council, in all likelihood will follow it. I’ll accept nominations for
somebody to replace Nancy.

**N. Castle:** Before people nominate we ought to say that generally what happens is that since
Paul will continue to be on the committee, whoever you are, you and Paul will meet with Dr.
Williams before the sub-committee meets to go over the agenda and goes through it page-by-
page, item-by-item and typically that’s late in the day earlier in the week and then Thursday the
Board of Trustees’ Committee, the FFO Committee, meets typically at 10:00 but if the 9:00
meeting runs late, the 10:00 meeting doesn’t start on time so it’s kind of a Thursday morning
commitment every 3 months or so and then the Board of Trustees’ meeting is another Thursday
morning every couple of months or so, so that’s kind of the time frame you’re talking about.

**P. Stoddard:** And the committee meeting, since there’s only two of us, it’s more important that
you be able to commit to that one since there’s 6 of us who can theoretically sit in on the full
Board, we usually don’t have trouble getting somebody to handle that so then Mari – yes?

**M. Valle:** Mari Valle, Nursing and Health Studies – maybe I’ll get it right this time. I nominate
Clerisida Garcia.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, and you accept the nomination?

**C. Garcia:** Yes.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. Second, anybody? Nancy, good move. Any other nominations? All right,
seeing none, you know the routine. Anybody care to make the motion? Good idea and second?
All right, go ahead and second. Yeah, sure. All in favor of Clerisida Garcia becoming our new
University Advisory Committee member say aye. Thank you, thank you for agreeing.

Castle made the motion; Garcia seconded.

Okay, next on the agenda is nominations for a representative to the IBHE but I don’t have to do
this. Excuse me? I’m sorry Ferald’s term is up and he’s consented to be appointed for a new
term. Therefore, we need to approve him. So can I get a motion to approve Ferald for a second
term or whatever term? Thank you Pat. Any other nominations for that position? Seeing none,
all in favor of Ferald say aye. Thank you.

Henry made the motion; Rosenbaum seconded.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Okay. We do have a representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the
IBHE. That is Earl Hansen from Engineering and Engineering Technology. He’s not here with
us today but we should see him on a more regular basis as he reports back to us on the dealings
of that particular body. For your information, the FAC is a group of faculty from around the
state representative four-year institutions, community colleges and private institutions. They
meet once a month in various places around the state and generally talk about the state of
education, higher education in Illinois and every once in a while will get to say something to the IBHE about it. We also get to listen to what the IHBE has to say about it which is considerably more. Pat has done this job for quite some time and she’s over there giggling because she knows what’s entailed. It’s actually a pretty interesting job. Earl has agreed to do it much, I’m sure, to Pat’s chagrin. Because it is an important job and it is a big demand on time, we’ve finally at least begun the process of giving some form of compensation to this person, essentially a month’s stipend during the summer. So, something to consider in upcoming years if you like getting involved in things like that.

D. Faculty Senate Committee List (Page 4)

P. Stoddard: Moving on, there’s item D on page 4, the Faculty Senate Committees list. So again, if you’re here as a department representative rather than as a University Council member, you should find your name at least once on that list. We need as the Senate to approve the committee assignments as displayed on page 4. Thank you. Second anybody?

T. Fisher: I second. Teresa from CAHE.

P. Stoddard: Any comments? I tried to give everybody either their first or second choice. I think I was successful for those of you who passed their preference along. All in favor say aye. All right. We’ve got committees so get to work everybody.

Novak made the motion; Fisher seconded.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The way this usually works is during the Executive Committee meeting if there are issues from the suggestion box or things that are just cropping up we’ll sit together – the Executive Committee consists of representatives of each college and the chairs of the standing committees and we as a group decide which committee is best suited to deal with any particular issue and so it gets assigned. Usually what will happen is you will see on a consent agenda that we referred such and such an issue to such and such a committee.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

P. Stoddard: Next up are reports from Advisory Committees. We don’t have one from the FAC at this point. We do have some from the Board of Trustees Committees. I guess our first one will be the BOT Committee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel. I believe Professor Bryan will be delivering that.

