I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Good afternoon. Welcome. We have a couple of interesting issues to deal with today so I think we’ll get started. I think pretty much we have a good crowd. We have almost everyone that usually comes so okay.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first thing we have to do is the adoption of the agenda. You should have two walk-in items along with the agenda. The walk-in items, one of them is a library resolution that we will get to under items for Faculty Senate consideration and the other walk-in is the Board of Trustees Report from Ferald Bryan so that will be under reports for advisory committees. I need a motion to adopt the agenda with the walk-in items. Second? Okay. Good, thanks. Any discussion? All in favor of approving the agenda say aye. Any opposition? The agenda is approved.

Novak made the motion; Hansen was second. The agenda was approved as amended.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the approval of the minutes. I apologize that you got those minutes only this morning and probably took most of the day to read them and decipher them so my apologies for that. We need a motion to accept the minutes; approve the minutes. Have a motion? Okay. Yeah? Question there? Are you making a motion or – Jana?

J. Brubaker: Yeah, I just wanted to say I sent in a correction so I assumed that ---

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, yes absolutely. We’ll get to that in a moment but yes, we have that. Okay? We have a – Earl made the motion. We have a second. Okay. Now, discussion of the minutes. Anyone have any additions, subtractions, corrections? I got Jana’s correction. For your information on page 2, there’s a paragraph that’s attributed to Zdenek Hurych and that is actually attributed to Jana Brubaker and we will make that correction. Jana pointed that out to us. There were also a couple of minor typos that have been called to my attention. Does anyone have anything else; anything major? Any comments? Okay. Call the motion. All of favor of approving the moments say aye. Opposed? Okay, the minutes are approved.

Hanson made the motion; Henry made the second. The minutes were approved as corrected.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have just a few items I wanted to let you know. First of all, that the letter that we approved at the last meeting was prepared and it was sent to the Governor and the legislators as we had decided here in the Senate meeting. A copy was also given to President Peters to use as he saw fit. He sent a note expressing his thanks to the Senate for their support so that has been taken care of and the President appreciates our support.

Next, the issue that we’ve been talking about or I’ve been asking people to poll their departments about is the question of whether we should be reconsidering whether to add +/- or some variation of +/- scoring to the grading system. In order words, revise the grading system to include something other than just a straight A,B,C,D,F. There’s an interesting vote. The votes that I’ve gotten so far are two departments strongly in favor, three departments opposed and four departments that have a split vote, at least one of those departments leaning towards the idea of reconsideration. The Executive Committee discussed this the other day and I think you’re also aware that there was an article in the Northern Star today in which students expressed their – or the opinion of students were expressed and it seems like the Star was saying there was about 60% opposed and 40% in favor. Do I have that right? Anyone who saw it. Okay. I think it was 60% opposed and 40% in favor. So there doesn’t seem to be strong student support for it and there seems to be decidedly split support among the different departments. Given that, the Executive Committee voted to table it, to not take it up for consideration at this time. However, I think given that a couple of departments just weighed in as of early this afternoon, that maybe it would be useful for us to take a straw vote to see if the Senate wants to send this to committee. So if the straw vote is not supportive of that, we’ll table it. That doesn’t mean we can’t bring it up at some future time. If the vote is in favor of it then we’ll have to discuss which committee this should go to and let the committee collect the information. So all in favor of sending this issue of +/- scoring to one of our committees which would more than likely be Academic Affairs – so Charles, I know what you’re going to vote – all in favor of sending it to committee raise your hand. We need a count. Keep them up; we have to count. Okay. All right. Hands down. All opposed? Show of hands. Get them up high if you really want to oppose this. 18 – 16 in favor of sending it to a committee. Okay. Ferald, do we need to make a formal motion? We do, okay. I need a formal motion to send this to committee. If no one makes a motion – one of the people with your hands up should make a motion. Okay. Charles?

