

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Domke, Falkoff, Haliczer, Klaper, D. Long (for Small), Tollerud

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Gebo, Hathaway, Small, Smith, Streb, Thompson, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: If we can come to order. We’re going to, hello. Greetings. I’ve been told by powers more powerful than myself that I have to first turn the floor over to our vice president George Slotsve. So that’s what I’m going to do.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m.

G. Slotsve: As many of you know, this is Alan’s last time that he’ll be secretary of the Faculty Senate, president of this Faculty Senate. So this is his last meeting and we want to thank him very much for his service. I know President Baker would like to make a few comments and then I’ll follow it up with a few comments before we have a presentation for Alan.

D. Baker: Thank you, George. Well in my first year I had to learn a lot and I’m still learning a lot and I’m going to learn a lot for a long time. But to help me through that process, I met a lot with this guy. We developed a good relationship. We’re able, I think, to speak truth to each other in respectful ways whether we wanted to hear what each other was saying or not. Most of the time we listened to each other, so that was good. There’s a lot to learn. The university has a lot of challenges. We have challenges budgetary and with enrollment and culture and climate and heavy competition and everything. And so we’re at a time of great change and great change can be scary, but you can get through it and come out a much better institution if you have good communication and trust and respect. And I really had that with Alan. I really felt like he would tell me the truth and bring me your perspectives on where things were in the institution. He worked tirelessly. He’s always e-mails me late at night waking me up and I’m not happy about that but he’s doing it anyway. And he’s been chairing the search committee for the provost position which is a big deal. That’s going to be a huge hire for us and the committee and he have
done a great job. So I’m here today to give my thanks to Alan for his great work and actually thanks to the senate for all of your hard work. In my youth, I held that position and found it one of the most rewarding and hardest positions I’ve ever had including being a president. You’ve got so many stakeholders with so many good ideas and so limited a time and it’s hard to juggle everything and keep everybody going the right direction. My thanks to all of you for working with Alan as well. Alan, congratulations on a great year.

G. Slotsve: Alan’s been executive secretary of the Faculty Senate for five years. As I recall you started in the fall of ’09 when you became executive secretary. I want to thank you for your service and the years of service that you put in here, Alan. One definition of a good leader is someone who takes a little more of the blame and a little less of the credit for decisions that are made; and I think, by these standards, Alan’s been a very good leader for us in the Faculty Senate.

There have been a lot of changes over the last five years. Some have been good, some have been bad. Some of you might have noted I tend to sit at the corner chair very near the door and people have noticed this in the past. And I’ll let you know it’s not because I’m trying to make a quick exit, nor is it because Alan has given me instructions to block anyone from leaving the room prior to the votes being taken. One of the reasons I do it is I can kind of see reactions especially during Alan’s presidential comments. And I can see how people respond to the presidential comments that Alan’s making. And a number of this hasn’t been good news over the last number of years with pension reforms that we’re all dealing with, state cutbacks to higher education funding, some of it’s the NIU financial situation. And I’ve seen Alan make his comments. I’ve also seen a number of senators’ shoulders every now and then kind of slump over a little bit and I watch senators’ reactions. I will say it often reminds me of a statement that Harry S. Truman made to Ed Murrow. What Truman said was “I never gave anybody hell. I only told the truth and they thought it was hell.” And that’s how I’ve often felt when he’s making his presidential comments and a lot of the bad changes that are occurring.

On the other hand, there have been a number of good things that Alan has been involved in during his tenure. As already mentioned, he’s on the search committee for the provost, but he’s also been on the search committee for general counsel, for the chief of police, for the CIO as well as on the presidential search committee. so I think Alan you’ve left NIU a much better place than when you arrived in ‘09. I think it’s going to have a big impact and influence on NIU going forward. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for your five years of service as well as your strong advocacy of joint governance here at NIU. Thank you, Alan. And before we go too far we have a gift for you, Alan. This is a picture Alan saw one time a few years ago, I guess, that he really liked. So it’s a picture of different scenes of Northern Illinois University and below is just a statement presented to Alan Rosenbaum, “President of the Faculty Senate NIU, 2009 – 2014.” Thank you very much, Alan.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, George. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, senators. This is a beautiful piece that was done by I think Mariano Spizzirri, right, sorry. He’s not here so he can’t say anything about that. So I thank you very much. It has been a great honor to serve as president of the Faculty Senate. I know I’m going to miss it, but I think it’s time and I wouldn’t argue for longer than five years for anybody. It has been a great run and I’ve enjoyed it very
much and I thank you for the trust you put in me. So thank you all and thank you, Mr. President, for coming down here and interrupting your schedule. I appreciate it.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, now to the business. First item is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. One is Gleb Sirotkin’s report on the Library Advisory Committee and the OARAA Task Force. Remember this is the one on open access publishing and Gleb has been our liaison to those committees and will give us a report on that, so that’s one of the walk-ins. The other one is a statement and Marc Falkoff will talk a little bit about this. He’s on the faculty of our law school and this involves the pension reform bill and it sort of is a little bit of an update on what’s going on and possibly something that we might be able to do. We’re going to put that pension reform statement in the Items for Faculty Senate Consideration along with Gleb Sirotkin’s report which you can see is already in there. So I need a motion to accept the agenda with the two added walk-in items.