A. FAC to IBHE – no report.

F. Bryan: Thanks Paul. Normally as parliamentarian I don’t involve myself in these reports unless, as in this case, Buck Stevens from Math can’t appear at the meeting due to teaching conflicts so this quarter I did attend and now I can report on this committee and just take note as parliamentarian I typically don’t vote. I’m here to offer advice about parliamentary procedure if we do have any. The August meeting of this committee primarily deals with recognition and reports but I would point out that these reports are things the administration takes very seriously. Buck Stevens and I met with Provost Alden prior to this meeting. He went through the agenda and highlighted these items I’m about to deal with. The meeting began with a report on the PhD program in Economics. Many of us were a little surprised at the June meeting that the Board of Trustees Chair Murer expressed some concern at the statistics on doctoral programs overall and the one in Economics specifically and as you can see, the numbers suggest some concern.

Provost Alden reported that there will be an external review of the doctoral program this fall and they’re going to report back on that in March so we’ll all have to stay tuned to see what they come up with.

Vice-Provost Virginia Cassidy presented a brief summary on performance indicators for law and nursing grads. These are regular reports. The Board is always concerned about how many people passed the nursing board exams, how many people passed the law boards and so forth and they get concerned obviously if numbers aren’t very high. These were all very good.

There was also recognitions of the 19 recently retired faculty from 18 different departments, all granted faculty emeriti status. There is a long list of Presidential Teaching Professors, Presidential Research Professors, Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award recipients, Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction Awards, Operating Staff Outstanding Service Awards recipients, and Presidential Supportive Professional Staff Awards for Excellence. All were recognized and the Board, as I said, takes this very seriously. There was a note that the brand new Board of Trustee Professorships which were announced last year will be announced later this fall. The actual first three recipients of this very high honor will be announced later this fall.

The Acting Dean of the Graduate School presented the FY2008 External Funding for Research and Instructional Projects Report. This is one that Chair of the committee, Vella, always is anxious to hear since we’re obviously under a lot of pressure to produce outside money. Our money received in this category was somewhat down from last year but assurances were given that it will be up this year.

Finally, and this was why the meeting ran long and upset the next committee so much, Provost Alden made a forty minute PowerPoint presentation which I guess he’s done to several bodies on campus about the proposed implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan. He apparently was doing a forty minute version of what, in some quarters, took three hours so I guess we got the thumbnail sketch version but they’re obviously taking this very seriously. He talked about the strategic imperatives. He outlined three key themes – thirteen, I’m sorry, thirteen not three and I assume we’ll hear more about that later.

The next meeting will be in November and I’ll entertain any questions if you have any about this report.
P. Stoddard: Any questions? All right. Thank you Ferald.


