I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: --- Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and you recall that that committee was put together, made into a joint committee very early in the term to look into whether or not raises were equitably distributed across the different divisions within the university so that is the walk in item and we will hear that under reports of either the Economic Status or the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. It’s a joint committee so that’s where it will be. Okay, I need a motion to approve the agenda. By the way, just one quick announcement. I want to remind everybody that it is especially important now to say your name when you do things, when you speak because Robin doesn’t yet know who everyone is and when we get the transcripts from the meeting, we’re very often at a loss with figuring out who it was that said something so please try to remember to day your name. So, who made the motion? David. Do we have a second? Earl? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Any abstentions? We have an agenda.

Wade made the motion; Hansen was second. The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2009 FS MEETING (sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item is the approval of the minutes of the November 11 meeting. You’ve all gotten the minutes I hope. Any – well, we have to have a motion to approve the minutes first. Motion to approve the minutes? Second? Okay. Any discussions on the minutes? Corrections, modifications, additions? Anyone read the minutes? Thank you. No modifications. All in favor of approving the minutes as written say aye. Opposed? Abstentions? The minutes are approved.

Thu made the motion; Kowalski was second. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: I have a few announcements; not a lot of announcements. We have a couple of orders of business today that I think may take a little bit of time or at least one. First, just a reminder that February 14 we’re approaching the second anniversary of the problem here at NIU. We are having the day of reflection of February 14. There will be a number of events that are going to be announced. We just wanted to remind you that that is a, I believe, a Sunday this year so it will not be a day of school but there will be a number of events.
Second item. You may remember that prior to the break, there was a notice that went around about House Bill 4706. House Bill 4706 is the one that repeals the 50% tuition waiver that children of university employees have been entitled to so anybody who is an employee of a university or college in Illinois, their child is entitled to a 50% tuition waiver. That bill is sponsored by Dave Winters of Rockford. This was announced by Ken Zehnder on December 16. It will become effective immediately if it’s approved by the legislature. This has some significant implications for us. First of all, faculty members are entitled to that. Many faculty members benefit from the 50% tuition waiver but it is also one of the incentives for many of the people who take lower paying administrative assistant or secretarial jobs and many of them may just be working for the tuition waiver. So it’s an important benefit for them as well. So we wanted to make a clear that this was a significant bill that has an impact on the university and to not necessarily encourage people, but to let you know that if you wish to make your feelings about this known, that you could call your legislatures or you could call Dave Winters himself. He’s in Rockford and remember also that, as with everything that involves politics, as state employees there are limits to what we are permitted to do so you are not supposed to identify yourself as an NIU employee nor are you supposed to use university facilities, either letterhead or telephones to contact your state representatives. Any comments or questions about that?

Okay.

The next item is that remember that prior to the break, I also asked faculty senators to go back to their departments and try to get an idea if there were items of business that the faculty in general wanted the Senate to deal with and I asked people to send those to me. So far I’ve only received three requests. I don’t know if anyone else has items. I don’t know if people brought them to the meeting today. We’ll find out in a moment. At any rate, just to give you an idea of what some of those things are, one of the items is kind of related to an issue that we dealt with a number of years ago and that has to do with the NIU grading system and a number of people have expressed concern that we do not have a +/- system or an A,B,C,D system, BC/DC system and the person who sent this in stated that their department was strongly in favor of having a change in the grading system such that we had + and -. Now this came up I don’t remember. I think it was about 3 or 4 years ago and there were a number of problems that were raised when that came up and one of the problems was that this might contribute to grade inflation; the fear that people would get higher grades. The counter-argument was that it would actually result in lower grades so – but that was one of the concerns. Let’s say it would result in different grades. Another problem was what to do with an A+ since our highest is a 4.0, when you try to equate the +’s and –’s to a numeric figure, it’s hard to figure out what to do with the A+ without raising the overall possible GPA to 4.2 or something like that. This is a potential problem because if you don’t have the A+, then you don’t really have anything to offset a B- so people were concerned that we couldn’t work out the logistics of this so that was another problem. Another questions is whether we can start this in the middle of someone’s career or whether we have to begin and make it effective only for entering freshmen or whether you can all of a sudden start putting +’s or –’s on someone’s transcript and create the impression that they didn’t get +’s or – ‘s in their first year or two but then they started doing better which might or might not be accurate. So that was another question. The last question that people raised was whether or not this could be done or whether it would require expenses alterations to the MyNIU system and I think at that time it was mentioned that the NIU system, anytime we try to make changes in it, we would be charged for it and not only would we be charge for it but that charge would be an
ongoing charge so you would be charged every year for a change that was made. So it wouldn’t be that you paid once and got it over with, but this would be an ongoing charge and given the current financial status, I think that if that turns out to be true, that would be a consideration. Nevertheless, at that time the Senate chose not to act and so this was tabled – it wasn’t tabled; we chose not to act so nothing was done. So this is being brought up again. I don’t know if there is wide-spread interest in this. As I said it came from just one person so if people feel this is an issue that is worthy of our consideration I think you should let us know – let me know and we can talk about raising that prospect again.

The second question that was raised was whether the faculty should have a strong voice in how money is spend at the university and what, I think, this involves is whether we should have greater participation in the budgetary process. Now there are questions as to whether we should and there are questions to whether they’ll sort of agree to let us have that and if we do, whether anyone wants to really put in the time it takes to engage in this budgetary process which I think is quite complicated. Nevertheless, that was one of the issues that was raised and again, I don’t know whether there is support to that. Kendall?

K. Thu: This is Kendall Thu. I just want to point out that not only should faculty be involved in budgetary matters, it is by Constitution required. That is, in the Preamble to the University Council description, University Council is to be consulted in both the preparation and the execution of the budget.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, that’s true. I agree that that is true. It’s never really been implemented in any way. In other words, there’s never been any formal attempt to involve the faculty in that process so – whereas we do have that Constitutional right, we would then have to decide exactly what we want our role to be in that and we could absolutely resolve to have some part in that process.

K. Thu: I should also add that there’s also add that there’s also a provision in the Senate’s Constitutional Bylaws that points to the necessity of having the Faculty Senate consulted in budget matters as well but in an advisory role.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah? George?

G. Slotsve: I know at the College Council level there is a budgetary --- At the College Council there is a budgetary planning task force that members of the College Council are appointed to as representatives of the faculty.

