FACULTY SENATE MEETING TRANSCRIPT  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2010, 3:00P.M. 
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM 


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present. 


I. CALL TO ORDER 

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. 

A. Rosenbaum: Let’s come to order and start our meeting. It is very warm in here. I don’t know how long we are going to last, and we have a number of pretty, possibly lengthy orders of business to take care of. So depending on how chatty people are we may be here a while. So let’s get going. The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. And we have only one walk-in item is the report that you should have gotten by e-mail from Academic Affairs and that refers to the Student Code of Conduct issue that. You don’t have a paper copy in your agendas, but you should have gotten it in your e-mail. I hope everyone did. If anyone didn’t get it and we will try to figure out what is going on later on. 

So with the addition of the walk-in from Academic Affairs, I will take motion for adoption of the agenda. 

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA 

The motion to accept the agenda was made by Carol Thompson and was seconded by Jeff Kowalski. 

A. Rosenbaum: We had a little problem with the recording system at the University Council Meeting. Apparently, the usual equipment failed, and we went to a backup system. I think we are still using the back-up, is that correct? We are. The problem with the backup is that it is very difficult to transcribe. So our usual transcriber was not able to do it and Robin had to do it and it was not easy for her to hear it even on our equipment. What that means is it is going to be a little difficult. Make sure you speak clearly. Make sure everyone has a microphone and say
your name when you start. It will make it a little easier for Robin to transcribe. It looks like she is going to have to do it again.

Okay. We have a motion, do we have a second to adopt the motion. Okay, Jeff. Any discussion?

Okay, all in favor for the adoption of the agenda say aye. Opposed? The agenda is adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 MEETING
(sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next, the approval of the minutes from the March 3rd meeting. I am trying to make them as long as possible so no one reads them. So how did I do? Did I succeed? Does anyone have any corrections? Suggestions? Comments? Omissions? Misspellings? I know they are in there.

J. Kowalski: they are rather long, but I thought that something might expedite this and would insure the integrity of the minutes would be that if everybody scans to see if what they said at the meeting seems accurate to them.

A. Rosenbaum: Another thing I would like to bring to your attention is we started putting a disclaimer on top of the minutes. This has been the practice of abridging the minutes and selecting out and summarizing and correcting has been going on for as long as I know it, but it occurred to me that it might not be clear to people that these are not verbatim minutes of the meeting. These are a transcript that I take and sort of correct and take out some of the language that shouldn’t be in there and make people seem at least somewhat grammatically knowledgeable. And, it is not everyone that has it, but all of us. If you actually do a transcript of what you say you would be horrified as I am every week when I look at the minutes. At any rate, I want you to be aware that there are two sets of minutes, 1) a full transcript of the meeting is available, but these minutes that we approve of at each meeting are abridged and excerpted. You see this is what I have to correct when I do the minutes. Okay? So that is just for your information.

Any other comments on the minute? We need a motion to adopt the minutes. Second? We have a second. All in favor of adopting the minutes, say aye. Opposed? Okay, we have minutes. The motion to approve the minutes was made by Pat Henry and was seconded by Abhijit Gupta.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The first item today, we are going to hear from Clark Neher who is retired faculty and who is working with Nancy Castle on the True North Faculty and Staff Initiative, and they have asked for a little time to talk to us. I think you all have received an e-mail from them. Clark will explain what they are asking us to do, so I will turn this over to Clark. If you can grab a microphone. Thank you.

A. Clark Neher, Ph.D. – Faculty and Staff campaign
Good afternoon. I am Clark Neher, former member of the Department of Political Science here at NIU and now co-chair of a faculty committee, a committee on faculty and staff development, True North. True North is a part of the NIU Foundation and True North is a campaign, the first in a comprehensive campaign that Northern has had to bring in money for faculty projects and now student projects and I will chat with you in just a second about that. I will be very short.