P. Stoddard: Next up is – we need to change the name on the BOT Committee for FFO, ?? anymore. On the agenda. Anyway, the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee met right after the previous one about a half hour late because it went over and this was even without an Executive Session which usually runs two hours or so. Both of these committees, they don’t actually approve things. They make recommendations that then go to the full Board which will meet in September as we said and the final approval will be done there. I’ve never actually seen the full Board reject a recommendation made by any of the committees however so these are usually pretty well set. Among the more interesting things that the FFO considered were the capital budget, not that there’s any real change in it. There hasn’t been any state funding for a capital budget in years and years so Stevens is still at the top and the Computer Science and Technology Center is next. However, Cole Hall has not inserted itself in there as well. Now, this is a little tricky and in the meeting I was asking Kathy Buettner who is our government liaison person about all this and she said – what I heard that Cole Hall was not in the ??? capital list but in hindsight that made no sense to me so I’m thinking that what she said was that it’s not in the BHE or IBHE capital list. The IBHE makes recommendations to the state. Cole Hall was not in that but it is in the version of a capital budget bill that is currently under consideration. You may have heard about this over the summer. There’s been a lot of wrangling about this. Dennis Hastert and Glen ??? from the Bipartisan Commission back in the spring to try to figure out a way to get a capital bill passed and what it should consist of and how it should be funded. After talking to everybody they came up with a plan which immediately got scraped. Their plan was for something like $39 billion dollars and part of it was to be funded by the leasing of the state lottery, by increasing the number of gaming facilities in the state and some other things which actually made more sense. That didn’t fly at that level. They’re now talking about a $25 dollar – a $25 dollar capital bill – which they think they may be able to find money for. A $25 billion capital bill which would include Stevens, it would include Cole and it would include at least the first stage of the Computer Science and Technology Center. I think the funding mechanism is more or less the same with the exception of new gaming facilities. That seems to be a real bugaboo to a number of legislators so that is where we stand. A big driving force behind this is that there’s $9 billion dollars in federal highway money that the state has to match. If we don’t match it soon it goes away and I don’t think anybody wants to be seen as frittering away $9 billion dollars in an election year so stay tuned. We may actually see something happen and Stevens might actually be improved; renovated. It’s only been how many years? Anyway, so that’s what’s going on with the capital budget. They also approved a non-appropriated capital budget. We don’t have to get special appropriations from the state for this. It’s minor, relatively minor, compared to new buildings and whatever, projects – mostly maintenance in nature – minor renovations that need to take place. However, in the regular budget, you may recall if you follow these things, the legislature did pass a budget. It was about $1.8 billion out of balance which is a no-no and so the Governor went in and vetoed about $1.4 billion of expenditures to try to bring the budget into something resembling balance. We lost $1.3 million dollars. That was the only cut he made but it was to what’s called our permanent maintenance line so this is a little over a million dollars that goes to maintaining buildings and whatever else around campus.
Without that money, we need to make those maintenance projects happen and so because we’re out that money, the Board approved – or the committee approved – recommending a new fee for the students called a campus improvement fee which I think is $6.75 per credit hour so if you take a full load you max out at $75.00 a semester. Ten of eleven of the other state institutions already have such a fee. $75.00 is the minimum amount any school charges and I think U of I is at the high end at $250.00 a semester. There was a bit of hand wringing by the Board about this. Our newest trustee, John Butler, very grudgingly voted in favor of it but the Board I think really does not like having to charge students for things that the state has been paying for. I’ll just quote somebody and I forget who said it originally but it was a great line about us going from a state institution to a state supported institution to a state – but eventually it will end up as a state located institution. So not very long ago, I know when I started here about twenty years ago, I think we were getting about 51% of our financial support from the state of Illinois. We now get a little over 26% so tuition and fees keep sky rocketing in large measure it’s not just inflation, it’s not that we all get these fantastic raises, it’s because the state is doing less and less to fund higher education. This is not just Illinois. In fact, at 26% according to at least one measure I saw, we’re slightly above average. The average nationwide is 22%. So this is a national phenomenon and I really don’t know what if anything we can or should do about that. It is a reality.

The Board also approved some large expenditures. They’re listed in item #3. This is a walk-in by the way, I should mention that. These large expenditures are what they call pass throughs which means someone else is footing the bill but because there’s so much money involved, the Board still has to approve the expenditure. So this doesn’t cost the university anything. You know, you’ve got a huge grant from NIH of NSF or somebody and a couple of these fall into that category. If it’s over a million dollars I think the Board has to – it’s less than that; half a million maybe – the Board has to approve it but we’re not paying for it ourselves.

Item 4 is the east chiller plant. This is the thing that’s going in in the Student Life parking lot and if you were around over the summer you saw them tear up Normal Road and a bunch of other things to lay all the pipes for this. This is essentially a centralized air conditioning unit so the pipes run cold air through various buildings on the east side of campus and the finances for this are very complex and Dr. Williams tried to explain this to us two or three times. Maybe Nancy has a better feel for it than I do. The bottom line is some of the funding fell through, some of the external funding – I think from the state – fell through and so we have to come up with $800,000 to complete the project. Otherwise, all that tearing up the roads would be for nothing.

--- if they couldn’t finish.

P. Stoddard: Or it would be permanent because they couldn’t finish right. That would be even more fun. Well, you know, we’d finally have that nice pedestrian walkway in the middle of campus like we’ve always wanted. No, that’s not nice. Anyway, so they authorized money for that and where that money’s coming from I don’t think even Dr. Williams knows yet.