C. Cappell: I move we send this to the Academic Affairs Committee for further consideration.

A. Rosenbaum: You are a gentleman and a scholar Charles. We have a motion that we send the question of +/- grading to the Academic Affairs, Charles’s committee. I need a second. George? Okay, we have a lot of seconds. Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Hey, come on, who’s opposed? Show of hands. All in favor, hands up. I know it seems redundant but I know Ferald will get all over us if we don’t do this by the book. Charles, you’re now in favor of it? You have a future in politics. Exactly. Illinois needs you. You got it? 20. Those opposed, hands? 13? 18. 20 to 18. Abstentions? Hands up for abstentions. 2. This pretty much reflects the flavor of the vote because clearly we are evenly divided on this so Charles, I guess – if I might just add a couple of points – there are as many people that are suggesting that the system be +/- as are suggesting A/B, C/D, D/F and there are some people that
have suggested some kind of a numerical system where you just rate everyone in the class or order them so you have class ranks for every person. So there may be a number of different systems. There were also some suggestions from departments that we inquire as to what most other universities do so that we get some kind of a sense that +/-, ABCD, whatever it is, is what’s most commonly done or at least get a sense of what the balance is on that. Okay? We have the motion. Any other comments on this? We voted already, didn’t we? Okay. No more comments; we voted. Go ahead.

G. Bennardo: Bennardo, Anthropology. I have the vote for Anthropology if you’re interested to be added to your list. The votes from Anthropology about this issue, they’re like 45% pro and 5% against. The other one didn’t vote.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, all right, you know again, this is similar from what we’re getting from other departments. There’s just really a lot of mixed feelings about this and so we’ll follow the will of the Senate and send it to Academic Affairs and see what comes out of it. Okay. Next item. There is an item – there is an award which is called the Bob Lane Award. I don’t know how many people on the Senate, I know probably some of the ones who have been here for a while know of the Bob Lane Award. Bob Lane was a faculty member; I did not know him so if there are people who know him better they perhaps can correct any mistakes I’m about to make. But in our achieves 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”. God, can you imagine that? “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 bare further inquiry.” This strengthens our shared governance and is a worthy effort and the most recent Bob Lane Award winner was Joseph “Buck” Stephen and we awarded that in 2004-2005 and we have not had a nominee since. So, given that, we will entertain nominations for the Bob Lane Award. You can make the nominations in here or you can send them to us and we can vote on that if we have any nominations at the next meeting. So, any questions about the Bob Lane Award or anyone who knows Bob, knew Bob and wants to make a comment? People who knew him – if Linda Sons was still here we’d have a more definitive description of the Bob Lane Award. Okay, so if you have any suggestions, feel free to send them to us and we will put them up at the next meeting and we’ll have a vote. Okay. The last thing, and this is just a minor item, the President, the Provost and the Chief Financial Officer of this institution are at this moment in Springfield and so they are, I think, advocating for our FY11 budget and we will probably have some kind of a report when they return so that is ongoing. At the moment, there is no news regarding our budget for 2011 and no, I haven’t heard any rumors about any intended layoffs, furloughs or any of those nasty words that we all are concerned about and really don’t want to hear so I have no news on that front but we may have something by the time we have our next meeting. Okay.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

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

A. Rosenbaum: The next item that we have is this item for faculty consideration. You have a resolution. I’ll give you a little background. I’ve also asked Doug Bowman; Doug here? Yeah. Doug is back there. I’ve asked Doug Bowman to join us. You remember at the last Faculty Senate meeting, Ferald called our attention to the fact that the library was disposing of many of the holdings in the periodical collections; that this was apparently done without the knowledge of the library representatives. It was done without consulting the faculty. I spoke to Dean Dawson of the library. The Dean gave me assurances that this was not a big deal. 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 and there seemed to be a number of reasons for the outrage. We’ll let Doug in a moment, talk to you and perhaps answer some questions if you have them. He understands some of this better than I do. One of the things that faculty members have talked about is the fact that some of the departments, notably Mathematics but I suspect there are others, the way they do their work involves working with the journals sort of as a whole, so they see an article and then they use the articles that are on either side of it or in the same issue and so they get ideas and get articles from within the journal and not necessarily because they have a reference that they can then look up on JSTORE. Another concern that’s been raised is the idea that JSTORE may not be that reliable a system. That it is apparently, at this moment, very reliable but it is a private operation. 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 journals. Another issue is the fact that we paid for those journals and quite a substantial amount. The number of journals is very large contrary to the impression that Dean Dawson has given us. Doug, what was the number, 15,000? Fifteen thousand volumes have been removed from the library so this is not a small number of journals. 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 of interest is that the journals – many of them 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 and he may say some more recent information on this – there is at least some chance that we could get those journals back. We might have to pay shipping, we may have to go out and get them ourselves, but there’s at least some chance that those journals might be able to be returned to the library. Doug, do you have any more recent information on that?

