FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2009. 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


W. Zheng attended for T. Fisher; R. Winkler attended for C. Thompson.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s get started so we have a chance to get out of here in less than two hours or so. Don’t groan; it’s not that long an agenda.

Hansen made the motion; Baker was second. The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. I don’t think we have any walk-in items to add do we?

D. Jarman: We have Earl’s report.

A. Rosenbaum: Yeah, but it’s on there so we’re not adding anything. You have some walk-in items that were given to you but they’re already on the agenda. So we need a motion to accept the agenda. Professor Hansen. Second? We have a second? Okay, all in favor of accepting the agenda? Opposed? We have an agenda.

Hansen made the motion; Baker was second. The agenda was accepted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2009 FACULTY SENATE MEETING (sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item, approval of the minutes from the September 30 meeting. We need a motion to accept the minutes. Professor Baker. Second? Dr. Valentiner. Okay. Any comments, corrections, concerns, additions? Everyone thrilled to death with the minutes. Okay.
Hearing no corrections, we’ll take a vote. All in favor of accepting the minutes say aye. Any opposition? Professor Baker, are you accepting the minutes this time?

**W. Baker:** Yes sir.

Good. Okay. All right. So the minutes are passed.

**IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, just a few announcements. We have a couple of things that - we’re going to have a report from Jeff Kowalski on the on Baccalaureate Review Committee so before we have that, just a few announcements.

One, you have all of course heard that the MAP Grant money has been restored which is a very good thing for us. Everybody was pleased. Personally, I think it was the Faculty Senate letter that turned the hearts of the legislators. But anyway, that’s a very good thing.

The next item, we have an ongoing process now for review of the Board of Trustees’ Professorship applications and the Faculty Senate is entitled to a representative on the committee that would be reviewing the Board of Trustees’ Professorship candidates. So it would be nice if we get a volunteer; somebody who loves to read those kinds of applications and participate in the process. I’ve been told that this will involve one meeting during the fall semester during which time the list will be whittled down to a short list of five candidates or so and then there will be at least one, if not more, meetings in the spring to deliberate on who the recipients of the Board of Trustees’ Professorships should be. So this is a really good thing. The Presidential Research Professorships, the Presidential Teaching Professorships and the Board of Trustees’ Professorships are really a positive thing for the faculty and we have many recipients amongst us so we would do well to participate. Dr. Jaffee, are you volunteering or asking a question?

**B. Jaffee:** ???

**A. Rosenbaum:** You need a microphone.

**B. Jaffee:** Oh, I have a microphone. There we go. I’m wondering if I could volunteer. I’m here as a member of the University Council. Does that count?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, all members of the University Council are Faculty Senate members ---

**B. Jaffee:** I’m volunteering.

**A. Rosenbaum:** so you’d like to go through that process? Okay, are there any other interested parties in being on this committee? I understand if you serve on the committee, you have a better chance of actually getting one of these things later on. No, kidding. Okay, if anybody else is interested in this you can certainly let me know. I will have to let Virginia Cassidy know by the end of this week who our representative will be so we have Dr. Jaffee. If anyone else is shy
about raising their hand but really, really wants to be on that committee, let me know and we’ll have to figure out a way of choosing. Okay.

Just a few updates. One, you may recall we had a Faculty Senate – (???) something wrong with the tape here) good, high quality materials we have – we had a discussion about how faculty would deal with absences due to H1N1 and agreed to a sort of policy that would certainly not take away faculty’s freedom to deal with this however those chose, but in sort of trying to be consistent with the recommendations of the CDC we agreed that professors would not ask for letters from Health Services in order to document that students were afflicted with H1N1. Apparently, not all of our colleagues have gotten that message or they have chosen not to go along with it. At any rate, this is resulting in an exorbitant number of students coming to Health Services saying they need letters. So Health Services is flooded – overflowing – with H1N1 candidates. Some of them don’t even have it but they’re going there to get letters so – I’m sorry? They’ll get it, right. So that is actually one of the reasons to keep them away from Health Services. First of all, we want to keep from inundating Health Services but secondly, it’s not a great place to be. I think Kishwaukee Hospital put up a tent outside their emergency room so that the people who were coming there would not be mingling with the other sick people. So at any rate, I would ask that people go back to their departments and remind their colleagues that although they don’t have to comply with it, it would be a good thing for all concerned if they remember that just for this particular health crisis, we’re asking and the university is sort of asking us to support this. Please don’t send students to Health Services to get notes. So if you would remind your colleagues in your departments, that would be good. Yes? Pat?