Information items – they had a comparison of student tuition in Illinois. We’re sixth lowest out of twelve so we’re pretty much right in the middle of the pack among four year state institutions.
There is a report about tuition and fee waivers for a total of almost $22 million of which about $18 million went to graduate students and then as Professor Bryan noted, this committee as well acknowledged all the professional excellence awards, those are the Presidential Teaching, Research Awards, the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and so forth and the staff awards. They went to I think approximately 17 people on campus. So it’s always nice to see people doing a good job get recognized. That recognition goes all the way up to the Board of Trustees who always have something nice to say about how wonderful our employees are here before they approve our .5% increment or whatever it’ll be this year. I don’t know, I haven’t heard anything about an increment. I am told that by the time the President makes his State of the University address which will be on the 25th of this month, we should know what increment if any, we are getting. The President did say he would like whatever increment it’s going to be – and hold your breath on small – I don’t see a large increment coming especially with some of the other financial concerns that are coming up – but whatever increment it will be, the President is recommending it be across the board. His feeling is we all suffered through a pretty lousy year last year in terms of events beyond our control and as a result, he doesn’t feel it would be right to reward some people more than others for surviving. That’s his philosophy and I haven’t heard too many people say anything negative about that idea.

Any questions about this particular one – sorry, I don’t usually take this long. All right, if there are no questions, I believe Bobbie you have Legislative Audit, Oversight, etc.


B. Cesarek: I do thank you. You will notice that the report is from June 5. I did not fall asleep at the August 28th meeting. That was indeed canceled. So unfortunately what you’re getting is old news so to speak relative to what’s been going on with the General Assembly and the Higher Education budget and etc. I apologize for that I was hoping for an update after a couple of months but that did not take place because that meeting was canceled so hopefully we’ll have information for you in November. Again, most of this information because it’s from June, is probably – you are well aware of it and the idea as far as state funding from the General Assembly as reported by Ken Zhender and also in regards to higher education and the Higher Education Act which, to my knowledge, still has not been passed. The Congressional Report regarding that identified some issues and there were certainly some concerns relative to the congressional Report # 2 Higher Education Act Conference Report and what it would involve and the concerns are many unfunded mandates, more involvement of the federal government in higher education. The wording isn’t there yet. There’s still a lot of debate going on so we don’t really know exactly what’s going to take place but there are some concerns by those – Kathy Buettner in particular – who are keeping an eye out for us in Washington and has noted that these particular items are of concern although at this point, again, it’s still being debated. So you’ll note in #3 the inappropriate federal involvement. I’ll let you read those and again the unfunded mandates. We certainly know about those from our state level as well more having to do with collection of materials and the fact that we don’t have vehicles to create that data they’re looking for which means more energy, effort, finances to collect data that who knows if anybody will indeed use. There was a nice report from Mallory Simpson relative to the Foundation and the size of the endowment and where we were going certainly with the True North Campaign and
our spending policy of 4% making sure that future students are benefiting so that was nice to hear about. Bob Albanese did a short report on audit findings. We had six findings. I guess the average state-wide was nine so we were looking okay but again the President was interested in knocking some of those findings down for the future. I think there were a couple that were repeats, that keep coming up that they’re looking at and trying to resolve. Again, fraud detection and prevention – you will see that they’re doing some things in order to comply with the audit findings. There was, I guess, a difference of opinion relative to what constituted an audit finding and what did not so I think they’re looking at those a little bit further.

There were a couple of other matters that were addressed as well. Kathy Buettner talked about university-related organizations and again, a difference of opinion with the Attorney General as to what should be exempted from the audit process and Northern ??? are that should not be and I think there are still ongoing discussions but it was noted that the NIU Alumni Association and the Foundation, at least for this past year, will follow the University’s audit procedures and standards and then we’ll see what transpires after further discussion.

A final matter, very quick, was discussion the cost recovery for February 14 noted some seeking some funds which I believe we had talked about at an earlier time and at this point in time, unfortunately since it has been since June, I don’t know what the status of those funds are but you can the dollar amounts and from whom we are seeking those funds. Again, hopefully we’ll have more information for you in November. Any questions? Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Bobbie.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report.

