FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2010, 3:00P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council website under Faculty Senate / Agenda Meeting Transcript.


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Allori, Arriola, Azad, Bishop, Brandt, Butler, Morris, Elish-Piper, Garcia, Gough, Greene, Hurych, Jeffrey, Lash, Liu, Lusk, Mateousek, Morgara, Parks, Ridnour, D. Schneider, R. Schneider, Shortridge, Smith, Stephen, Sweet, Thu, Unger Yamagata-Lynch

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Novak made the motion; Hansen was second. The agenda was approved as amended by the addition of two walk-in items: a draft resolution by G.Bisplinghoff related to the library issue and the BOT report from F.Bryan.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 10, 2010 FS MEETING (sent electronically)

E.Hansen: made a motion to approve the minutes. P.Henry was second.

J. Brubaker: asked for a correction of a statement that had been erroneously attributed to J. Hurych.

A. Rosenbaum: For your information on page 2, there’s a paragraph that’s attributed to J. Hurych that should be attributed to Jana Brubaker and we will make that correction. There were also a couple of typos that have been called to my attention.
The minutes were approved with corrections.

IV. **PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. Rosenbaum:** The letter that we approved at the last meeting was sent to the Governor and the legislators. A copy was also given to President Peters, who sent a note expressing his thanks to the Senate for its support.

With regards to the question of whether to revisit NIU’s grading system to include intermediate grades [e.g. +/-], so far two departments are strongly in favor, three departments opposed and four departments that have a mixed vote, at least one of those departments leaning towards the idea of considering the change. The Executive Committee discussed this and there was an article in the *Northern Star* today in which the opinion of students was expressed. The report in the *Star* said there was about 60% opposed and 40% in favor. There doesn’t seem to be strong student support for it and there seems to be decidedly split support among the different departments. The Executive Committee voted to not take it up for consideration at this time, however, given that several departments just weighed in as of early this afternoon, I’d like to get a straw vote to see if the Senate wants to send this to a committee. The vote was 18–16 in favor of sending it to a committee.

**C. Cappell:** moved to send this to the Academic Affairs Committee for further consideration. G.Slotsve seconded. The motion passed 20-18.

**G. Bennardo:** I have the vote for Anthropology if you’re interested to be added to your list. The votes from Anthropology were 45% pro and 5% against. The others didn’t vote.

**A. Rosenbaum:** There are clearly mixed feelings about this so we’ll follow the will of the Senate and send it to Academic Affairs and see what comes of it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Briefly described the Bob Lane award. In our archives in the Senate office we have this, which I will read to you directly. “The late Bob Lane was often a thorn in the side of administration. He was very good at discovering when members of the administration were telling the faculty something other than the whole truth and nothing but the truth. This award is offered in his memory. It was originally named the Bottom of the Deck Award as in dealing from the bottom of the deck. There was also supposed to be a Nose of the Camel Award as in “don’t let the camel’s nose into the tent,” but this was never implemented. With the improved faculty/administration relations that we are now enjoying, it was suggested that the name be changed to something less confrontational, hence, the Eternal Vigilance Award. The award is intended to honor a faculty member who has been listening carefully to what is said and what is not said and brings to our attention items which might bear further inquiry. This strengthens our shared governance and is a worthy effort.” The most recent Bob Lane Award winner was Joseph “Buck” Stephen in 2004–2005 and we have not had a nominee since. You can make nominations now or you can send them to us and we can vote at the next meeting if there are any nominees.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Disposal of library holdings – resolution – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: I’ve asked Doug Bowman to join us for this discussion. You remember at the last Faculty Senate meeting, F.Bryan called our attention to the fact that the library was disposing of a number of holdings in the periodical collections without the knowledge of the library representatives. It was done without consulting the faculty. Dean Dawson gave me assurances that this was not a major operation and that it was all over and done with. Since this has come to light, a number of faculty members, and not a small number, have expressed outrage at the fact that the Dean would apparently unilaterally without consultation, remove periodicals from the library’s collection. One of the concerns expressed by faculty is that the way they do their work involves having the journals in journal, rather than electronic, form. Another concern that’s been raised is the idea that JSTOR may not be that reliable a system. It is run by Stanford University and that they might at some point decide to sell it or they might decide to discontinue it. There may be a charge that becomes associated with it in which case the library would be required to pay that charge, regardless of how high it got, otherwise we would lose our access. The number of journals involved is very large contrary to the impression that Dean Dawson has given us. According to D.Bowman’s research, fifteen thousand volumes have been removed from the library. The list is quite extensive and, thanks to Doug’s efforts, we have a complete list of the journals that were removed from the library. Another point is that some of the journals were thrown out, but many of them were given to collections in various parts of the country and according to what Doug has been able to find out there may be some chance that we could get those journals back.