P. Henry: Just sort of as an alternative to that, I’ve started in my class the policy that if you have something, you have to document it in writing, not necessarily getting a note from the doctor but that there’s something tangible that if it turns out they weren’t telling the truth, presumably we could call them on that. So documentation but not documentation from Health Services is another possible way to go.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, as long as it’s clear to the student that you’re not asking for something with a doctor’s signature on it, maybe that will keep them away from Health Services. So it’s not the most important point we have to deal with but if you could remember and go back to your departments and let them know that they should do their best to follow this, that would be great.

Okay, just a quick update - the resolution that the Senate passed regarding the services and accommodations for faculty with disabilities. This was given to President Peters. He referred it back to Steve Cunningham. Apparently, there are a number of things going on including the federal government revising their regulations to how this should be dealt with. I got a rather lengthy note from Steve Cunningham today updating me on what that situation is. It seemed too lengthy to bring in and have people read on the fly so what we’ll do with that is it’s going back to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee from which it came. They will look at that memo and sort of form some kind of a judgment as to whether or not they’re complying with that resolution. We will have a discussion around that at Executive Committee – at the next Executive Committee meeting and, if need be, we will bring it to the University Council if the committee doesn’t feel that the university is complying with what was the spirit of that
resolution. So in just reading Steve Cunningham’s letter briefly, I think we might have some questions about whether or not they’re complying with the spirit of the Faculty Senate’s resolution. So if that turns out to be the case, we will have to sort of take it to the University Council as opposed to letting them resolve this informally but again, that might be premature and I’ll keep you posted on that. Does anyone have any questions about that? Okay.

A. Updates on Baccalaureate Review – Jeff Kowalski (Pages 3-13)

A. Rosenbaum: We have as the first item an update on the Baccalaureate Review by Jeff Kowalski who is on that committee and Jeff will enlighten us.

J. Kowalski: Thank you. Everybody if you had a chance to look through your packet saw that there was a somewhat lengthy report on the process and the findings of the Undergraduate Baccalaureate Review that was undertaken last spring and gave a bit of background on how we came to put together focus groups for faculty, for administration, for students, for staff, for alumni, for various constituencies and it talked about at least the outcome and findings of those sorts of activities as of this summer that were then published as both a one-page sort of summary report and an eleven-page public report which is what we chose to include in your packet in order to keep things manageable and a lengthier twenty-three-page university report that is easily accessible on the NIU main page by clicking on the undergraduate or the Baccalaureate Review button and you can download pdf’s of any of those three reports which I would certainly urge people to do and it may repay reading even the twenty-three-page report since it is the more authoritative and more thoroughly documented report. I don’t intend to go through all of that report with you but just to sort of go over the process briefly to give everybody an idea of how this report and the lengthier one came into existence and the basic findings and then talk a bit about where we go from here.