True North has reached its goal of $150,000,000. That is a remarkable achievement. And it is going to use that money for faculty projects for endowed chairs, for student scholarships, for all sort of things. And one might think that because they have reached the goal that this is the ending of the campaign, but that is not the case. In this last year, they want to emphasize student scholarships and faculty and staff involvement; in particular, they would be interested in the faculty and I would be interested in the faculty contributing to this fund for True North. It is not important how much one donates. The big issue is that we have a very small percentage of faculty and staff who have contributed and they want those percentages higher. That means that you could give $10.00 a month which would be $120 a year or $5.00 a month or you could give much more than that if you are able.

I think everybody at True North realizes that there could not be worse time to ask for money from people who are in trouble regarding that. The recession is in full swing as you well know. There have not been salary increments of any amount for a very long period of time. The cost of everything has risen. I just looked at President Peter’s memo to the faculty that seems incredibly bleak to me.

But there is a corresponding problem that many, many students who want to come to NIU can’t afford to come without some scholarship. NIU is significantly more expensive than before as you well know and part, not part, virtually all of the money that the faculty and staff contribute to True North will go to student scholarships unless you designate your money for a particular area, and that of course is possible to. If you go on the website which is alittlekindness.niu.edu there will be full details. As members of the Senate I would like to ask of you to talk to your chair of the department that you represent, talk to colleagues, and tell them that the amount of money, of course important in one way, but really the Foundation and the University is looking for as full participation as possible. Thank you very much for all you do for NIU, and if there are any question I can respond.

C. Thompson: Last year our dean asked if we could give money, and I did. Is this the same campaign?

C. Neher: If you gave money between July 1 2009 and Jul 1, 2010, that is the fiscal year and it counts just the same as if you gave it now. I think there have been various memos and things that have gone out. If you do not designate it will go strictly to scholarships and not one penny will be used for any administrative costs. Thank you very much.

B. President’s e-mail memo

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, Carl. Carl is talking about the memo to the university from the president. This is a good lead in to the next topic. I spoke to the president just before coming
over here and I thought there might be some questions about the meanings of his memo, e-mail. And so he did give me some information and I can tell you what I do know and answer some questions if you have them. First thing, the gross figure. The reason I think the president is coming forward with that in an e-mail is because he is releasing those figures publically and there is concern that these would be picked up and that people would be aware of them and not have the word of the president and that there is something going on behind closed doors that we are not aware of. Those numbers were requested by the legislature. They wanted to know what would be the impact on the university and the community of the budget cuts that are anticipated. Now the president spoke to myself and also Jay and Bobby who represent the Operating Staff Council and SPS Council and this was a couple of weeks ago. At that time he described three scenarios. He described what he called the worst case scenarios. Then he talked about what he thought was the probably scenario and then he talked about the best case scenarios. It appears that the best case scenario is unlikely at this point. The probably scenario seems to be getting less probable and we are inching a little bit toward the worst case scenario.

What was presented in that e-mail today can be characterized as the worst case scenario. That would mean layoffs of about 254 faculty and staff. Faculty and staff I think means anybody working at Northern. That would be including everybody. He has said that there are no current plans to layoff anybody. So there is not, as some of the rumors have suggested, a set of pink sheets that are being drawn up. There is not a battle plan of who they will get rid of, they will not, and how many faculty, and trying to break tenure and things like that.

So, he assures me that there are no plans for layoffs at the moment. What he has asked the deans and vice presidents to do is begin to close budget gaps, about 3% from the operating expenses. My understanding is that the provost along with the deans and department heads would have some leeway in how to create those cuts. He also said that a fair number of the cuts would be made through attrition in other words failure to replace open positions, and so, he may not mean the firing of 254-56 current employees. It more likely means that in addition to current unfilled would remain unfilled, that retirements as they occur would not be replaced. Now, this would certainly be preferable to laying off people, but as you can imagine, it does put additional pressures on faculty, teaching loads and number of students. So there is going to be most likely some of that going on. I don’t know what is going to happen because this will be from the president and deans. The expectation is that they will look for faculty input in this problem and if it reaches the point where we are losing tenured faculty, we would certainly make our voice hears.

