I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we can come to order. Is this working? Yes, apparently it is. Before we start, I just want to remind the faculty senators that have been here before and also to inform the new faculty senators that whenever you speak for whatever reason, whether it's to make a motion, to discuss something, to second a motion, that we need you to use the microphones and when you speak, please say your name. The minutes of the meeting are recorded and that's what we use to create the minutes that we send around and we certainly know some of you but we don’t know all of you, especially the new people. It will take us awhile to get used to everyone so please when you speak, use the microphone. Thanks. I’ll remind you again because everyone forgets.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05pm.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. I would like to add the resolution from the walk-in item. You have three walk-in items there that were on your tables. So we have a resolution from the Faculty Senate from last year that will be added to the agenda under Unfinished Business. I’ll entertain a motion to accept the agenda. Professor Baker.

W. Baker: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Second? All in favor say aye. We have an agenda.

W. Baker made the motion to approve; J. Jeffrey made the second. The agenda was approved as amended.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 22, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (Pages 3-6)

A. Rosenbaum: First item is the approval of the minutes from the April 22 meeting. It is located on pages 3-6. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes? Professor Baker. You’re setting a record so far for making motions. Second? Any discussion of the minutes? Do we have any problems with them? Yes? Name. Your name.

C. Thompson: There are some names in the minutes that have question marks who weren’t identified. Who are they?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, I have noted those myself and I don’t know who they are. I’m assuming Donna will find those out for us? Is there any way? Okay, on voice recognition because apparently those people did not say their name into the microphone before speaking or nobody said their name or they didn’t say their name clearly so hence the importance of that part of this.

C. Thompson: Well these are winners of elections so presumably somebody knows.

A. Rosenbaum: Again, we’ll do our best to find that name out but thank you for pointing that out. Any other comments on the minutes? Yes.

B. Lusk: Under newly elected, it should be Ayhan Lash from Nursing and Health Studies, not Nursing and Health Sciences.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you. Yes?

P. Henry: Isn’t there usually a list of who attended the meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes there is usually a list. Do we not have that? This is from last year remember.

P. Henry: I understand that.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m trying to eliminate sloppy work in the Faculty Senate office. It’s going to take me a while to undo my predecessor’s mistakes. Not Donna’s by the way. If I offend Donna I’m finished, so I would never do that. So noted. Anyone have any other comments on the minutes? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. We have minutes.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the first thing I want to do is welcome you all to the Faculty Senate. We have a nice mix this year of new members and old members. We have a lot of new faces on the committees and, as I said, it’s going to take us awhile to get to know everybody so try to be
patient with us. I think the first thing I want to do is make some introductions. Most of you who have been here before, been on Senate before, know Donna Jarman who is the Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate and the University Council and Donna is the person who knows most about how this operation runs and she’s been trying to educate me and the unfortunate thing is Donna will be leaving us in December so we’re trying to suck the life out of her as best we can until she goes and have her take good notes and keep us posted on all the things that have to be done. She’s also going to help us recruit her successor and so that’s one of the orders of business for the fall term. Donna has done a great job here for ten years or more – ten years? Ten years and will be leaving and I will be a little crazy when she does so we’ll have to muddle through. Ferald Bryan has graciously agreed to continue on as parliamentarian and so he will keep us on track in terms of our following the rules of order in running these meetings.

For those of you who have not been on the Senate, just a few words about where the Senate originated or how the Senate originated and how it functions. People very often have concerns that the Senate is a body that doesn’t have a lot of power and to the extent that we can pass rules, we do not have a lot of power but we have a great deal of power in an informal way in the sense that we are advisory to the University Council and to the administration. So NIU follows a policy of shared governance which I know some among you have questioned whether that shared governance is truly shared but at any rate, we act as though we had full shared governance and the faculty contribution to that comes from the Senate. Originally, the University had only the University Council. The University Council of course is the body that does pass binding rules, can make changes to the Constitution and Bylaws which guide us and the University Council consists of representatives from all the different stake-holders in the University so not just the faculty but faculty administration, deans, vice-presidents, the supportive professional staff, operating staff council, so it is truly a more broadly representative body but the faculty represent the largest component of the University Council. Originally, the faculty members on the University Council began getting together prior to the University Council meetings to talk about what concerns they might have and what they might want to bring forward to the University Council. That group however, only consisted of people who were elected from each of the colleges and did not have representatives from each of the departments. That has since broadened into the Faculty Senate which does have representatives from every department in the University and also has a number of people here who are non-voting members and those include Tim Griffin who is our Ombudsman, Bobbie Cesarek who is President of the SPS Council and Jay Monteiro who is President of the Operating Staff Council and they’re sitting over here and they also fill us in on issues that are of import to the faculty that are going on in various areas in the University. One of the things that I had hoped is that we would really function the way a senate ought to function in that since each of you represents a department in this university, that you would be able to bring forward to us items that are of concern to the faculty in your areas and also to communicate back to your faculty the issues that we’re talking about here and items that the administration would like faculty to consider or to give some input on. So it is very important I think if we’re going to really function as a true senate, that people fulfill that role; that they take it seriously, that they attend our meetings, that they communicate back to the institutions, excuse me, their departments and that they try to actually bring forward items that are of concern to the faculty. We would then be able to discuss those to decide how broadly they are of concern to the faculty and to send resolutions forward to the University Council. If we don’t send items forward, if we don’t have our voice heard, then we can’t complain when the
administration doesn’t do what we would like them to do. So it is my hope that we will take this charge seriously, that people will attend the committees, that the committees will deliberate on the issues that are sent to the either from the Senate, from the administration or coming up to them from their respective departments and so hopefully we will be a strong voice for the faculty in this university and there are things that are in the wind so it’s not all going to be smooth sailing. Many of you have been paying attention to some of the budgetary problems that the state is having and I can give you a few updates that I have gotten from the administration. Some of these things you may have heard about and some of these things you may not be aware of.

First of all, you may have noticed that Kishwaukee Hall is no longer in existence. It was destroyed in one fell swoop I think a couple of week ends ago and quite effectively. I mean people didn’t even notice it was gone – people in the Art Department I’m sure noticed it was gone but others of us had to be told that by the way, take a look out the window, Kishwaukee Hall is not there.

A couple of items of interest. One, the budget of the University has now been reasonably approved; officially approved. There are at present no salary increases in our future although the President tells me he has not given up on the possibility so the President’s hope is that there might be a possibility that some money could come lose. This was originally in the budget. It was vetoed by the Governor so it was a line item veto I believe and if it had stayed in the budget, we would have seen a 1% across the board increase. That apparently is not going to happen but if, by some chance, money drops down to use, the President assures me that we may have a 1% increase by January so don’t give up hope.

Secondly, the University budget was balanced as many of you know by rolling back our allotment from the state to 2006 levels and then the difference was made up to bring us up to 2009 levels by using stimulus money from the federal government. This is a very dicey way of balancing the budget because the stimulus monies will go away leaving us with something of a 4.5 million dollar deficit. The hope is, whether it’s realistic or not, is that there will be some influx of money, whether that comes from increased taxes on the population or whether it comes from improved financial circumstances in the state, nobody’s able to say. However, the hope is that by the time that stimulus money goes away and we are ready for our next budget that this will not be a problem but as you all probably can guess, it may very well be.

The more immediate problem some of you may be aware is the monetary award program monies which are received by I think four or five thousand NIU students and enables them to pay for their education at NIU, those monies are available only in the fall semester and, at this point, in January those monies are not available and so a large number of our students will find themselves potentially without financial aide beginning in the spring semester. This is a significant problem. The administration is working very hard to have money restored. This not only represents money to our students but also represents monies to the University so this is money that contributes to our operating expenses. It is state-wide problem; it is not a NYU – NYU, it’s not an NIU problem, excuse me for that, and so it’s not clear how this will impact NIU. It is conceivable that since many of the students in the state come from the northern part of the state that they will be unable to afford to continue at Champaign/ Urbana or Southern or
Western or Eastern, so we might actually see an influx of students. We might see a larger number as students come, live at home and find that Northern is the closest university to them. So it’s unclear whether we will lose students or gain students or whether they will find the monies to restore the MAP awards and naturally that last one is the one that we hope will occur.

Another item that is affecting the budget is that we are obligated to provide educational benefits to veterans; the state is obligated. The state has now dumped that onto the universities as an unfunded mandate so we are now in the position of having to pick up tuition, room and board for a large number of veterans and I don’t want to be quoted on this but I’ve been told that that figure is something around a million and half if I remember correctly but again, don’t quote me on that – anyone.

Okay, so that’s essentially the budget situation. The President is hopeful that things will continue to move along but there are a number of these things going on that are of concern. So we’ll keep you posted on that.

Pension plan. At the moment there are no changes to the pension plan. The state has appointed what is called a pension modernization task force. I don’t know if we want to be modernized. I think that modernization will probably not leave us in a better situation than we are now. You have heard a lot about trying to pass along an additional 2% of the contribution to employees. That has not happened. There are questions as to whether that can even been done constitutionally and since we voted not to have a constitutional convention and they can’t change the constitution, we may be saved from that. The main concern is that going forward the benefits available to new hires will be effected and that is going to affect us in terms of the quality of faculty that we’re able to recruit so it could affect the quality of the University and so the faculty should be concerned about that as well. So, but those people who are in place, we are not seeing, at this moment, any changes in pension nor are there any changes in health benefits for active employees. So at this point, there is no pass-along charge on the indemnity plan or the Quality Care Plan I think it is called. Some people don’t think it’s such good quality but nevertheless, that’s its name and so those expenses have not been passed along as was feared and so for current employees there are no changes. You may have heard that annuitants are now being required to pick up a portion of their dental insurance. You should know that dental insurance and vision insurance are not considered part of the core health coverage for retirees. One piece of advice, this is said every year; I don’t know how many people listen to it but we also ask you to advise your departments that everybody should be a member of the Annuitants Association. Every time our benefits, retirement benefits, are threatened it is the strength of the Annuitants Association that helps us circumvent or stop whatever negative deeds they are trying to perpetrate on us. So the Annuitants Association is very important to us and this item that older employees and we all are aware of this, but it’s sometimes hard to impress on younger first year employees and younger faculty that should be joining the Annuitants Association as well. It’s not very expensive so we would ask that you let them know that. Yes? Microphone.