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.


A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Okay the agenda is adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 26, 2014 FS MEETING

A. Rosenbaum: The next is the approval of the minutes of the March 26 Faculty Senate meeting. I need motion first to adopt the agenda.

T. Arado: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, a second?

M. Rosenbaum: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Any changes, corrections, omissions, subtractions? Okay all in favor of approving the minutes say aye.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Opposed? Abstention? Okay and so we have the approval of the minutes.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
A. Rosenbaum: Next is the executive session. We need to first get a motion to go into executive session for the purposes of the report from the committee evaluating the president of the senate and the report from the committee to evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. And so I need a motion to go into executive session.

J. Wilson: I’ll make the motion.

A. Rosenbaum: Second?

T. Arado: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: All in favor?

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Any opposition? No abstentions? Okay we are in executive session which means that everybody who is a non-voting member of the senate must join me out in the hallway and our vice president George Slotsve will take over.

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of University Council

B. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor

G. Slotsve: I’d like to thank the committees for the report. I know it’s a fair bit of work especially at this time of year and coming at the end of the year where you’ve got a number of other responsibilities, so thank you to both of the committees for your hard work. I’d like to make a motion to leave the executive session and I need a second.

J. Wilson: Second.

G. Slotsve: All those in favor of leaving the executive session say aye.

Members: Aye.

G. Slotsve: Any against? Abstentions? Then we’ll leave the executive session and invite everyone else back in the room. Thank you very much.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, did you vote to come out of executive session? All right, great. Okay let me get to President’s Announcements. The first thing I want to do is introduce the new Chief information officer. I think that’s not your entire title is it? Vice president for IT and chief information officer, Brett Coryell. Brett just started, I think, a few weeks ago, three weeks ago. And, although he’s only been here for three weeks, he’s already rocking and rolling in the tradition of Doug Baker and so there are a lot of things happening. And since this is our last
senate meeting of the year, Brett asked to be able to talk to the senate a little bit because there are some things going on that could happen before the first senate meeting in the fall and he wants faculty to be aware of those things. So, Brett, you want to come up and tell the Faculty Senate what they need to be worried about.

B. Coryell: Can you hear me okay. Well thank you for having me. I hope this is the first of many times I get to come and address this group. I think the outreach that the central IT unit does to various members of the community or different slices of everybody that’s at NIU is a really important aspect of my job. And I want to make sure that I’m available to tell you what I’ve got planned as a community as a whole and for my central IT group, but also to hear back from you about where your pain points are. For today, I know we only have a few minutes scheduled for this so I wanted to hit two topics pretty quickly. One of them relates to Microsoft Office licensing and another one relates to network changes.

So I’ll start with what, I hope, is going to be the really good news that will happen before we come back for fall classes. And that is that, just in the first couple of weeks, I’ve discovered that we are not, as an institution, actually fully compliant with our software licensing around Windows and Microsoft Office. So you can imagine all of the budgetary pressures that individual departments or groups around campus may have felt in order to try to get things done, but maybe not having all the budget they felt they needed to buy all the licenses. So we have a quote that we’re trading and almost done with Microsoft right now that will give us full campus-wide licensing for all faculty, students and staff for all of the Windows products that we would need in order to be fully compliant if we are able to successfully complete that. That would result in five copies of Microsoft Office available for everyone’s personal and institutional use. You would be able to install it on tablet devices, both Android and iPad tablets. You would get access to web copies of Office and you would have fully installable local copies as well. That alone, our compliance burden, if we had found and were fully punished for even one stolen copy, the amount that we’ll pay to get fully right with the law would be less than just one stolen copy should Microsoft choose to pursue it to the full extent of the law. So that’s fantastic news.

Along with that will come other options for no additional price such as the use of SharePoint, the use of Link, which is an instant messaging client, and the ability to migrate out of GroupWise and into Office 365 which would give us 50 gigabyte inboxes instead of two gigabyte inboxes. So there are a large number of reasons why we might want to do this and you’ll hear more about that, but the conversion of e-mail and calendars out of GroupWise into Office 365 is a non-trivial effort. That can’t happen by the time you get back, but we should be compliant with Office licensing by the time you get back and I hope that’s really positive news.