But again, the president was not talking in those terms; he asked me to assure the faculty that he is working hard on this. It is a number one priority that it is too much…(?). That was all we had time for. Does anyone have any questions?

**B.Jaffee:** It just occurred to me that attrition sounds all well and good, no one is actively concerned about losing their job. In truth, it’s a grander mechanism. It would affect departments in ways that are really arbitrary. Attrition does not sound as comforting.

**A.Rosenbaum:** I don’t know that any of this sounds comforting. My understanding is that it is a choice between a rock and a hard place, so none of this is good. You have read his memos,
heard this rhetoric before. We are facing major budget cuts. The legislature is not paying us the money. The university has a problem. We are probably ahead of the curve in the sense that other universities have been affected earlier and more severely. Whatever management strategy was used here, it seems to have protected us to this point. But it is going to get ugly. I think a loss through attrition is better than fresh blood being spilled. And so, the only thing we can do is play it by ear. We don’t have a reality right now. We don’t have a budget, we don’t have a statement that anything is being done. I think we have to wait and see what happens and act accordingly. This body can certainly speak for the faculty. We will at the point that we have something substantive to work with, we will process as we always do and we will speak our piece. I agree with you. We don’t want to lose any jobs; we don’t want to have increased teaching loads; we don’t want to have larger classes, but we also don’t want to get fired, losing tenure track faculty, even untenured track faculty. The maintaining our position has to be the number one priority. We will stay on top of it.

P.Henry: Just a quick question, the memo that I read said something about a lapse of 2%. What does that mean, how does that tie into the deans cutting their budget, do you know?

A.Rosenbaum: My understanding is that the lapse means putting aside money from this year’s budget rather than cutting into next year’s budget. And so deans and vice presidents were told earlier on and if I am not mistaken, they were told earlier on to protect more than that 2%. So that is less than they would probably spend. And this is not inconsistent with what the state does. Even if the state gives us our money there is nothing to prevent them from later in the year saying, “oh, by the way, you have to give us back some of that money,” and so the university always has to be aware of what we are going to do if that happens. So I think what they are doing is asking the chair or whoever that was directed at, where are we going to capture this money right now? And I think that will come out of unused travel funds that may suddenly disappear, perhaps unused commodities, whatever deduction to non-central expenditures, I don’t know. It’s really not pleasant. Again, what they are trying to do is save the money in ways that do involve loss of people.

Any other? Abhijit?

A.Gupta: Just curious, is that number based on average salary?

R.Rosenbaum: that is based, yes, an approximation of what it would take to get the amount of money we need. The president said he that might not be it; he is hopeful that it will, but it might not. So that is a dynamic. We cannot cut the 250 lowest paid people and think that this will make up the difference. So, in previous conversations with the president, I think that he has acknowledged that the cuts will have to come from a lot of different levels, including administrative levels. So I do not expect that we are looking at simply cutting the lowest paid people or people lowest on the totem pole, but cutting into the administrative as well. And I would expect that would be the case because every level should be considered and those are not direct teaching positions and they may be even more expendable. These are all approximations. What we are hearing today may be different two weeks from today or even two days from today. As the president says in his memo, we don’t even know if the legislation is going to accept these. This is based on the governor’s budget. The legislation can cut further. The legislature can cut
back on map grants which would put us even further behind. There are whole bunch of different
variable that are at play here. And so this is just guess work on the president’s part. This is what
he might have to do. The other thing to keep in mind, I think that part of the objective here is to
mobilize people. One of the things that I think is happening is that as they talk about what these
cuts entail, for example it was not accidental that the President mentioned the impact of
$11,200,000 on the DeKalb community. What he is saying is that you folks living in DeKalb
running Inboden’s or Fatty’s, $11,200,000 is going to come out of your pocket so even if you
don’t work at the university, you might want to go to your congressman and say, “we need the
university supported and one of the things that I have heard is that the public universities are
almost all in Republican districts. Republicans have been opposed to tax hikes and so maybe
mobilizing people in republican districts to talk to their congressmen will help as well, get them
more on board. It is clear that a tax hike is necessary. You cannot spend money indefinately. So
some of this is what is going to happen if you don’t do something about it. That doesn’t mean
it is actually going to happen, but mobilizing people… in each memo he mentioned in the e-mail
that we should be contacting our congressmen and screaming bloody murder not as
representatives of Northern Illinois University but as private citizens and the students should
also. They are going to be looking at tuition hikes, they are going to be looking at deductions.
We have got to get a movement going that people are screaming.