D. Bowman: No, I don’t have any further information on returning of journals, just it’s conceivable somebody might given that – be able to return them given that the faculty were not informed about their removal.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I asked Gretchen Bisplinghoff to pass a motion for us 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 really 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 open floor, I’ve asked Gretchen to introduce the motion so Gretchen can you maybe say a little bit about this and then introduce the motion? Would that ---

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Certainly.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Thank you.

**G. Bisplinghoff:** Thank you Alan and thank you for your introduction. I think he’s covered quite a few of the areas of concern that have been expressed about this. I’m presenting a resolution for Faculty Senate action regarding this disposal of library materials including the, as he mentioned, 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. I thought this would be useful for you to have and also, as was mentioned a minute ago, Doug Bowman presented – gave me a timeline which I have put which is on the back. The timeline of the events so you can see the unfolding of the way in which this happened last summer and into the fall and it is ongoing in terms of the weeding out of materials, monographs, etc., so this is an ongoing issue and I think as we get into discussion, we can certainly have Doug Bowman talk about some of these issues as well as the timeline. I tried to boil down the various issues that were expressed in the resolution and I tried to be succinct. You can read the various concerns that Faculty Senate expressed here that were appalled by the disposal of the original research materials without consultation with the faculty or the library representatives to the departments and this action runs counter to the spirit of shared governance. As well I talk about the waste and things that Alan just mentioned. So, the resolution then is:

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

2. The library is asked to recover the donated periodicals wherever possible (and we do know where these went in many cases due to Doug’s work) wherever 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. (There is a link right now on the library website and all that says is these are the materials that have been removed to JSTORE. That’s all it says and there’s a listing there. It gives you no other information about, you know, what happened to those journals).

4. In the spirit of shared governance, any future actions which affect the library holdings should be preceded by consultation with the Library 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. (We felt that if the Faculty Senate was notified through Alan, through the Senate President, then we could get the word out to the faculty and, of course, the Library Advisory Committee members should be consulted and this has been done in the past, certainly in our department. If they were cutting down on journals and wanted to know which ones we really wanted to keep,
we were there to consult). According to the Libraries Advisory Committee website, “Actions which involve a substantive change in policy are subject to University Council approval.” That’s the resolution.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so you’re moving the resolution?

**G. Bislinghoff:** Yes. I’m moving the resolution.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Earl, okay and we have discussion. Jana?

**J. Brubaker:** Jana Brubaker, Founders Library. 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 JSTORE 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.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. By the way, when I mentioned that I was saying that is what faculty members have said so I think one of the things that might be good, you had spoken about how mathematicians use these journals and I think that was what I was trying to capture and perhaps you can address why this is or is not an adequate response to them.

**D. Bowman:** Thank you. First of all, I’d like to just respond to just a couple of things in this timeline that are here. This is an old version of the timeline and not a new one and I don’t know – I gave a new version I believe to Gretchen but somehow it didn’t get in or maybe there was – I’m not sure what happened there, but there’s some changes that should be made on here. First of all, in the time line the first date says Spring 2009 or earlier and then there’s a paragraph on the right under event and where it says “at Library Department Heads Meeting”, it should say Library Advisory Committee and/or Library Department Heads Meeting because I heard both from different sources. Also, there should have been quotations ending after “possible project” and around “not really discussed”. The date – then the next change is where it says “summer to fall 2009”. There actually are specific dates on that; it should be August 4-7. Then finally, on fall 2009 where it says landfill, that should be changed to recycling. So indeed, I was aware that was recycling and not – that should be on this and finally in terms of how mathematics uses the volumes, physical volumes as opposed to electronic ones, the representative for the Math Department to the Faculty Senate, Professor Blecksmith here, will address that.