The other topic that I wanted to talk about is the network. And our network here was architected, both wired and wireless, it was architected during a time when the internet was a more inviting, open and friendly place. And it is certainly not that right now from an information security standpoint. So right now, if you go back and you have lab equipment or just your personal laptop or desktop machine, all of those machines right now are open and sitting on the free and hostile internet with no barrier between anybody and any country on the planet who wants to scan your machine for vulnerabilities and try to work their way into it. There’s no barrier between them and our campus. The networking people in my group have already found that out.
There’s a design and there’s a plan in place right now to implement a perimeter, a border, for the network that will provide various types of protection for us and sort of get us up to the common practices. So we would have a firewall that would protect us. We would look for traffic that’s going to or coming from known hostile sites that distribute Malware and we would detect that traffic and block it. And then we’ll also be doing something about peer-to-peer file sharing. We have hundreds and hundreds of RIAA and NPAA recording industry and movie industry take-down notices because they’ve detected that we’re illegally pirating movies and songs. We’ll be shutting down a lot of that as well.

Of course, when you go from having nothing to having something for the first time, there can be hiccups and I just want faculty to know that I’m very aware of all sorts of issues that are going to be possible. So I know that there are probably people who study peer-to-peer files sharing in the computer science department and I can’t block. I know that, when we put a border up to the network, then the scientists and maybe musicians who rely on high speed, low latency connections may not be able to get that, so we have a separate zone for them that just lets them out onto the internet nice and quick so they can do large file transfers or they can do interactive music concerts. So we’re aware of that. And I’m also aware that fully a third of all machines, if you just go around the planet, a third of all machines have some form of Malware on them. So anybody in this room’s machine might be affected and, without your knowledge, communicating with a hostile site or that hostile site is trying to recruit you to participate in a cyber attack. And you wouldn’t know that ordinarily but, when we detect it and block that, to each individual person’s machine, it will look like you’re cut off from the internet and not able to access the internet. And that will be a disruptive state to be in. So I just want to make everybody aware that we know that that’s going to happen ahead of time.

I’m starting to communicate with all of the IT people across campus. My group and the 200 or more other IT people who don’t work in the central ITS group, will be prepared with desktop support, distributed IT, the Help Desk, network engineers. And we may just even recruit other IT people to be around and to be available as we deploy this zone-by-zone or building-by-building across campus. We’ll be there to try to assure that, if you detect it, you’re unable to get to the internet for any reason, then we’ll scan your machine for Malware, we’ll reconfigure your network address and just work with you personally until you’re back up and running again so you aren’t waiting days or weeks to have somebody come by and just respond to your service outage. With that, that may happen before people get back, or if we’re a little delayed then we’ll probably push it back to sometime either Christmas break or if there’s an opportune fall break, I’m not sure what our calendar looks like, it could happen before you get back or it could happen during that time. We don’t want to wait too long, of course, because we need the security protections. And with that I’ll any questions or offer any clarifications if there are some. I’ll start here.

**J. Novak:** You didn’t mention which version Microsoft Office we’re going to be having. Is it the newest version?

**B. Coryell:** Yes, the newest version, which I believe is Office 2013. George?
G. Slotsve: I was just going to ask you, Brett, I know we received and e-mail. Is it Heartbleed virus that came through?

B. Coryell: Yes.

G. Slotsve: Do you just want to mention what people should be doing, or should we change the passwords and that, because it is a big issue. I just thought here we could report that.

B. Coryell: Sure thing. Quickly on Heartbleed, this is a security vulnerability that has affected large numbers of companies or large numbers of machines on the internet. There is some open source software that had just a programming oversight when someone contributed to the advancement of that software. That software is used in commercial products at any number of sites like Yahoo, FaceBook, Twitter, Gmail, I forget the complete list. And for two years it has been vulnerable to an attack which is completely undetectable by the people that are running the servers. What happens is you write, just in a few minutes, a piece of code that will visit a website, inject the attack, and receive a small chunk of the memory on that server without anybody knowing. What you get back is anybody’s guess, right? It’s like sort of reaching your hand into the bingo bucket and you pull out a ping pong ball and you don’t know what it’s going to say, but it’s been demonstrated multiple times that you can get back interesting chunks of memory like your name and unencrypted password, or the server’s security certificates that try to help it encrypt information.

So what you should do is, you should go change all of your passwords, and as you’re taking a moment to think about passwords, I would ask, if you can, and it’s a bit of a stretch, please use a different password to every site. For many people that’s impractical without a password manager. So we haven’t begun to talk about how to use password managers and their not entirely intuitive to use. So I would just say at least have three passwords. Have one for NIU, have one for any of your financial life, and have one for your fun sites. Because at least that way you begin to compartmentalize any of the damage that can be done if anybody guesses or steals your passwords. You don’t want your NIU passwords stolen and then they’ve got access to your retirement account and your Chase bank account. Other questions?

H. Bateni: I just want to bring your attention to another category of faculty member here at NIU who would be interested to have administrative password to the computer. For them, that includes myself. In my research lab, I am not really interested to have internet connection. But I do have interest to have administrative password so that, if anything goes wrong after hours and then there’s an emergency to fix it, I can take some measures myself. So I just want to make you aware that also. If that’s a possibility, that would be great.