P. Stoddard: All right, finally on the last page of the walk-in packet, a report from the June 19th meeting of the full Board. I’m not going to go into much detail in here. This is kind of the wrap up meeting for the year. They did approve a tuition increase for incoming students of 9.5% approximately. It sounds like a lot but remember that’s a tuition increase that once a student comes in, truth in tuition means that we can’t raise their tuition again for 4.5 years – well, 4 years but we chose not to do it for 4.5. 9.5% really covers the full 4.5 years they’re here. Yes?

B. Cesarek: I’d like to make a comment about that. Because when we’re talking about truth in tuition, that’s only for Illinois state students and that 9.5% increase is not for out-of-state students and the previous year it was 14% for out-of-state students and it continues to go up at that large rate for out-of-state students. They do not have the advantage of truth in tuition. I don’t know if there are particular departments that put – different for graduate students certainly, but undergraduates if various departments have got a relative large number of out-of-state students – they’re seeing some really high tuition rates on a continuing basis that the Illinois students are not.

P. Stoddard: Thank you. Okay, moving on. Sometimes it’s a good idea to plan ahead. Motor pool has a contract essentially to buy gas, gasoline. They also have a large percent of the fleet as hybrids although they’re looking to increase that percentage as much as they possible can. All the regular passenger cars, they’re looking to move to hybrids. Things like vans and trucks,
obviously they can’t do that with that. That being said, they also managed to secure a very good price for gasoline including taxes of about $2.23 a gallon and so as gasoline hovers somewhere around $4.00, we’re actually getting a pretty good deal and no you’re not allowed to take a personal car over there and fill it up with gas. I’ve tried – no, I didn’t try.

I think already knows this but the Board of Trustees did approve all of our 2007-2008 tenure/promotion decisions and they did note various appointments, perhaps most significantly for the Graduate School to replace Dean Bose who left to go to Miami of Ohio – or was it Ohio University – anyway, off to Ohio. James Erman who used to be Chair of the Chemistry Department and had retired was called back out of retirement and so was Interim Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies. Dr. Bradley Bond who was Assistant Dean under Dr. Bose will be the Acting Dean of the Graduate School so the two jobs that Dr. Bose had been handling are now being split between Dr’s. Erwin and Bond. Richard ??? will be Acting Dean of VP&A and the Libraries have managed to hire a Dean, Dr. Patrick Dawson. The Board did approve a new PhD in Geography so that’s kind of exciting and a new Advanced Computing Assimilation Emphasis in Mechanical Engineering in the Bachelor of Science there. Then if you haven’t heard, we’re getting sued by ??? You may have gotten an e-mail or two from them. Essentially they’re a private concern and they want to set up a ??? proton treatment center within a few miles of where we’re trying to set up our proton therapy treatment center and they claim that we illegally blocked their approval from the state and so there’s a law suit about that and so the Board had a special meeting in August and held an Executive Session and they didn’t say what that was about but that’s what it was about. I don’t know, I am not privy to what goes on inside there so I don’t know what they actually said but they deal with that issue. Well, the Board can’t stop it. I mean they decide how we’re going to respond to it. If we have to make them an offer or if we have to go to court or hire somebody. Anyway, so I think that’s all I have, all any of us have on the Board of Trustee meetings for the last several months. Any questions on any of those? Good.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

**P. Stoddard:** Moving on, my understanding is that none of the standing committees have met yet. I would have been very surprised if they had but I would like the chairs of the standing committees, as I read off your names, to just introduce yourselves very briefly so that your committee members especially know who you are. I’ll start off with Academic Affairs and that’s Mari Valle. If you want, you’ve already said enough and everyone knows who you are. Well, I didn’t mean it to come out quite like that. You’ve spoken already at this meeting so. Economic Status of the profession, C. T. Lin from Chemistry. Resource, Space and Budget is Michael Morris. I don’t think I saw him here yet today – not so much, okay. He’s from Foreign Languages. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, rosemary Fuerer, okay, grab a microphone.

