I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business, as usual, is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. One of them is Earl Hansen’s report on the FAC to the IBHE and the second is a report from David Goldblum on the Resources, Space and Budgets Committee.

J. Novak: made the motion, M. Smith was second.

The agenda was adopted with the two walk-in items without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 30, 2011 FS MEETING
(sent electronically)

W. Pitney: made the motion. B. Lusk: was second.

The minutes were approved without changes. There were no dissenting votes or abstentions.
IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate voted to go into executive session for purposes of reading the evaluations of the Executive Secretary and Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. The session was extended by a discussion of a current financial issue and an update on plus/minus grading.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of Faculty Senate members who have completed their terms, who have been re-elected, or who are newly elected

A. Rosenbaum: Acknowledged the service of Faculty Senate members who are completing their terms.

A. Rosenbaum: Earl Hanson is our representative to the FAC to the IBHE. We do not have an alternate for Earl. Earl is in the second year of his position, but when Earl can’t make it to a meeting, it’s good to have somebody as back up. Sonya Armstrong has strong interests in this based on her area of expertise and would like to volunteer to be the alternate. We do have to open it up, though. Is anyone else interested in being an alternate to the FAC? Any other nominations? Seeing none, I would like to nominate Sonya Armstrong to be our alternate to the FAC to the IBHE and I need a second.

A. Lash: Second.

Sonya Armstrong was approved without dissent or abstention.

A. Rosenbaum: Sonya, congratulations, you are now our alternate on the FAC.

A. Rosenbaum: I want to make a few comments on committees and chairs. We just thanked people who are leaving the Senate. I also want to thank the chairs of our committees for their work this year. They have done a great job. It’s always difficult for us to get chairs. When you are thinking about what committees you want to be on, please give it some thought, fill them out and send them back to us and please some of you volunteer to be chairs so we have people that really want to do it and it’s not so difficult to make the committee assignments. The committees as you have seen are very important. The jobs that a committee does determine what actions the Senate takes and so please don’t put the form aside.

A. Rosenbaum: Next, I want to call on Sue Willis to give us an update on the situation with the Libraries Advisory Committee. I had requested on behalf of the Senate that they give us more of an operational definition of “substantial removal.” We wanted to know what will define a “substantial removal of items” that would trigger a notification of the faculty. I got a letter back from Michael Spires who said that the committee could not agree on what “substantial” was and, therefore, they were not going to do that for us. Sue Willis is our liaison to the Libraries Advisory Committee so, Sue, can you perhaps bring us up to speed on what’s going on there?
S. Willis: Okay, yes. I was named the liaison to this committee early this semester. Unfortunately, I missed the first meeting of the semester that I was eligible to attend because I was on family leave taking care of my father. I did manage to attend the second meeting. Basically, as far as the Libraries Advisory Committee is concerned, the ball is in our court as far as defining “substantial.” They do not plan to take further action on that. They also did issue a request for departments to place requests for return of paper copies that were gotten rid of when things went on the JSTOR. They received an early request from the Department of Mathematics. They have not received any more requests and they now consider that matter closed.

A. Rosenbaum: Do we want to do anything about pursuing this issue of what a “substantial holding” is or are we comfortable leaving it as is, trusting their judgment to let us know what they think is a “substantial removal”?

P. Henry: If they couldn’t come to an agreement instead of a definite term, how can we expect them to notify us if such a position is reached? It seems like at this point the door is open for them just doing away with the paper copies and never letting us know.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue, do you have any comments on that?

S. Willis: I would suggest that if this body wants a definition and the library refuses to write one, then maybe we should write one for them.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay.

S. Willis: Perhaps that is something that some appropriate committee of the Senate could work on.

A. Rosenbaum: We could certainly do that if that’s the wish of the Senate – I think one of the problems that they raised is that “substantial” not only refers to number, it also refers to the nature of the material. It may be one item that’s very important that would be considered “substantial” by a department and so they’d have to list everything that they’re planning to remove in order to be sure that somebody’s not going to say, “Well, you got rid of this journal which is critical to our program.” Now, I asked whether or not they couldn’t just post it because I assume they don’t just walk around the library and randomly pick out books and throw them away, that somewhere there’s a list that says these are the books and periodicals and whatever that we want taken off the shelves. Is that accurate? Does anyone know how the library does this?

J. Brubaker: A lot of the stuff that is withdrawn are materials that are in bad shape and typically we don’t, I mean there are occasionally times when librarians will go into their collection, subject specialists, and determine things that they think we no longer need. But, as a general rule, I would say it’s mostly things that are no longer useful because they are falling apart.