D. Blatz: This is Debra Blatz from Marketing. I actually followed up on this from the Faculty Senate last spring because I told my department and everybody wanted to be part of the Annuitants Association and I went over to HR and they couldn’t seem to find the right form so I wondering can we get the form somehow to pass on to our departments?
A. Rosenbaum: I would suggest ---

D. Blatz: Or how – what is the best way to do this because I thought going to HR would be the best way?

A. Rosenbaum: We can look into this. My guess would be that they should go to the SUAA website and there should be information there. But if we – we’ll look into this and if that’s not the way to do it, we’ll let you know.

D. Blatz: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Other questions about any of this? No? Yes? Microphone.

B. Jaffee: Yeah, I’m Barbara Jaffee from the School of Art. Just going back in your announcements you said no faculty raises? Is that no raises on campus or no faculty raises.

A. Rosenbaum: It is probably – that’s a difficult questions because there are certain contractual agreements that have reached between the University and some of its bargaining bodies so if there is a previous contractual obligation such as with the, what is it the CS – the civil service employees or with any of the other unions, then the University is bound to honor those so those will be followed. What I’m talking about is raises that are not covered by any of those contractual arrangements and so the faculty would certainly be in that group. Okay?

B. Jaffee: Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes?

D. Goldblum: Could you briefly describe how the benefits for new employees, new faculty have been affected or is that not determined yet?

A. Rosenbaum: They have not been effected tremendously as of yet. A couple of years ago they changed the money purchase portion so that is not available to new employees. I think that happened in 2006 or 2007 and so far as I know, that’s the only change. So new employees that began this year are not seeing anything other than that non-availability of the money purchase plan. What they’re talking about is going forward, that we’re probably going to see changes in the benefits in the future, but that’s just talk at this point. Nothing has been done. Any other questions? Okay.

The next item is one that we’ve heard about before and this has to do with the Higher Education Act Reauthorization. You may recall last semester that we learned about the fact that beginning in the Fall of 2010 semester faculty will be required to give their book orders for the semester in advance and what will happen is these orders will be given to the bookstore, the bookstore will have to post with the registration information once that becomes available to students. The course texts, the course material and the prices of each of those things, so students will be able to look and say this course will use this text. This text will cost $112 and I’ll also be required to
buy “x” amount of dollars worth of art equipment, lab equipment, whatever and so this is a federal mandate. This is not the University’s idea. From what we’ve been told, apparently the person that’s pushing this the hardest is Dick Durbin and so because Dick Durbin is our senator, we are apparently trying harder than other universities to try to comply with this requirement but again this is not ours. This is a national, excuse me, a federal act and I can tell you that what it says that universities will be required, and this is a quote from the regulation “to the maximum extent practicable disclose in their course schedules the ISBN number and price of all required text and supplemental materials.” “Lacking accurate information, the institution is permitted to indicate that this information is to be determined”. Now, the questions that come up most frequently are what’s the penalty if we don’t comply with this and what do we do about the fact that very often we don’t know what courses we’re teaching, especially with regards to the fall semester where we will have to make these book orders in – at the end of March or early April and many people have not even considered their syllabi for fall at that time. Other people don’t know what they’re teaching and so that’s where this loophole “to the maximum extent practicable” comes in and where the University can use “to be determined”. Nevertheless, the objective whether it’s legitimate or not is to try to reduce text book prices to students so publishing houses will be required to provide prices. If they have to give very high prices and there are other courses that have lower priced books, maybe that will be downward pressure on textbook costs. There’s also a bunch of other information which if people are interested we could go into but not having a tremendous amount of time, I would prefer not to but textbook houses will have to provide prices. They’ll have to provide information regarding changes for any new editions and so all of this will be done by the bookstore. All we will have to do as faculty is to fill out the order forms that the bookstore sends around and if we fill out these forms, then the bookstore will take it the rest of the way. So they will find out the ISBN number is. They will get prices from the publishers. They will put it in the registration materials. Now, the problem with this is that the bookstore has told the Provost’s Office that faculty have been very delinquent in filling out these order forms and so – I think they’re sometimes called adoption forms – and so if we look at the number of faculty that actually submit those forms by the deadlines, it is about 30%. So, and I’m just as bad as anyone. I usually submit my forms at the last minute so I’m not speaking to you as someone who does the right thing, I’m just telling you what the administration is telling me. So we could be good doobees and try to fill out those adoption forms at the time that the University bookstore is asking us to do so and to the extent practicable we should try to do that. So Vice Provost Seaver has asked me to sort of get the faculty’s, you know, feeling on this and I don’t know what problem we could have with it. This is not the University; this is a federal act. We could write to our senator and say this is stupid if we wanted to but that would get us probably no where. So does anyone have any comment on this or any questions about it? Yes? Name.

D. Unger: Just – it would be helpful I think if the bookstore would provide – would contact us, give us the option of doing this by e-mail as well as using these forms because if faculty is away over the summer sometimes, it slips your mind and ---

A. Rosenbaum: I don’t know that they wouldn’t accept that. I’ve submitted things to them by telephone when I’ve missed deadlines so I don’t think I’ve ever used those forms. I’ve called them up or something so I don’t know that they won’t take e-mail. Yes? Name?
B. Jaffee: Do we know if this affects optional books; books that will be optional?

A. Rosenbaum: I believe it’s required books only but again I can’t guarantee that because they don’t mention optional text. You mean recommended readings but not required? I believe it’s restricted to required readings but again, I could check that out if you want that information. Dr. Seaver had offered to come to the Senate and tell us about this but I didn’t know if that was necessary but if we have significant questions, he’s always willing to come and talk to us. So I believe it’s required reading and materials that are required so that would apply to, for example, art courses, laboratory courses, anywhere where you have to purchase materials. Yes?

D. Goldblum: Excuse me if I’ve missed this but it’s effective when?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, it’s effective the fall of 2010 but the latest is that we’re going to try to do this in time for the spring semester. So this is actually the easiest semester to do this for because for the spring semester, the deadline is late September/early October. It’s really not that far and most of us know what we’re teaching in the spring and have probably gotten our syllabi into shape so this will be the easiest one to do. The fall semester is of course the most difficult to do because you have to be thinking about this in March. So the plan right now is to get this up and rolling for the spring semester, spring 2010. Apparently, what’s blocking it now are all just technical issues. In other words, the mechanics of getting this stuff into the registration materials. So we should be prepared to start getting these forms within the next month and be prepared to submit our adoption forms by late September/early October and maybe I’ll have an update for you at our next meeting if you haven’t already heard about this material. Yes?

K. Freedman: So is it true that you’re saying that we really – it’s fairly useless to make comments or ask questions if this is a done deal because there are just so many things wrong with this. There is a list of things wrong with this. Like for example, not staying up to date with newly published books. Another problem having to chose books in spring for the fall courses. It’s just inappropriate. The idea of, you know, setting us up in a situation where we don’t want to change our syllabi, you know, to keep them up to date basically. This is going to force us to not change our syllabi and keep them up to date and the list goes on so I’m not really clear about what you said when you said well, we could write a letter but it wouldn’t do any good.

A. Rosenbaum: Well.

K. Freedman: Are we, you know, are we doing what you asked us to do in the beginning and acting, you know, at least as a consultative group or are we just rolling over and saying even though we know this isn’t good for students in the long run and it’s not good for keeping our courses up to date, are we just going to say okay, let’s just do it?

A. Rosenbaum: Well again, I don’t think it’s inconsistent with what I was saying because, while the University practices shared governance, the government doesn’t. So I don’t think the government – this is a federal act that has been passed so ---
**K. Freedman:** Okay, but one of John’s responsibilities to the University and to the faculty is to ensure quality. This seems to me as if it’s a step in the wrong direction and he certainly does have influence in areas where this, you know, these comments could be made.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so your point being that we could pass a resolution that we send to the president to ask him to bring this to the government, to the senator perhaps. So, would you like – yes?

**J. Jeffrey:** Joe Jeffrey, Computer Science. I missed a point in that. Is the federal law – is it the federal law that specifies it must be done six months or is the university bookstore requiring that it be done six months in advance?

**A. Rosenbaum:** The university bookstore is not changing the deadline so it’s not being moved up. It’s the same deadline they’ve always had for ordering books. So those forms that we’ve been getting for I don’t know how long, with the deadlines for submitting your adoption forms, those haven’t changed. It’s not being moved up because of this act.

**J. Jeffrey:** Oh, so this is actually no change then?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, there’s no change – well, except that we didn’t always ---

**J. Jeffrey:** Except the feds want us to do it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right.

**K. Freeman:** Okay, there may be no change in what the bookstore wants but obviously 70% of us don’t agree with what the university bookstore wants. If only 30% of us fill out those forms by the deadline, then 70% of us don’t and it’s not because we’re lazy, you know, it’s because we don’t agree with making selections that early in advance when new publications are coming out for example.