B. Coryell: I can respond to that quickly to say that all the nuances of that request will take too long to answer efficiently here, but I am familiar, that’s a very common request across universities all over the country. There are reasons to not want people to have the administrative password. Ninety-two percent of all cyber attacks can be prevented by simply not giving somebody the administrative password. A machine where you don’t have administrative rights is immune to 92 percent of the attacks that have come out in the last either 12 or 18 months. So that’s why people want to take it away.
You want to have it for all the reasons you just stated, and the conditions under which there’s a balance for that, are what’s probably too nuanced. If you have no internet connection, if you’re on a completely isolated network segment, if you don’t have thumb drive coming back and forth or USB drives that you cycle back and forth, we can probably get there together. Let’s have a separate conversation. Okay? Thank you for your time.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you, Brett. The next person who’s asked for some of my time to talk to senate is our outgoing Faculty and SPS Personnel Adviser, Toni Tollerud. So we’ll give Toni a few moments.

T. Tollerud: Thanks, Alan. I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank the Faculty Senate. It’s been an honor to serve as your SPS Faculty Personnel Advisor for the past two years. I was hoping to make a third year of it, but retirement has come in the way. So I am retiring. I would like to invite you to my retirement celebration on May 1 if you are open. I would love to see you there. But it’s been a real learning experience, and I hope that any of you who have an interest in working with fellow faculty members. In a perfect world it would be great if we didn’t need an advisor. But we’re not in a perfect world and it’s been a wonderful learning experience for me to work across campus and to serve you in many capacities, be it retirement, tenure, whatever, conflict, just listening sometimes. And please spread the word that this is a wonderful opportunity to get a person who is not in your own department to be able to sit down and talk with you as well as to guide you in what your rights and responsibilities can be as a faculty member here. So again I really am honored that you put me in this position and thank you for that opportunity.

A. Rosenbaum: And I might add that Toni’s thanking us, but we really should be thanking her because she did a spectacular job for the last two years. And, by all accounts, you more than likely heard that in the evaluation which we didn’t hear, but Toni’s been great and we’re sorry to lose her. We’re delighted that we have someone very qualified that’s been nominated to serve next year. But, Toni, we really wanted to thank you for all of your help and, on behalf of all of the faculty and SPS employees on campus, thank you very much and good luck in your retirement.

And again I should thank a few other people. It’s one of those days. I apologize, we’re going to be dragging on a little bit, but I really would be remiss in not thanking a number of people that have certainly made the job of being executive secretary possible, if not easier, or is it the other way around? First, of course, I’d like to thank Pat Erickson who has been a great administrative assistant. She’s been with me for four years and she has made this job a thousand times easier. So I appreciate everything that she’s done for me and with me and I’m delighted that she’s going to be serving our next executive secretary. It makes me feel much more comfortable that the boat will stay afloat. So thank you very much, Pat. I appreciate all your efforts. And I also want to thank Ferald Bryan our parliamentarian. He’s been parliamentarian for as long as I’ve been here and I think he’s continuing even though I’m leaving. Is that true Ferald? All right so you’re not going to give it up just because I’m leaving. Okay, great, so thank you, Ferald, for all your help over the years. And also I think George Slotsve has been my vice president for pretty much the whole time I think, four years, yeah. Okay great so I really appreciate George’s counsel and his
help over the years as well. And also, thank you to all of the chairs, people on the Executive Committee and people on the Steering Committee. I know there’s some of you here as well. Again, this is certainly not a one-person job and there are a lot of people that make it possible and I thank you all for your help over the years. I appreciate it. Okay, I think that’s the last of that sort of thing.

So now we can move on a little bit. I’m going to shorten the announcements as much as I can. I just want to make it know to you if you haven’t seen the messages that our final candidate for the provost position is Marek Dollar. He will be on campus Monday and Tuesday, this coming Monday and Tuesday. And there are open forums for faculty, for staff and community members, and also for students. You should make an effort to get to those forums if you can, one of them at least. We are getting feedback from people. If you go to them, you’ll get a feedback form. We’re organizing all that feedback for the president. So if you want to have some say in this, the president is responsive to comments that he’s getting from the rank and file, from the faculty, from all the different constituent groups in the university. So do your bit, show up for some of those forums, ask tough questions and then give feedback. So that’s Monday and Tuesday. I think the faculty forum is Monday is that right? Monday at 1:30 in Altgeld 315. So that’s the Board of Trustees room in Altgeld. Hopefully, I’ll see some of you there.