A. Rosenbaum: Liberal Arts and Sciences?

G. Slotsve: Liberal Arts and Sciences, yes. I know that’s been at least 2 or 3 years. I served on it this past fall. We were involved in this case, if there were going to be cuts, where would cuts be made and things like that but there is some involvement at the College Council level for LA&S.
A. Rosenbaum: And then again as cuts may be necessary in the upcoming years, we might want to assert ourselves more strongly in this process. Yes, Mili?

M. Kostic: Milivoje Kostic from Engineering. I’ll comment on both of your items. First of all, grading. I think we already have inflation of grading a lot nation-wide. There are many articles which say average A stands for an average and C is supposed to be an average. What does it mean? Average in all grades should be C and another thing is I think it’s going to be a national issue you know, after the financial bubble and high tech bubble there will be educational bubble sooner or later and we’ll need to take on more responsibility so I was thinking could we adopt the ??? system and have 0.1, 1.1, 2,3,4, and will that incur any additional expense, will give more flexibility if it’s 3-/3+ and 4-/4+ or B/C whatever, why don’t we do ??? and just a number like any other number. And the other good system of grading would be ranking. So you have to rank your class from the first to the last and then the students may say, I’m the first in the class, I’m the 16\textsuperscript{th} in the class instead of getting half As or giving a failure grade at all in some classes as a rule. So that’s my comment about grading.

About the influence of faculty in budgeting, or what did you say, I think we have the right the way the gentleman said, the Constitutional right, but if it’s advisory function only then we do not participate in shared governance. It should be I think approval of the budget administrators make by the faculty they way they share into our governance of peer reviews even. When we have promotions we have peer reviews by faculty and then administrators have to approve it; not just to be giving advice the ???. So I think we’ve got to be more serious because everything depends on everything in quality of our education. Bottom line depends on how money is spent and we should have a share in it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Yes, Pat?

P. Henry: Just one thing on the – sorry, Pat Henry. On the grades situation, we actually had brought that forward just before we were switching to the MyNIU system and that was part of the impetuous for doing that before we got into a new system that would cost us money to change we would try this other system. So, would you like us to go back to our departments and ask what the feeling is about this? Because my personal feeling is there was a lot of support for this in several departments.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know, again the intention of this was to see if we had items that were of general concern to the faculty. So I’m raising these issues because these were the only ones that were sent in but if there is strong sentiment that we should be dealing with some of these issues then yes.

P. Henry: I’m for that one.

A. Rosenbaum: So I think people should, you know, ask whether or not there is strong interest or whether there’s interest and if we get enough people who feel there’s interest then this would be something we would add to our agenda. Okay? And as for the type of grading change, that would be wide open. I mean this would be something that would have to go to committee; the committee would have to consider what the possibilities are. We could certainly get a sense of --
P. Henry: A/B thing.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, whether it’s A/B, whether a decimal system, whether it’s a +/- . It would be up to that committee to determine what would be the best way of doing this. So, yes it would be a good idea for people who have an interest in these individual – these items that are being brought up – if we could get a consensus on that, we could then make decisions about what we want to tackle. So in terms of our influence on the budget, whether we want to put together a committee which would then ask for budgetary approval or whatever, we would need to know that there’s some sense that people want to do this.

P. Henry: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Other comments? Okay, I think that those were the main comments that we received. If other Faculty Senate members have received comments from their department you can either let us know now or send them to me and we’ll organize them and if you haven’t yet asked your department, it’s not too late to do that so if you go back to your department at the next faculty meeting and ask about what they would like to see the faculty do at Faculty Senate then we’ll be able to perhaps steer the agenda in the second semester. Okay. Anyone have any comments on anything they haven’t sent to me or that their departments have raised? Sonya?

S. Armstrong: Sonya Armstrong. I mentioned to you last week I think in Executive Committee that my department was very interested in the issue of benefits, specifically how things are panning out with health insurance.

A. Rosenbaum: You mean the idea that the state is not paying its bills?

S. Armstrong: Right.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah, I was going to mention that also in the context of the Board of Trustees’ report but yeah, that would be something again we could certainly express our feelings about the fact that the state is not meeting its obligations. Okay? Yeah? Milli?

M. Kostic: Me again obviously. About the state government budget for education, I wanted to say something about that. I mentioned it yesterday while at a meeting but I think it’s of vital importance. Basically, we are now in a very ??? recession area and everybody suffers which is brought by the greedy people on Wall Street and banks and whatnot and while they were enjoying, you know, unreasonable pay and whatnot, we were pretty barely paid, you know, and now when they screw up, they’re talking about the importance of education and they do not have even the minimal money to support the education. Even what was promised they’re not paying and I think we have to help our President, not just wait for the President’s memos from time to time to peacefully demonstrate or express ourselves and say what do we think about the whole affair and I think, and I’m surprised the faculty is not heard through the state, what’s going on. If they are running deeper and deeper in debt, we see where the money is going or if they don’t have money or what are the priorities? Why do they talk about education being a priority and now not supporting it in reality? So we look like a sitting duck to be shot at and just being quiet or being afraid of if we’re going to have a job or have a salary and I think we should say we were
minimally paid when everybody was greedy and running the prices high. The reason we have high medical expenses, high ??? expenses, high other expenses is because money was flowing around easier and everybody was ??? up but not educators. So I’ll say in my own personal experience, you know, a couple of years ago, my neighbor, a 75 year old man, told me hey, my son-in-law graduated two years ago and has five times higher salary than you and that was the case. And now we got to pay the price or we got to furloughs for state to spend on something else and I’m just saying that we as faculty, as people dedicated to education, has to raise our voice, not just to be waiting and hearing what others are telling us.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Professor Baker?

W. Baker: Deborah Haliczer has in an excellent way followed up and provided the answer to a question I raised at Senate before the vacation. Deborah?

D. Haliczer: Hi, I’m Deborah Haliczer from Human Resources. The mystery question was why didn’t we get updated contracts back in the summer the way we traditionally do and the answer from Human Resources is every summer since we have given up updating your contracts years ago, eight to ten years ago, we issue in the summer normally an increment notice which tells us of our new salary based on an increment. Since there was no increment, there was no increment notice so it’s not a lack of contract; those are increment notices.