**A. Rosenbaum:** You know again, the – well let me take some people in the back. We had some way in the back. Behind you Barbara. In the back? Yes?

**J. Hurych:** Jitka Hurych, University Libraries. What I’m going to say may be controversial and I don’t know if it’s legitimate; I don’t know if it’s in teaching faculty’s interest but some of the textbooks are just incredibly expensive and you would not believe how many students to look for the textbook. I would like to suggest that those, at least those that are very expensive, maybe one copy could be put on reserve and those who can afford it and want to have their own would buy it and those who could not afford it would have a chance to come to the library and study there. I had a student who said I’m taking six courses. Every book costs over $100 so it would be almost $800 I would have to spend on textbooks. I felt sorry for the student. Obviously, something really should be done and it’s hundreds of students who come there everyday asking us, you know, we have to explain well, you know, if we have one copy the first person who comes gets it and that’s it so you’re out of luck and you have to buy but like I said, I feel sorry for them, you know, spending $800 only for one semester textbooks.
A. Rosenbaum: And I think – oh, I’m sorry.

J. Hurych: So I don’t know if it’s legal, legitimate but we may want to think about it. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and I think, again, I don’t know if this is something that will actually work but the objective is to try to reduce textbook prices. Whether this going to actually eventuate in that I don’t know but that is at least the expressed intention of this. Yes?

R. Feuer: Rosemary Feurer, History Department. I’ve talked to a lot of our faculty members about this and there is a universal rejection of this from everybody I’ve talked to so that’s the sentiment and the main reason is in terms of flexibility. We have flexibility now to add and the fear is that, you know, if you start to say – with the bookstore, when it’s the bookstore, you can say well, drop that book, I’ve changed my mind and that’s still a possibility but when you put it out there and, you know, you’re obligated to use that book I would say that’s a real problem so we have to have something to the effect in – to the extent that we can comply with it it’s fine but, you know, pedagogically it’s a real problem and most people are saying it leaves me with very little flexibility and that’s something that we should reject I think and so the other question – the question I have is I don’t think you’ve been clear about deadline the law mandates for this being posted for students availability. So can you clarify that?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes. The act specifies that the information has to be available when the students are able to register. In other words, as soon as the registration is opened so at the point at which they can register for courses, that material must be available to them.

R. Feurer: And that date is for the spring is what?

A. Rosenbaum: That I don’t know.

R. Feurer: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Whenever the – I don’t know when the university date is. Do you know? Yeah, I don’t know a specific date but the first week in November? Okay, whatever that date is, that’s when the law specifies.

R. Feurer: And there’s, you know, there’s all sorts of problems especially when you teach graduate courses. I can’t emphasize enough that this is really not in students’ interest if we have to post them in the spring for the fall. So many of us add a book or subtract and it would be terrible if we’re somehow legally obligated to post this.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know again, there are some loopholes in the phrasing such as you can use “to be determined” or the University can and also “to the extent practicable” so it may not practicable for, in certain cases, to do that so there are ways around this but if I hear people saying we want to make a statement that can be given to perhaps our state representatives or
senators or whatever that says the faculty are opposed to this for the following reasons, then we
certainly can consider that as a body. In back?

**M. Morris:** Michael Morris, Foreign Languages and Literatures. I’m the coordinator of the
Elementary Spanish Program and we use a custom volume for the first three semesters of
Spanish which it gives the students a black and white version of the textbook in hard copy and it
gives them an electronic copy of the textbook plus an electronic copy of the work book and they
use this for three semesters but it’s not a product that the publisher regularly stocks and so each
semester we have to have a new ISBN generated for it and it takes the publisher quite a bit of
time to generate this ISBN once we order the text and I’m sure that we will not get the ISBN in
time to meet the bookstore’s deadline but the more significant concern I have is once we submit
that ISBN to the bookstore, without fail every semester the bookstore screws up the order. This
has gone on for at least five years and I know that in my department anyway, the competence of
the people who are responsible for processing the orders in the bookstore is legion and I’m really
concerned about what the bookstore is going to do with additional responsibility when they can’t
even handle the responsibility they already have.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, without commenting on the bookstore, the point you raised is one that
the bookstore is aware of so this business about not having an ISBN number or texts that are
custom created or bundled or whatever, they’re aware of that and they know that this is one of
the areas where they’re going to have trouble getting ISBN numbers so they are aware of that
and again, this may be one of those situations where they’re unable to provide that information
because it’s not available from the publishers and, you know, people are noting this. Well, this
was the easy item. Okay. Go ahead. Let me do this. Let’s take just one or two more and then
maybe we want to decide to give this to a committee to do some fact finding for us and see if we
want to come up with possibly a resolution. Yes?

**B. Jaffee:** Because this is the first time I’ve heard the use of the term materials, this was – when
this came up in the past you said textbooks and I’m just wondering how this effects – I mean my
understanding was it was supposed to somehow put pressure on publishers to keep down the
price of new editions, but what is this business about materials? Does this affect our colleagues
in the School of Arts who have studio classes?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, I think again this is designed for students to know what they’re getting
into when they sign up for a course, what their financial obligations will be so it does include
materials according to the way the act is phrased; required materials. Yes? I’ll just take one
more and then maybe we’ll want to give this to a committee.

**J. Kowalski:** Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. First of all, I can see the point that was
made earlier about how the suggestion that we must file these by a set deadline restricts
academic freedom to some extent but also may prevent professors from picking a textbook based
on what they feel is the quality of its contents rather than its overall price tag so I think that could
be detrimental to students and I think that is what we should emphasize as the possible pitfall and
problems that faculty have with this particular act. However, I think it’s important that faculty
make it clear that in having these legitimate concerns that we also recognize the legitimate
interest that students have in trying to find ways to make textbooks more affordable. I’ve
encountered many textbooks over the last few years where I see sort of price inflation going through the roof and again, as you said, over $100 per textbook sometimes even second hand and I think we need to stress that where it is practicable, that we should make efforts to let students know what our textbooks will be when we are certain that they will be used in the coming semester but if there are cases where we’re not quite sure because we’re weighing textbooks and appraising them, we may need to wait until after the deadline and, you know, that’s my basic point and I think faculty need to make it clear that this isn’t the faculty against the students. We have the students’ interests at heart in terms of the content and the currency of information presented but we recognize the need and appreciate that ways need to be found to try to keep textbooks affordable.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’m going to try to close the debate on this for the moment because we have a lot of items and a number of elections that we have to go through so have a very large agenda as you’ve noted. I would entertain a motion if somebody wants to send this to perhaps the Academic Affairs Committee to develop possibly a statement or to review whether we want a statement on this. David, are you ---? So moved. David Valentin. Do we have a second? We will remit this Academic Affairs and see if they can look into it and come up with a statement for us.

Okay, next item. Many of you are aware of the baccalaureate review process that has been going on in the Provost’s Office. That process has been completed. The final report was issued on August 4. We are now moving to the next step in that process which is implementation and there has been the development of a task force that will try to implement the findings of that baccalaureate review. Some of you may remember that if you read the final report of the Executive Summary that what it concluded was that there are three items of import. One they came up with was critical thinking. The second one was communication and the last one was context. These have been dubbed the “Three C’s”. There has been some concern as this works through the University that when this gets to the Gen Ed Committee that certain gen ed courses would be more or less likely to satisfy these requirements. The Provost’s Office is assuring me that these are process items not content items and that any course can fit in under one or more of these requirements so you could have courses that address critical thinking in science, in humanities, in math, in engineering, in anything and the same for communication and context so the notion is that these goals can be incorporated into any course in the University and we should not have to be concerned that courses – gen ed courses – will be dropped so this is the current state of the baccalaureate review process. Yes?

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski. Again from the School of Art. As a member of the Undergraduate Baccalaureate Steering Committee that was involved with putting together the various focus groups that some people may have participated in last semester, I also want to make it clear that there be a process this semester where we take these reports back to some of the same, not all, but some of the same constituency groups and get a kind of final round of both discussion and feedback from them before they are taken to that sort of implementation phase.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, okay. Any other questions about the task force? Okay.
Next item. This is an item that was called to my attention by the Provost’s Office and this involves the fact that although we have the CARR Office that is available to provide services to students with disabilities, we do not have a comparable service for faculty members and the stimulus for this was apparently that we have a person with hearing impairment on the faculty who is unable to participate in many of the functions at the University, Faculty Development functions, for lack of an interpreter and so the Provost’s Office is asking us to see if we want to develop a recommendation for how these types of services ought to be paid for and so in the past they have been paid for by either the person themselves or by, in some cases, the head of the Faculty Development Office but there is no formal process to pay for interpreters for people who are either hearing impaired or have other disabilities and so this seems like something that we should be addressing and I would like to entertain a motion that we give this to our Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to develop a position for us. David? So moved. Second by Brigid Lusk. Yes. So with David Valentine and Brigid Lusk. All in favor signify by saying aye. Any opposition?

THE FIRST SIDE OF TAPE ENDED HERE – NO BACKUP TAPE SO WENT TO SECOND SIDE – SOME WAS MISSED HERE.