**R. Blecksmith:** Hi, I’m Richard Blecksmith from Math Sciences. 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 – well, for one thing it’s just the enormous cost if you think about it. 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—a figure—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 in 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 kind of came in the middle of the night and took our journals away because nobody knew about it until it was a done deal. 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. As far as the way—this is what’s so upsetting—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 and we do consider that we have a resource mission in this department, that we’re not a community college or a four year college, that we want to use the library and I have in the past, many, many times gone and looked in journal articles. Nobody’s ever going to record that; you don’t take them out. There’s always—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. You of course discussed this whole idea about adjacency. Sometimes there are special issues of a journal; sometimes there’s proceedings that involve a single topic that you’d be interested in. Sometimes there’s sort of other things that I guess we wanted to say. There’s—faculty access differs. Not everybody has access to these things on their computers. There’s also kind of the prestige of the university. I don’t believe that Harvard or Berkley or Princeton or any university like that would—it’s unthinkable that they would get rid of their journals. As a matter of fact, you can kind of understand why AIM was so happy to get a hold of them in the first place. There’s one final thing and that is some of those journals had supplements in them. Mathematics of Computation was certainly one of them. The supplements, oh, you have the supplements? Okay, well then forget what I said but I guess the point I want to make is that mathematics goes back a very long time. Calculus goes back to Newton or to ??? in the 1600’s. You can really take it back to ??? if you want to and it doesn’t really go out of date like other disciplines. Once you prove a theorem, pretty much that theorem is true and it’s nice to have the original proofs. It kind of saddens me to think that the journal issue that the ??? proof of ??? last theorem that was in our library once and you could look at that issue, is gone. It seems like mathematics will stay around for hundreds and hundreds of years; I doubt of JSTORE will. Tell me that in a hundred years but we’ll see.

A. Rosenbaum: Any—yes? Say your name. Wait until I turn the mike on.
G. Nicolosi: Gina 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 consideration 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 oh, they had nothing better to do. I’m thinking that there was a cost associated with keeping these redundant journals, so that’s my comment. Redundant, yes because we haven’t lost any information. It’s all entirely accessible online.

A. Rosenbaum: Kerry?

K. Freedman: Is the mike on? Okay. 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 JSTORE 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 electronic digital – from digital copies that you from a hard copy that you would need in a history course. I’m sure there’s 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. Rosenbaum: Okay, Abhijit?

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, not whether some article can be ?? or not. 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.

A. Rosenbaum: John and then David and then Jeff.

J. Novak: NOT ON MIKE – that Computer Inc. is very expensive. In fact, I’m not even allowed to make copies for my students or anything. I’ve got to put everything on Blackboard and I just can’t imagine how much it’s going to cost to make new copies of all these articles and if the answer is just use the screen, well, you can’t sit your screen on your piano and read music from it. It just doesn’t work.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. David? You need a microphone David?

D. Valentiner: I have a mike.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah, but it wasn’t on.
D. Valentiner: David Valentiner from Psychology and 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Jeff?

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 but with regard to these questions about whether or not this was being done on the basis of some cost benefit determination or analysis, I think that’s the type of information that we really do need to have and my initial response to this was well, moving towards e-journals, 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 simply disposing of all these journals and was it a cost benefit analysis that determines this? That’s what it would be interesting for me to know.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Jana, do you want to address that?

J. Brubaker: Well, um, Jana Brubaker, Founder’s Library. Not necessarily because, as I say, I wasn’t involved in the decision but I do recognize that we have finite space in the library. Space is worth something as well and we cannot keep everything. I’m not saying — I have my opinion — other people have their opinion about whether these materials should have been kept or not, but, you know, we aren’t an archive and we cannot store everything indefinitely forever and ever.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. I’ll get to you next Pat.

