FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT  
Wednesday, April 20, 2011, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


James Carter attended for Erik Calmeyer.


I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, let’s come to order. We have a, as usual, a healthy agenda. I don’t know if it’s healthy, but it’s big. So we might as well get started.

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 our report from David Goldblum on the Resources, Space and Budgets Committee. Those are both walk-in items. I’ll entertain a motion to accept the agenda with the two walk-in items.

J. Novak: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and as I’ve just been reminded, say your name before you do anything so it’s on the tape and the transcribers know who said what. Second?

M C. Smith: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay Cecil. Any discussion? All in favor of adopting the agenda with the two walk-in items, say “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Any abstentions? Alright, the agenda is adopted.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 30, 2011 FS MEETING
(sent electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: Next item is the approval of the minutes of the March 30, 2011 Senate meeting. I need a motion.

W. Pitney: So move.

B. Lusk: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any corrections, changes, omissions, grammatical mistakes. You know, since Bill Baker is no longer on the Senate, we just don’t get the same kind of grammatical assistance that we used to get. Everyone love the minutes? All in favor of adopting the minutes say “aye.”

Members: Aye.


IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is that we will go into executive session, executive session meaning that anybody who is a non-voting member of the Senate will retreat to the anti-room to eat cookies and drink punch. We need a vote on this, do we not? I need a motion to go into executive session.

B. Lusk: So moved.

S. Willis: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All those in favor say “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A Rosenbaum: Any opposed? Okay we are in executive session; non-voting members will leave and George Slotsve will take over as Vice President of the Senate. Our recorder is, of course, as always, Nancy Castle.

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: I have a few presidential announcements. First, we want to thank the people who are completing their terms on the Senate. Those people are Teresa Fisher, Sonya Armstrong, Jesse Johnson, Lichuan Liu, Reinaldo Moraga, Julie Johnson-Hillery, Giovanni Bennardo, Joseph
Bujarski, Joe Jeffrey, Chris Nissen and Mary Cozad who served after Mike Morris passed away, Jay Stravers and Hui Hu, we really appreciate your service on the Senate. C.T. Lin is leaving the Senate because he is taking over a seat on the University Council so he’ll remain a Senate member by virtue of his membership on the University Council. Brad Cripe, Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Rosemary Feurer, Valia Allori and Larry Arnhart have all been re-elected to the Senate. We thank people who are leaving for their service and we’re delighted to have the re-elected people back.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next item we have as you know, Earl Hanson is our FAC representative or our representative to the FAC to the IBHE. We do not have a back up or an alternate for Earl. Now as some of you know, this is a four-year position; there is some salary attached to it. 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.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Ayhan Lash second. Any discussion? Good. All in favor?

**Members:** Aye.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Opposed? Sonya, congratulations you are now our alternate to the FAC.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, the next item we have is the, 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 committee for their work this year. They have done a great job. It’s always difficult for us to get chairs. People don’t seem to volunteer very much and I have to lean on people to be chairs, so please – they didn’t get the forms yet, did they? Did you get the forms? Did you send them back? Just got them. 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. So I’d really appreciate that. 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. I know last year when I made the assignments, I had far too many people who we didn’t know what their preferences were and we just tried to figure out what committee they might go on. I like to have continuity, so it’s good to have people on the same committee, so unless you absolutely hated your committee, please stay on it and get those back to us as soon as you can. Thank you.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Next, I want to call on Sue Willis to give us an update on the situation with the Libraries Advisory Committee. Where we left off with them is I had requested to them 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 we would have to be notified about. I got a letter back from Michael Spires who basically said that the committee could not agree on what “substantial” was and, therefore, they were not going to do that for us. So, that’s as far as I know.
But we do have a liaison, 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, but anyway he’s fine now. So 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. Then there was some other information about developments in the library, in general, which I won’t go over unless people have specific questions about, just in the interest of time.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, questions? No questions for Sue? 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”? Any comments? Pat?

**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:** I think one of the problems – 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 reaching some kind of a balance, it’s almost like they’d have to tell us everything, which is what they said. 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? Is there a library person here? Yes, library person, Jana?