A. Rosenbaum: Passed along to a committee. I would refer you to the walk in item. This is a draft of a statement that will be jointly issued by the Provost’s Office and with the approval hopefully of the Faculty Senate. It is a draft; we can make changes in it. There are – just to give you the high points of this, one of them is that the instruction that is being given to students and faculty alike is that if you come down with the symptoms of the flu which include a fever, that you should stay home. You should not go to class and your students should not go to class. This is the way the CDC is recommending that we try to stem what they expect to be a fairly wide-spread epidemic. The interesting piece of this is that we are also being asked not require doctor’s notes which is a little different from the policy that most faculty have used. Most faculty I think require a doctor’s note. The reason CDC is recommending that you not ask for a doctor’s note is because of fear that the health system will be overwhelmed and so the recommendation from the CDC is that people stay at home from 3 to 5 days or until – not or – but until the fever has broken for at least twenty-four hours and the expectation is that in most cases, this will require 3 to 5 days but in some cases it could take longer. We are being asked to make whatever accommodations we reasonably can for students who are unable to attend class and the key piece here is that we don’t want hero students who are coming to class even though they’re sick because they’re going to spread he illness and I don’t think faculty want that and certainly students don’t want that. So this requires a slightly different approach. This statement that you see before you, this draft, is a draft that was originally given to me by the Provost’s Office and I reworked it somewhat based on information that I gathered from the Health Service. The original statement was in opposition to the Health Service recommendations. So not in opposition but it wasn’t completely consistent with it so this is what we’re asking faculty to comply with. The University is loath to tell faculty what they ought to do in this regard so the Provost does not want to issue this as a mandate. He’s asking us to co-issue it and support amongst our perspective departments. Any comments or questions about this? Yes?

J. Kowalski: Kowalski again. One possible point of clarification. Do we know whether once a student has had H1N1 they can contract it again during the same semester and b) a simple
editorial comment on what is otherwise a finely written draft. In sentence 1, strike the apostrophe from “its spread”.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that’s probably the part I didn’t do.

J. Kowalski: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

J. Kowalski: It’s the professor in me.

A. Rosenbaum: The first question is a good question. This is similar to students I presume whose relatives die several times during the same semester. I don’t know. Do we have a health person here? Brigid do you have any thoughts on this?

B. Lusk: You can get it again.

A. Rosenbaum: You can get it again?

B. Lusk: You can get it again.

A. Rosenbaum: Speak into the microphone please.

B. Jaffee: My daughter had the virus this summer and we were told you can’t get it again.

A. Rosenbaum: You can get it again?

B. Lusk: You can get it again.

A. Rosenbaum: All right. We have a mixed opinion here. It seems like some people are saying yes and some people are saying no and I have no idea. I can look into this for us but in the meantime unless there are objections to this statement, can we endorse this statement.

P. Henry: I have one other – Patricia Henry – and I teach a first year Foreign Language class that meets five times a week so I have a fairly draconian attention policy because otherwise things fall apart and I have required at least that they get something from the Health Service that says they were seen, not necessarily, I mean, obviously not something that says exactly what they had and its my understanding that you’re saying that even this would overwhelm the system?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, that is the – I’m giving you what the Health Service tells me is the CDC recommendation so they are very worried that anybody who sneezes is going to have to go into a, you know, medical facility and it will --- so I don’t know.

P. Henry: Yeah, okay, how about I make them sign affidavits?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know – you know, we do have something of an honor system I think and we have an honor code. I mean we’re not West Point but – okay, at any rate, this is what’s being asked of us. If people have objections to this let’s put them into our statement here and come up with something we can endorse. Yes?
**B. Lusk:** Brigid Lusk. I was just wondering if it couldn’t be a recommendation here that they go home. It mentions that they can stay at their homes, resident halls or apartments but I know University of Illinois is encouraging students to go back to their homes and not stay in resident halls. I wonder if that could be a sentence here?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we can certainly suggest that to the Provost’s Office. I don’t know where they’ve come up with this particular recommendation unless this is precisely what the CDC is saying. Okay? But in terms of accommodations I think where it affects faculty is in the situation where, you know, what will we do about missed work? Will we make work available on Blackboard? Will we accept work through the internet? Will we put our lecture notes up on Blackboard? Will we do everything possible to help students to not fall behind if they comply with this set of guidelines. David? Could you pass him a mike?

**D. Valentiner:** Hi, I’m David Valentiner. Is it true that if a student misses a sufficient number of classes that we can simply tell them that they should be seeking some kind of medical withdrawal. I mean there comes a point where a sufficient number of absences really prevents them from being able to – you know, you can’t just keep providing accommodations, you know, for everything. So I think that there is some recourse that we have if we believe that there’s some abuse of this. If somebody comes down with three different flues during the semester, so I think there is some protection that we have. I don’t see a problem with it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Yes?

**K. Thu:** This is Kendall Thu from Anthropology. I am a little concerned that should a student file a grievance for a grade at the end of the semester that they could invoke this as part of the grievance process and what I would like to see put in there that might help on that front is perhaps a sentence at the end of the second paragraph indicating that - reiterating the point that faculty have final say in terms of, you know, judging whether or not the condition is reasonable or something to that effect. I don’t know exactly what the language would be but the faculty member has the final say in determining whether or not the student’s circumstances are legitimate or they make the final – say about assigning a grade.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I suppose we could ask for that. My concern is that we don’t want to discourage students from staying home and by putting in different, you know, technicalities it might increase the likelihood that someone will not comply with these for fear that it will affect their grade.

**K. Thu:** What everybody else might feel about that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yeah, let’s hear other opinions on that. Joel?

**J. Jeffrey:** Well I wouldn’t want to see anybody have any additional pseudo ammunition they could use in a grievance so I’m certainly sympathetic to that but I’d hate to be in a position as a Ph.D. not an M.D. of having to tell a student I don’t believe you had H1N1. I don’t see how I could possibly approve or disapprove it.
J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski, School of Art. I think that the statement would read better if it simply said something that “while working to accommodate students with an illness, faculty remain the final – make the final determination regarding whether course requirements have been met”. That type of idea.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Other feelings about this? Yes?

C. Garcia: I think that makes sense because that points to the fact that it’s not that we don’t believe that the student is sick and the student could be sick and we don’t want anyone else to get sick but at the same time we are looking at the material of the course if we are doing what we are able even with the sickness to coordinate the material or no. I think that is a good idea to put something like that. It still let us be sensitive to the student’s illness and at the same time maintain the standards of our requirements.

A. Rosenbaum: Can I get an informal vote on whether we want to add this to it. I’m not asking for a resolution. I just want an informal vote on whether we – I can do that right? What’s been suggested is that we add a line or we ask the Provost to add a line that says the faculty member remains the final arbiter of whether the student has completed successfully the course requirements. I’ll phrase that in English but something – does that – so all in favor of that being added please raise your hand. Any opposed? Okay, without opposition we will recommend that this letter be adopted as is with the addition of that line. Is that reasonable? Yes, please.

K. Freedman: I don’t know if this makes sense but seems as if several people have made comments having to do with multiple illnesses during the semester and maybe we should consider asking the medical staff if there could be a way that if the student has already been ill once, if they say they’re ill again, they need a certificate of some sort. You’ve also got an “r” missing in one of the words in the last paragraph.

A. Rosenbaum: I’m from New York so that explains it.

C. Thompson: I was thinking about it at the beginning but I think someone mentioned and, of course, it’s probably quite valid. The thing is whether they know H1N1 or not if they have flu-like symptoms or, you know, cold-like and it’s of course entirely conceivable that students might get several times. It may not all the time by H1N1 but if we’re trying to keep them, I mean, I initially had the exact same worry but then someone else had mentioned, of course, the possibility that it doesn’t preclude you getting some other flu and then the trouble is how is the student going to distinguish. They’re not going to the doctor in principle, they’re trying to stay at home and take care of themselves.

A. Rosenbaum: Perhaps what we can do is just seek that information out and provide that to the faculty as information as to whether or not you can get it more than once. Would that be satisfactory? Yes?

L. Elish-Piper: I have a procedural question. How is this going to move forward in terms of students being informed because I’m thinking of in my department most of my colleagues have
very specific attendance statements in their syllabi and they’re tied to grading policy and I’m concerned as to how that’s going to play out and when that’s going to play out so that people can be prepared if they need to about how to operationalize this in their teaching.

A. Rosenbaum: My understanding was that this is going to be issued as a statement from the Provost’s Office and will, with the agreement of the faculty, supersede individual arrangements that have been made. Now the interesting question of course is can we compel a faculty member to do that or is that an infringement on academic freedom. So I think that’s why the Provost is actually looking to us to avoid that kind of debate and simply say that the faculty is in agreement with this and hopefully people will follow it. I suspect that if a faculty member chose to not follow it we, well I don’t know – I shouldn’t say – I have no idea what would happen. I can certainly raise this issue.

L. Elish-Piper: So would we expect that this would be like posted on the website and everybody would be informed of it via various channels like the student newspaper?

A. Rosenbaum: Probably yes. I would guess that that is the case. That this would post on the website and probably in the student newspaper. Since the student newspaper is probably here they’ll probably beat us to the punch. But I think it would be also a good idea. Remember this is not just the student health that we’re concerned about. This is also faculty health. So it might be in your best interest to have this discussion in your classes as in “I know this is what is posted in the syllabus but the Provost is issuing and statement and this is what we’re asking students to do and so this is how I’m going to accommodate that”. So I think that if we’re in agreement that this is a reasonable request and we’re sort of signing on to this statement, that I think we ought to bring it up with our students and pass it along to our respective departments so they, you know, have this discussion. Personally, I would rather not sit in a room with someone who has H1N1 so I want them to stay home.

L. Elish-Piper: As a follow-up to that, the second part of my sort of operationalizing question is what do we do if faculty is out with this? What sort of expectations or provisions does this take into account about if you’re not there to teach your class, many of us don’t have anyone else who can teach that class, then what happens in that situation?