D. Zahay-Blatz: This is Debra Zhay-Blatz from Marketing. I know that these journals were disposed of and the space and being repurposed for student group study which concerns me because again, I think I agree with the resolution that we should have been involved as faculty. That bothers me. I was on the Library Advisory Committee 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, you know, 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 Stuart to 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. So I’m very, very sorry about ??? last theorem, even though I’m not a mathematician.

A. Rosenbaum: Let’s first address – you’re trying to amend this and you’d like to change holdings to read what?

D. Zahay-Blatz: Can we do make it “broader holdings and online databases” or – I think “holdings” mean physical ---

A. Rosenbaum: Holdings and ---

D. Zahay-Blatz: Or, you know, library materials. I think there should be – it just seems like it’s very closed right now. We don’t get – all of a sudden we’re told we’re eliminating this; this happened to us last year, just like the Math Department. What do you mean you’re eliminating that? We might as well not teach our classes; we use it in all our classes so – is it “holdings” ---

A. Rosenbaum: Holdings and other materials?


A. Rosenbaum: Holdings and resources? Holdings, digital and paper. Will that do it? Holdings, digital, paper. Now, is this a friendly amendment? Are we accepting this amendment Gretchen or do we want to vote on it and then --- is it okay so we can accept this as a friendly amendment Ferald? Wait a second. Don’t make me use the hammer! Okay. So first, we need a second to the friendly amendment. Does anyone want to second the friendly amendment? Pat. Okay, so we have a second to the friendly amendment. We’re changing this from holdings to holdings (paper and digital?). Yes? No, what? Resources?

???: They’re not a holding but resources ---

A. Rosenbaum: You want us to say library resources? Is resources better than any of these other choices? Holdings and resources. Holdings and other resources. Gretchen? Are you accepting any of this?

G. Bisplinghoff: Yes, actually this came up at one other point when we were discussing language and I was checking this with folks and they said you need to broader journals to include other periodicals, anything that might be, as we’re saying here, anything that might be library materials such as, you know, any kinds of films or DVDs, databases, or anything so I think resources ---

A. Rosenbaum: So holdings and other resources would be okay?
G. Bisplinghoff: I agree.

A. Rosenbaum: So we have a friendly amendment; we have a second. Pat, we have a second. Okay. One thing I just want to add to sort of get at some of the things people are saying, 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 materials, things that departments use so this is not restricting, you know, the library could very easily say we want to clear out space for student use and then they come to the faculty and then the faculty decides is that the way we want to clear out space; are we okay with that. So it’s just asking for us to be able to say wait a minutes, don’t do this so quickly. Okay. Kerry? Oh, Pat, I’m sorry, I have her first.

P. Henry: Some things are redundant and we do agree that they need the space more. Other possible ways could be found to use some of these materials like for students or other things so that rather – sometimes that might be too complicated – but in some cases, I think we could – the faculty could suggest uses that would be helpful to the library as well.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Kerry?

K. Freedman: I was just going to say that that’s, 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 ourselves. We certainly would have done that in the School of Art.

A. Rosenbaum: And Math also. First David, then Doug. David?

D. Valentiner: I just want to reiterate my question as to which of these issues are 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?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, if I’m not mistaken our choice is to either table this, or vote on it, or amend it but we would have – before we could ---

D. Valentiner: I’m asking a question. Depending on the answer, I may make an amendment and 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?

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Doug?

D. Bowman: Thank you. I do want to speak to that also. In terms of getting materials back, having a resolution that we want to get them back will aid in doing that. If we can go to another
library or place where these were donated and say hey, the faculty has spoken together and say we would like to be able to get these back then we have something to stand on in terms of getting them back and 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. So that was the first thing and the second thing was about the previous question about why this was done at the library. 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 here is from an anonymous source at the library who is not either the Dean or librarians but this is what this person said and I’m quoting – I guess the Dean is very enthusiastic about getting more things to be electronic and away from the paper copies and this ties into a project about re-labeling and reorganizing the periodicals. Someone didn’t want to wait on this so the easiest way to lessen the cost of the reorganization was to get rid of periodicals. It has nothing to do with space. We have plenty of space for remaining 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 what I heard consistently from everybody I talked to.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Milli?