As you see, the title is “Discovering What NIU Graduates Should Know, Value, ad Be Able to Do” and this sort of activity was prompted as a result of NIU’s Strategic Planning Initiative that identified the need for undergraduate curriculum review. One of the first thoughts and efforts was to begin by reviewing the General Education Program and during the summer of 2008, seven members of an initial steering committee, a baccalaureate review steering committee, went to a conference for that purpose. It was decided as a result of that however, that the goals for undergraduate experience should encompass more than simply general education, that they needed to be incorporated in and we should find ways that they can be expressed both in the major and disciplinary concentrations in the General Education as well as in various co-curricular activities at the university. In order to get feedback regarding the broad aims and a set of basic goals that we felt would be important to use as an over-arching model for this Undergraduate Baccalaureate Review, we added to the steering committee a task force composed of students and faculty, staff and administrators, the composition of which is mentioned in this report as well and working together the steering committee members and the task force members began to devise a process in order to get more feedback and more contact with a wider array of constituencies on campus. We were interested in devising a process that would be very inclusive, that would try to reach out to and talk to as many different members of the university community as possible and whose outcome would be giving us enough feedback so we could propose baccalaureate goals that seemed to be vetted thoroughly and to have broad support based
on the kind of responses we achieved. So we sought feedback from students, from faculty, from
dstaff, employers, administrators, centers and commissions, parents and community colleges. We
did this through a series of focus groups that included 16 different student focus groups and 29
focus groups involving different faculty, administrator, staff, centers and commissions and
employer focus groups and complimented that with an on-line survey that was available
throughout much of the spring semester. Again, available on the NIU homepage and 929
members of the community availed themselves of that on-line survey and provided feedback as
well. The survey had a number of different sorts of aims that were listed as potentially important
areas to be included in the baccalaureate experience and respondents had an opportunity to sort
of rank – rate them let’s say – to rate them on a 1-4 scale for being sort of most important and 1
being least important and in the focus groups we used 7, well actually 6, sort of broad aims in
order to direct discussion with the administrator groups, the students groups, the staff groups,
and so forth and then for faculty we used just this basic sort of – this basic sort of rubric of what
should our NIU graduates know and be able to do and what kind of people do we want them to
come out of the university sort of being because we found out through trial and error that if you
go much beyond that with faculty members, that they start asking you all sorts of questions abou
tell, why do you only have 6 aims, who thought up these aims, why that aim and not another
one so for faculty we wanted to keep it as broad and open as possible. Yes?

G. Slotsve: George Slotsve, Department of Economics. You’ve got 7 listed, one of them is ???

J. Kowalski: We noticed that –

G. Slotsve: This wasn’t made public ---

J. Kowalski: It has been made public.

G. Slotsve: This is embarrassing.

J. Kowalski: It is embarrassing and embarrassing things happen and we have noticed that
unfortunately, only after the fact that it was posted, but it will be brought to the attention of the
steering committee and we will – how should we say – we will address that and correct it but we
are aware of it at this point. Yeah. It’s one of those type of things that you see something so
many times that sometimes you just don’t see it anymore if you know what I mean and that’s an
unfortunate error that crept in to it.

Now the upshot of this was that after getting all of this input and feedback from these different
focus groups, over the summer a sort of subgroup of the steering committee got together and
with assistance from people who are wonderful at working with sort of statistical analysis, put
together a kind of analysis of the data we compiled and found that they grouped it into 3 basic
sort of components or categories that were nicknamed “The Three Cs” and these consisted of
critical thinking, communication and context. Critical thinking which was the most cited goal by
people involved in this process had subcomponents including literacy, what was called
reflectivity, being sort of aware of your own on-going process of learning and that it changes
over time and information skills. Communication had subcomponents of technology, language,
particularly mastering and effectively using English language, and collaboration, working well in
teams or in group situations. The final C as it emerged from this summer’s analysis was context including subcategories of historical context which might include for example looking at historical, cultural, social contacts in which knowledge is produced and in which it will be used and so forth. Global context, wanting our students to know more about their relationship with the world at large, social context and so forth. Now, the reason I’m mentioning these and that I bring them to your attention is that this is part of a process that we want to involve the faculty, students, these constituency groups in again. We want you to read this or the longer report. We would then ask you to go back to the NIU home page, click on the Baccalaureate Review button and there is a link there where you can provide your responses to the report as they currently exist and you could say hey, reduplicated a category dummies or something like and we would not take umbrage. We would agree with you; that was dumb. But, more seriously you could also see if you agree with our general organization. If you think we have omitted something that seems important to you that you think we need to consider reorganizing an aspect of the report and so forth. And I can already report that this is beginning to have an impact on and to sort of reshape the thinking of the steering committee at this point. A number of responses that we have had so far have mentioned that there’s not a strong emphasis on another potential C, a category of creativity. Do we want NIU students to have opportunities to think creatively, to be engaged in creative activities of different sorts? Do we want NIU students to be interested in not only thinking critically but find solutions to problems, innovate and that type of thing? And so that is something that is already under consideration but you all looking at these reports, may see other areas that you think need adjustment and this is your opportunity for the next month or so to go back into that site, read the reports and give them your best shot at this point before we take the reports and go to the next stage which will be to – first of all – to revise them and then after revision, to bring a revised version of the report with its recommendation about what these broad overarching goals will be to governance bodies such as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council for example to the University Council. I expect too back to the Faculty Senate so that we can get a final sort of buy-in endorsement of these goals at which point, although we haven’t determined the exact process that will be used, I expect that there would be – I anticipate that we expect that they would then be brought back to colleges, to departments and through that to individual faculty members so that using these big concepts such as you know, critical thinking, communication, context and possibly creativity as well, that everyone can think about ways in which the courses, the assignments, the activities that they’re already involved in achieve those goals but perhaps they can also think creatively about ways they can modify what they’re doing with their curriculum and course work and so forth in order to strengthen those goals as they are applied and experience by our students in their general education, in their major and disciplinary expertise and in extra-curricular types of activities on campus.