A. Academic Affairs – Mari Valle, Chair

B. Economic Status of the Profession – C.T. Lin, Chair

C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Fuerer, Chair

**R. Fuerer:** I’ve long been concerned about the erosion of faculty rights and not so concerned about the erosion of faculty responsibilities. I said that to say that I take this very seriously and hope that if you would like to get something going.

**P. Stoddard:** And a few ideas have been percolating in your direction already. It’s come up in Executive Committee so that’s excellent. Rules and Governance, Nancy Castle. Nancy might be looking for somebody in that committee to step up as chair but – or she might not.

**N. Castle:** I’m looking for no things to do this year.

**P. Stoddard:** I don’t know if I can guarantee that.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Cason Snow, Chair

**P. Stoddard:** Okay and then we do have one committee that needs to do some work and I don’t think too many of them are here today but Elections and Legislative Oversight, Cason Snow is chair, as we’ve established he’s not here today, so please look and see if you’re listed under Elections and Legislative Oversight on the committee list. We have a little bit of work for you today. We have four elections that we – there are things we need to deal with. I’ll describe them as we get started handing out ballots. Can you identify yourself if you’re on the committee please and come up front I think so Donna can work with you on getting the ballots out where we need to get them. Let’s see if I’ve got a copy of that. Okay, for elections it is Cason, Clersida Garcia, Earl Hansen, Valia Allori, and Debra Zahay. So okay, I guess we’ve got three of you here and that should probably be enough. Okay, the first thing I think we’re doing is the Hearing Panel. The Hearing Panel is a body selected from tenured faculty. We got a list of all the tenured faculty and then randomly select, I think, twenty people – Donna, is it twenty people we randomly select? Oh, forty. Forty-four, okay, so we get a list of all the tenured faculty, we magically randomly come up with forty-four names. Those names will be on a list that should be appearing in front of you shortly if not already and then you are asked to pick twenty names from that list and that’s the pool from which any Hearing Panels we may need to develop will be called. The Hearing Panel is essentially only called if there is a dismissal with cause case. I think that’s the only time this ever happens so a tenured faculty member has done something that warrants dismissal at least in the minds of people in the position to make that decision. That person quite frequently will appeal the dismissal decision and that appeal is then heard by a Hearing Panel. We had one of these cases last year; first one in many years. There is another case percolating that may come this route so it is conceivable and I won’t go into any specifics because that would be a violation of various codes, but there is a possibility that a Hearing Panel this year will be called upon and generally what will happen is that out of the twenty people you vote for, five to seven I think are selected to actually form the panel that hears the case. So just because you vote for somebody doesn’t mean they get to hear it but whoever doesn’t get elected at this point will not get to hear it. If that makes any sense. When you’re done voting, please raise your hand and – okay, just hold on to them and we’ll collect everything at once and sort it
out later. So if you get nominated – where am I, I’m losing things. If you get nominated to be a University Council and find yourself on a Hearing Panel, let us know and we’ll check what we did. Okay, so I guess when you’re done if you’ll just look up so we’ll have a feel when you’re done. I understand, I understand – they’re names, you know, who you might think are particularly suited; there are names, you know, who you think are not particularly suited. Well, if you know the people that would be one way, I assume most of don’t know everybody on the list. It depends on your philosophy in this. If there are people you specifically would be good at it, vote for them. Obviously the reserve is true. Then if you don’t feel comfortable voting for all twenty people, vote for the ones you’re comfortable with. That would invalidate your ballot and if there are any hanging chads we’ll have to invalidate that at least we’ll check with the parliamentarian as to how handing they can be before we count them. I know, it’s a difficult choice and a lot of these people you don’t know them but it is what’s written in the Bylaws that this has to happen. All right. Is everybody finished voting? Anybody still voting. Okay, if not moving on, we need to elect members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. And if you thought the last one was interesting – this one is done purely by lot so you don’t have to know any names and Clerksida has very graciously agreed to pull names out of a hat. It really isn’t her fault if you’re selected. She will be pulling 15 names and 5 alternates I believe? Is that correct? Yes. And again, this is a pool of potential people – a pool of people who could potentially be asked to serve on a grievance committee. It’s something a bit less serious that dismissal for cause, this comes along if you’re unhappy with any of the things you might go see Alan for and going through Alan does not get you satisfaction through no fault of his I’m sure, but nevertheless through the ??? of whichever parties you’re dealing with, you do have recourse to a formal grievance procedure. You can file a grievance and what happens in that case is after you’ve walked through all the non-confrontational ways of resolving it and not been successful you file an official piece of paper and describe what happened essentially and then I sit down with Steve Cunningham, Vice President for Human Resources and we look at the list of Faculty Grievance Committee members and try to pick a committee that can fairly and impartially hear the grievance. Then depending on the nature of the grievance or who’s involved – if it’s faculty and faculty, or staff on faculty or faculty on staff – the committee consists of faculty and/or staff members and so again, just because you’re named to this committee doesn’t mean you ever see any action. We get on average maybe one or two grievances a year that get to this point so just listen for your name.