**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 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 image 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.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Rosemary?

**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, any motions on this? Does anyone want to make 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.
A. Rosenbaum: The last item I'll mention is that on the 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. Now what you have on the consent agenda is 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?

S. Willis: Blue Ribbon.

A. Rosenbaum: Oh, I’m sorry.

D. Wade: Here’s where we’re at and I’ll give it to you fast and loose. The last meeting of this panel, the last full meeting of this panel, was the week before classes started in January. At that meeting, as far as I could tell, we had finalized the language, pretty much and it was therefore 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 Provosts office to wonder what’s going on, no response. 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 in which I 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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so no one has to work until fall so that’s good.

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 blood-thirsty legislators, I don’t know.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, any comments or questions for David? Apparently the blue ribbon panel will re-convene in the fall do you think?

**D. Wade:** I hope so. I’ve been chasing them down and it’s like I’m a pest. They have another Tsunami in Altgeld Hall which is delaying this process. Don’t ask me what Tsunami they’re referring to this time.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Ayhan?

**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.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay. Other questions, comments? Rosemary?

**D. Wade:** I surely hope as a personnel SPS faculty personnel advisor that this would have gone through this year because I feel this is an important matter.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Rosemary?

**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.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Charles?

**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. It starts with a baseline of 3-3. 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, they would know that, but outside they would not. And was, 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? I thought they were sort of expecting more guidelines for how workload is.

D. Wade: And that’s what we developed, that’s correct. The 3-3 is very

A. Rosenbaum: So the guidelines is the issue, the 3-3 is what we started with and then it’s just guidelines for what?

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so in other words the things you’re talking about now. How would you, for example, count how you would do a recitation section or an art group or whatever?

D. Wade: Clinical supervision.

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, and again, I’m having trouble getting information even from the horse’s mouth, that 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 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: I’ll do that. I’ll put it on the website.

D. Wade: As a member of the committee, I feel like I should know.

A. Rosenbaum: If I find out anything, I’ll write a little note on Blackboard website.
R. Feurer: Alan, one more thing.

A. Rosenbaum: Rosemary?

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. As far as I know, what I found out, my concern is that this will then be, 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: Okay, other comments? Okay we can try and keep up with President Peters in terms of what he, he supposedly is chairing that committee or he’s at least a member of the committee, so we’ll see if we can…

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 despite the absence of Faculty Senate meetings during the next couple of months. If you 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: Okay, moving along, the consent agenda. These are essentially appointments to committees. 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 move.

A. Rosenbaum: Any discussion? If anyone wants to know who these people are we can tell you but we didn’t think you’d really care. All in favor say “aye.”

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed. Abstentions? Okay, we’ve approved the consent agenda.

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, David Wade to suspend the secret ballot and vote by acclamation. We have traditionally done this.

???: Second.

D. Wade: We have a motion, we have a second. Discussion? All in favor of the motion, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

D. Wade: Opposed, “nay.” Motion carries. I make a motion to elect Alan Rosenbaum as the President of the Faculty Senate for 2011/2012.

A. Lash: Second.

D. Wade: All in favor

Members: Aye

D. Wade: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you for your vote. Not that there is anyone else for you to vote for and I don’t know exactly whether it’s a good thing or not, but thank you anyway. The next item – this is again one of the curiosities of the Constitution – is the way it writes is the Faculty and SPS
Personnel Advisor position is a two-year appointment, renewable for an additional year. But it
doesn’t say how this renewal works. So traditionally, what we have done is just made the motion
that David Wade be continued for the third year of his three year term. It’s a non – you can’t re-run
– it’s a term limited situation so he will be ineligible to run after this year. I’m making the motion
that we elect David or that we renew the appointment of David Wade as Faculty and SPS Personnel
Advisor for an additional year. I need a second.

G. Bennardo: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Alright David you’re re-elected and you can now take it back.

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 representative. I
ask John Novak and Beverly Henry to help me here.