So that’s sort of the overview of this and if there are questions about it, I would do my best to answer them but I’m sort of throwing the ball back in your court at this point saying be sure you read the reports and then if something chaffs or doesn’t seem quite right or needs improvement in your opinion, tell us about it. This is what we want.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Jeff? Okay, thanks very much.

J. Kowalski: Thanks.
V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, next item on our agenda are reports from Advisory Committees. The first is the FAC to IBHE and Earl Hansen has a report which is I think walked in so it’s part of your walk-in packet. Earl?

E. Hansen: Well first and foremost, we held the last meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee for IBHE here on the campus and I want to start off by saying that all we heard were accolades, everything from parking to technical assistance and overwhelmed by the service that they got at the Holmes Student Center and I passed that on to everyone else. The other thing that was most significant about the meeting here, irregardless of the other stuff ???, is that John Peters spoke to the group. That’s the first time we’ve had a university president come in and talk and talk about higher education issues. This was extremely significant because the makeup of our particular body consists more of community colleges than it does anything else. There are few state institutions and we’re all in the same boat, especially if we’re directional. The private institutions, the big ones, University of Chicago and Northwestern, aren’t necessarily in that boat. Then the smaller liberal arts colleges have a different agenda but it was extremely enlightening for the people from the community college constituency on that group to hear what John had to say and he was well-received and it was well-discussed the significance of having him come in and I just wanted to make that as a note here because I think it’s important that as we look at the IBHE/FAC that we understand the makeup is quite different than what it is in this room. It’s a very broad makeup of all the two-year, private and parochial institutions within the state and that includes your technical institutions like DeVry and others. They’ve all got in and they’ve all got issues and as we look at the notes that I’ve given you, the significant that came out of this – there’s a meeting on November 17 in Springfield on the P-20 longitudinal policy research summit and the Executive Committee and anybody interested on our group that’s interested in educational policy research are going to be invited to that. If there’s anyone on this campus that has an interest in that, if you would contact me I would be more than happy to try to get you down there for that particular meeting if you’re teaching educational policy or have something to do with it on campus. The concern we had with it is what sort of data is going to be collected and how is it going to be collected. Secondly, the idea of assigning a student a unique identification number to track them throughout their education was considered a key component of this. That brought us to the situation, while is a state initiative, it has ties in with the federal government and there may be a tracking problem for out of state students who move to Illinois or Illinois residents who move out of state to go to school, to see what’s going on in education and we’re confronted with the same issue that – the committee is confronted with the same issue across the board as what are we teaching these students and what do we expect them to know. So I think that the initiative that is coming forth here is quite significant and important. It’s the first one I’ve seen in the state; that’s just me.
Moving on down on this thing, they were ecstatic that the MAP funding was returned and we had a call in from IBHE representatives down in Springfield. The big questions are where’s the money coming from? That was the question that was asked there and I guess it’s the question being asked elsewhere. The other issue that came up which is one that you probably normally wouldn’t pay attention to is that while the MAP issue came up, there are other issues in higher education that are not covered by the leading news media in the state, the Tribune, Sun Times, WBBM, or any of those items. In fact, on the day of the meeting there was nothing of any significance in either one of the Chicago papers regarding the MAP get-together in Springfield.