A. Rosenbaum: Earl?

E. Hansen: As the representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee of the IBHE, we are at times given privy to information that we kind of wait for it to come out. The Comptroller’s quarterly report is out and just to summarize it very briefly for it, if you really would like to be depressed you can go on line and read it yourself, but we’re 5.12 billion dollars backlogged of unpaid bills as of December of ’09 in the state of Illinois. That was at 1.844 billion in December of ’08. The state must begin to pay back with interest 2.25 billion, that’s with a “b,” in short-term loans issued for the year ’09 and the balance in the budget is a negative, as of December 30, a negative 5.029 billion and it doesn’t get any better reading it and one of the things that you hear when you go to the these meetings are the trials and tribulations that every institute in the state – I don’t care whether it’s in Champaign or in Chicago – I don’t care where it is, they’ve all get similar issues to ours and we can do what we can do but I think the answer is in the elected officials and they’re going to have to get off the dime and do something. That’s just my opinion. I cannot go on and say – I’m not going to repeat scuttlebutt that I hear about situations at different universities because that’s up to that chief executive officer at that institution to make that announcement and not somebody from their – not one of their representatives. So if you’re hearing any scuttlebutt, you’re not hearing it from me.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Okay. One – just a reminder to people. We haven’t made this announcement in awhile but I just wanted to remind people that the Faculty Senate meeting is covered by the Northern Star so there is a reporter here so just so you know that we are on the record as we begin the next set of discussions. Okay.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: We have no reports I think from the IBHE. Right Earl? No report. No report from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel. Those are the Board of Trustee Committees. They haven’t met and that’s why we have no reports.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT - Alan Rosenbaum – report

A. Rosenbaum: We did have a full meeting of the Board of Trustees and so I have a report from the Board of Trustees’ meeting which is on page 3 and 4 of the agenda. Just to give you an idea of the highlights of that report, I guess maybe highlights is not the right word, but the important issues that were raised. 1) Chair Strauss updated everybody on the status of the True North Campaign and they were very excited about the fact that the True North Campaign has exceeded its original goals so they were thrilled with that. The main focus of the report was the President’s update on the status of finances in the state as they impact NIU and many of you might have followed the speech. It was streamed live and I’m sure many of you saw that. If not, you probably read about it in the Northern Star so I won’t go into it in tremendous detail but along the lines of what Earl was just speaking about, the state is clearly in arrears to the university to the tune of approximately 56 million dollars. If you figure out that our payroll is about a million dollars a day, we are 56 days in arrears as far as the state is concerned. The state contributes about 25% of our budget. Our budget is about – almost half a billion dollars so it is well worth over a 100 million dollars that comes to us from the state. The state – we are currently meeting expenses out of the university income fund. The university income fund is comprised of tuition and fees. If you look at the annual calendar our tuition and fees pay about 30% of our budget and so we cannot survive for more than a third of the year on tuition and fees. There needs to be money coming in from the state. He announced a number of strategies, a number of measures. The first was a hiring freeze except for critical hires. He called it a hard hiring freeze. I believe that any appointment needs to be approved at least at the vice-presidential level. Departments were asked to decrease spending and delay purchases and they were also asked to reduce travel and other related expenditures. He expressed concern that as we head into FY11 problems will become worse rather than better. We really had a scare with the MAP grants in the fall term. They were restored for the spring but they did not provide a funding stream for that MAP grants. There’s no guarantee that the MAP grants will still be here
in the fall. If we lose the MAP grants, that’s a major problem. If the state cuts back on its contributions to our budget, that will be an additional financial burden on us. According to the President, small agencies have been told to expect a 14% decrease in their operating budgets from the state in FY11. We are not a small agency and so it did not include us but if small agencies are being cut, there is certainly the possibility that universities would be cut as well. These are problems that are affecting all of the state universities. We’re certainly not alone and, if truth be known, we’re probably in somewhat better financial shape than many of the other state universities.

So that was the highlight of the Board of Trustees’ meeting. They also approved the changing of Faraday West to John E. LaTourette Hall to honor the 10th president of NIU. Apparently President LaTourette was instrumental in getting the building constructed and that change was effective immediately so that part of Faraday is known as John E. LaTourette Hall. That was the essential components of the Board of Trustees’ meeting. Any questions? Okay.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: The only committee I think that we have a report from today if I’m mistaken, so if there any committee chairs here that have some items that they would like to call to our attention, please let me know, but the only one that I’m aware of is again the walk-in item. This is going to be presented by Rosemary Feurer who is the Chair of our Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee and she is speaking again for the joint committee of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and Economic Status of the Profession. Rosemary?

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair
B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair
C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair

R. Feurer: I don’t have to read this right?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, it would probably be a good idea to just give people, you know, just sort of a rough summary of what the situation is.

R. Feurer: Okay, as most of you will probably remember, in the September meeting we, the Faculty Senate, authorized the two committees listed here to investigate issues of equitability of resources across academic and administrative divisions and throughout the fall semester we met – we either met or corresponded by e-mail trying to get information in a form that we could manipulate and understand. Promises were made by university officials that we would get this information and basically we were trying to get it in an electronic form. It’s the papers, as it says here, the papers of the university, what is it called, working papers.
A. Rosenbaum: Could I just cut in here for one second? Those of you who are not aware, the university is required to publish the salaries of every employee. These are published in what are called the “working papers of the university”. They are available at the library. We also have a set of them in the Faculty Senate office. They are in book form and so they are sort of a word processed version. What we were looking for is a copy of the working papers in spreadsheet form – either an Excel spreadsheet or some other type of spreadsheet which could then be easily analyzed using statistical packages. That was what was requested of the university. The President did assure me that we would have access to that material and several assurances were made but the time frame kept getting pushed back. So we were supposed to have those materials prior to Thanksgiving, just after Thanksgiving, at the end of November and definitely by the 18th when the university closed for the break. It was not until the morning of the 18th that I was told by the President that he had a better idea and I’ll let Rosemary finish this.

R. Feurer: And that better idea as listed here is proposing a commission that would act on this. Our joint committee met and also corresponded by e-mail again and came up with the following resolution that agrees to participate suggests we will agree to approve participation and this is the resolution that we are bringing forward today.

In this commission with the understanding that: 1) the faculty members who are participating will be approved by the Faculty Senate; 2) Faculty members of the commission will have full access to added data from the first meeting of the commission; 3) That the faculty members of the commission will have the right to request their own analysis of these data, the analysis that they think necessary or important and that the first meeting of the commission should take place shortly after the resolution passage after today, proceed expeditiously and have a report by March 19 which would include recommendations regarding equity of salary increases over the past 10 years related to the academic and administrative divisions.

In other words, comparing the academic and administrative divisions to see – to essentially do the investigation that we started out to do in September. So that was, that is our proposal, and we can discuss it.

A. Rosenbaum: You’re making the motion?

R. Feurer: I am making the motion.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we need a second. Second by Kendall Thu. Okay, discussion?