A. **Recognition** of faculty members who have completed their terms – Page 4

A. **Rosenbaum**: The next item is our annual recognition of faculty senators. First, the faculty senators who are completing their service, let’s hold your applause until we go through the whole list of people. If you’re here, you might want to stand up but my guess is, if you’re here, you won’t want to stand up. Brad Cripe. I won’t read all the departments. You can see them up there and we’ll get through it a little bit quicker. Jane Rheineck, Mayra Daniel, Lynette Chandler, Lichuan Liu, Sherry Fang, Winifred Creamer, Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Ibrahim Onyuksel, Christopher Nissen, Mark Frank, Eric Jones, Sien Deng, Leonard Clapp and Art Ward. So these are our senators who have completed and are now rotating off the senate for at least a little while. So let’s have a round of applause for them, our senators completing their service. Gary Chen is moving up to the University Council. Jozef Bujarski has been re-elected and we have on-coming newly-elected members. Lee Covington Rush, Eui-kyung Shin, Greg Conderman, Reinaldo Moraga, Mitch Irwin, Jimmie Manning, Minmei Hou, Robert Reichle, Ismael Montana, Joseph Stephen, Valia Allori and Kheang Un. And I apologize if I have butchered any of the names, but those are newly-elected faculty senators. So welcome to all of them.

VI. **ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

A. Libraries Advisory Committee, Gleb Sirotkin, FS liaison – report – walk-in

B. Open Access Research Articles Act (OARAA) Task Force, Gleb Sirotkin, Winifred Creamer, and Rebecca Hunt, FS liaisons – report – walk-in

A. **Rosenbaum**: Next order of business is our Libraries Advisory Committee report, Gleb.
G. Sirotkin: So, not to be conspicuous so I tried to put everything in the report, two pages. The main business was open access bill for research article act. And so we had Open Access Week in October of 2013 and we will have one in 2014 also somewhere I think third week of October. And it will be, I think they plan to make it smaller this time – maybe a half day of talks.

I put some links in the report with the bill itself which was, I think it was signed on August 9 last year, so it’s a good idea to – the main idea is to make everything, the whole research done in public and it is to be available to the public for free. It’s getting momentum and all magazines, journals, it is only about papers and journals. It’s not about books or manuscripts. There are some bills on the federal level that are considered by Congress right now, but nothing active right now.

What else? At NIU level we have a repository for free access already established and that will be the base for the implementation of this act. But as I said, big magazines, big publishers already offering the open access format of publishing. Of course, they act for some publishing fee, good magazines a good fee, of course. Library has a fund for that kind of fees. They offer up to $2,000 per person, one paper per year and I give the link to that fund and available. I also found at American Medical Society webpage, but the funds that are there are accessible for open access purposes so it’s not just mathematics papers. There are funds available not on there from our library funds.

What else? The biggest difficulty for this act is how to treat open access publishing for tenure and promotion purposes, And for that, again on the library side you can find a web link to the well respected open access magazines and journals that have a peer review that have an editorial board And we also have one managed and created by one of our faculty – at least one that I know of – and I listed it at the end of the Department of Communication. And library will offer some orientation for different departments. They can make a presentation about things that relate to that.

Another way to implement open access publishing is to publish it before, but negotiate that copyrights of your papers will stay with you and the magazines can agree on that with some embargo period so you will not be able to post your papers for six months or a year. But, after that, it is possible. And that is another alternative that is suggested as having publishing in well-established magazines and support an open access initiative. That’s about it.

A. Rosenbaum: Any questions for Gleb?

G. Sirotkin: I’m sorry. One more thing, there are two meetings coming up that you might be interested in. There will be a library advisory meeting on April 25 and there will be the task force the open access research act open meeting on Monday, April 28. So you can be interested in those.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, any questions for Gleb? Okay, thank you very much and thank you for representing the Faculty Senate on those committees. We appreciate it.

C. Pension Statement – walk-in
A. Rosenbaum: The next item is the, this draft. I know we didn’t have a lot of time to look at. I didn’t get finalized until this morning. Marc Falkoff is a faculty member in our College of Law. Marc and Elvia Arriola volunteered, I think at the last meeting or possibly at the University Council meeting, to meet with the attorneys, or at least contact the attorneys, that are pressing the lawsuits against the government with respect to the pension reform bill. I’ll let Marc explain what’s going on and he’ll also explain the purpose of this draft statement that you have as the walk-in item. Marc.

M. Falkoff: Thanks, Alan. Okay so as everyone knows, we’re all going to be effected in one way or another by the pension reform law, but some of our colleagues are about to be put in an impossible position because there is category of university employees who may not want to retire but feel pressed to do so because they want to lock in the benefits that are due to them without a diminishment that will come about because of the new law taking effect. So their quandary is that, if they retire and it turns out that the new law is deemed unconstitutional by the courts, then they’ve retired needlessly and they can’t unretire. If they look at the law and decide that it is patently unconstitutional and decide to take a chance and not retire and then it turns out that the courts decide that the law is constitutional, then they cannot retroactively retire. So that’s the kind of situation where you would normally ask a court to issue a preliminary injunction to keep the law from taking effect until the courts definitively determine whether the law is constitutional or not. So you simply would be asking the courts to delay the effective date of the law.