Any questions? You have one for me?

A. Rosenbaum: You all might recall that at the end of the last meeting, Dr. Friedman raised an issue related to one of the items in your last report which was that the law apparently requires or allows for there to be a faculty member on the IBHE and yet in the report we were told that there is none or that they are trying to look into how that might be ---

E. Hansen: We had just discovered at that meeting that that was even available to us.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes.

E. Hansen: What the IBHE/FAC has done is put forward two names from the committee. That doesn’t mean that anybody else that’s interested across the board shouldn’t contact the committee and say I’m interested in serving in that particular capacity, that the president or chairman has a seat on the IBHE but he’s not a voting member. He’s a participant but not a voting member. We asked for two seats; one representing IBHE and one representing faculty at large in higher education to placed on that because we do the same thing for students across the state to sit on these committees. Why can’t we have faculty on it. That’s what the question is and I don’t have an answer for you on that question.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Now, when you say non-voting, does the law require it to be a voting member or it’s not specific.

E. Hansen: Well, we’re talking about two things here. The non-voting member is John Bennett from Lakeland College. He’s the president of our IBHE/FAC. He represents us there but he doesn’t have a vote. The two people we’re trying to put on there, wherever they are, wherever they come from, would be voting members.

A. Rosenbaum: I guess what I’m saying is – I’m asking – we had started out with the idea there’s a statute that allows for there to be a member. That would be a voting member?

E. Hansen: That would be my understanding but I haven’t read the statute

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. I’ve also been told that there are two members of the IBHE that are emeriti faculty from some universities in the state so would those be considered faculty or would it have to be an active faculty member to satisfy the statute?
E. Hansen: I can’t answer the question. I don’t know.

A. Rosenbaum: Because it may be that they are seeing that as already satisfying the requirement. I have no idea.

E. Hansen: Well, you would think so but here again, without having read it I can’t answer.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Any further questions for Earl about FAC or anything? Okay. Thanks Earl.

We have no reports from any of our other advisory committees.

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

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

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

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – report (Pages 14-19)

A. Rosenbaum: We do have a report from our standing committee, Academic Affairs, and Charles Cappell is the chair of Academic Affairs and your packet contains the report of that committee. So, Charles?

C. Cappell: Thank you. I’ll try to be brief. The report is an information brief and it does contemplate actions the Senate might take. The first part of the brief summarizes the general discussion that took place and my research on the exact statute which is included as an appendix so you can read the verbatim text of a new federal law. In addition to summarizing the faculty concerns that emerged in the September 2 meeting, our committee also deliberated and added those concerns and a third source of information was an interview that I conducted with Mr. Turk who is the Bookstore Manager about how NIU is going to implement these procedures. So I’ll just draw your quick attention to page 15 in the agenda where we summarized the points that were raised first by Mr. Turk. You can just see, rather than reading them to you, you can just see that the administration is skeptical and is aware of unintended consequences that are going to result from this legislation. So it’s not as if the sense I got from my communications were that we naively think this is going to have the – be able to achieve the ultimate purpose of reducing textbook costs. There are some, I think, pernicious consequences and that is if the required books get published early in the registration process and there is a change, students may actually incur greater costs by purchasing books that are not going to be eventually used in the course so that is an unintended consequence that might impact students negatively.
A long lists of faculty concerns again I think just raise our skepticism about how it is going to be difficult to implement this. The primary concern is the burden on faculty through the informal suggestion or constraint that we make these decisions earlier than we’re usually accustomed to making them and to perhaps more firmly commit to them once they are made so that this isn’t this dynamic turnover for students. If you read the actually legislation, you’ll see there are conditions in there that in no way are these new rules meant to restrict the academic freedom that faculty have in conducting their course. There is no understanding from either Mr. Turk or myself that NIU is going to change any requirements for faculty. It basically is going to be implemented through the same procedure we’re using now. You turn in your book order forms and then the Bookstore and the ITS specialist will integrate that information with the registration material. It’s my understanding from Mr. Turk that that’s going to be updated on a weekly basis so if you do change your mind, at most there will be a week’s lag before that new information is posted. That information will be posted as soon as the registration is open for students, however, the University Bookstore will not actually open their on-line book ordering form until a few weeks before the beginning of the semester so if the students want to wait to get their books from NIU sources, there won’t be this confusion by hopefully three to four weeks before the course starts. The book orders will be finalized. So there’s a lot of dynamic play here and implementations are being tested. It shouldn’t affect faculty accept for this pressure of getting our book orders in timely perhaps also taking note of textbook costs so that the decisions we make are somewhat sensitive to the burdens of students and that once we’ve decided on our lists of required readings and materials that we be a little cautious or perhaps reserved in making changes, taking into account the cost to the students. I’ll be happy to answer questions about that.