K. Thu: I appreciate the work of the joint commission and I think the stipulations that are in your resolution are appropriate and given the time frame here, much needed. I think it’s essential that, particularly given our earlier discussion about the need for faculty involvement in budget discussions at a time when we’re in a budgetary crisis, is even more evident. So more transparency, more involvement of faculty in the budgetary process is timely. So I think that this resolution is appropriate and I fully support it and I think all the data that are produced should be accessible and transparent to all faculty absolutely and let’s be very clear that this is – we are requesting data that we are legally bound to be provided anyway so I appreciate the resolution. I fully support it.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Charles?

C. Cappell: Charles Cappell, Sociology, Academic Affairs Committee. Point one, the faculty members will be approved by the full Faculty Senate. Is there any reason why the Faculty Senate should not have the power of appointment without approval, you know, it sounds like this could be an administrative device to garner the membership in a certain way and if the Faculty Senate can directly appoint, then we don’t have to worry about an approval.

A. Rosenbaum: No, we can appoint. That’s just saying that we’re going to make the appointments and approve. I think Rosemary’s concern that she – we could have just appointed people and she wants it to be voted on I believe in order to make it clear that those people are responsible to the Senate so they report back to the Senate. But no, it’s our choice as to who goes on that committee. Just to flesh this out just a little bit, what the President has suggested is that Ray Alden and I chair the committee; that we get together and we make decisions about how many people are on the committee and all of this. That the President’s notion was that the committee would be well-represented by faculty; that faculty would be the largest group on that committee. They are not trying to exercise any control over which faculty members are on that committee. And so the issue is whether or not we want to select those faculty members for the commission from the Faculty Senate or whether we want to have broader representation and perhaps select for the committee that are not necessarily Faculty Senate members and whether or not we need to vote on them today. One of the issues here is we need to get this going quickly and so we don’t want this to drag into another semester. We want to have this settled but if you look at the schedule, the last Faculty Senate meeting of the year is in April. We don’t want to leave it for the last Faculty Senate meeting which means this has to be done by the March meeting which only gives us two months so we can’t wait until the next meeting to approve the list of people so that has to happen very quickly. Either we have to say we’re only going to pick people from the Faculty Senate and we can nominate and elect them today or if we want to have a broader representation, then we’re going to sort of get a list of people and then make the appointments either myself in conjunction with the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and Economic Status of the Profession or with the Executive Committee of the Senate, either one but my concern is I think there might be people in the university who are not on the Senate and therefore we could not really do all of that today. It’s my feeling that there is a chance - those people who are aware of the commission on the Economic Status – the gender equity study – there is some concern within the gender equity study that people on the committee might have felt some constraint as to what they were able to do. We want to have strong, assertive faculty members on this committee that will stand up and say this is what we need and not be swayed by other people on the committee. So in doing that, I think we need to have strong leadership among the faculty and that might include people from this room but it also might include others that we know of who would be good members for that committee.

C. Cappell: A point of clarification, if “they were approved by” was changed to “they were appointed by” that would make it very clear that the Faculty Senate is appointing its member representatives.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, is that okay?
F. Feurer: Yes, fine.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, appointed by the Faculty Senate? And I believe that’s the President’s intention as well. His intention was that the Faculty Senate, either through me or the committee, would appoint the faculty members to be on this committee. At this point, we don’t know how many there will even be so I can’t say we’re going to appoint five or we’re going to appoint three. I have no idea what the size of that commission will be. It’s also the President’s intention that that commission be a broader-based commission so it will include representatives from Operating Staff and SPS as well. Okay? That makes it more of a university-wide committee rather than a Faculty Senate or faculty committee. David?

D. Valentiner: Hi, this is David Valentiner. It doesn’t seem practical to me that we can as a full Faculty Senate do a selection that’s expeditious so you had raised the possibility of maybe the Executive Committee going through and doing that selection. Is that something that they can do expeditiously or is that something they can accomplish in a week or so?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes. We can call an Executive Committee meeting at any time to deal with issues like this.

D. Valentiner: So one possibility is that we could change “by the full Faculty Senate” to be “by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate”. That would be one adjustment that could be made.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s note that and --- yes?

C. Garcia: Okay? Yeah, I think it’s a good idea ---

A. Rosenbaum: Name.

C. Garcia: Clersida Garcia from K&P. In terms of speeding up the process but I think when we have someone who is appointed by the full Senate it gives power to this committee that is doing this job. So it’s kind of a tricky ??? – I like the idea of appointing or approving or appointing is probably the best thing since we don’t have time but when it’s going to be selecting other people and it is only the Executive Committee although the Executive Committee has the power of this body, it becomes a little bit more ??? and not necessarily the power of this body. I don’t know. I kind of have that feeling. I don’t know if I’m making a mistake here.

A. Rosenbaum: The appointment would be in the name of the full body so it would carry that weight. We are confronted with this problem where we want to get the right people on the committee; we want to do it quickly and yet we don’t have the time to hold off until the next meeting and that’s what happens very often. Things are just dragged out until they disappear. We don’t want that to happen in this case. Joe?

J. Jeffrey: Joe Jeffrey, Computer Science. In terms of the resolution itself, it seems to me to be obviously a good idea. It seems like a good idea to get this going quick, have people from the
Senate on it and participating and all that. I have a different question though that I’m hoping you could speak to or a set of questions in there. I’ve been sitting here trying to formulate them in some kind of intelligent fashion. I guess they are I would – I’ll try it this way. This started out as the resolution says in September with this body asking for data that we are totally entitled to. We have heard a series of excuses and oh gosh, not yet and oh gosh, yes it’s coming and oh, gee we don’t know where it is. Personally, I believe none of them. All of those books are produced by electronic programs. Now, come on. Surely the university has data backup facilities. I don’t believe a word they’re saying. After four months of fooling around by the administration and a series of excuses for not giving us what they’re supposed to give us and they promised to give us and now, at the last minute, comes the President saying, as you say, I’ve got a better idea. Let’s have a commission. Could you speak to what you think he’s doing by doing that? Because it matters to me. I’d like to know the context. The orange warning lights are going off in my head and maybe they shouldn’t be.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I guess I can’t speak for the President.

J. Jeffrey: Would you be willing to at least take a guess because we’re all saying – bluntly, we’re all sitting here saying what the hell’s going on? Is there any reason not to take it that this is a complicated administrative stonewall, hoping it will go away? And if there is such a reason, please tell us what it is.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I guess the only thing I – I guess there are a number of ways to look at it. There are charitable ways and there are less charitable ways to look at it. Okay? Of course you want the less charitable way.