P. Stoddard: Actually, Giovanni is filing in for Kendall.

D. Jarman: Well, Kendall is on University Council and Giovanni is the Faculty Senate, yeah.

P. Stoddard: If you really want to avoid being on the Grievance Committee, just file a grievance --- don’t do that please. Okay, next up is election of University Council alternates so surprisingly enough, there does come an occasion where University Council members cannot
make a University Council meeting. Since the University Council is a voting body and we feel it important and we feel it important to have maximum faculty representation or at least as far as possible, we like to encourage you if you cannot make regularly make a University Council meeting, to find an alternate which we are about to select to go in your stead. So what we will do now by college is hold elections for University Council alternates. So if you are not presently of the University Council but are a member of the Faculty Senate you are eligible to run for this. You are already actually running for this and we will pass out ballots by college so take it away!

**D. Jarman:** College of Business, would you raise your hands?

**P. Stoddard:** College of Business, raise your hands please. Can he vote. Yes, you can vote. Just the once. After you pass away, this being Chicago, we’ll arrange for more voting opportunities but until then, just please vote one time.

***: If we are a member of the University Council, we can still vote in this election?

**P. Stoddard:** Right, *** because that would just be silly.

**D. Jarman:** Okay, College of Education, you’re going to get the blue ballot. College of Engineering, white ballot. Please raise your hand if you’re in Engineering. Health and Human Sciences, yellow. Liberal Arts and Sciences. Everybody please hold up your hand and wait. It’s going to take them awhile. Visual and Performing Arts, salmon.

**P. Stoddard:** The good news is you’re not on six committees. All right, moving on, we need to nominate two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. This is essentially scholarship ethics and the Vice President for Research and the Dean of the Graduate School will get together now and from those two names choose one to serve on that committee. So if you know of someone who’s interested or if you yourself are interested in serving on that, I’m on that – ex officio – they meet once or twice a semester I believe – twice a semester for a couple of hours. I don’t remember what day that is so I can’t tell you anymore than that about it but just essentially making sure that we do everything appropriately in terms of our research scholarship and other such things. So any nominations for this? Pretty good stuff. They might serve cookies; I’m not sure but they might. Well please think about it and get it some consideration. We really do need to get someone from the Senate on there. If you put your name up it’s only a 50/50 chance you’ll get selected. All right, well please think about it.

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**P. Stoddard:** Under new business, I’ve been approached repeatedly, about once a year, it finally got to the point where I remembered to put it on the agenda to think about it. Jan ???, would like and thinks it would be a good idea to get a representative from the Athletic Board, an ex officio member, probably non-voting, on the Senate since this would increase communications between Athletics and the faculty. I personally think it’s a good idea and this year the university is up for
its periodic recertification from the NCAA. Some of us are involved with that and this would be
an excellent time, I think, to start better communication between Athletics and the faculty. This
has nothing to do with ??? records, this recertification, it has to do with issues like academic
integrity, governance and rules compliance and gender equity issues, all of which – even if we’re
not sports fans – are issues that we feel strong about. So, I think what we ought to do is refer this
to somebody who has to deal with the rules and governance of the Senate. I don’t think it’s
controversial; I’m hoping it’s not but having said that, I’m sure it will be. So, having said that, I
would like to entertain a motion from somebody, it doesn’t have to be Nancy, probably won’t be –
to refer this issue to Rules and Governance who will report back to us soon and we can act on
it. And this would be amendment ultimately to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. It would not
have to go through University Council. This is something we can do ourselves but because it’s a
Bylaw change, it would probably require a couple of meetings, first reading and then an actual
vote unless we vote to suspend the Bylaw in that instance and go directly to a vote. So because it
is a bit of a lengthy process, I would encourage Rules and Governance, if in fact this is referred
to them, to handle it expediently. Is there a motion? Professor Bishop would like to address the
Senate.