Now in terms of action items, we debated – we included a resolution which you can see stated on page 16. The committee when polled and asked to vote to recommend this resolution, split fairly evenly, 2/3, so that there’s not a strong recommendation from the committee whether further action from the Senate is deemed necessary. In the Executive Committee meeting last week, we tossed around some rewording of the resolution and we’ve kind of left that open that if someone does want to introduce a resolution for further action that expresses a concern with the negative consequences that could arise from the quality of the course or some other issues, that the Senate should be open to that but the Academic Affairs Committee in its deliberations does not have a strong recommendation whether that be entertained or not.

A. Rosenbaum: Charles you said the vote was 2/3. That was 2 in favor of the resolution; 3 against?

C. Cappell: I think 3 were in favor and 2 were against.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Discussion? I think we have really a couple of questions to answer here. One of them is do we want to form any kind of a resolution or statement. Could you just address the committee’s thinking on this? In other words, why were the people opposed to it, opposed to it?
C. Cappell: We did this through e-mail exchange and the comments generally were it’s probably not a big enough issue to take a stand on it. There’s really no new action that’s required. It’s a piece of federal legislation that the university is going to conform with. Those that voted in favor, as I recollect, did not have a great deal of elaboration on that. They just felt that this was a bad law and wasn’t going to achieve its desired consequences and the Senate should make those sentiments known.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. So we have to decide whether we want to do anything with this and what form that should take. I don’t know that should be a resolution or just a statement coming out of the Senate and secondly, who are we proposing this to? What are we doing with it? Are we sending it where? So we need to have some idea of what would happen with this if we decide we want to pass something. So those are some of the questions. I guess the first one is do we want to do something? So I’ll look to the floor for comments. We’re a chatty bunch today aren’t we?

J. ???: I’ll put in my 2 cents with the people who said it’s not important enough to deal with. As I recall we were basically asked – this was originally presented as a ??? pushed it and we’re being asked to do it. I think we should just keep quiet and do it. I think it’s a triviality frankly. I don’t think it was ever intended to lower textbook costs. I think that’s a cover story intended to make the politicians look good. I don’t think we ought to worry about it. Politicians do what politicians do to look good; let’s be somewhat realistic here. I think it’ll have no significant impact on us as faculty members. I think we should say okay, fine. Anything else, in my opinion, makes us look narrow, self-serving and small minded.

A. Rosenbaum: Dr. Jaffee?

B. Jaffee: Well, I actually had a question because it seems like the first time we discussed this, there was some question about this term’s supplemental material and some people seemed to think this implied that say faculty in the School of Art who teach studio courses would also have to have lists of their supplies. But it seems pretty clear to me now that we have this statue that supplemental material is supplemental to a college textbook. So, am I correct in assuming this will not affect studio courses for example?