M. Kostic: Milvje Kostic from Mechanical Engineering.

TAPE TURNED OVER HERE

---paper is compromising ??? because of the font sizes and I know, I had many digital copies where graphics is pretty much unusable or in a very poor quality. And then the other question is recycling. I understand if you give it to some institution or whomever, before recycling ??? it should be offered for whoever is interested to take it, either scholars or even general public. So there are many missteps here and it comes down to the really shared governance. Shared governance is a very critical and important thing. I said it some meetings ago, that should include shared governance, not only in education and teaching but in budgeting. Money talks. Money works and our administrators are always justifying everything with basically, cost cuts benefits and that’s easy to be done and they actually become unconsciously, because they handle huge money with their own decisions, they think they know the best. That was in the Wall Street Journal’s whole article about ??? and Wall Street, you know, and we faculty, if our administrators here ??? cost share governance about promotions and peer review, why they shouldn’t be hearing the same sharing in approving budgets. So something they decide they can execute it without us basically approving it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

M. Kostic: Yeah.
A. Rosenbaum: Jana?

J. Brubaker: I have trouble with this mike. Jana Brubaker. I would be interested to know how many people have actually looked at JSTORE? 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.

A. Rosenbaum: What do you think is the way to go about this?

J. Brubaker: I would like to see it go to a committee or committees.

A. Rosenbaum: George?

G. Slotsve: I was just going to comment – George Slotsve, Economics – I was just going to comment on the JSTORE. 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 JSTORE either so there’s a lot of issues just using JSTORE 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Jeff?

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 reproduce through JSTORE 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 so we are – I’ll leave it there.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Carol, you have a comment?

C. Thompson: Um, I love libraries and I love books and I love magazines and I certainly come from a community where in principle – I actually sit on my butt most of the time and do all my journals electronically. But there was a comment – there are several comments that I – we’ve been discussing a lot where it’s sort of the complaints and part of it, I agree very much with Jeff Kowalski’s notation that yes, we have these print journals and in the future, because of costs and various things, we know they’ll be going more to e-journals and that’s just the way the world will work and it will fine – that’s fine but on the other hand there was another comment which I disagree with strongly or perhaps this is the difference what many of the faculty have been
saying in the library, there was a comment that the library is not an archive and 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; they want if it’s ??? surfaced
or whatever and so I – a lot of the comments that I think have come out have actually kind of fall
in that divide. I think many of the faculty is that the library, we feel, that it is an archive whether
we’re doing the research where we need to look at the archival materials or not, we are glad and
we know that there are other researchers and scholars who need that kind of access. So I don’t
want to add more comments on whether it’s good or bad, it’s just that I personally think that the
arguments revolve around it, that we believe that it should have been an archive and so that’s
why the print journals that we have shouldn’t have gone away. The other aspect is sort of the
resolution and so I just one – ask question, in part 4, was that supposed to be some kind of
change in a bylaw or something? Is that why it discusses that actions which involve a substantial
change in policy are subject to University Council approval or is that 4th just simply a comment.

A. Rosenbaum: No, it’s not a bylaw.

C. Thompson: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: I think one thing, I don’t know if we need to sort of go any further with some
of this because I think what’s clear is that it’s clearly much more important to certain
departments and to certain disciplines than it is to others so some disciplines can do perfectly
well with JSTORE electronic copies. 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. So, Jana?

J. Brubaker: I’ll just make one more comment and then I’ll shut-up. JSTORE, yes it is behind
and that’s why we kept the newer journals. We lost no content whatsoever and if the JSTORE
journals are limited, we didn’t get rid of anything that wasn’t on JSTORE. So we have no fewer
journals now; some of them are in a different format, so ---

A. Rosenbaum: Didn’t we get rid of the PAIS database or whatever that was? What was that,
Doug, what’s called PAIS?

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, this kind of stuff. 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 and that – where did they go?