A. Rosenbaum: This is an excellent question. My assumption would be that this is a statement that applies to both faculty and students so they want faculty out of the classroom as well and so I guess what this is asking us to do was think about how we might deal with that situation as in telling our students that we’re going to open up a chat room on the Blackboard or we’re going to post materials on Blackboard if that happens. Lecture notes, quizzes, tests, whatever. So I’m assuming that this is, you know, what we’re being asked to do is to figure out how to accommodate both student absences and faculty absences. Okay? I will pass this along to the Provost along with the addition of the statement that we just endorsed. Yes?

C. Garcia: I just think that we are all vulnerable to get this illness too and so in lieu of that, I think we all should be kind of prepared ahead of time. Have like – be prepared in case something happened to us to have something that we an always put up or send the students or something so kind of have a rainy day lesson plan ready.
A. Rosenbaum: It also might be a good idea that within each of the individual departments to have this discussion with the chair and maybe as a department figure out how this might be better accommodated so that would probably be useful as well. Yes?

N. Castle: Nancy Castle, Allied Health/Communicative Disorders. I would also like for us, it doesn’t have to be in this statement, but for us to encourage the Provost and Student Affairs to think about having something in writing encouraging students to go home if they have it. We live, our students, live close enough to home that would be I think a big help as opposed to spreading it in the dorms as well.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. I will pass that on to the Provost. Yes?

P. Henry: Too I think the Health Service perhaps will need more resources and this is something that the administration is aware of as well.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes and my understanding is that they are meeting and dealing with this as best they can given their resources so it’s certainly something they are working on.

B. Jaffee: If they continue to have a fever long than five days than they should seek medical help and have a doctor’s note to come back? I mean, in the case of my daughter who had this, she was sick for ten days and ended up in the hospital.

A. Rosenbaum: You know again we can – I can certainly ask about that.

B. Jaffee: Because otherwise it’s just a very kind of lose, you know. But if they miss, what I’m saying is if they miss more than five days of class, then they still come back without a doctor’s note and all is forgiven?

A. Rosenbaum: Well you know again, three to five days is guidance. It’s not, you know, everyone deals with illnesses differently so some people might have more difficult cases or more severe cases.

B. Jaffee: But we’re telling them not to go to Health Services in this ---

A. Rosenbaum: We’re not telling them not to go to Health Services. We’re not requiring them to go to Health Services. I think it would be a mistake for us to say don’t go to Health Services but what we’re trying to do is avoid everyone going to Health Services I believe. Okay, go ahead.

B. Lusk: The actual H1N1 information is on the website and that’s informative about when you need to go to the doctor. This is basically for faculty that give the students a break and give some common sense information about not overwhelming the Health Services so it is all there on the website.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, very good. Okay, next item. It has been – there’s an item that appeared in the *Northern Star* at the end of the end of last semester which many faculty members have expressed concern about. This was the article that referred to the problem of nepotism at the University and also talked the salaries and salary increases that had been given to some of the people who were allegedly given their jobs as a result of nepotism. When this occurred a lot of the faculty expressed great concern about it and actually more than a couple suggested to me that I’d better do something about this. So what we have been doing is I’ve been talking with Steve Cunningham and Joe Grush along with Paul Stoddard because this began while he was Faculty Senate president and we have been trying to get information from the University. Where this stands right now, I’d like to make or entertain a motion. The part that relates to nepotism, the University Council Steering Committee felt that this is a University-wide concern and not simply a faculty concern and so this will be given to the University Affairs Committee of the University Council. The part of this that does seem to be faculty concern has to do with whether or not faculty raises are comparable to the raises that are given in other areas and so one of the concerns that Paul Stoddard raised or has been raising for a while has to do with whether the resources that the University has are evenly distributed or equitably distributed I think is a better way to put it, between the academic side as represented by the Provost’s Office and the finance side as represented by the finance side and so Paul is concerned about that or was concerned about that and there is also this concern that the raises that were eluded to in the *Northern Star* article which we have verified are much in excess of any raises that are being obtained by faculty members and so I will entertain a motion to give this issue to our Economic Status of the Profession Committee and have them look into it. I’ve been trying to collect that information with very little success but I will continue to work with that committee to help them get the data that they need in order to report back to us on whether or how large a problem this might be. So I will entertain a motion rather than a debate because this debate will take a very long time. Name?

C. Thompson: I move that the discussion about the equitability of the resources allocated to both sides of the University be looked into by the Economic Status of the Profession Committee.

A. Rosenbaum: In there would you like to include also the salary raises not from both sides but from the different groups within the University?

C. Thompson: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

C. Thompson: I just can’t remember the whole thing.

A. Rosenbaum: We will pass that hot potato along to the Economic Status of the Profession Committee if there is agreement. Do we have a second? There’s a second. Any discussion? Joe? We have to get another microphone for this table.

J. Jeffrey: Maybe this is just a point of clarification. I was trying to understand. As I see it, there are two issues or three and I’m not sure we’re doing the same counting. Nepotism generally means hiring family members. That’s entirely separate from whether someone has control over the salary of a family member. I don’t know what you mean by saying we’ll forward
the nepotism issue to the UC. In terms of the well, outrageous raises reported in that Star article, in view of the fact that, in my opinion, there’s an obviously unmistakably apparent conflict, I say apparent, conflict of interest involving Eddie Williams, Steve Cunningham and Karen Baker, I’m not sure that’s the same issue as nepotism. I think that ought to be investigated by a much higher body than this group here. Specifically, I would suggest that this body ought to entertain a motion to refer that specific issue to the Board of Trustees because nobody on this campus has the juice to investigate Eddie Williams.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, one of the things that I think people are trying to avoid is to sort of make this a matter of personality as opposed to a general issue so the University at this point doesn’t have – well, when you name people that you want investigated that’s becoming ---

J. Jeffrey: We’re keeping personalities out of it. I don’t know any of these people personally. It’s not a personality issue. It’s a case of whether it is appropriate for this body to encourage an investigation of what appears to be a blatant conflict of interest, namely Eddie Williams having control over his daughter’s salary.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Kendall?

K. Thu: Well I think what is appropriate for this Senate is to get an explanation and I think it’s appropriate for us to get data that gets to the bottom of the salary raises. Presumably we can do that by getting aggregate data from different divisions and comparing them and then, of course, the UC has the ability to set policy and deal with the nepotism issue. I’m not sure what’s going on quite frankly. There’s some tantalizing facts and figures in the Northern Star issue that I keep close with me and I trust my faculty colleagues who are on the committee to get the information that we need to understand what steps that we need to take. So at this point, I would not want to recommend it to the Board of Higher Education because we don’t know yet about what’s going on.

A. Rosenbaum: And again, the fact is that the University does not have I think a specific nepotism policy. I think the state has some language around that but the University itself does not have a nepotism policy and so you can’t be in violation of a policy that doesn’t exist so I think a first step is for us to develop a nepotism at the University Council level and if we refer this to the other aspect of it, to the Economic Status of the Profession we can see that as a good start. Yes?

G. Slotsve: George Slotsve, Department of Economics. On the nepotism issue what you’re saying about the University – seems to me I recall that being on the ethics test that everyone of us has had to take and those specific issues have come up so yeah, we’ve got to pass this exam. I’ve seen those questions on there so I’m not sure I would buy the argument you’re making here.

A. Rosenbaum: As I’m saying, that’s the state. The ---

G. Slotsve: Well that may be but we’re required as faculty to – by the state to be passing these exams. I assume that everyone at the University has been required to take this, not just faculty. I
assume administration as well, so it’s not that it’s not fair game. We know these issues. We’ve had to pass exams on it.

A. Rosenbaum: Again, I’m not defending anybody or any aspect of this. I think that the conclusion that the Steering Committee of the University Council reached was that we needed to perhaps develop our own university nepotism policy and that’s why I’m – we’re suggesting that this be referred to the University Affairs Committee at the University Council and the salary issue again, if we get a vote on this, we will refer it to our own Economic Status of the Profession Committee and see what they come up with. Yes?

R. Feurer: I see this, I mean what the most disturbing thing that you’ve reported is that there is some reluctance to give information and, you know, I’ve been saying that this is part and parcel of a long history at the University where faculty don’t get information. It’s not clear. We’ve been told over and over that there’s no money for raises – to address issues – and I know these salaries wouldn’t by any means address some of that but I do think that it’s part of an issue of faculty rights as well as economic status of the profession so I would suggest that we work as a joint committee. As chair of that committee, I’d like to be involved in this because I think it’s part of a larger issue that’s going on at this university where faculty don’t get access to information that should be publicly available and the administration conceals that information.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you would like to amend the motion to add Faculty Rights and Responsibilities to the committees that will be looking into this?

R. Feurer: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: So for an amendment, what do we need? She’s amending the motion. Okay, do you accept the amendment? Okay. It’s a friendly amendment. Okay. So the friendly amendment now makes our motion to refer this to the dual committees; the Economic Status of the Profession as well as Faculty Rights and Responsibilities who will then take this on and report back to us what their findings are. Given the lateness of this an the number of things we still have to do, I think this is a very important issue and that we can certainly spend time at another meeting discussing this and I’m sure we will when these committees report back to us but I would ask that we take a vote on this now. All in favor of referring this as stated in the amended motion, signify by saying aye. Any opposition? Okay, the motion carries and we’ll ask those committees to look into that.