Along those lines a second item, this just come to my attention earlier today and I asked Robin to
look into it and she found only sketchy information. There is going to be a rally and some of you
may have heard about this already, there is going to be a rally day on April 21 called the Save Our
Schools Rally Day. Now form the look of it, I thought it was only K-12, and it seems to have a
K-12 emphasis, but I called them and they claim that this is higher education as well. But at any
rate there is this rally and we should be encouraging people, assuming that there are going to be
higher education as they said. They say they will. You can go to the website yourself. It is
Illinoiseducationassociation.org. It is SOS rally day. Yes, Rosemary?

R.Feurer: ASME is also organizing that day. (Higher ed is involved – paraphrased from my
notes, could not hear.)

A.Rosenbaum: That is what they said, they said they thought it did involve higher ed. I asked
them what universities would be represented and they said they would call me back and let me
know exactly. If you’ve heard that…Jay?

J.Montiero: I also heard that the Annuittants’ Association is planning a bus to go there.

A.Rosenbaum: In fact the website they actually talk about making buses available for groups
that want to send representatives down. So I encourage you to look at that. Robin found it fairly
quickly.

Okay. Any other questions about where the budget stands, what I heard from the president or
any of these other issues. We are obviously going to stay on top of this. This is probably going
to be a significant task. I will keep you posted as this goes on.
Okay, a couple of updates. One I want to update you on the Library Resolution that was passed at the last meeting. The Library Resolution was fortunately or unfortunately covered by the Northern Star. Many of you read the details the following day. This created an uproar at the library. I don’t think that people were that thrilled. What we did with this was I met with Provost Alden and I gave him the senate’s resolution. He said that he would look into it and investigate the situation. He has met with Dean Dawson and has also met with Dr. Bowman who was here at the last meeting and has done a lot of leg work for the mathematics department. His intention is to hand this over to the Library Advisory Committee and he is asking the Library Advisory Committee to develop a liaison process with the faculty. Whether they will take our resolution verbatim or whether they will prepare something else, I can’t tell you. There is a little bit of a delay in that he could not be present at the last Library Advisory Committee meeting because he was in Springfield. He intends to get the library committee together in the near future and get some action. As to the attempt to recover existing materials, he is concerned that he does not want to spend money for just one department; other departments may come forward subsequently and say what about our stuff? So he is a little reluctant to say let’s help math get their journals back when he expects to have art say what about ours? So any departments that feel that they have lost significant materials that want the Provost to try and get those materials back, please send him a memo and say you would appreciate any efforts made to get those journals returned to us.

I don’t know whether all of the journals are recoverable, only the math …know where they are. So I would guess that any departments who want their journals back, they would have to find out where those journals are. And then the Provost would have to consider the expense of getting those journals back. This would relate to the first part of this conversation would be we are trying to cut money from the budget, whether or not the provost would be able to find the substantial amount of money necessary to …Anyway, that is the status of our library resolution. Does anyone have any thoughts, questions…Pat?

**P.Henry:** Just one and that is bringing this up to the library, but it seems to me that each department has a member who deals with the library and can that mechanism be used in regards to this?

**A.Rosenbaum:** the hope is that the library advisory committee will come up with a plan that includes the library representatives. The hope would be that they would do that. If they don’t do something, if the proposal they make to us is not to our satisfaction, then we can certainly say that this is not what we are looking for and we can lobby for a stronger council.