J. Jeffrey: Because we all know what the charitable ones are, you know, as I sometimes tell my students, you don’t have to go to graduate school to hear this one. We know the charitable ones. Maybe some realistic ones?

A. Rosenbaum: I have two possibilities that I think are possible. One is, as we all know, data can be cut up and looked at in a number of different ways and so there are ways to look at data that makes them appear better than they are; there are ways to look at data that makes them appear worse than they are. My guess is that this data set can be parched in a number of different ways, just like any complicated data set can be and I think that there is concern that if it’s looked at one way it will produce a result that is perhaps less favorable to the university than if it’s looked at another way and perhaps there is concern that we need to sort of manage the way the data is looked at. So that is one possibility. Another possibility is that by making it a broader issue, in other words by bringing Operative Staff and SPS into it, one possibility is that the faculty will not be able to complain quite as much because we’re in much better shape than some other groups on the campus are. So it sort of may be a way of diluting the argument that we can make. In other words, we may be able to say well, administrative salaries are, in fact, - administrative raises – are much better than faculty raises but faculty raises are so much better than what they’re getting down in the trenches so to speak. So it may be a way of doing that. I don’t know. I’ve not seen the data. It may be that the data will support what is being said that we do not ---
J. Jeffrey: Thank you. That’s a very fair assessment. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Back of the room. I can’t see who you are. Oh, Bobbie. It’s you. Okay.

B. Cesarek: Bobbie Cesarek, SPS Council. This is the first I’ve heard of this. From our perspective I know that our Council does not meet for three more weeks but I am more than able to get a consensus from our entire SPS group as to possibly some nominations and some thoughts with a vote from our SPS Council electronically. Fortunately, we are able to do that and I can get that to you within a week. What I might like to suggest here from this group is to maybe call for nominations from the floor whether they be here in the Senate or from individuals elsewhere and then have your Executive Committee be able to vote on those within a quick amount of time because if we only have two months, we need to move.

A. Rosenbaum: You know Bobbie to be fair, this commission does not exist. This was a proposal by the President so we have brought – or I brought it to the Senate or brought it to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities joint committee because I think we have to decide if this is the way we want to go. We have to decide whether we want to participate in this commission and I think that is what the committee is doing. We’re saying okay, we’ll participate but there are some ground rules that we have. So at this point, the commission is completely up for grabs. I’m supposed to meet with Ray Alden tomorrow and at that point I assume we’ll discuss, you know, if the Faculty Senate is in agreement, we’ll discuss some of the parameters. How many of each group, etc. Professor Baker?

W. Baker: What’s the alternative we have, because we’ve last semester made such a request which so far has not been satisfied? What alternative do we have to this?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know again, speaking – you know, this is my opinion. Other people might suggest that we have different alternatives. One is to say that we don’t want to participate in a commission. We want to data. We want to go forward with our original plan and that the Senate has voted to ask the university to provide the data as requested. Now, one of the things I think we need to be concerned about is that going forward, whatever remediation we’re going to get, is going to have to be agreed upon by the President and so one thing to consider is if we appoint the right people to that committee and if they do the job correctly, we will be able to I think have much more leverage with the President with that coming from the committee that he asked for.

THE TAPE TURNED OVER HERE

A. Rosenbaum: I think most people I’ve spoken to see him generally as a positive, faculty president and, you know, an example of that is the face that while other universities are talking furloughs, our President is saying he doesn’t want to do that. He has always said that one of his main objectives is salary increases for faculty and employees. Whether you believe it or not, he has said that. So one would, I hope, want to sort of get what we want without also alienating the President. So one of the things we could do is to say okay, we’ll go along with this but at the first indication that it’s not being done the way it was supposed to be done, we could then go back and say look, we agreed to this, this is what was supposed to happen, this is not what’s
happening, it needs to be fixed. So, you know, our option other than that is to say no, we want the data and we don’t want to participate in a commission that is just going to drag out and weaken the issue. Brigid?

**B. Lusk:** Brigid Lusk. A somewhat different aspect, I am quite worried about the charge to this commission if we decide to have a commission. This is to me a huge issue; I’m not naïve. I know where it’s coming from but it’s a huge complex issue with hundreds of variables and we are trying to do it or proposing to do it in a very short period of time so I worry about individual people maybe getting hurt by this and I worry about trying to rush a very, very, very complex issue. So I just have those grave concerns about this. I understand why it’s happening. I understand why there needs to be some sort of questioning about this but I’m just – I’m worried about the process frankly and I wanted that on the record.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I can appreciate that too but I think the commission would have the right to say that this is a preliminary report; this is as far as we’ve been able to get to as of this spring and lay the groundwork for further consideration. I don’t think it has to be a complete rush to judgment but at least we can find out something and the other thing I wanted to mention is that it seems to me the committees, the two committees that have been working on this, the Economic Status of the Profession and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities committees sort of have a grounding in this and that the members of those committees would be a sort of natural pool for at least some of the members of the commission to be drawn, I mean, with others possibly added as well but at least they’ve had some background on this.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Clersida?

**C. Garcia:** Clersida Garcia from K&P. I move that we friendly amend the first point here to where the faculty members would be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and then, if you guys approve, I move that we vote.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Ferald do we have to find out if that’s a friendly amendment or is that accepted or do we have to – we can’t vote on that amendment until we vote on the full one? **F. Bryan:** The maker of the motion would have to agree. That’s a pretty substantial change. She made a motion ???

**A. Rosenbaum:** So we can discuss the second motion while the first one’s still open?

**F. Bryan:** If she wants to amend it we should discuss it and deal with it right away.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. So we’re now discussing the amendment that the members of – excuse me? Oh, do we have a second? Jeff Kowalski, okay. Kendall?

**K. Thu:** Kendall Thu. I support that motion to amend it. Just – I appreciate Brigid’s concern about the pace of the effort but the bottom line is I trust my colleagues to make the judgment about data. That’s what we do in our everyday lives is to assess and evaluate data so I trust them
to do that. I think we need to get going and so I like the idea of the Executive Committee putting together the representatives from the Faculty Senate. The Senate is recognized by the Constitution as the representative body of the faculty. We don’t necessarily need to go outside the Senate and I also want to point out that by virtue of our participation in this commission, that does not preclude the possibility of the Senate doing other things. Most notably, I would want to make sure that if this data is provided to this commission that others may have access to it; that it is not simply kept in wraps by the commission itself so that others may have access to it as well.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well before – let’s take these one at a time so now we’re discussing the amendment so let’s restrict this conversation to the amendment. Yes?