A. Rosenbaum: And if I’m not mistaken, I think you mentioned that we have a – 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: And that we were one of the universities that actually had a set of that; it’s not very common.

D. Bowman: I’m not sure how common it is.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Jana?

J. Brubaker: I said I’d shut-up. I don’t know about that and it had nothing to do with the JSTORE thing, not that it’s not relevant.

A. Rosenbaum: It is relevant only to the idea that it’s clear that it’s not just items that don’t represent the loss of content that are being dealt with. You know, again, 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 some loss of some other resource that somebody on the faculty has a great need for. So, if there are any other comments about this? David? Are you waiting for a mike?

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. I’m not sure if this is the solution to address the problem of shared governance and I think that should be something that should be considered more thoroughly. This is not the forum. This is an inefficient use of our time for trying to vet these issues. 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. 1 I have no problem with; I want to support.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. 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 amendment, an amended resolution. So, is there any other wording change to this amendment that we have before us; this resolution that we have before us that someone wants to suggest? What? Okay. Why don’t we take a vote since we have – the resolution has been made and seconded. We’ll take a vote. If it is voted down, then we will entertain additional motions including the motion to send it to committee. So that’s our vote – 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. Okay? All in favor say aye. All opposed? Let’s have a show of hands even though it’s fairly – this is the ayes, those in favor, hands up – these are the ones in favor. Hands high, we can’t see them all. We’re getting a count. What? We can do it. You done? Opposed? Okay. The motion carries and, just so people are aware, the intention was to carry this motion to
the Provost and so Doug and I and other interested parties who would like to attend that meeting, we will take this resolution from the Senate 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. Okay.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: We have nothing on the Consent Agenda. Oh, by the way, thank you for doing that and Doug, thank you so much for all the work that you did and looking into this. Okay.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a report from Earl Hansen from the FAC to the IBHE. This I think was in your folder; it is not a walk-in. It is fairly long because I think it includes some things that Earl wanted the faculty to be aware of. Earl?

E. Hansen: I felt you needed something to pass your time away in the afternoon. I gave you some reading. There is no quiz on it as usual. There are a number of points here and walking you through this, of course if I can find it buried in all this paper here. A point of interest to begin with on the first page is that in the opening statement there 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. That was a real topic of conversation at breakfast on that Friday morning at Edwardsville and I did get a text on that at about 5:30 in the morning or something like that as I suppose the rest of you did too. It’s interesting the compassion that exists among institutions when there are trials and tribulations at another institution. They really do care and they do step forward as individuals and as institutions.

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. In the past we’ve gone to these meetings and we’ve sat in the peanut gallery so to speak and watched the happenings go on and with the situation that we are all confronted with, every institution in the state, we feel that it’s vitally important that the IBHE knows how you and I and any other faculty member and administrator feel about this and what your opinions are and 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 particular meeting. I do plan on going to it.

I’m going to skip through some other things here. The University of Illinois at Champaign is dealing with the implications of the budget situation on March 4 and March 8 so they’re doing that as we speak here. Some of the material that you received was material that I and the others received down there and that’s just for your reading, to look at it and maybe keep you informed. I don’t think that – I think these meetings sometimes get a little carried away with what we did. One of the comments that I heard at lunch today was what’s going on; they didn’t know it was
the HB4706 – but the note I got – that’s the – that’s what I left on, I’m going to bring it up but I left it on Alan’s table up here. The bill is the proposal to remove the benefits of employees of state universities of having their children or others receive discounts and as of the 25th of February, that had not taken place. That bill is still sitting there and it looks like it’s going to die because it in essence, it’s been pointed out many times that the benefits probably outweigh the negativism of doing this because a lot of students that go to school here, that their parents and family work here – Eastern or other place – might have gone to school out of state. That’s – it’s a fact in the case of one of mine anyway.

The other questions that came up were picking the representatives Faculty Advisory Committee from the community colleges and they have their own issues that are similar yet different from ours.