As you probably know, there are multiple lawsuits pending challenging the validity of the law. At this point there are five of them. They’ve all been consolidated in front of one judge and I’ve spoken with some of the lawyers and we’ve discussed this particular issue about the preliminary injunction. So what we’re concerned with right here is not with the ridiculousness of the law or anything like that. We’re concerned with a particular issue: people being put to a choice before they have adequate information. And we’ve inquired whether they’re planning on filing for a preliminary injunction and no one wants to say anything definitively because it’s all litigation strategy. But it seems very clear that within the next week or so there should be a motion for a preliminary injunction filed. No guarantees, but all indications are that’s what’s happening.

Now the question is, there are several things, but the two first questions are: Is there anything that we can do to help out those lawsuits and that prospective motion for a preliminary injunction? And there are two things: One thing that we can do is we can gather the names of persons who are going to be put to this untenable choice. So someone who is going to have to make a choice in the next month or so whether to retire even though they would prefer not to retire but they don’t know whether the law is going to be constitutional or not. And we might be able to talk about how we can get as many names as possible and we can get in touch with the lawyers.

The second thing that we can do is, as a group, issue a statement that could potentially be used in the press if we wanted to, but could be used by the lawyers and the litigation to demonstrate to the judge to give a little bit of evidence that this law is having a perverse effect and a real effect in that there are identifiable problems. In our case, as in the case with many of the institutions across Illinois, there’s basically going to be a very large brain drain for no reasons whatsoever.
So this is, what you have in front of you, is a draft statement for your consideration. And it basically, it doesn’t do too much, it’s not meant to be a legal argument. It’s simply meant to be something along the lines of the sense of this body that this law is going to be putting a number of us in a very difficult position. And it basically notes that we anticipate losing up to 800 employees at the university. That may be a high number. I presume it is a high number but that’s a number that’s been bandied about. Again, this is not a legal argument so I wouldn’t be too concerned about getting that number as precisely by nature is indefinite.

It identifies the two major reasons why we expect a wave of retirements. I won’t go deeply into them, but one is that there is a kind of grandfather clause that was written into the law that was designed to keep exactly this kind of thing from happening. But, more or less, there was a typographical error and this is not exact, but the idea is that there should have been a reference to something happening on June 30, 2014 but instead the law says it will happen on June 30, 2013. So, if you effectuate the law as written, people stand to lose a year’s worth of benefit accruals. This has been recognized as a mistake by a co-sponsor of the law, but that co-sponsor of the law doesn’t think that the legislature of the General Assembly is going to be able to change it in time because, if they open up the law again, then there’s going to be all kinds of changes. So that’s very unfortunate, but that’s the way it is.

And then second there’s an interest about the calculation of the effective interest rate. I don’t go into here, but the calculation of the effective interest rate. I think I will not go into it here but the basic idea is that there is something in the law that is going to mean that, if you retire on May 30, you’re going to lock in a favorable interest rate on what’s essentially over payments that you have made into the system. If you retire the next day, June 1, you get a less favorable interest rate that will cost, it will cost one of my colleagues for example, well north of $100,000 and he’s not the only person that that will happen to. It just notes that, and finally it notes that irrespective of our views about the wisdom of the pension law, we’re simply noting that massive retirements are going to be triggered for no rational reason and that it’s our hope that the law won’t take effect as scheduled and the courts will do something about it. So that’s the gist of it and I can answer any questions, fill in some details if you’d like.

A. Rosenbaum: Questions?

A. Gupta: Just curious can you please elaborate on that mistake maybe. I couldn’t follow it. What was that mistake?

M. Falkoff: I don’t pretend to understand this entirely, this is not my real job. So first of all, I’ll note that you can do a little bit of Googling and you can find a few statements. The University of Illinois was talking about this kind of stuff and there are attempts to explain it there. It’s also quite easy to find the complaints that have been filed online and the lawyers do a decent job of explaining in more detail.

The basic ideas is that the legislators recognize that there might be a mass defection and a mass retirement and they wanted to prevent that from happening by writing into law that essentially
you would not lose benefits if you didn’t retire immediately. This is my take on it. If you didn’t retire immediately upon the law taking effect and this provision would have prevented that kind of stampede if the, it’s not literally, everyone keeps calling it a typographical error, it’s not literally, but the effect is it’s as if instead of writing in June 30, 2014 is when your benefits get calculated, they had written by mistake June 30, 2013. It’s slightly more complicated than that but that’s the gist of it. Anyone who’s been in for a while should, I know it’s difficult to get these meetings, but you really want to be talking to a SURS representative to figure out whether this affects you.