**J. Stravers:** Jay Stravers, Geology and Environmental Geosciences. I guess this does relate to it but one of the things that comes to mind is that the integrity of the *Northern Star* reporting and that’s what has brought much of this to light. I know that in our department we have considered – people often take for granted or sort of dismiss the integrity of the *Northern Star* reporting. I think they have done a lot of the data analysis that has brought this to light and I think we need to recognize that and perhaps part of this commission should include some of the reporting staff from the *Northern Star*.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, okay. All right. That sounds to me like a different point from the amendment.

**R. Feurer:** Could I ask a question about the amendment? I have a question about the amendment and I just want to clarify it. I really support the idea that it be the faculty, members of the Faculty Senate, from the principle of democracy that we are the representatives of the faculty and I really actually oppose going outside the Senate for that very reason. There may be very strong people who are there but this is something that arose from the Faculty Senate. We have the responsibility to the bodies that we represent or to the groups that we represent so I really feel strongly that they be members so I would accept or I would agree with this that it could be the Executive Committee as long as it’s understood that what we agreed – that what the Executive Committee should be charged with is choosing members of the Faculty Senate. We may not – we’re the ones that we brought to the dance so to speak.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes, Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** Jeff Kowalski. I can certainly see the point that it would be preferable to have members who were elected to the Faculty Senate and solely members of the Faculty Senate serving on this committee, however, I think that most of the people who voted for us did not do so with the explicit knowledge that we might be serving on this particular type of committee or that anyone of us necessarily have the expertise necessary for interpreting this type of data. So although I agree that if we delegate the ability to appoint members of this commission – faculty members of this commission to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, that I’d like to let them have enough discretion if they feel there’s an individual who has special expertise in statistical analyses of something of that sort that would be helpful, they would be able to exercise it. That’s my opinion.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Why don’t we – this sounds like we’re amending amendments at the most so why don’t we start out with the first piece which is whether want this committee to be appointed by the Executive Committee based on, you know, the nominations that are made. So if we start with that then we can have a second question as to whether or not they should be members of the Faculty Senate or not. So, yes, Carol?

C. Thompson: I am commenting on that amendment. I don’t think I’m actually in favor of that amendment. Partly again, I think we begun very quickly that I’m unhappy with the Executive Committee being in charge of the nominations but I think elections can be done very quickly either through electronic or whether it’s either a yes/no that the nomination slate will be approved but I do think that there should be an election that is the Faculty Senate. All members participate whether they have to send their ballot in by e-mail or not. So I don’t think I’m actually in favor of that amendment for that reason.

A. Rosenbaum: Any other comments on this – Milli.

M. Kostic: I talked couple of times but this is my first discussion about this issue and I was present yesterday on the committee. That’s the only presence I was and I think it’s ??? that we cannot vote on one issue only. Originally I thought the Faculty Senate would like to have our recommendation to get our statistical data not anybody ??? and to do it the way we want. Now the things is ??? widely to all bodies of the university; faculty members, representatives of Operating Staff and I don’t see the end of it. ??? should be I think president is Faculty President but either we miss-communicate with him or he’s ill-advised. The ??? should be here is the data but we also propose to have a joint commission and invite university wide. Not like oh, ??? I propose something else and I think what we are looking for he will give it to us because we are entitled to it and I’m not sure whether we communicated properly. Yesterday I had an impression we have to go to the commission because we could not get data otherwise and then data are in the library, that’s a, you know, a laughing ??. Those data printed in the library came from some electronic file. They did not fall from Mars and why would now read and rewrite and whatnot. They are in electronic forms. It thought we do not have money now it appears we do not have time either. We are in a rush to do something now. Let’s do it short because we don’t have time and so on and so forth. It took four months to come to here and this is unrealistic to be done in such a ??? for two months and we are not in control. I think we need to do our job and then we would be told it is so complex. Actually, it is not. It is so easy statistically ??? to do anything and I think there might be volunteers to do the job, you know. I’m for a little more discussion here before we come up with the amendments and whatnot.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, what we’re trying to do though is again, the amendment was brought up. We need to deal with this in some order. The amendment has to do with who the appointments should be made by. The amendment that we have on the table at this moment is that the faculty members be appointed by the Faculty Senate through the Executive Committee. So that is the motion that is on the table. Some people are clearly in favor of that; others are not. We can put that to a vote unless anyone wants to add any other comments but in the interest of keeping this in order, why don’t we call a vote on this okay. So the first vote is on the amendment as to whether the appointments, whoever they be, be made by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and that way we can do it more quickly. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed?
All right, I need a show of hands. All in favor. Hands? We need a count. Keep your hands up please. Opposed? Abstentions? We have 2 abstentions – I see 2 abstentions. Anyone present but not voting? Okay. Okay, the motion carries. So the appointments will be made by the Executive Committee.

The motion carried by 33 in favor, 7 opposed, 5 abstentions.

The next question is whether it should be restricted to the Faculty Senate or whether we should open it up and allow people both from the Faculty Senate and from the faculty at large to be nominated for this commission. Any discussion of this issue? I guess we should sort of do – okay. Well then we’d have to frame it. Someone want to frame this as a motion one way or the other? Pat?

**P. Henry:** That the Executive Committee will nominate the faculty members of the commission from the Faculty Senate.

**A. Rosenbaum:** From the Faculty Senate. We need a second.

**K. Thu:** Language to will select rather than will nominate?

**P. Henry:** Will select.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so the Executive Committee will select the members for this panel from the membership of the Faculty Senate. We had a second from Dr. Baker. Yes? Okay, discussion? Any more discussion on this? Okay.

**P. Henry:** This is a very – to some extent a side issue – but it seems to me that even if the members are chosen from the Faculty Senate, if they need to call on the expertise of somebody outside the Faculty Senate, that can be brought in and I hold to the basic premise that the members should be of the Faculty Senate and that they can call on other people to help them out with stuff.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I would just like to add my own feeling about this since I am a voting member of the Faculty Senate. I think we would like to have the strongest possible people on this committee. I think that it’s going to require people to stand up to the people in the administration and I think we want to have the strongest possible group. I don’t want to in any way say that that strongest possible group does not come from the Faculty Senate but I don’t know that it does so I would like to have the option of us nominating somebody who might not be on the Faculty Senate even if the majority of the people end up coming from the Faculty Senate so I’m opposed to this motion but that’s just my vote. Any other comment? Brigid? Okay, we’ll take Clersida first because she has the mike already. Okay.