T. Bishop: Terry Bishop, Management. Before I make the motion I’d like to comment on that.
I do believe that what Jan has asked for is more specifically the FAR to the NCAA not just a
representative to the Athletic Board. The FAR does sit on the Athletic Board but specifically the
FAR, Faculty Athletic Rep to the NCAA and that’s what Jan was asking for. I know that
because I’m the Athletic Board chair. So the motion I’d make is that we refer this to the Rules
and Governance to consider modification of the Bylaws to consider the addition of the FAR to
Faculty Senate.

P. Stoddard: Ah, what a step up. All right. Any comments other than from the chair of Rules
and Governance?

N. Castle: What will happen is that the Rules and Governance Committee, the four of us, will
communicate about this, come up with language and then bring it back. So it’s not just I’m
going to do something and bringing it back. If the committee votes that this isn’t, then I bring
back the committee vote.

P. Stoddard: Right.

F. Bryan: I also was going to point out that anyone who wants to look at the Faculty Senate
Bylaws or the University Council Constitution and Bylaws, those are all on line and they’re great
reading.

P. Stoddard: Oh yeah, cure your insomnia. There are some interesting bits in those. Usually
when there’s something that you’re very upset about, that’s when you go to the Bylaws or the
Constitution but if you’re familiar with them, then you know where to look and if you’re not call
me, or Tim or Alan and we’ll, with a smile, point you in that direction, although if you’re calling
us you’re not going to see the smile. Anyway, we have a motion on the floor. It has been
seconded. Any comments? All in favor say aye. All right.
The motion was approved.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Any comments or questions from the floor? Professor Lusk?

B. Lusk: Brigid Lusk, Nursing and Health Studies. A question came up today about now that we do not have starred courses anymore, we have 400 and 500 level courses, about faculty evaluations. It seems to us that we will need to give two separate evaluation packets to the students, the 400 course packet and the 500 course packet. We have some courses where we have just one or two graduate students and we’re worried about the anonymity of the students. Just thought I’d bring it up.

P. Stoddard: Yes, well I know with small classes that’s always an issue even if it’s five or six or under that.

B. Lusk: But one or two which we do have, in fact, in one course we have one grad student.

P. Stoddard: Pat, do you have a thought?

P. Henry: I’ve actually had this problem with some of my smaller courses too and what Foreign Languages has done is have a form that is a waiver and the students in the class have to sign a waiver and agree to do the evaluation or not to do the evaluation so it’s still up to them and if they decide they want to do the evaluation, they can do it but if they both – if there are one or two of them – they don’t want to do the evaluation. However, you are still without an evaluation which is still a problem.

P. Stoddard: Yes, in the back.

???: I thought if the class is four or less there is no evaluation. Is there such a rule? Then I thought evaluations were voluntary to begin with.

P. Stoddard: That’s my impression that they are voluntary and I think that rule somewhere vaguely in the back of my memory someplace, it might be by college or department, that small classes, because of the anonymity issue, are not required to have evaluations but it was always voluntary in my understanding. So if you’re the only student in there where anything you write would be identified with you, yeah. But I mean there are small classes throughout – three or four students – once I taught with one which is silly but I did – a lot of people thought that. But that’s something I can ask about for you. Any other comments or questions from the floor? If not, thank you all for coming and I will now entertain a motion to adjourn. All in favor get up and leave.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIV. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.