The motion passed as amended.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I think on that note we’ll be going way over if we don’t get to the other items on our agenda so let’s move on to item V which are items for faculty consideration.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Selection of Vice President and Secretary of Faculty Senate
A. Rosenbaum: The first item is the selection of the Vice President and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Can I move this or do we have to have someone nominate? Can I nominate? The floor is open for nominations. Can I nominate you – okay, I probably can’t but I will. I nominate Michael Morris for Vice President of the Senate and the Vice President of the Senate, the role of the Vice President of the Senate is to preside at the Senate in my absence or if I become incapacitation which is highly likely given the discussion that we’ve had today and he will certainly provide when we go into Executive Session in the last Senate meeting of the year when we evaluate both the Senate President and also the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor and so Michael – does he have to accept – do we have a second for the nomination? Seconded. Okay, Michael do you accept the nomination? Very good. All in favor? Opposed. Good. Michael Morris is our Vice President. Thank you for agreeing to serve.

I’d also like to nominate Nancy Castle as the Secretary of the Senate and Nancy has been our Secretary for a number of years. She didn’t leave?

G. Bisplinghoff: She had to leave but she said she would accept if nominated.

A. Rosenbaum: She is accepting in absentia. Okay, so I would like to nominate Nancy Castle who has been our Secretary for a number of years now and has done the job ably. I need a second. Second, good. I don’t suppose we have any discussion on it – we’ll vote on it. All in favor? Opposed? Good. Thank you.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Faculty Senate Committees for 2009-2010. (Page 7)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, the consent agenda. The approval of the Faculty Senate Committees. Every Faculty Senate committee, uh member, is on at least one committee. Many of you are on two and even more. These committees are listed on page 7. I’d like a motion to approve the committees. So moved. Second? I’m sorry?

K. Freedman: What if you’re not on the list?

A. Rosenbaum: You have to let me know and then we’ll figure out why not. Oh, University Council are not.

D. Jarman: She is a University Council member and they are not on Faculty Senate Committees.

Rosenbaum: You’re on University Council committees? Faculty Senate members are the only ones that are on this. Okay? Okay. Do I have a second on that? Somebody? Second, good. All in favor of approving the Faculty Senate committees. Aye. All opposed? We have committees.
VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report (Pages 8-9)

A. Rosenbaum: Reports from the advisory committees. The first we have Earl Hansen who is the FAC to the IBHE. His report is on pages 8 and 9 and Earl has waited patiently for the first hour and twenty-five minutes of this meeting to give his report and then, since he’s not a member of the Senate, he wants to leave which makes sense. Earl.

E. Hansen: Anyway, my report is found on pages 8 and 9. I’m assuming everyone has read it and is ready for the essay examination on it. Seriously, we had a caucus meeting right behind the IBHE meeting at DePaul University back on August 11. What was an eye opener for me was sitting in the IBHE meeting and our President and I didn’t put it in the notes here, did get a round of applause twice for comments that he made which actually made some common sense which was kind of interesting sometimes when we go to these meetings. In essence, the financial situation in the state is not very good. The IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee is looking for things and trying to determine how we can best get information to our colleagues on campus and then hopefully get some response back from them. I’ve been sending you memos for two years and I’ve not heard from anybody so I don’t know what’s going to happen elsewhere but I’m your representative and everybody who’s at these meetings feels the same way. If you’ve got concerns, let us talk about it. I can’t do anything for you about insurance; that’s between you and the legislature as an individual. I can’t do anything about your pay raises but other things yes, there’s a possibility. I don’t know what they are but you do need to ask so that we can discuss it and correspond with one another across the state. That’s our role. The MAP grant thing came it. It was an immediate problem at that time and it is – they are trying to discuss this thing with the Senate and legislature in Springfield. I don’t have any reports on that. I’m not on the Executive Committee and they don’t let things out until they actually have something going on that they can report but I know that the faculty representative group has worked vigorously in trying to do something to restore that. I just found out today that we have 5,000 students who were supposedly affected by reading the notes here. I had asked on campus could someone tell me how many that was because I got the reports from other state universities and I was the only one who was unable to get a report in. I must have called the wrong number.

Improving retention and graduation rates is an issue. It’s an issue on all campuses and it’s something that you and I and any other faculty member is going to have to find out how to address. The ball is in our court and if you read the last two bullets on here where I made the statement “Items of interest I have seen from the position” as your representative are 1) As change in higher education takes place; those in higher education need to determine if they are going to steer those changes”. It’s up to us as faculty to get off our duffs and do something. Quit whining and crying and all of us including and everybody. Everybody wants to sit around and talk about it but we’re going to have to do something and if you look at the report that had been released on the 10\textsuperscript{th} of August I believe it was, that indicated – by a group called Education Sector – offered a state-by-state evaluation of higher education accountability and system and the bad news is that Illinois did not score very well in that. The good news is that at least the public agenda addresses some of the shortcomings that we have in higher education or in education in the state of Illinois. According to Inside Higher Education they graded states, Puerto Rico, the
District of Columbia on a three-grade scale. The highest grade was ‘best practice,’ that to 10 states that were well above reporting mechanism. The second ranking, ‘in progress,’ was given to 27 states and the lowest category ‘needs improvement,’ went to 13 states which Illinois is a proud member of. So, you know, if we want to make changes, we’re going to have to do it. It’s us. We’re going to have to step up and do something as faculty.

The entire report is available at the site on there. I suggest that you go and read it. Any comments you’ve got, want to make to me in private or public or whatever, feel free to do so because I’ll just go back and report to them as to where we are. Okay?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Thank you Earl. Any questions for Earl? Yes?

**P. Henry:** I don’t know – Patricia Henry, sorry – it would be appropriate for the Faculty Senate to pass some sort of resolution that we really are behind trying to restore the MAP grants because that is of all of the priorities, all of which are important, I think restoring the MAP grants are certainly my priority and I think it would be of most benefit to the University. I would so move to have such a resolution if that’s appropriate.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, so you want to make a motion.

**P. Henry:** Yes.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Do you want to frame the motion for us.

**P. Henry:** That the Faculty Senate urges the IBHE or, yeah, via the FAC to pursue every possibility to restore MAP funding.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Earl do you feel that this is a vehicle that ---

**E. Hansen:** I can certainly carry that on. I have no problem with that but it’s a legislative thing. I mean the – I sat through the IBHE meeting and those people care about education in Illinois. They really do and comments that were made ran the gauntlet and let me finish – well, go ahead and then I’ll ---

**P. Henry:** I’m not so much trying to persuade the IBHE as to give backing to the IBHE. In other words to just be another demonstration of ---

**E. Hansen:** To support their effort in restoring funding to an adequate level or survivable level for higher education I think is what you’re basically trying to say and that’s consensus of a all – community colleges, the private institutions, the whole makeup of this thing because it’s not just the state universities.

**A. Rosenbaum:** So the motion would be that we support the efforts of IBHE to restore the MAP funding?

**P. Henry:** Anyway possible.

E. Hansen: Could I make another comment?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

E. Hansen: John and I spoke with the President of the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee to try to host one of the meetings here. I think it’s imperative that the state schools host at one of our Advisory Committee meetings on the different campuses. The next one is at Spoon River but – a community college, but the point is they haven’t gotten back to me with dates yet. If we hold that, and I have no qualms and I don’t think the Advisory Committee would have any qualms about some people sitting in on parts of the meeting to get a feel of what this is about. I would certainly bring that forward to our group.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we’re making efforts to get funding through the President’s Office for that meeting. Okay. In terms of the motion, we have a motion to – I don’t remember the exact wording of it – but we have a motion. Do we have a second? I believe it’s to encourage the IBHE to continue their efforts to restore the MAP grants. Do we have a second? Second, Brigid Lusk. Do we have any discussion? Is there any opposition to this? Yes? Okay. Then we will vote. All in favor of this motion signify by saying aye. Opposed? Okay, we have a motion. We will frame it and send that to the IBHE or give it Earl to be read at the IBHE meeting.

Henry made the motion; Lusk was second. The motion passed.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report (Page 10)

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs. Yes? I’m sorry.

K. Freedman: Who do you want to go first?

A. Rosenbaum: You go first.

K. Freedman: Okay.

A. Rosenbaum: Say your name.

K. Freedman: Kerry Freedman. I agree with the vote of course. I think that’s important, symbolically if nothing else but I think all four of these agenda items need to be addressed. I think they should be given to committee and I think that the committees who handle these agenda items should respond to Earl’s request for example to develop ways we can link the campus issues to public agenda items. I mean, this is going to take more than this group can just do in this room. This is going to be, as he was saying, real work and so I think each of these agenda items should be given to a committee to do further work on.
A. Rosenbaum: Okay. When you say each of these four that we’re looking at on page 9?

K. Freedman: Yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. What committee would you recommend that we give this to? Academic Affairs? I think Academic Affairs would be the one that comes closest to that. Okay. So we have a motion to add these four items or give these four items to committee, Academic Affairs, is that what you’re moving? I’m sorry? Okay.

K. Freedman: The first one may be an Executive Committee issue. I’m not sure.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. You want to frame it as a motion?

K. Freedman: I think 2, 3 and 4 are Academic Affairs but I’m not sure about the first one. Maybe it’s Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. I’m not sure. But I would certainly move that the second, third and fourth go to Academic Affairs.

A. Rosenbaum: Restoring MAP grants, improving retention/graduation rates and assessment and learning. There are just for your information, I mean the University is certainly working on restoration of the MAP grants number one and number two the retention/graduation rates that’s being handled by a new committee that’s been established by the Provost’s Office on retention that was announced in a message that was sent out by the Provost’s Office – by the President, excuse me and so this is a Office of Enrollment Management so these are being handled and, in fact, we have a request from Brian Hemphill for a Faculty Senate member to be nominated to serve on the Enrollment Management Committee so perhaps you would be interested in doing that?