**C. Garcia:** Well I think that if the person is a faculty the Executive Committee should be entitled to call whoever they think would do the job so I support that the Executive Committee find the person that can best do the job.
B. Lusk: Brigid Lusk. I’m with the other viewpoint. I believe that we don’t necessarily need – I don’t mean necessarily need the strongest but I don’t think we need people who are of one type to serve on this committee and I believe that the faculty elected us to serve on this committee because we are representative of the faculty and I’m worried about this getting into faculty members who maybe have just a singular outlook out-look on this complex issue.

A. Rosenbaum: That can happen within or outside of the Senate. Yes? Mike.

M. Morris: Michael Morris. My concern is if we nominate people from outside the Faculty Senate to serve on this commission, to whom are they going to be accountable. Those of us who are members of the Senate are accountable to people who are in our own departments. To whom would at-large people be accountable?

A. Rosenbaum: I would think to the Senate. Joe?

J. Jeffrey: Joe Jeffrey, Computer Science. I like your analysis. I’d like to see the strongest possible team. It seems to me that Michael’s concern could be addressed by including that as an explicit statement in their request to serve. You’re accountable to the Senate.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. We had someone in back; I can’t see who it is. Go ahead.

C. Smith: Cecil Smith, Educational Psychology. I’d like to suggest and I’d be willing to make a motion that only tenured faculty members serve on the committee. Not to suggest that untenured faculty members cannot be strong individuals but there’s probably some need for some protection.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. I think that’s a reasonable point. Now, I’m losing track of all the votes we have going here. Okay. Let’s do this first. The first vote will be on whether the – the motion that has been made already. The motion is that they be selected from the Faculty Senate. If you vote no on this saying they can be drawn from either the Faculty Senate or the university at large. Okay? So all in favor of the motion, signify by raising a hand. We’ll try that.

R. Feurer: I don’t think we finished discussion at this time.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s fine. The motion that is on the table I believe is that the committee members will be selected from within the Faculty Senate. So only Faculty Senate members if we support this, only Faculty Senate members would be eligible to participate on the committee.

M. Kostic: This is good comment and we are somehow putting it aside.

A. Rosenbaum: No we’re not. We’re voting on one at a time. We’re not putting it aside. We’re voting one at a time. Okay.

R. Feurer: Rosemary Feurer again. I would like to emphasize that I think this is an issue of accountability and I would suggest an issue of the way we started out this year with the intent on really asserting ourselves in the Faculty Senate and I really do feel that it would dilute it even if
these people are in theory stronger it sends a signal that we don’t trust the Faculty Senate so I would just argue that we need to have an accountable body and this is about accountability and you can say to any individual around the campus that they may be stronger and more outspoken or may have a wider range of abilities but I think, you know, this is an issue of accountability. I would suggest that we have the ability as Clersida said that we have the ability to get the information, the people involved who might have the ability to understand this data in another way so.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Jeff? First Jeff and then we’ll ---

J. Kowalski: I’d just like to say once again that I would agree with Alan that we should put confidence in members of the Executive Committee, give them some discretion to make the choice that they feel will best represent those of the faculty and to enable us to see that the information we seek is both properly obtained and properly analyzed and in terms of accountability, speaking as someone who feels accountable to the people who elected me and I am willing to be accountable to my faculty for thinking that that’s the best way to proceed and for making that judgment. So that’s me. Thanks.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

S. Martin: Steve Martin from Physics. This might be a relevant question, how many members are there going to be because some of them could be from the Faculty Senate and some from outside then I think that would be helpful.

A. Rosenbaum: We don’t know the answer to that question.

S. Martin: Do we know roughly the answer to that question?

A. Rosenbaum: No we don’t. There’s been no meetings around this. It’s just been raised in the abstract so ---

S. Martin: Perhaps we should add that to the resolution.

A. Rosenbaum: Well we don’t know how many we want unless someone wants to make a suggestion. Not me.

S. Martin: I don’t either but somebody ought to. Okay, thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, sorry. We don’t have an answer to that.

R. Schneider: Bob Schneider, Theatre and Dance. Previous question please? Can we vote?

A. Rosenbaum: We can if the discussion is done. When I tried to call the vote there was a suggestion that the discussion wasn’t done. Okay, you’re ready to call the question. This motion is that the committee members be drawn from the Faculty Senate. If you vote no, it means it will be drawn more broadly from the university as well as from the Faculty Senate. All in favor of
this motion, signify by raising a hand. Need a count. Keep them up for me to count. This is from the Faculty Senate. All in favor? Keep them up again. We have a dispute. We’re not going to let them handle the data if they get it. Yes? Opposed? Close vote. What’s the vote? It’s 20 to 26. It is voted down so the next motion would be I guess we have to make the motion that it would be drawn more generally? Ferald? Okay. I’m going to assume that since it’s not restricted to the Senate we can draw from the Senate or outside according to that vote. Okay, before we get to you David we had the motion that it be tenured faculty members only. Is that a motion? We need a second. Okay, we have a second. Who made the motion? Cecil Smith made the motion. This is the motion that only tenured faculty members be placed on this committee I assume for their own protection. Okay. Do we want to discuss this? Any discussion? Okay. We’ll call the motion. All those in favor signify by raising a hand. Okay. Opposed? Okay. The motion carries with one opposition. Okay. So where we stand now we have the selection of the committee will be made – well actually, these are all amendments. We haven’t voted to support the commission. Okay. Now we have the main resolution. Wait a second. Okay, we have the main resolution which has now been modified.

P. Henry: I think at the risk of getting too many motions going, I think it would be helpful to have some specification that the majority of the members be from the Faculty Senate or the preponderance of members be from the Faculty Senate even if, you know, I mean, I think the point was closely voted on and a lot of people feel that the Faculty Senate – I mean, it’s not that we don’t trust you it’s just that maybe there should be something in there specific about Faculty Senate or maybe not.

A. Rosenbaum: I think that the vote is close enough that we will be largely from the Faculty Senate without the motion. I, you know, Rosemary is on the committee and she can.

R. Feurer: I’m watching him.

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t know how I got to suddenly be the bad guy in this but okay. David?