A. Rosenbaum: Charles, any thoughts on that?

C. Cappell: My understanding is that that’s correct. Currently I think on registration materials things like lab fees and artistic supplies are listed and that would be continued. The course materials I think really refer to materials that publishers are putting together, special custom orders for faculty of reprints and chapters from books that are put in new packets. There was an issue with getting ISBN numbers early enough that prices could be affixed to that and that’s a burden on the publisher. So I think that’s correct that the existing total costs to students including things like field trip fees, lab fees, lab supplies, would be listed but they won’t be necessarily affected by this legislation.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, other comments? Okay, is anybody in favor of doing anything? Joe’s in favor of not doing anything so. All right, hearing no support for doing anything, we’ll continue
to do what we’ve been doing, send in our book orders or not depending on how conscientious we are and wait for ??? to come and scold us. Okay, well thanks very much to the committee for vetting this whole thing. There’s a lot of work there and thanks for doing that. Oh, wait a minute, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I just wanted to say thank you for actually providing us with the statue. I think that’s very useful information.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Very good.

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

**C. Resource, Space and Budget – Michael Morris, Chair – report** (Page 20)

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next report we have is from Resource, Space and Budget, Dr. Morris.

**M. Morris:** Resource, Space and Budget met on the 1st of October and really the function of the meeting was more informational I thought than anything. Eddie Williams was asked to describe the budgeting process and, you know, he described it as ongoing with continuous fine-tuning and refinement but he didn’t really have a whole lot of specific information. When he was asked to list specific priorities in spending on academic pursuits that concerns faculty most greatly, he directed the subcommittee to ask the Provost that question which several of us on the committee found a rather telling response. He did go out of his way though to let us know that large amounts of the budget are not freely allocatable. They are encumbered for specific purposes. Money that is derived from bonds, from student fees, from other sources are often dedicated to very specific needs and cannot be distributed to other endeavors. Joe Grush came into the meeting later and his primary point I think was that the university is looking at a 4.5 million dollar deficit once the stimulus money from the federal government runs out which was used to plug the hole caused by the state cut in the budget and he emphasized that the university is going to have to find a way to either plug this hole assuming that the 4.5 million dollars is not reinstated by the state of Illinois or otherwise the state is going to have to decide where to make some cuts which may prove to be very painful. At this point, all bets are off as far as what those cuts may be but they may include strategic further reductions, further downsizing or even elimination of specific programs. He also mentioned, you know, there was some discussion as well about budgeting for specific colleges and Barbara made the comment that several colleges (tape turned over here) pointed out that this is really problematic and Joe Grush attributed this to the fact that some colleges have made it more of a practice than others to save for a rainy day but what incurred to me at that point was well, if you don’t have any extra money, how are you supposed to save any money for a rainy day when you have absolutely every cent that you have is going for what are here and now concerns. He said that the reason that some colleges are better positioned to survive lean times are because they have more of a tradition to save for a rainy day and I think that’s a pretty concise summary of what was discussed at the meeting.

**B. Jaffee:** I would add one thing as the University Council co-chair, that there was discussion from Joe about how capital planning has now been funded right and that there will be opportunity over the coming years to have some faculty involvement in the planning process and
that was something as a committee we discussed getting involved with and, in fact, we thought we would come back to the Senate and University Council and maybe solicit your ideas and suggestions. If we’re going to be involved in planning, what kinds of things would you like to see in the NIU of the future that may have more money than it has at the moment.

M. Morris: I just wanted to say thank you Barbara. I think that that discussion took place after I left. I had to teach at 2:00 so I missed – that was probably about the last 15 minutes of the meeting. Okay, thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions of either Michael or Barbara.

M. Morris: I didn’t use the phrase “a penny saved is a penny earned” at any point in that discussion did I?

B. Jaffee: He didn’t actually use the phrase “save for a rainy day either” – it was something slightly less flattering.

M. Morris: Okay, great.

A. Rosenbaum: We have no other reports from standing committees but do any of the committee chairs have anything for us by way of an update or complaints or anything? Informational items? I think the Senate has learned if they don’t say anything they get out earlier. Okay.

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

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

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

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

A. Rosenbaum: We have no new business.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: Any comments or questions from the floor? Anything from the troops that you want to bring to our attention? No, people are trying to catch the first elevator. Okay. We have no other items. I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn. Dr. Baker? Second? All in favor. We are adjourned.

Baker made the motion to adjourn; Novak made the second. The meeting adjourned at 3:57PM.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS
XIII. ADJOURNMENT