A. Rosenbaum: Gretchen Bisplinghoff has prepared a motion for the senate to consider This is something that we have to consider doing very quickly so it didn’t seem that we would be able to do this quickly if we sent it to committee. So if the Senate is not of a mind to deal with this without first sending it to committee, we can certainly make a motion to move it to a committee but on the chance that we might be able to work this out on the floor, I’ve asked Gretchen to introduce the her motion.

G. Bisplinghoff: I’m presenting a resolution for Faculty Senate action regarding the disposal of library materials including the 15,000 bound volumes. The walk-in that you have includes background information on the actual minutes of the Library Advisory Committee where Dean Dawson spoke about this. Doug Bowman gave me a timeline which I have put on the back. I tried to boil down the various issues that were expressed in the resolution and I tried to be succinct. So, I move the following:

1. The process of destruction and/or donation of library materials must cease immediately.

2. The library is asked to recover the donated periodicals if possible by contacting the involved libraries and requesting their return.

3. The library should provide full information on the disposition of all removed materials to the full faculty.
4. In the spirit of shared governance, any future actions which affect the library holdings should be preceded by consultation with the Libraries Advisory Committee and with faculty through the representatives to the various departments and the Faculty Senate. Prior notification of the Faculty Senate President of decisions substantially affecting library materials is requested. According to the Libraries Advisory Committee website, “Actions which involve a substantive change in policy are subject to University Council approval.”

E. Hansen seconded the motion.

J. Brubaker: I’m not an official spokesperson. I wasn’t involved in this decision but a couple of bits of information that I think are misinformation, you can look at the entire volume issue of a journal on JSTOR in context. You can go from the first article to the last article so it’s not like you have to have a citation to pull anything up and the second thing is anything that was not given away was recycled. It was not thrown away in a landfill.

D. Bowman: Corrected some of the items in the timeline that was given to the senate since there was a more recent version. Regarding how mathematics uses the volumes, physical volumes as opposed to electronic ones, the representative for the Math Department to the Faculty Senate, Professor Blecksmith, will address that.

R. Blecksmith: I’ve been here for 25 years on the Math faculty. I must say that the first time I learned about this was the last Faculty Senate meeting and Buck kind of reassured me when he said well, those are just some journals of time and light and we don’t have to worry about it and then I found out that 3,000 math journal volumes of the most prestigious journals that we use, the American Math Monthly, the Annals, the transactions of the AMS, the Math Comp, which is what I publish in, those are all gone. They have just disappeared and what’s particularly upsetting about this is the enormous cost. I mean, 2,768 of those journal volumes went to AIM which is the American Institute of Mathematics in California and I believe that they paid for the shipping there and a certain number, smaller, went elsewhere so that’s about 3,000 of the 15,000 journal volumes that were eliminated from the university. A rough cost easily is $200.00 a journal volume so that’s about $600,000 worth of investment that we’ve given in those resources that are just gone. Maybe it’s three to five times that for the entire university and the 15,000 that were lost. It’s also kind of upsetting about the timeline because apparently these things were bought in July of this year and then they were taken to AIM in early August and all of this was done without any consultation of any person in the Math Department. They didn’t talk to Bill Blair who’s been the Chair of our department for 20 years. They didn’t talk to anybody on the Library Subcommittee. Doug is that representative now and Professor Deng, who’s sitting next to me, was the representation a year ago. He had no idea they were going to do this. I don’t know whether or not they talked to Dean McCord who’s discipline is mathematics but it does seem to me that it really violates the idea of shared governance and it has kind of this feeling of somebody came in the middle of the night and took our journals. If you look at the timeline, it’s not until October, a month after these journals were removed, that somebody finally found out that they were gone and perhaps if we’re lucky, there’s a chance that we can get them back. It doesn’t seem like anybody in the library ever talked to anybody in our department about how we use the journals to do what we do. It has happened so many times to me that I discovered
something serendipitously, that is, when you’re looking for something you discover something else that you wanted to know that relates to other things that you are involved in and that’s just the great thing about having these journals accessible to you. It’s not always that you have a title or an author and you can just look them up. Sometimes there are special issues of a journal; sometimes there’s proceedings that involve a single topic that you’d be interested in. Not everybody has access to these things on their computers. It seems like mathematics will stay around for hundreds and hundreds of years; I doubt of JSTOR will.