That pretty much sums it up. You can read it and there are some points on there if you want to link in to it and get further information.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, thank you Earl. Any comments or questions for Earl? Did you have a question back there? No, okay. George?

**G. Slotsve:** Just one quick question, it may be just the wording but, the second paragraph it was mentioned that the state down to an ugly list of options and then you talk about Guidance for Handling Tenure Denial. Linking them in the same paragraph, are you saying that budget problems are going to lead to more tenure denial.

**E. Hansen:** --- were you talking about so I can?

**G. Slotsve:** ?? not on mike.

**E. Hansen:** Okay, he’s talking about the second paragraph on the first page. It was mentioned that the state was down on an ugly list of options due to budget problems. An article in the Chronicle meant the Chronicle of Higher Education that they were referring to and just looking at the state as a whole. I think we all know we’re in the bottom end of the list, or maybe the top of the list, depending on how you want to look at the list in regards to economic problems.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay? Any other questions? Okay.

**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**
A. Rosenbaum: The next report we have is on the Board of Trustees Meeting and Ferald Bryan has that report for us.

F. Bryan: Yes, thank you Alan. I covered the meeting at your request and this was 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 except I will highlight a few things.

First, as usual, it’s always interesting to know how long they spend in Executive Session. I don’t think they set a record but they came close; two hours and forty minutes. You see that there were a total of 30 action items but only about 11 are listed that they actually voted on individually and discussed. I think they’re getting a little bit more efficient with consent agenda and I can assure you, if you will look through the report, most of those were routine. The most controversial and the big budget items are all listed here. We’d already seen the College of Law Academic Excellence fee. There was a lot of discussion about that because as you know, several people on the Board are lawyers and they were very impressed that our fees compare very favorably with other law schools around the state. The contracts and 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 is 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. I had not heard that before so that we may not find out until the summer. The fee increases we’ve already read about, although I think the *Star* also noted that while the aggregate was below 3% which is what the President insisted, Athletics and the bus fees were well above that. Again, the student residence hall fees went up 7.5%. 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.

The other information you can see there but it was still – the meeting adjourned more quickly than I assumed given how long the Executive Session was but I’d be happy to answer any questions about any of these items or more detail if you want them but that concludes my report.

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 I – 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Any other questions for Ferald? No, okay.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: Next reports from standing committees. There are no reports from Academic Affairs, right Charles? Okay. No report from Economic Status of the Profession. Although it says no report from Resource, Space and Budget I think Mike Morris would like to make a comment about the Resource, Space and Budget. 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 so I’ll let Mike sort of make his comments on the committee.

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 committee there certainly is a need – 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 to show this in the budgetary process?” One idea that was presented is the idea 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. So just to give one example, one member of that committee mentioned that perhaps Visual and Performing Arts may have fewer students than some other colleges but Visual and Performing Arts needs pianos and violins and other resources that are going to be quite expensive and that needs to be taken into consideration in the creation of a budget. That’s just one example that I remember from the meeting itself. There was also a concern raised about the amount of revenue that is directed to the Finance and Facilities Student Affairs side of the university versus revenue that’s directed toward the academic side and, in particular, 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. Any comments or questions? Barbara, you were there. You have questions?

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. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. Any other questions or statements?

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 – no report
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: Okay, the next item, I will turn the mike over to David Wade who is chair of Elections and Legislative Oversight. Well, I have to give him a mike first.

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 yearly position. The list of faculty eligible to serve in this position appears on the last page of your packet. There is – this is an ongoing role. Alan is on the list of faculty eligible to serve and he is eligible to serve another
term as well. So opening the floor for nominations. You want a motion to that effect? Hearing none, 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. Okay.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: We have no unfinished business. We have no new business. Any comments or questions from the floor?

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Rosenbaum: The information items listed here, I want to tell you what those are. 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. Where would they find those? They should be on the Faculty Senate website. If you want to read any of those minutes and you don’t find them, please let us know and we’ll track them down for you.

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. Dr. Baker. Dr. Hansen, okay. All in favor? Thank you very much. Have a good break. We’ll see you at the end of March.

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.