**P.Henry:** I emailed you about this too. When I look at the library website in regards to collection development policy it does have a place where it says criteria for the selection is in the Library Administrative Hand Book, Policy 063 and actually that would be an interesting thing to have a look at. But then the other thing, it does say that storage decisions made at the broad level are made by specialists in consultation with the departments, and I can see that putting it on JStor is not getting rid of it but it is a change in storage for sure and that is the source of concern that faculty was not consulted about that.
A.Rosenbaum: Yes, I absolutely agree with you that we are on thick ice, asserting that we have not been consulted on this and I think that the policy that you located does address that. And my hope is that this will be brought to the Library Advisory Committee and I will make sure that Provost Alden is aware of these different issues. Hopefully, they will get resolved as we have asked them to resolve this. Everything is a process.

Yes, Jitka.

J.Hurych: I just wanted to say the provost is meeting with the Library Advisory Committee on Wednesday after Easter, the third week, and that should be an open meeting.

A.Rosenbaum: Do you know the time and the place for that meeting?

J. Hurych: It is at the library on the fourth floor and I don’t remember the time but, it was in the newsletter today, that’s how I know.

A.Rosenbaum: If people are interested in knowing when this meeting is, if you would let us know, we could send out an email to the senate and let you know when that meeting is and that would be a great place to voice some of these concerns and listen to a dialog and make sure that we are represented. Any other comments about this? Yes, I can’t see who you are back there.

R.Blecksmith: I just wanted to say that what happened with us is that Doug Bowman and I wrote a letter to the head of AIM and that is where most of them, just about 3,000 journal volumes went to. AIM is in San Francisco, California. That’s pretty far away from here. They paid $5,000 to get the journal volumes and they very graciously agreed to return them to us but they would like their $5,000 and we would have to go through the expense of getting it back. Now that is not just an enormous amount of money, when those math journals were shipped they should have been just sent to institutes of the State of Illinois. I think that has changed since then. I would think most of these things with other departments if they were shipped out within the state thee would not be expenses nearly as great as we have. So, I guess maybe that expense is multiply $2000 to $3000 for each department involved.

A.Rosenbaum: I think that is a good piece of information but it also would suggest that there is some work involved in finding out where these journals have gone. And so any departments that want any chance of this happening, I think would have to do some of this leg work and find out where theses journals are. I don’t think the library would do that. If you want to know how Doug found this out, maybe he would be willing to let you know. It seems like there is some work involved and also some expense and the university and the provost would have to decide if we want to spend that much. $5,000 reimbursement to them plus I assume the same amount of money to get the journals back, $10,000, I don’t know if they will do it.

Other comments, questions? Okay.

The next item, you may recall that we passed as resolution on the senate participation on the committee for lack of a better name is called the Wage Equity Committee. This grew out of the joint committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and Economic Status of the Profession
who are looking into whether or not raises are equitably distributed among the divisions and the administration and faculty. The president asked us to participate in this commission. We agreed to do that. He set a deadline for that participation of March 19, and that deadline has come and gone. We have not been asleep at the switch. The committee has been working very hard to get the data we need. I will turn this over and ask Rosemary Feurer to update you on the status of that committee. Rosemary is the chair of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and she has been spearheading this faculty senate representation. Rosemary, do you want to go ahead?