G. Nicolosi: I totally disagree with this resolution. It contains irrational judgement. To consider sunk costs as a basis for ongoing decisions. The only thing that we should be considering is future costs and future benefits, not what was expended in the past. Further, it’s entirely one-sided. It only looks at, as I mentioned, previous costs which shouldn’t factor into the decision, but it looks at expected future costs and it doesn’t take into consideration any benefits. I don’t think the library did this just because they had nothing better to do. I’m thinking that there was a cost associated with keeping these redundant journals. Redundant, yes, because we haven’t lost any information. It’s all entirely accessible online.

K. Freedman: First of all, this is not a question of redundancy. Obviously information was lost when the physical hardcopy of the journal was lost because you don’t get all the information on JSTOR as from a physical copy of a journal. You only get reproduction. You don’t get to hold it your hand, you don’t get to see the quality of the paper, you don’t get a good representation of the visual artifacts. One of the ways that we use journals in our program is in our history course. You don’t get a lot of important information from digital copies that you do from a hard copy that you would need in a history course. I’m sure there are other historians in the room who can say more about this. So, this is not a matter of redundancy. This is a matter of scholarly respectability as was pointed out and also of the students’ education.

A. Gupta: My view is whether the library had appropriate reason or not considering the impact of this action, the resolution at least wants to make sure that this thing doesn’t happen in the future so that’s my main concern. I think all faculty, at least in the department, the reaction seems to be this should not happen in the future and if there is a good reason let them inform the Faculty Senate and I’m sure if there is good reason, faculty will support it. If not, they will oppose it.

J. Novak: expressed his support for the motion.

D. Valentiner: I noticed, regarding item 2, the library is asked to recovery donated periodicals whenever possible by contacting the involved libraries and agencies and requesting their return. If this is not highly time sensitive, then it may be possible to separate the first item from the remaining items. The first item I think is very time sensitive and in support of the Math Department, I think we should probably try to act on that and support that but if the remaining items are not as time sensitive, then perhaps it’s possible to break those out and put those into committee so that we can weigh and try to come to some way of getting the library and the faculty all on the same page which I see as kind of the purpose of this.
J. Kowalski: I like that the resolution includes that the library should provide full information on the disposition of all removed materials to the full faculty. I understand why in this day and age, we’re moving now to have more and more journals online and that obtaining hard copies, you know, may not be as easy in the future to support financially, but these journals existed. They had a physical location in which they were being housed. What was their rationale for simpl

J. Brubaker: We have finite space in the library. Space is worth something as well and we cannot keep everything. I’m not saying whether these materials should have been kept or not, but we aren’t an archive and we cannot store everything indefinitely forever and ever.

D. Zahay-Blatz: I was on the Library Advisory Committee for years. I know that they were concerned about getting students to come to the library but I’m not sure we need to sacrifice our research mission for that. I also wanted to provide some insight on not only the physical journals since we were talking about physical versus electronic, but some insight into how the library has acted in the past regarding electric access to databases. We are very heavily involved in electric databases in the Business School and the Marketing Department in particular and last year the library decided unilaterally that they wanted to eliminate a database that we all use in our classes and I just see this now as a pattern, on the part of the library of acting unilaterally and not involving the faculty and I would like to amend point 4 “in the spirit of shared governance, any future actions which affect the library holdings”. I think “holdings” is too restrictive. I think we need to include online database access and it really is a shame it has to come to this point. I would also like to have Dean Dawson come and address this body too because when I see things like this happening not only affecting my department and mathematics, it’s very distressing. The library is a very important part of the university and we need to be involved.

After extensive discussion, G. Bisplinghoff accepted a friendly amendment changing “holdings” to “holdings and other resources.” P. Henry was second on the friendly amendment.

A. Rosenbaum: Remember we’re not telling the library they can’t get rid of anything. We’re not saying they can’t do this. What we’re saying is they need to consult with the faculty before doing something that might affect one or another department’s resources.