A. Rosenbaum: So do they walk around and look for those items?

J. Brubaker: No, usually when they come back through circulation they’ll send it to be mended if it can be. If it can’t be, then the subject specialist will say, “Replace it” or “I don’t think we need this anymore.”
A. Rosenbaum: And those are individual items. But what we’re talking about is something akin to what happened last time which is that they ridded us of thousands of volumes. So for something like that, would there be a list of those items that they’d be working from?

J. Brubaker: Right, I mean I can’t foresee that happening again, but yes I would imagine there would be a list.

A. Rosenbaum: So would it be reasonable to say that “substantial” would be any items that were actually put on a list?

J. Brubaker: No, probably not.

R. Feurer: It seems to me that you would have to take that out of the card catalog, so when it’s being taken out, couldn’t it be put on a list then as it’s being removed from the computer system?

A. Rosenbaum: Well, what Spires said in his note was that they would need a full time secretarial person to do that. Now whether that’s true or not, that’s what he said. Okay, does anyone want to propose a motion on this? Do we want to send this to a committee early next year? Sue did you think it should go to a committee?

S. Willis: Well, I think that if this body wants there to be a specific policy that might address this sort of thing, whether or not the wholesale removal of things and putting them on JSTOR, whether or not that’s likely to happen again, I don’t know. That may very well have been a one-time thing and it’s done and now we are just back to the calling of things that where we have multiple copies or stuff that’s falling apart and can’t be replaced or whatever. But I would certainly say that if this body wants to have a policy then it sounds like we ought to write one. I’m not sure I’m the person to make that decision for this body, particularly since my department it’s not an issue for us, just because the way our library is. But there’s certainly departments that have been more heavily impacted than mine has and I would say it’s up to the body, but I don’t think it’s up to me.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I’ll open it up. Does anyone want to make a motion? Okay, we don’t have a motion, we’ll move on.

The last item is that under Information Items you have the meeting schedule for the 2011-2012 academic year and you can access that through a link on our Faculty Senate website.

B. Provost’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Workload Policy – David Wade

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next item is the consent agenda. It’s our obligation to either elect or approve candidates for various committees of the university. The ones that are on the consent agenda are people that are running unopposed. Yes Sue?

D. Wade: Here’s where we’re at and I’ll give it to you fast and loose. The last full meeting of this panel, was the week before classes started in January. At that meeting, we had finalized the language, pretty much and it was forwarded up the chain of command ostensibly to the Provost’s office. Having heard no word for some four to six weeks, I attempted to contact the Deputy
Provost's office to wonder what’s going on. I got no response. I talked to the administrative assistant to that person and they said, “It’s percolating.”

I then ran into Provost Alden a number of weeks later, approximately seven weeks ago, and asked him, “What’s going on with that workload committee?” Well we’re working on it – we have important fish to fry. He’s going to get back to us right away. That was, like I say, six to seven weeks ago, no word. I have talked to another member of the committee, someone in an administrative post rather than a faculty member, and much to my concern and chagrin apparently there has been at least one meeting between the Provost, Deputy Provost and two of the members of the workload committee who happen to not be pure faculty, at which point they have apparently decided that it needs more boundaries. And when queried what “boundaries” means, there was no clear statement of that. I do not believe there have been any subsequent meetings, that meeting was maybe two or three weeks ago, from best I can gather. No subsequent meetings – it appears to me from talking to that person that this issue is dead until fall.

D. Wade: Well, golly we work so freaking hard and then we do nothing, I mean this is just typical.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, can you give us a sense of what was sent forward that they think needs more boundaries?

D. Wade: I can’t. I wish I could. I queried specifically that question and it’s not clear. The information that was given to me just as an aside was that this document is not solely for internal administration. It is also a public relations document intended for third parties to the university, most notably legislators and members of the general public; and, therefore, I suspect that whatever boundaries they are referring to are boundaries that would somehow satisfy, please or something those outside members. I feel confident that internally we can understand everything that there is about this workload policy and deal with it in an appropriate manner. Whether that will satisfy the legislators, I don’t know.

A. Lash: Thank you so much because I was waiting for this report and I was afraid it wasn’t going to come up until much later. Was there any agreement with the committee as far as the deadline for decision making? Could they go forever with investigation and so forth?

D. Wade: This could die a slow and lingering death. Never proceed any further than it is now, I guess, because at the end of the day I suppose it requires some sort of endorsement by the administration at the Provost’s level I would suspect. So I suppose they could simply trot around until people forgot about it or became so disinterested that they let it go. I don’t know whether that’s their intention. My impression is that they are loaded with bigger fish to fry and this has been put on the back burner.

R. Feurer: Is there any hint that you have that this is based or related to the performance-based funding legislation issue?

D. Wade: I don’t have any explicit knowledge of the relationship but it sure would seem to me that it would have something to do with it as a personal analysis. But I don’t have any other corroboration of that.
C. Cappell: Can you reveal any substantive points in the report like what is the quoted base load?