K. Freedman: Okay, all of those are good things but I just want to remind you Alan that the purpose of the Senate is to provide advice for those groups and that’s what these committees should be doing. That’s what we’ve done in the past and that’s what we should be doing in the future. So even though those administrative units are organizing responses, the Faculty Senate is supposed to advise those groups.

A. Rosenbaum: And my point again is that they’ve asked for a Faculty Senate member to be a member of that group which would be one of the ways that the Faculty Senate could be advisory to those groups. But nevertheless, if you want like to make a motion, make a motion and we’ll vote on it.

K. Freedman: Go ahead.

F. Bryan: May I make a suggestion that we let the Executive Committee make the determination of where these should go.

K. Freedman: Okay.

F. Bryan: Could we do that? That would expedite things perhaps.
A. Rosenbaum: Is that satisfactory?

K. Freedman: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Ferald Bryan – report (Pages 11-12)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item on the agenda is the report from the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee and also Finance, Facilities, and Operations which are both by Ferald.

F. Bryan: Thank you Alan. I’ll be very succinct. Much of the information in both reports probably come under the category of old news since this dates back to the beginning of the summer.

First tape ended. Went to second tape. Some dictation was missed.

That Trustee Boye as well as other members of this committee expressed their very strong support for the tenure process and that’s very valuable for us to understand. Appointments of a new dean, new research centers, new degree programs and new specializations were all approved. The information items may be of value since we heard from two faculty to present a report. So far this Board likes to hear reports from faculty and I think we should look at that as very encouraging and it was a very well-structured report from Professor Peters and Professor Douglas.

So that concludes my brief summary in highlighting the meeting. I can certainly answer questions if you have any.


F. Bryan: In terms of the second committee report and I was pinch-hitting for my colleagues with this, I would just highlight that the June 4 meeting of the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee sets purchases for the new fiscal year so you see most of the action items were important purchases for the year. I would highlight that they got a really good deal on gasoline and I would point out that health care costs continue to increase. I did check and I did not find in the report any cost for how much it – the resulting cost of removing Kishwaukee Hall. I know you mentioned that and our colleagues are interested. That price wasn’t listed but some of the other prices are listed and I think those are always informative. Again, most of this has been reported before and I would certainly entertain any questions on this committee report if you have any.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions?
F. Bryan: I can finally report that there was a meeting of the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee last week. My colleague, Buck Stephen from Math, will report on that next month but no major developments there that I think we have time to address here. You’ll hear that next month.

A. Rosenbaum: I was at that meeting as well and the main items of interest I think were that the capital bill has been approved and there is money now for the renovation of the Steven’s Building after a quite extensive waiting period and also for the renovations to Cole Hall and so those have all been appropriated by the legislature and the University is requesting release of the monies. So we’re expecting, the University is expecting, that that money will be forthcoming pretty quickly and they’ll begin to develop a plan for both of those buildings. Okay.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – report (Pages 13-17)

A. Rosenbaum: The Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee. We have Jay and Jay is not here. Bobbie?

B. Cesarek: Thank you. Bobbie Cesarek with SPS Council. As you can see, again it’s pretty much old news from June 4. There were no action items during this meeting whatsoever. It was simply lots and lots of information that was shared as you can see by the notes that I took from a variety of individuals. I think the one of concern that was brought up of course was the budget, was on page 15, notes from Kathy Buettner’s discussion relative to the MAP that might provide you with some numbers relative to the MAP funding. Those were presented at that time. Some information again on the next page relative to the appropriations from the Higher Education Reauthorization Act which name has been changed. There’s also an update on that because we as well – there was another committee meeting on this as well last week and I’ve just completed the notes on that so I’ll be able to report on that one next month.


E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report

A. Rosenbaum: The Board of Trustees meeting, we don’t have a report on that. Oh, it’s a walk in?

B. Cesarek: We have a walk in on that. Jay was kind enough to do that. Again, really when the Board of Trustees meets it’s a compiling of the three committees that you just received reports on so it’s basically a reiteration of that same information in a condensed format.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you.
VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Rosenbaum: Reports from the standing committees. We have no reports I believe from any of the committees with the exception of Elections and Legislative Oversight. I’m going to call on David Wade who will conduct the elections that we have to do at this first meeting.

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 – report.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair.

D. Wade: All right. Thank you very much.

1. Hearing Panel Election – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

D. Wade: You have in front of you a purple ballot. You need to pick 20 members of that 34 members. They basically represent randomly chosen – 34 randomly chosen tenured faculty members of which you’re going to pick 20 which will serve on the Hearing Board, specifically part of the due process regarding dismissal for cause of a tenured member of the faculty or dismissal for cause of a non-tenured member of the faculty before expiration of that faculty member’s contract period. These people will form a panel from which a smaller group will be chosen in the event such due process needs to be done. Everyone should have one in front of them. You need to pick 20 and if you would just – right now. Yes? Jeff?

J. Kowalski: We serve by virtue of serving on University Council do we vote for this?

D. Wade: My understanding is yes. If you’re a faculty member on the Faculty Senate you vote for 20 out of the 34. Yes.

2. Election of members of Faculty Grievance Committee.

D. Wade: So while you’re doing that, the second thing on the agenda was to pick members of the Faculty Grievance Committee. The pool which is in this lovely little box right here is the pool of all the University Council and Faculty Senate tenured members from which I am going to pick 15. While I’m doing that and we’ll write those down. Do you want to just do it one at a time right now? Okay. Ready? Very exciting; it’s very exciting stuff. Khan Mohabbat. Kerry Freedman. Lucky ducks – you lucky – huh? No. I’m going to guess on this, Milivoje Kostic. I apologize. Thank you. George Slotsve. Jeff Kowalski. I can’t do it because I’m the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Kendall Thu. How many we got so far? Okay. Laurie Elish-Piper. Vicki...

3. Election of University Council alternates – ballots will be distributed at FS meeting.

D. Wade: Third. If any members of my committee that we just approved your appointments could step forward and help me with the next step, I’d greatly appreciate it. The next idea – if you are and this is the alternates deal – if you are a tenured Faculty Senate member who is not a member of the University Council, so just Faculty Senate members who are tenured who are not members of the University Council, okay, you’re going to vote by colleges. College of Education for you. College of Engineering and Engineering Technology. Health and Human Sciences. What? Oh, they do? Okay, never mind. Everybody votes then regardless. You’re going to hand these out to people based on their colleges. If you could – for example, first we’ll do College of Education. If you are from the College of Education, please raise your hand and I’ll give you a College of Education ballot. Correct. Okay. Right behind you. One more behind you, right there. If you are a member of CEET, College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, please raise your hand. That should go quickly. Nobody? Okay, well I’ll leave that for here. If you are a member of the College of Business. VP&A. Okay. LA&S. You can hand those out and if you could just write those down, turn them upside down and leave them at your place with your purple ballot that would be great and fold them in half. Yup. HSS if you’ve got it, raise your hand. Any college that has not been called? I think that’s all of them. Okay. Yup. Just give them to me and we’ll make a big pile. Everybody has had the opportunity to vote. We don’t want to deprive anyone of their right to exercise the franchise. Okay.

4. Nomination of two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School will choose one member from the two nominations to serve on the committee.

D. Wade: Next on the hit parade. We need to nominate two Faculty Senate members to serve on the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. The floor is open for nominations. Don’t everybody rush forward at once, okay? It’s overwhelming us! Sure. You’ve got me. I’m just in charge of running the due process. Apparently there’s a Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee. I guess there’s something to do with, you know, human subject experimentation. Okay, thank you. Here we go. Ready? Thank you very much Donna. The Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee reports and is advisory to the Graduate Council. Let’s see – duties, the purpose is to provide awareness of complex ethical and related dilemmas that could occur in the scholarship process and to suggest ways to address them. The goal is to create a shared culture of responsible scholarship. The program will not develop explicit rules that restrict intellectual activities. Awareness of ethical and responsible scholarship includes maintaining an awareness of professional responsibilities, creating a shared culture of responsible scholarship, identifying and responding to potential ethical problems, recognizing and understanding cross disciplinary issues and standards and communicating to the NIU community the content of applicable internal and external policies. I’m sorry? They are nominations from the Faculty Senate. That is correct.
C. Thompson: I don’t have a nomination. I’m on the University Council so you can’t nominate me but I think the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship was initially started when there was going to be a federal mandate where a variety of required ethics courses or something and programs. That mandate did not come about but the Responsible Conduct of Scholarship stayed around. What they’ve done and what they typically do – we develop the new recommendations for – I don’t know if they went in the Bylaws – but we went through a variety of conflict of interest and research recommendations again to establish and put Northern’s – not in the Bylaws but as sort of recommendations so that we would be more in compliance with a variety of some of the different – like NIH and NSF and various places. They also in the past have helped work with the Faculty Development Office for when there are a variety of workshops every so often – one or two workshops a year on ethical practices whether in the Health and Human Sciences or in Biological Sciences or Physical Sciences and then – I was on sabbatical last year so I don’t know what they did but that’s what they have been doing. They both have made not so much policy but have clarified a lot of the rules in faculty handbooks about ethical research and conflicts of interest and they are not the IRB. The IRB which are of course for the biology and health and human subject research – they’re not that but the two things they have done in the past is make sure that our basically faculty handbooks and faculty brochures are in compliance with any new federal mandates coming down and processes and in addition that they also are able to help recommend when there are Faculty Development workshops to try to put some money into different workshops whether it’s for faculty or students that would be for ethical research – ethical research or ethical conduct in research so there have been those kind of workshops so it’s usually been recommended by this.