P. Henry: The faculty could suggest solutions that would be helpful to the library as well.

K. Freedman: I was just going to say that, as far as I’m concerned, that’s the real point because if the library had bothered to consult with faculty, it’s very possible that faculty in some programs would have taken the journals and stored them themselves. We certainly would have done that in the School of Art.

D. Valentiner: I just want to reiterate my question as to which of these issues is time sensitive. In your preamble you said that this was not being sent to committee because we needed to act quickly but if there are some issues here that we do not need to meet quickly on, it may be a good idea for a committee to take this up and yet the issues more thoroughly and more carefully than can be done in this forum. So I would ask if there are any of these that do not have to be acted on today if not acting today doesn’t represent a significant loss, can we give them to
committee? My question is whether all of these items have to be acted on today. The first one seems like it is urgent and we really do need to get that done. Is that true for all of these? Can perhaps Gretchen or somebody speak to that?

**D. Bowman:** In terms of getting materials back, having a resolution that we want to get them back will aid in doing that. The longer somebody else has something, the harder it is going to be able to do it. I would say it’s urgent to get a faculty consensus that we would like to get these returned as well. The second thing was about the previous question about why this was done. I’ve interviewed numerous people at the library, some people involved in this; some people not involved in this all the way from people who represented the Dean in these actions to librarians to people who are not a part of this and they were all consistent in their explanation as to why this was done and it has nothing to do with space. We have plenty of space for storage. And I heard this from numerous people including Jim Millhorn who actually did the physical work involved in organizing and getting rid of the journals and getting them set up for donation. He said this was what it had to do with. The library is changing from alphabetical order for the journal storage to going under the Library of Congress system and getting rid of 15,000 volumes saved money in hiring movers to move them around the library. This is what I heard consistently from everybody I talked to.

**M. Kostic:** I had many digital copies where graphics is pretty much unusable or in a very poor quality. So there are many missteps here and it comes down to the really shared governance. Shared governance is a very critical and important thing.

**J. Brubaker:** I would be interested to know how many people have actually looked at JSTOR? Well, why are people saying that you can’t look at an issue of a journal because you can look at every single article in there. It goes from page 1 to page 5, page 5 to page 10. The graphics are in there. The other thing is that I think this is really one-sided and just going around getting random opinions from people in the library, I don’t think is the way to go about this. I would like to see it go to a committee.

**G. Slotsve:** I was just going to comment on JSTOR. I’ve been there many times. Generally, they are 2 to 5 years behind on the journals so they’re not very up to date on the journals. I’m just saying, they’re generally very far behind. The other thing is that we’ve got a very poor selection. It isn’t a very good coverage of the journals that we’ve got sitting on JSTOR either so there’s a lot of issues just using JSTOR or trying to go in through Science Direct or using any of them. Often the graphics in some of them are very, very bad as has been pointed out so they’re not the complete substitutes by any means here and you are missing a fair bit of information in journals.

**J. Kowalski:** Well, speaking as an art historian, I’d like to second the comment that was made earlier about the nature of the images or graphics that appear in the articles that we use. It may not be as essential for every field of study but I can assure you that when you take out an older issue of a journal like *The Art Bulletin* and look at the quality of reproduction of the art works that are in that journal, they are greatly superior to those that you will be able to either see on the screen or reproduced through JSTOR and where we deal with visual data, this is important. It’s nicer to see the original if possible, but in lieu of that, having the best reproduction possible is
vital for our students and our fields including art education and for the fine arts and for our
design professors as well.

**C. Thompson:** I disagree strongly with the comment that the library is not an archive. I do think
that in a university environment, the university library is an archive, at least that’s the way I tend
to think about the library. I very much am sympathetic where I can certainly understand the
arguments by the historians or by the communication people where when they want to look at the
journal, they want to look at it because they want to see the pages.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I don’t know if we need to go any further with this because I think what’s clear
is that it’s much more important to certain departments and to certain disciplines than it is to
others. Some disciplines can do perfectly well with JSTOR electronic copies. For others,
apparently those in the arts and in mathematics, it’s meaningful for them to have the original
journal. So as a faculty, I think we have to support those of us who have needs for these things.
I think that even if it doesn’t matter to one department, that we have to support the fact that our
fellow faculty members do have those needs and therefore, we have to act as a body to support
them.