D. Wade: Base is 3-3.

C. Cappell: You recommended or decided base was 3-3?

D. Wade: That’s been the case from the very first meeting that the baseline is 3-3 and then there’s a bunch of means by which that can be adjusted. You know, everything from teaching graduate classes to large sections, to advising duties. There are all sorts of ways that you can do it. And I guess that’s one of the concerns, it appears as though there are so many outs of the 3-3 that to an outsider looking at it, it might be difficult for them to understand that justification. Internally, people who do the work would know that, but outside they would not. And I have to confess, from the very beginning, the Provost made it clear that this is a document intended to help explain to other people what we do.

A. Rosenbaum: If the committee started with 3-3, which is what the administration is saying should be the workload, then what were they expecting the committee to do?

D. Wade: Guidelines for modifying that 3-3 load.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and that’s what the committee sent forward that needs new boundaries?

D. Wade: I thought it was reasonably clear that we expected to have one more meeting to tweak it gently and now we are, from the best I can gather, it needs more than tweaking. I don’t know whether that means a total re-visit or what and apparently we’re not having a meeting to discuss that or memos or anything else. Someone is going to make that decision I guess and then we will have a meeting.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I can put it on the table at my meeting with Provost Alden and President Peters and see where that stands.

D. Wade: Maybe you can find out some information. I’d appreciate it and if you do, could you forward it to me because I’d love to know.

A. Rosenbaum: If I find out anything, I’ll write a note on our Blackboard website.

R. Feurer: I’m sorry to belabor this, but I think the faculty members should know that, based on what I’ve found out, this performance based funding for Illinois-based universities will develop a committee and they are going to come up with a program this summer. My concern is that this hard work will be mitigated by another committee that’s come up with a different kind of formula. I think we should be aware of what’s going on here.

A. Rosenbaum: We can try and touch base with President Peters since he supposedly is chairing that committee or he’s at least a member of the committee.
R. Feurer: Yes, it’s going to be worked out over the summer though and I think that they’re setting these things in place for the fall.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, we still have the Faculty Senate Blackboard website so we can keep you posted during the next couple of months. Check the website every once and a while; we’ll try and keep updated on some of these things that are going on through the summer.

VI. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of candidates running unopposed to serve on the following Committees of the University:

Academic Planning Council, Athletic Board, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment, Computing Facilities Advisory Committee, General Education Committee, Honors Committee, International Programs Advisory Council, Libraries Advisory Committee, Responsible Conduct of Scholarship Committee, Student Conduct Board, Undergraduate Coordinating Council, University Outreach Advisory Committee, University Press Board (COB and CLAS candidates only), University Scholarships Committee

A. Rosenbaum: The people that are listed on the committees under the consent agenda are running unopposed and therefore we just have to approve them as a group. We don’t have to vote individually on them. I’ll take a motion to accept the consent agenda.

S. Willis: So moved. J. Novak: was second.

The consent agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair

A. Rosenbaum: What I’d like to do because of the lateness of the hour is move ahead of the agenda, we’ll come back to some of these reports, but I want to get to the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee so we still have enough people here voting and then we can have discussions about some of these other issues and people can stay as long as they wish. So continuing the David Wade week, I’ll call on David Wade to begin the proceedings.

1. Election of President of Faculty Senate 2011-2012

D. Wade: Okay, the first thing on our agenda is the election of the President of the Faculty Senate. Normally this is done through a secret ballot, but I would like to make a motion to suspend the secret ballot and vote by acclamation. We have traditionally done this.
D. Wade: made the motion which was seconded and approved without dissent.

D. Wade: I make a motion to elect Alan Rosenbaum as the President of the Faculty Senate for 2011/2012.

A. Lash: Second.

The motion carried without dissent or abstention. Technically this is a nomination to be sent to the University Council for approval.

2. One-year renewal of Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you for your vote. One of the curiosities of the Constitution is the way it describes the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor position as a two-year appointment, renewable for an additional year. I’m making the motion that we renew the appointment of David Wade as Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor for an additional year.

G. Bennardo: Second.

The motion was approved without dissent or abstention.

3. Election of UCPC representatives for 2011-2013 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college; votes will be counted the following week and new UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

D. Wade: Thank you. The next thing on the agenda is the election of the UCPC representatives. Ballots were distributed by college and Senate members were instructed to leave the completed ballots at their places when they left the meeting.

4. Committees of the University 2011-2012 – Candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Packets/ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting – walk-in

D. Wade: Called the Senate’s attention to the ballot packet for these positions again with the instructions to fill them out and leave them at their places at the conclusion of the meeting.