**A. Gupta:** That brings the second one. Maybe it helps to strengthen this petition that not only we believe, of course, it’s unconstitutional and there may be typo, bigger problem is that SURS at least many of my colleagues said that, even if they want, they cannot get an appointment. All appointments have gone for the individual or in groups. So whether the law is unconstitutional or not or how bad it is, the bigger problem is and I think one major problem, people don’t know exactly how much they’re going to lose. So they are guessing based on the website but there are many things that are a guess at best. For example, it has a sick leave. Now does sick leave mean only uncompensated sick leave? Does it mean uncompensated and half of the sick leave which is compensable but not paid? Does it mean, etc. so question is, one thing should be told the judge that whether good or bad, at least people need to know how much they are losing and even that information is not available.

**M. Falkoff:** Well, I figured out your numbers for you, no I’m kidding. I don’t want to speak too much above my pay grade. Of course, those are all important issues and it seems to me at this stage we’re looking to again this is not a legal document, this is much a PR document as anything else. We’re looking to hit the major issues and there’s no doubt that, when the preliminary injunction is argued, and it has to be argued promptly, those kinds of issues about realistic, practical lack of information to all of us is, no doubt, going to be aired.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, Milivoje.

**M. Kostic:** So, basically, to clarify, you said you repeated 2013 and ‘14 it’s a grandfather guarantee so does it mean that the retirement I will have now will be lost but what I would have last year will be guaranteed in 2013?

**M. Falkoff:** And I really don’t want to answer that question except to say…

**M. Kostic:** So I’m only losing one year basically what I earned from last year to now?

**M. Falkoff:** Yes. I really don’t want to answer that question because I’m not qualified to answer it.

**M. Kositc:** …the mistake.

**M. Falkoff:** Yeah, the mistake, I’m simply, because I really haven’t read through this as a lawyer, and it just wouldn’t be a good idea for me give any information. But, that said, you can
find descriptions of the mistake and you can read the language that it’s based on and it would be easy enough to figure out.

**M. Kostic:** But, if you as a lawyer are not sure, how could I be sure as an engineer? It’s all basically, everybody’s like not knowing…

**M. Falkoff:** But the serious answer to that question is that, with respect to how that language affects your retirement benefits, you must talk with a SURS representative to tell you. And the second question is what the legal effect of an apparent mistake written into the law will, or should, be and whether a court, given that ambiguity in the law because of an acknowledged mistake, should delay the effective date of the law. All we’re saying, and the reason I don’t think it was necessary for us to go too deeply into the law, is that there are enough ambiguities and unanswered questions. The mere fact that the law is being challenged in its entirety, on constitutional grounds, is adequate to make us all, to put us all, anyone who might retire, put us all in a position where we can’t make a rational choice.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I know. Let me stop for a second because we have a limited amount of time and the point I want to make is that this is an emotional issue. Everyone has concerns about their own retirement. Marc does not know the answers to these questions. What we’re trying to do simply is to see if we want to make a statement that suggests that we’re supporting the idea of an injunction. An injunction will at least delay the implementation long enough for people to hopefully get the answers to the questions that they’re looking for. Rather than continue in that vein, let’s look at this document and decide whether or not we want to endorse it. If we want to endorse it, then we will take a vote and we’ll give that document to Marc who will get it across to the attorneys and they may or may not get anywhere with it. So let’s try and restrict ourselves just to this document at the moment and if we’re okay with this or if someone has an objection to something in the document. Yes?

**Unidentified:** I am just wondering if we want to use this word mistake given how much we’ve kind of worried over its appropriateness. I’m not suggesting an alternative.

**M. Falkoff:** Mistake is there, none of my answers will be defensive by the way. Mistake is there because as originally drafted, we had something along the lines of a typographical error, but the nature there is not typographical. There’s a phrase that was poorly constructed. Mistake is, we thought, a relatively anodyne term. But that’s the justification. Certainly, any quibbles about any of the words we should talk through recognizing that this isn’t a legal document, it’s not a contract, it’s more trying to convey a sense of where we’re coming from. Any mistakes or misrepresentations, we don’t want those certainly and we should correct everything.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right, if we agree to the substance of this or to the spirit of this, we can wordsmith it as necessary according to the attorneys. So it’s the question whether we agree to the substance of this. Do we want to say that we feel that an injunction is important?

**M. Kostic:** Somehow this whole draft is like making statements nothing we asked for or request. We hopelessly hope. That’s the last paragraph. Can we say we request and of course and then I’m confused about courts will see the injunction, I thought it’s already filed in court and is about
to make decision and you said it’s even maybe it will be filed this week and if it’s filed this week how long will it take court to even make a decision on injunction? I’m not familiar with the term.

**M. Falkoff:** First of all, five cases were filed across the state and the courts consolidated them so that they’re now all going to be decided by one judge because they all raise common issues. So if there is to be a preliminary injunction, at this point it’s going to be issued by the judge before whom all the cases have been consolidated. We could demand whatever, we could use language like demand it, if we wanted to. Just two things: First, if we are truly demanding something, it’s our prerogative or representatives of this class, to seek to intervene in the litigation or to file our own complaint. It’s actually the intervention mechanism is something that would be appropriate to consider if no preliminary injunction is eventually filed. So I’ll just note that. There is a way to literally get into court if you want to. And then second this was drafted in a way to, I’m going to use the anodyne before, it’s meant to convey the sense of the senate in a kind of measured tone which is all that we were going for.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Yes.