**R. Feurer:** Even though our resolution was in January, we started in the fall in an effort to get more transparency which I think is a tier of faculty rights and responsibilities. My particular committee that is one of the reasons I got involved to begin with. I have to say that I have been very frustrated as a member of this commission. I understand that the administration suggested that the working papers cannot be made available to us, that they are not available in electronic form. The other thing that they raise is the issue of legal liability on revealing data that is captured. We have gone through a lot of hoops. We have tried to jump through every hoop that they put before us. I am not suggesting that there is disingenuous behavior on the part of the administration, but after a certain point on March 19th came and went, I made a decision as chair of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities to pursue acquisition this data on my own and with the help of several other faculty members and Robin have been acquiring a data base. Now, does it make me slightly offended that this is not my job and that there is a department with many, many people who are paid to collect data and turn it over. That this data is public information and I am having to build a data base myself. It does. But, on the positive side, we will have a data base. I promise you we will have a data base that we can use. I have to say that, Alan, you can pick it up here, that President Peters now as of yesterday has agreed to turn over information, so maybe we will have two data bases, but we will have a data base.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Just to fill that in as Rosemary suggests, one of the stumbling blocks is that the committee requested a certain amount of data, certain pieces of data that we needed in order to address the question. There were a number of obstacles that we faced. We have met each of them. The latest one having been that we put through an IRB proposal and they approved it as an exempted research. Although we never thought of this as research, there was a concern raised that we would need IRB approval so we did that. We have IRB approval. We have signed confidentiality agreements and so Provost Alden and I on behalf of the committee wrote a letter to President Peters asking him to make available the information we had requested. That request was made four weeks ago. I received the response from President Peters yesterday afternoon. And so in that response, he has agreed pretty much to give us what we have asked for. There are one or two items he doesn’t want to give us but we are not terribly concerned about them. And so we are supposedly getting all the material we have asked for. Unfortunately, we have no idea how long it is going to take to get this because the data has to be compiled. It is not available in the form we have asked for. I know people are incredulous, but I have talked to a number of people from the university and the answer is always the same, that yes, this data does not exist in the form that we think it exists in. It has to be put together. And now since the university is facing all sorts of financial problems, I don’t know how long it is going to take to get this data for us. Rosemary has agreed to the fact that she and her committee have been working on getting the data themselves. We will more than likely bring that data to the committee and we will say, “okay, can we go forward with this?” Hopefully we will have something for you by the
last meeting. The only thing I can do is assure you that we are not dropping this issue. We are determined to get the answers to the questions. We are not getting this as quickly as we want. We are determined to answer the questions that the senate has put before this commission. I don’t know what else to say about that. We can answer questions. The committee is doing what it can and doing it as fast as it can. This is what the reality is. Any questions from the floor for either Rosemary or myself? Yes, Mili?

M.Kostic: Once you or we get the data what will we be able to do with the data? What is our objective? To compare salary increase of staff versus faculty? Do we know what we are after?

A.Rosenbaum: The plan is for us to do some sort of trend analyses from linear modeling to look at whether the trajectory of percentage increases are comparable across different divisions across the university. And so we will construe divisions in several different ways. One way will be to look at faculty verses administration, another way would be to look at the academic student affairs side verses the finance and facilities, FFO, finance and facilities operation side. There are several ways to do that. This is an initial question. The committee has reserved the right from the beginning to ask additional questions as we develop those when we see the data. But the initial question that we have been trying to get answered for the immediate senate, in other words this year before we start traipsing into the summer and next year, Is there equity in the way raises are distributed across the divisions. We have been firm on this. Rosemary?

R.Feurer: One of the questions that I ask regularly in the commission meetings is why, I’ve been asked this by faculty members often, why can’t you just give us an electronic form of the working papers. I just want to explain what the answer has been that it is a one-time request of ITS and that it is printed out. We asked that we have a one-time request made for us and that question has been debated and avoided. One of the commission members has put this on the table. One of the commission members, ex-officio said why don’t you go to the working papers and write it down. That prompted

A.Rosenbaum: the problem with this, I actually can tell you the truth and I don’t want you be stoned for this and I don’t want you to think I am stoned but, the, I believe the administration does not have this data in the form that we think they have it. It seems to be something that faculty, myself included are incredulous about. We cannot believe that they don’t have it and I have been convinced that they don’t. Maybe this is because of the way we keep records here or the fact that there are different so called silos that keep parts of the data set and they don’t communicate with each other in a way that would allow us to put the data together. It’s kind of like when you get a speeding ticket in Illinois and they don’t know about it in New York. They don’t talk to each other until now. I hope they do not figure that second one out. I believe that they do not have the data in the form that we want it and it takes a great deal of effort to get the data in the form that we want it. This is truly a job. There is no smoke blowing. Oka nay other questions about this?

B.Jaffee: Do we have some sense of a new schedule or deadline?