A. Rosenbaum: Do you want me to call for hand raising by certain colleges?

D. Wade: Each college and internally, yes.

A. Rosenbaum: We’ll start with anyone. We’ll start with Arts and Sciences, Arts and Sciences,
hands up.

D. Wade: I think they’re probably the greenies maybe, pinkies?

A. Rosebaum: Do you know which color Arts & Sciences are?

D. Wade: The Pinks

A. Rosenbaum: Pink, Arts and Sciences are pink.

D. Wade: Like I say, you will see on this and remember this only goes to voting members of the
Faculty Senate, again only one of these is it’s a one-year these are generally two year UCPC terms
the only one year term is to replace Terry Bishop in the College of Business, so if you get that you
only vote for members of your college so look at the number in parenthesis and respond
accordingly.
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: While they’re handing those out, we can deal with the number four matter as well. On your table before you when you came in was a small packet that looks this. These are the ones we vote on the consent agenda were the ones that were running unopposed. These are the ones that are running opposed. You need to vote on each one. Keep turning the pages, there is one, two, three, four total votes. You will vote for one in each class. One for the APPM Advisory Committee, one for Campus Security, one for Unity and Diversity and one University Press Board.


D. Wade: Got em. COB.

A. Rosenbaum: Who else do we need?

D. Wade: College of Business.

A. Rosenbaum: College of Business – hands. One in the back. Okay, do we have any others? College of Education – hands up.

D. Wade: And probably Engineering – Engineering and Engineering and Technology.

A. Rosenbaum: No, no Engineering. Why are you saying no Engineering?

D. Wade: Did we do CEET? CVPA? Visual and Performing Arts, did we do them?

A. Rosenbaum: We did VPA, I think, no? Okay, some people are not getting to vote.

D. Wade: College of Education raise your hand.

A. Rosenbaum: Education we have in the front. You got yours? Okay, does anyone not have a ballot?

P. Erickson: VPA doesn’t and Engineering.

D. Wade: They don’t have an opening. No openings for you guys.

A. Rosenbaum: Say again.

??: I was notified (inaudible)
A. Rosenbaum: The only two on the education ballot would be, say them again. Rosita Lopez and David Walker. So the other people are leaving so they thought they’d run quickly before they left. Get elected then leave.

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’s very serious matters. Once you have voted, fold your ballot in half and leave it at your table place and the same thing is true of the packet of five votes that was set at your table to begin with. Just leave it with everything else at the end.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, that completes the

D. Wade: That concludes it.

A. Rosenbaum: If you fill those out and leave them, we’ll be all set with that.

VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, Earl Hansen has left the building and so you have his report which you can read and he’s not here to answer questions so we’ll move on.

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

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have a report from David Goldblum. That’s our next report.
D. Goldblum: We have a tag team here.

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: Okay, any comments? 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, I don’t think there would be any problem with them, they would have any problem with this. So again, thanks to the committee for this. 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 or do we want to have insurance and other benefits?

A. Rosenbaum: Well insurance would sort of be the benefits so I think if you broadened it to benefits that would include both?
L. Elish-Piper: Does that work? I can just strike that word?

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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we need a second.

J. Kowalski and M C. Smith: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, we have a couple of seconds there. Jeff and also Cecil. Any discussion? Further discussion? Anything we want added? Yes.

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: In the first sentence.

First line of four.

A. Rosenbaum: So what would you recommend changing that to?

???: I would just make that benefits.

L. Elish-Piper: The benefits instead of insurance?

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.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so with those two changes, any other changes? Any other priorities that people would think we need to include that are not in here? Very good. All in favor of sending this forward as we described say “aye.”

Members: Aye

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 anything else? I don’t think we have any other business. 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. There will be – I will try to find out as much information. 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 legislation, 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: Yeah, corruption in Illinois unheard of! Very good, okay we’ll try and keep an eye on that and again, please check Blackboard during the summer. One last, is Kendall still here? Did Kendall leave? Oh too bad I wanted to congratulate Kendall on behalf of the Senate for being one of the first three presidential engagement professors so we have that in the record and Kendall can read it if he’s not already. Is he here? Cliff Mirman too, okay great. I’m sorry. Congratulations!

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: All in favor? Alright, you’re all leaving anyway. Have a good summer.

Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.