**J. Brubaker:** JSTOR, yes it is behind and that’s why we kept the newer journals. We lost no
content whatsoever and if the JSTOR journals are limited, we didn’t get rid of anything that
wasn’t on JSTOR. So we have no fewer journals now; some of them are in a different format.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Didn’t we also get rid of the PAIS database?

**D. Bowman:** The PAIS index was eliminated and we don’t have that on JSTORE or anyplace
else. That PAIS stands for Public Affairs Information Service. It was a government index from
either 1900 or 1901 through 1985. It indexed things like Senate hearings and House debates and
things like Amnesty International information. The sort of things that would be important for
people in Political Science, History, Law, Public Affairs, that kind of stuff and we had these as
bound volumes and they disappeared very recently. Where did they go?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think you mentioned that we had one of the few complete sets dating back to
1905 or 1895 or something like that?

**D. Bowman:** I think it was 1900 or 1901.

**A. Rosenbaum:** It is relevant only to the idea that it’s not just items that don’t represent the loss
of content that are being dealt with. I think our concern is not only what’s been done, but what
will be done in the future unless we assert ourselves in this. We don’t want this to be able to
happen so that two years from now we’re talking about the loss of some other resource that
somebody on the faculty has a need for.

**D. Valentiner:** I would really like to support the Math Department and other departments that
suffer because of this and I think it would be easier for me to do if it was in pieces. Item 1 I have
no problem with. Item 2 I have a problem with because it doesn’t specify at what limits or what,
you know, are they going to recover it at the expense of everything else or what so that doesn’t
seem quite right to me and items 3 and 4, I just don’t see the urgency to address these. I think
there is a problem with shared governance and these are trying to address that. So I would say 3
and 4 I’d rather see go to committee. Number 2 I’d like to see some limit put in there such as “is
asked to consider recovery” or “is asked to recover if reasonably possible” or some kind of limit
on that.

A. Rosenbaum: I think the way we perhaps should handle this is when we’re ready we’ll take a
vote on it. If it gets voted down then you can propose an amended resolution. Why don’t we
take a vote since the resolution has been made and seconded. If it is voted down, then we will
entertain additional motions including the motion to send it to committee. If you vote yes on this,
it means we’re accepting the resolution that Gretchen has proposed with the change that was
suggested and accepted as a friendly amendment.

A. Rosenbaum: called for a vote on the resolution. The motion passed. For your information,
the intention was to present this motion to the Provost and hopefully the Provost will instruct the
Dean to follow the wishes of the Senate. If not, we will come back and we’ll decide how to
pursue this further.

A. Rosenbaum: thanked G. Bisplinghoff for writing the resolution and D. Bowman for all his
work researching the issues.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report (pages 3-14)

E. Hansen: At the beginning of the meeting the group observed a moment of silence for the
tragedy at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and the overnight shooting at NIU. On April
6, the Faculty Advisory Committee is going to have lunch with the members of the Illinois Board
of Higher Education at Harold Washington College in Chicago. The luncheon was set up with
the intent of being able to talk one-on-one with Board representatives with the Faculty Advisory
Committee. I would like to ask you if you have opinions, to just drop me a note on it and I’ll be
more than happy to pass on your opinions and your thoughts on this at that meeting.

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 and Greg Waas –
no report

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

E. BOT – Ferald Bryan – report – walk-in
F. Bryan: Yes, thank you Alan. I covered the full Board meeting on February 25. The summary of the report is before you and much of it has already been reported in the *Star* and other campus outlets so I won’t go over it in detail.

There were a total of 30 action items but only about 11 are listed that they actually voted on individually and discussed favorably with other law schools around the state. The contracts all were approved. Point D, I really expected more discussion because as you know, the *Star* had done an expose on the Proton Treatment Center still being a large, empty field. There was virtually no question or discussion about that. They simply blame the economy and they seem to say that this is all going to happen in the future and I think more questions should have been raised and we’ll just have to be very vigilant on what actually happens to this very expensive proton center that’s going to be well behind one that’s very nearby that’s going to be on line sooner.

Finally, the Cole/Stevens Complex capital project was officially approved and you’ll note there the 35 million dollar total tab. Something new, that I had not seen or heard reference to before, was that they are thinking about raising the Cole Annex if they need to. There was great support for sabbaticals so those all were approved without much comment and we do have as of July 1, a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Lisa Freeman, coming to us from Kansas State University. She was present and received lots of praise. They made changes in the BS degree in Philosophy and approved it the BA degree in Russian.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you Ferald. I have one question and that is the Chair’s report where it says that Mark Strauss recommended an amendment to the Board of Trustees regulation regarding Freedom of Information laws? What was the amendment that he was talking about.