A.Rosenbaum: I can’t say yes to that. All I can say is our sincere hope is to have something to say by the end of the year. We are bound and determined to have something for you by that last
meeting. Whether we are going to succeed. They have missed so many deadlines already that I
don’t want to …we are certainly pushing. The faculty members on the committee are really
going in this. They really are working with this and will do this as quickly as we can. And
again, the other piece of this is we want to be fair to all parties. We don’t want to rush out with
something that may turn out to be inaccurate or ill-conceived. We need to get this right and we
will do that even if it takes us longer and at the last meeting we have to say see you in
September.

**D. Zahay-Blatz:** Can we just go into the working papers?

**R. Feurer:** The initial question has to do with the …our position is that faculty members often
have their duties expanded without any raises. The question that we are asking at least initially is
has there been an equitable salary increases and that is based on base salary.

**A. Rosenbaum:** there are a lot of different questions that could be asked.

**R. Feurer:** Iowa for instance has all of its salaries online with the DeMoin's Register. You know,
I guess the perspective is, the reason that the working papers cannot be made available to us is
because names are attached to it. But I can look into the working papers and see everyone’s
names. I understand where the University’s position is coming from, but I don’t think it has hurt
the position of the University of Iowa to have the salaries online. There is a certain element of
transparency and a certain understanding that you get. It informs us and helps us make a plan of
how to go forward together in hard times. To have the knowledge rather than the suspicions of
what others are making. The damage I believe has been done is unnecessary. People have
worked across the last eight or nine months to acquire that data for us I don’t think there would
be as much problem as there is now where the faculty had to acquire it on their own. I think it is
a real shame.

**A. Rosenbaum:** These points are all good points and I think what happens as we begin to get
this information… If we say this is different and they say this is because of this that and the
other thing. We will have to see what they say and if it holds water. This is going to be an on-
going process.

Okay we have an important item on the agenda. One last item I want to bring up. Last time I
asked if you had nominees for the Bob Lane Award. You remember this award is for somebody
who is keeping an eye on the administration. It used to be the Thorn in the Side Award and then
I forget what else. It was the Bottom of the Deck award, but that is not the most recent. Do we
have any nominees would anyone like to nominate anyone? Yes?

**P. Henry:** I nominate Rosemary Feurer.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we have a nomination. Do we have a second? Okay. Second. Do we
have any other nominations? The nominations are closed. All in favor of awarding the Bob
Lane Award to Rosemary Feurer signify by saying “Aye.” All opposed? Rosemary Feurer,
congratulations. You are this year’s recipient of the Bob Lane award. And this is the first time it
has been given our since 2004.
Nomination of Rosemary Feurer by Pat Henry, seconded by Cleraida Garcia.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE - Earl Hansen – report (pp 3-7)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, we have a report from Earl Hansen but he is not here to explain his report. You can read his report on pages 3-7. If you have any questions you can get in touch with Earl. Earl was not at this meeting; he essentially derived this report from the minutes of this meeting. I do not know that he would have any further explanation but maybe one of those questions FAC to IBHE, Earl would be the person. If you have questions and you don’t want to contact Earl, you can contact me and I will contact Earl and find out for you. 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 – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

C. Resources, Space and Budgets – Michael Morris, Chair – report

Next I would just like to go out of order slightly. Michael Morris has asked if he could go next. Mike, still here? Mike will give us the current report on Resource, Space and Budget. He has to leave so I am going out of order.

M. Morris: The Resources Space and Budgets subcommittee met with Eddie Williams and Ray Alden last week. I think it is fair to say that Barbara Jaffee and I found the meeting very disappointing. For each concern that faculty raised, the administration seemed to have a pat, prepared response which were just “the university is dealing with fixed expenses for which they had no other options, that these were made at the college level or administrators who were not present at the meeting were actually responsible for making decisions. At the end of the day the meeting felt like a maze where we hit dead ends. It also seemed that we were dealing with differences between external and internal budgets. As Barbara and I were talking before the meeting, I think that she and I agree that the external budget is one where faculty already received considerable information. But we have many more questions about the internal budgeting and how that is done. It seems that this internal budgeting process is the one that seems to be shrouded in mystery and which the administration does not seem to be in any great hurry to disperse the clouds that are surrounding it.
Research Space and Budget does have another meeting with Dr. Peters in two weeks a last ditch effort to salvage something. I am not sure how hopeful I am in that. Barbara and I would like to thank everyone who sent us their concerns for the committee. Some of the concerns were generalizable for larger context in that within the University where others seemed specific to individuals or small groups. But what we can say, I think in general it is clear that many faculty feel deprived of a voice in these issues and that the people who should be hearing faculty concerns are not doing so and don’t care (?)