D. Wade: As you can well imagine, UCPC is an unbelievably important committee within this structure and one that is not easy. It’s an extremely labor intensive committee and you should want to be on it to be on it that’s for sure. It deals with very serious matters.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Earl Hansen has left the building. You have his report which you can read.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – no report

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report

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

C. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs – report – walk-in

L. Elish-Piper: I’m going to start the report and then David will take over. We put together this statement of budget priorities to fulfill our responsibility to have an advisory role and we wanted to put together this written document to synthesize the big issues that we’ve addressed this year as well as to reflect the input that we receive from Faculty Senate and University Council members. The purpose in creating the statement was to just have a written document that articulated the specific priorities that our committee advocates when considering budget decisions in the future.

D. Goldblum: We have a document here with five main points. I’ll just highlight them very briefly. We wanted to acknowledge that we should be safeguarding the teaching mission of the University, strictly student learning and welfare and that we’re concerned about the long term consequences of diverting the limited funds to prioritizing the core mission of the University and we’re concerned that there will be a slow degradation of infrastructure and resources on campus here. We also understand that much of what’s going on with pensions and insurances occurring at the State level but we ask to be informed of discussions and negotiations as they proceed and the University administration has been pretty good with that thus far. We also support the administration’s decision to build for the future through the sale of bonds. We are concerned about, as mentioned above, that degradation of infrastructure such as the dorms and the effect it will have on student – attracting students and retaining students – what that means for the long term viability of the campus.

A. Rosenbaum: I want to commend the committee on doing this. I think it’s a great idea that the faculty make an annual statement to the administration on what we think spending priorities ought to be. And so they haven’t necessarily invited it nor have they told us we can’t do it, so we’ll submit it to them and I think this is framed very respectfully. Do you think you want a motion to have the Senate support of this document?
L. Elish-Piper: That would be great. I’d also like, if we’re going to do that, someone mentioned to me on my way in today that in our discussion here in item number four about pension and insurance, that perhaps instead of just saying insurance maybe we want to say benefits because there’s been a concern about the tuition waiver issue. So I wonder if we might want to alter that language slightly and, when I present this at University Council, I’ll be sure to indicate that when we’re talking benefits, of course, we’re looking at insurance but we’re also looking at the important role that tuition waivers play for faculty and staff as kind of a recruitment and retention device that is really important for a lot of our community.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, do you want to give us wording so that we can vote on it?

L. Elish-Piper: I can do that, yes. I think where it says maintaining adequate pension and insurance benefits could I just say maintaining adequate pension and benefits.

A. Rosenbaum: So we’ll take out insurance. Okay, let’s start with a motion. You want to make a motion to accept this and forward it to the administration via the Resources Space and Budget Committee.

L. Elish-Piper: Yes, I’d like to make a motion that we do what Alan said.

J. Kowalski and M.C. Smith: Second.

T. Arado: It’s just one quick thing. Insurance is in the first sentence as well. Do you want to switch that to benefits as well?

A. Rosenbaum: Pension and benefit programs? Is that what you’re saying?

L. Elish-Piper: Pension and benefit programs? I think that the committee would be okay with that, I’m looking around.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you accept that as a friendly amendment?

L. Elish-Piper: Yes.

The motion, as modified by the friendly amendment, carried without dissent or abstention.

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

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
A. Rosenbaum: Do we have any comments or questions from the floor? Rosemary, would you like any further discussion of your issue?

R. Feurer: It probably would take too long but I just feel that I hope that people will keep updated on the website about this performance-based funding. I think that has a lot of potential to affect our jobs dramatically. Maybe not at first but the way that this is going at other universities is a pretty deep concern to me and to at least the other members of the history department. My concern is that I have tried to find information from President Peters and I haven’t gotten a response on some the questions that have come up from my department. So if you have any questions, I do think it’s important that more people assert the hope that he will include faculty in whatever committee derives from this Illinois legislation. There’s a lot of variability in the kinds of outcomes that are put into place in this outcomes-based, performance-based funding across the country. And if you read a recent article in Chronicle of Higher Education, there are deep concerns about the business input into the Texas system and how corrupt that has become. I don’t say that that is happening in Illinois, but I think we will have to be on our guard to make sure it doesn’t.

A. Rosenbaum: congratulated Kendal Thu and Cliff Mirman on their appointment as Presidential Professors.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Meeting Schedule – 2011-2012
B. Minutes, Academic Planning Council, March 7, 2011
C. Minutes, University Assessment Panel, March 4, 2011
D. Minutes, University Assessment Panel, April 1, 2011
E. Minutes, Graduate Council, March 7, 2011
F. Minutes, General Education Committee, 2010-2011
G. Minutes, Honors Committee, 2010-2011
H. Minutes, Athletic Board, 2010-2011
I. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee, 2010-2011

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, I’ll take a motion to adjourn.

D. Valentiner: So moved.

A. Lash: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Have a good summer.

Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.