D. Valentiner: I wanted to speak to the question of haste because I think when we were talking about this and coming up drafting this, the issue of haste was important to us but I think that one of the things it’s related to is the issue of scope. If you take a look at the first sentence, I’m sorry, yeah, the first sentence the charge originally to the joint committee was to investigate the equitability of the resources allocated to different groups in the university and the occasion for the proposal is to review the data, the proposal to form a committee is to review the data and I think that it would be a mistake if we accept a commission whose goal is to review this data and only review this data. I think that the scope of the commission hopefully will be to investigate the equitability of the resources allocated to different groups in the university and that the March 19 date was proposed as a way of trying to get things to move expeditiously and specifically to deal with the issue of salary increments over the past ten years and that’s a fairly narrow question. It doesn’t deal with salaries; it deals only with salary increments. It doesn’t deal with other resources. Again, I think perhaps there’s something that we can say about that the work of the committee will extend beyond March 19 to address other questions related to equitability of resources. I just think if we’re only reviewing this data, you know, I personally don’t think that this data is going to answer the questions that I want to know the answers to. I think that what
we need is we need comparison with other universities, with how much, um, how – what percentage of our budget is going to administration. How does that compare to comparable universities and so on.

**A. Rosenbaum:** David I’ll remind you again that, you know, Kendall’s point early on was that we’re not restricted to doing what this committee wants to do so the joint committee is still in existence. The joint committee will continue to do much of this work that you’re talking about. The joint committee could also through this commission get the data that they need to answer some of those questions. So I think that it’s perfectly reasonable for this committee to continue to work on a number of these other issues while at the same time this joint commission is getting access to the data pieces that we need. So this commission – we’re not delegating all of the responsibilities over to this commission. Okay? We’re simply using this as a way of getting access to the data that we need and that we don’t seem to be able to get in other ways. Okay?

**D. Valentiner:** Well, I think that the business of the committee is probably going to turn to another data set and that we’ll probably have the same sort of issues with that data set as we have with the current data set that we’re talking about so I think that it would be helpful if this commission were not – to draw a commission to review a data set? That seems to me like a fairly narrow charge for a commission.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. By the way, we’re going to have to move this along because we do have to do some more business so we need to sort of – unless people want to stay here until 5:30. Jeff, quickly.

**J. Kowalski:** This is something a bit different and it was just with regard to I think the short turn- around time then I heard I believe from Pat one recommendation that we perhaps describe this report by March 19 as a preliminary report but my thought was that if people would accept this as a friendly amendment that we add a point 5, you know, and it would read something on the order of “this report will be shared with the full Faculty Senate which will determine whether further review is needed.”

**A. Rosenbaum:** Is that accepted as a friendly amendment?

**F. Feurer:** I think that was originally in there and we just wanted to shorten it so.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, I think we had one person on the – yes?

**S. Martin:** Steve Martin from Physics. Maybe this is implicit in all this but I didn’t see anything on here that sort of guaranteed that the data considered by the commission will actually be available to outside people and it seems maybe we might want that to be true and so adding a point that says “the information in the data considered by the commission will be open.”

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. I don’t know, you know, I think that was one of the things the committee was also in favor of. I don’t know, you know, if we look at this the main objective in offering us the commission is to avoid handing over the data set to us. If they want to hand the data set over to us, we don’t need the commission so I’m perfectly happy to represent this to the
President if that’s what the Senate wishes but my guess is that that would sort of be the reason why he formed the commission in the first place so that will. I think, give us the problem of, you know, doing this in a way that the President feels positively about while at the same time trying to do the way we wanted to do it originally. So if we want to do that we can. I think my advice would be that we give them a chance to do it the other way and at the point at which we are being stonewalled we then, as a group once we get that report from our representatives, we then go to the President and say this is not happening the way we need it to happen. So we don’t give them too much rope on this but that we do at least allow them to, you know, do this in good faith as they have proposed. So I don’t want to say – I’m not saying; I can’t so no to that but that would be response to that. Kendall?

K. Thu: Just briefly, I should also point out there’s nothing in this that precludes the data from being shared.

R. Feurer: I would just add to that that I really don’t think that it’s necessary to say it.

A. Rosenbaum: Dr. Baker – you want to call the question. Okay, now I think the real challenge will be to be able to phrase this. You all have this complicated set before you. The motion is that we agree to do this commission under the provisions that have been written and amended and so those have to do with setting a deadline. They have to do with the members of this, the faculty members, being selected by the Executive Committee and appointed in the name of the Faculty Senate. They will come from the Faculty Senate in large part but may also, if we feel there is an appropriate person outside the Senate, we will be free to draw someone from outside the Senate to be on that committee. These will be tenured faculty members. Does that capture I think the essence of the motion. Okay. I’ve been asked to call the question so all in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye. All opposed. Any abstentions. One abstention. Okay. The motion carries and I will forward that to the President tomorrow. Thank you very much.

The motion was voted down 26 to 20.

The second motion carried with 1 opposition.

The last motion passed with one abstention.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: We have one last order of business and that is the drawing for the set of steak knives and also for the – every year the Senate is responsible for evaluating both the Executive Secretary, namely myself, and also the faculty and SPS faculty advisor who is David Wade. This is done by lot. We put all the names into a hat. I’ll call on David. If you’re luck enough to have your name drawn, you will be the evaluation for myself and David Wade. Well, two separate committees.
1. Selection Of a committee for the Evaluation of the Executive Secretary of University Council and President of Faculty Senate – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7.

A. Rosenbaum: Next we need 2 people from the Faculty Senate, 2 people from the University Council and 1 student name from the University Council to form the committee to evaluate the Executive Secretary. Is that the Faculty Senate? Okay. We need 2 David.

D. Wade: The first winner is Deborah Blatz.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and the second?


A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Then we need 2 members of the University Council. Do you have the University Council envelop.

D. Wade: We do.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, these are Faculty Senate members who are also on the University Council. We need 2.

D. Wade: Okay, the winners are number 1, Rebecca Butler.

A. Rosenbaum: And number 2?

D. Wade: Number 2, Dan Schneider.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Now we need 1 student member.

D. Wade: And the lucky winner is Michael Guinta from EET.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the people who have been selected for those committees, if you would like the names of people who did this last year so they can sort of fill you in on how it’s done, just call our office and we’ll try to get that information for you.

2. Selection of a committee for the Evaluation of the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor – see Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 7.

A. Rosenbaum: The first thing we need is 3 members from the Faculty Senate to evaluate the SPS and Faculty Personnel Advisor. David you can’t do that since you are that person so why don’t you hand that to Ferald. This envelop contains the names of everybody on the Faculty Senate. Ferald will draw 3 names at random.

F. Bryan: Professor Kostic.

A. Rosenbaum: Professor Kostic. Second winner?

A. Rosenbaum: And our final lucky contestant.

F. Bryan: Our last winner, Rosemary Feurer.

A. Rosenbaum: Congratulations Rosemary.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: People are leaving in droves. I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. Professor Baker and second? David Valentiner. All in favor? Opposed? We are adjourned. Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.