A.Rosenbaum: Any other comments, questions for Mike? Okay. I feel that this is an important issue for us and we are going to continue to serve as a faculty voice in Resource Space and Budget issues; we have asked the president and provost to maintain those meetings with the committee as they are supposed to do. As there are problems with finances at the university we will do our best to give the faculty a voice in the decision and distribution of resources and allocation of funds. We will keep you posted. Faculty involvement in this is going to take some time to establish our right to do that. We will continue to work.

A. Academic Affairs - Charles Cappell, Chair – report – walk-in

Okay. The next item has come to us from Academic Affairs. Charles Cappell has brought forth and this is based on the walk-in item distributed by email earlier in the week. Charles.

C.Cappell: Thank you. I also want to thank the members of this committee who have been active in this – Professor Martin, Professor Collins, Professor Johnson-Hillary, Professor Nicolosi. We deliberated by email regarding the language in two separate initial drafts. We tried to remedy the situation. Option 1 (I can’t hear this) Option 2, the first draft that was circulated, Option 3 my notes say went a little beyond the initial cause. But reading through particularly the set of procedures that could be invoked to the appeal proceedings at the first level. It became clear that the ultimate authority (cannot hear). So option three is circulated as (cannot hear). In option one the verdict can be reversed. (cannot hear)

A.Rosenbaum: We need a motion in order to discuss. Do you want to move option 1, option 2 or option 3.

C.Cappell: Given the sense of the deliberations, I move that the senate to option 2.

A.Rosenbaum: We have a motion. Do we have a second? We have a motion. We have a second.

Charles Cappell made the motion to option 2. Barbara Jaffee seconded.

A.Rosenbaum: I would like to make a comment on this. My concern with option 2 and this is why I did not put this in, my concern with option 2 is that the faculty has not control over any penalty beyond an F to start off with. So if the faculty is asking for anyone to be dismissed by the university because of academic misconduct that is a decision of the board and not a faculty decision. They can appeal the penalty only to the college council. I don’t know that that makes
any sense. This is a judicial board decision. The whole idea of this, remember, the whole intention of this, remember, was that there was different language. It wasn’t that the language in the college catalog was not adequate language or that professors were having a problem with this. There were no complaints that professors were not being given fair opportunity to decide on penalties or anything like that. The whole problem was that there was different language in two different places. What we are really doing here is trying to clean up the language. What we are doing here in option one and part of option two is they are saying that the decision to appeal and that is unfair to the student as you might have a professor who is unreasonable, the student can appeal but once innocent or guilt is determined the penalty cannot be appealed. The penalty is not dictated by the college but by the judicial board. The judicial board can rule on the guilt or innocence as they do now. But if they are found guilty or admit guilt then the penalty will be as specified.

In addition to this is whether we want to make any part of this appealable. This last line – do we want to allow do we want to put a safeguard in there. (can’t hear).

T.Griffin: If I may. My name is Tim Griffin and I am the university ombudsman. (can’t hear).

From my notes, there was discussion and finally a motion to postpone made by David Wade and seconded by Pat Henry. All voted “aye” with the exception of Bob Schneider form Theatre and Dance.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Rosemary Feurer, Chair – no report

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, February 22, 2010

B. Letter of Acceptance of Nomination from Alan Rosenbaum (pp 8-9)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A.Rosenbaum: The next meeting is the last meeting.

Motion to adjourn – David Valentiner, seconded by Charles Cappell.
Meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.