F. Bryan: It was required by federal law and it did not seem terribly significant but I think it was in response to a new change in the federal law but I will double check that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so it wasn’t something we had a choice about or that he was initiating?

F. Bryan: No, no this is something they were required to do.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: Although it says no report from Resource, Space and Budget I think Mike Morris would like to make a comment. You’ll recall that last time we spoke about the idea of the faculty exercising more influence in the budgetary process, There seems to be substantial support for us having a little bit more voice in the way money is allocated at the university. We talked about the mechanisms that we have in place, the main one being the joint Faculty Senate/University Council Committee on Resource, Space and Budget. The Committee on Resource, Space and Budget is chaired by Mike Morris from the Senate and Barbara Jaffee from the University Council.

M. Morris: The Resource, Space and Budget Committee met this afternoon with Barbara Jaffee who is the co-chair and I leading the meeting. The overall theme of the meeting was what do we
want the role of faculty to be in terms of advising and informing the upper administration in the creation of the university budget. I think among the members of the there’s consensus that the committee needs to be more active and more activist and to insist on greater transparency among administrators in the entire budgetary process which I think is kind of a mystery to most faculty. One question that arose was “how do we implement transparency in the budgetary process?” One idea is that we need to insist that upper administration follow the University Constitution and communicate openly regarding how and why specific resources are allocated to different campus constituencies. Several other ideas that were presented by various members of the committee: one that the revenue that each college receives should be proportional to the number of students that are enrolled in each college and to the instructional needs of the instructional staff in each college. There was also a concern raised about the amount of revenue that is directed to the Finance and Facilities side of the university versus revenue that’s directed toward the academic side. There is a perception among the faculty that the number of administrators continues to increase even as many faculty are uncertain as to what it is that those administrators actually do. Another issue is a need for a greater sense of clarity in so far as what the role of administration is relative to actually educating students and why it is that the growth in salaries among these administrators far exceeds growth among the faculty.

Those I think are the main points that we raised in the meeting. We are going to meet again within two weeks after spring break.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and also the committee decided that they do want to ask the administration to follow the requirements in the Bylaws that says that the President and Provost, either independently or together, should meet with the committee two or more times per semester to discuss the issues of Resource, Space and Budgets. So we are going to go to the President and ask him and the Provost to meet with the committee and we’re certain that they would be in favor of doing that given that it is in the bylaws.

B. Jaffee: A comment. I would just like to encourage people to contact me, Barbara Jaffee or my co-chair, Michael Morris, because again some of the issues that you just heard were ones that were raised within the meeting representative of concerns of various colleges. I’m sure there are others out there and we would be happy to bring them forward, especially as we will have this opportunity to meet with upper administration so, it’s your chance to have your concerns heard.

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report
C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair 3 – see above
D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report
E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – report
1. Nominations for Executive Secretary of University Council/President of Faculty Senate – See list of University Council members eligible to be elected (p. 25)

A. Rosenbaum: I will turn the mike over to David Wade who is chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight.

D. Wade: Thank you. It is our duty today, under Article II of Constitutional Bylaws of Northern Illinois University to accept nominations for the role of President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary of University Council. This is a one-year, renewable position. The list of faculty eligible to serve in this position appears on the last page of your packet. W. Baker nominated A. Rosenbaum. The nomination was seconded. Hearing no other nominations, I’ll close the nominations unless there’s an objection from the floor. Hearing none, I close the nominations. We have one nominee, Alan Rosenbaum. He is required to submit a letter of intent prior to the election which will be held at the last meeting of the year which I believe is April 24 this year. So I’m sure you’ll be looking forward in your packet to his letter of intent and a serious consideration of his qualifications for this role. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you. I accept your nomination and I’ll try to run a clean campaign.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Rosenbaum: We are required to post the minutes from a number of different committees that report back to the Senate and the Council and so the things that you see under Information Items have now all been posted and they are available online. They are on the Faculty Senate website.

A. Graduate Council minutes – November 2, 2009
B. Graduate Council minutes – September 14, 2009
C. University Benefits Committee minutes – November 19, 2009

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: If there are no other questions or comments, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. W. Baker made the motion. E. Hansen was second. The motion carried without objection.

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.