D. Wade: Thank you very much. Can I just say one more thing. There are two nominations that will go forward and then the Vice President for Research is going to select one of those two. All right? So ---

K. Freedman: I nominate Jeff Kowalski.

D. Wade: We have a nomination of Jeff Kowalski. I’ll second that nomination.

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe you won’t get picked.

J. Kowalski: Does it have to be a Faculty Senate member?

D. Wade: It seems to indicate that it does, yes.

J. Kowalski: But not University Council.

D. Wade: One member of the Faculty Senate selected from at least two Faculty Senate members nominated by the Faculty Senate. If that’s not enough Faculty Senate repetition I can say it a few more times. Seems to be that; got to be.

J. Kowalski: How many times does this committee meet?
D. Wade: I don’t know.

C. Thompson: In the past it hasn’t met regularly.

D. Wade: As needed. It doesn’t seem to have a set schedule, right?

C. Thompson: Right.

D. Wade: Thank you Jeff. Anyone else want to walk the plank? Well, I’m going to nominate somebody at random. Joe Jeffrey. You were sitting right next to me. What are you going to do? He seems like a responsible fellow.

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe he won’t get selected.

D. Wade: Right. It’s possible. All right, the nomination. We’re looking for a second. We have two nominations.

P. Henry: I second the nominations.

D. Wade: Unless I hear otherwise, I’m going to close the nominations. So be it. Do we need a vote for this? All in favor of the two nominations, Joe Jeffrey, Jeff Kowalski – aye? Opposed nay? Abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you very much for volunteering.

5. Election of two Faculty Senate members to the University Judicial Advisory Board.

D. Wade: Next, this is good news, we need to elect two Faculty Senate members to the University Judicial Advisory Board. Luckily, the currently serving members, Jeff Gordon from the College of Business and Larry Gregory from VP&A have graciously offered to continue in their role here and I would move to allow them to do so unless there is serious opposition out there so I’ll make a motion to that effect; looking for a second. We have a second. Any further discussion of this issue? All in favor aye? Opposed nay? Abstentions? Motion carries. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, are we done with the elections?

D. Wade: We are.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Rosenbaum: One last item of business. This is an unfinished business item. You have it in your packet as a walk in. This is a resolution that was approved by the Faculty Senate at the last meeting last spring. En route to bringing us up to the University Council we revisited this. It is my concern that this does not accurately represent what the Faculty Senate’s wishes were. When we passed this we really didn’t satisfy ourselves as to the wording it was a last minute thing and, if you recall, the Senate sort of decided that we would let the University Council change the wording on it. The essence of this is concern that when a department puts forward a set of
people for either the Research and Artistry Award or sabbatical leaves that these are sometimes changed in order by either the College Council or further up the administrative line and it seems as though the sentiment of the Senate was that when a department sends something like this forward it shouldn’t be tampered with unless there were very good reasons. So my concern was that the way it sounds in the resolution, it sounds a little bit weaker than saying it shouldn’t be changed unless there are very good reasons. It sounds like whenever you do that, you should at least tell us why and so what I’m wondering if we want to entertain a motion to reconsider this resolution, to send it back to the committee from whence it came for rewording and perhaps additional discussion to make sure it says what we want it to say. We don’t have to do that. It will apparently, Ferald tells me, require a two-thirds vote. Is it two-thirds of those present or two-thirds of the Faculty Senate? Those present. So if we have a motion to reconsider this, if someone would like to make that motion. If nobody wants to make that motion we will send it forward to University Council as written.

**P. Henry:** What is the committee that it would be referred to? Sorry.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Which committee had this – was it Academic – Rights and Responsibilities. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

**P. Henry:** I’ll move.

**A. Rosenbaum:** You’ll move that we reconsider this resolution?

**P. Henry:** That we send it back. Yeah.

**B. Jaffee:** The problem with reconsidering is that we’re – the problem with reconsidering is that it is the season for Research and Artistry and sabbaticals and if we’re going to have a voice in this, this is our chance.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Rosemary.

**B. Jaffee:** Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Microphone.

**R. Fuerer:** My understanding is that this was supposed to have been referred to the University Council meeting and I’m really distressed to hear that it never was frankly because that’s why I pushed it at the last meeting. I had been pushing it at the Executive Committee before that point and I kept getting delayed last year and now to find that there’s another delay just – I really wish – we can amend it at a later time but I hope that we can just forward this and get some movement on it.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, but again I don’t know if there’s been a University Council meeting since that came forward. I’m not sure about that; do you know if there has? Okay. Okay, so you are suggesting – well, at any rate we don’t have to argue. If there’s no motion then there’s no discussion and it goes forward so I’m hearing no motion.
J. Kowalski: I have a possible motion.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski. We don’t have to do this but if we wanted to we could amend this to read “the Senate recommends that ordinarily no changes be made to the departmental ranking that affects funding of Research and Artistry or sabbatical leaves. In the case such changes are made, they shall be explained in writing” continue with the rest of the wording except for cutting the word as next to "to" in the penultimate line and that would be my recommendation for – well, I’ll move it if I can get a second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so we have a motion to amend this resolution and a second. Do we have any discussion? Rosemary is that satisfactory to you or ---

R. Fuerer: As long as it’s not being referred back to a committee that it would come out of this and go immediately. Yeah.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes?

C. Thompson: In the discussion ---

A. Rosenbaum: Say your name.

C. Thompson: Carol Thompson – so in the discussion I actually kind of prefer the wording as it states there as opposed to – again, having served in College Council sometimes where this has come up – the word that was recommended or the change in wording that was recommended sort of was – it seems to me that the main thing that this has is that there’s going to be explanation and transparency but to sort of strongly recommend that the College Councils don’t make some kind of estimation – I guess I personally would vote against that change in the wording.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so yes?

D. Blatz: Debra Blatz from Marketing. I was a little confused reading this. The changes be made by which bodies? I had to read it like four times. It seemed like oh, why do we need these changes it’s just in the department so is it the College Council so that any changes made by the College Councils? Is it the Provost’s Office? Is it the President’s Office? Okay, well that wasn’t clear reading this and I didn’t remember from last April.

A. Rosenbaum: So are you suggesting that it needs to be clarified or ---

D. Blatz: Yes, I didn’t want to make the clarification myself because I didn’t know what it was so it’s the Graduate School that changes – will changes be made by the Graduate School?

B. Jaffee: In the part that I can clarify, part of the problem is that it’s two different governing bodies in the case of – in both cases Research and Artistry and sabbatical the recommendation is
to the college to not change the department’s rankings. After that, Research and Artistry goes to the Graduate Committee and sabbaticals go – question mark – UC/PC.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Do we have a rewording of this that we can vote on? Does anyone want to suggest a rewording of this that we can vote on or do we want to not reword it?

P. Henry: This will go to the University Council?

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

P. Henry: Can the University Council also reword it?

A. Rosenbaum: They could.

P. Henry: Oh, Lord.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s where we started last – we sort of left it up to the University Council to perfect the wording of this. Okay, so what I’m hearing is sort of differences of opinion about this. One is that we sort of specify that we prefer that this not be changed or we do not want it changed unless there are circumstances and then those would have to be explained. There are other people who are feeling we should not reword it. We have a motion on the floor. It’s reworded as specified. Yes?

J. Jeffrey: Joe Jeffrey, Computer Science. I agree with Carol. Having been on College Council for a couple of years, sometimes we would see things come from departments and we were very loath to alter rankings. We only did so with very good reason and it was always gee, the proposals – especially with sabbaticals – often one applicant would do a much better job of explaining the significance of their research and as outside reviewers we had to rely on our understanding as outsiders doing a good job explaining that to outsiders is part of their proposal. So I would not be comfortable with saying they shouldn’t change them. Sometimes we want to change them for good reasons. We have, but I’m not on it anymore.

A. Rosenbaum: Given the lateness of the hour and people leaving, let me just ask this. Ferald the first item would be we can’t change it unless we vote to reconsider it, is that correct?

F. Bryan: Right.

A. Rosenbaum: So the first vote would be whether we want to reconsider it; the second vote would be whether we want to change it. So why don’t we take a vote just to see if people want to reconsider it. If we don’t get two-thirds vote then it’s not reconsidered, it goes to the University Council as written. Okay?

K. Freedman: Reconsider – could you explain?

A. Rosenbaum: Reconsider means that we’re going to again, instead of passing it along, we’re going to alter it in some way or consider altering it in some way so it enables us to make changes
in the resolution that’s been passed. So the first vote is whether we want to reconsider. If the reconsideration vote fails, we don’t have to discuss how to word it. So, let me – we had a motion, we had a second. Wait, we withdraw the motion for reconsideration. So the first step is we need a motion for reconsideration which we can then vote on. Does anyone want to make a motion for reconsideration? Anyone want to second the motion? Second. Okay we have a motion, a second, we’ve had some discussion so let’s get to the vote. We need a two-thirds vote so we’re going to have to ask you to keep hands up. All in favor of reconsideration, please raise your hand. That doesn’t look like two-third. Okay, the motion fails. The resolution will go to the University Council as written. Okay. That being done we have no new business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Comments and questions from the floor? Thank God.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. 2009 – 2010 Meeting Schedule (Page 18)

A. Rosenbaum: Information items. The meeting schedule is on page 18. You’ve all seen that.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. Second. We are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.