**R. Moremen:** Robin Moremen, sociology. I just want clarification. When you talk about the mistake in the second paragraph, can you talk about the relationship between the mistake and the problem with the interest rate with the money purchase formula which is really part of what is motivating people to retire by June 30 as opposed to after that point in time because, as I understand it, because of whether it’s a mistake or not, the interest rate changes. It may take for example, three additional years, hypothetically, for you to make up what you would have lost to just to get up to the point where your benefits would be the same as if you retired before June 30. Is that the mistake that you’re referring to or is this something else that needs to be addressed?

**M. Falkoff:** No, that’s not the mistake. So there are two separate issues. One is the calculation of the effective interest rate and the basic idea there is that long-time employees have been paying into the retirement system. Once you’ve paid in to a certain degree, you will in essence have funded the entire cost of your, this is my understanding, you will have funded the entire cost of your annuity. And to determine whether you funded the annuity, you look at the amount of money you paid into the system as well as the effective interest rate that the university recognizes and there are four factors for determining what that effective interest rate is. So this is all before any changes in the law. Many people will have essentially put in much more than they needed into their retirement account. Once you take their contributions plus the effective interest rate and put them together, if there’s more than was necessary to fund your annuity, then you’re entitled to a lump sum payment back.

The interest rate with the new law has been changed and now, instead of getting a seven to ten percent interest rate which is what historically you would have gotten, you’re going to get a rate pegged to treasury bonds and the rate’s going to be something along the lines of five percent, which means that your lump sum payment is going to end up being smaller. So, yes, people will lose a $100,000 to $150,000 in one lump sum. So that’s that issue. That’s the second issue.

The first issue is this mistake about this grandfathering clause and the fact that it will have, I’m much less well versed in that second one, but our understanding is that they’re two separate
issues. And I’ll just make one more point. Of course we don’t go into all of that here, we are simply gesturing towards the larger issues. All of the nitty-gritty of that is going to be hashed out by the lawyers.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, yes.

M. Koren: I just wanted to mention that there is going to be a presentation on Thursday, April 24, right here in the Holmes Center by SURS and it will also be live-streamed so it may shed some light on this. And I wanted to personally thank Marx and everyone else that helped you with this document. It’s great.

M. Falkoff: Thanks.

A. Rosenbaum: Do we have other questions or are we ready to take a vote to see if we want to endorse the document?

M. Kostic: The proposal is to add just to unclose the last paragraph.

A. Rosenbaum: What is it?

M. Kostic: It is, “We, therefore, are very concerned and hope that.” Now it’s only, “we hope.”

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you want “are very concerned”?

M. Kostic: “And hope for” whatever they say.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay. Is that okay Marc?

M. Falkoff: Fine with me.

A. Rosenbaum: All right, first I’ll take a motion. We need a motion from a member. Novak. Second, Slotsve. Okay so you’re moving that we endorse this with the change suggested by Milivoje Kostic. We already had discussion. All right so we’ll vote it on the clickers. One-yes, two-no, three-abstention. One, you’re supporting this document with wordsmithing and maintaining the flavor of it. And two, you are opposed to that. And three, you’re abstaining. So one, two, three, ready vote. One in favor, two opposed, three abstention. Anyone need more time? Okay let’s close it. Okay we will polish this up, Mark will take it to the attorneys’ and thank you.

35 – Yes
0 – No
0 - Abstain

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve list of candidates running unopposed to serve on committees of the
A. Rosenbaum: Okay, moving along. Our next item is the Consent Agenda and so we need a motion for the consent agenda.

S. McHone-Chase: So moved.

W. Pitney: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: There is no discussion of the consent agenda. All in favor say aye.

ALL: Aye.


VIII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 7

A. Rosenbaum: We will now get very brief reports from our advisory committees. The first one Sonya who is not here. There is a written report only.

B. Student Association – report

A. Rosenbaum: Second, Dillon has left? Did Dillon leave? Did he leave a substitute?

C. University Benefits Committee – Deborah Haliczer, Chair; Therese Arado, FS-Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession Liaison - report – Pages 8-9

A. Rosenbaum: All right, rolling right along. Deborah Haliczer, University Benefits.

D. Haliczer: Hello. I’d like to compliment Professor Falkoff and his colleagues on an excellent statement and for a very brilliant discussion of some very technical issues, so compliments to Marc. The Benefits Committee: You have our written report and I want to again point out that there are two benefit meetings. The one today from 5 until 7 is for retirees or people about to retire. A representative from SURS and the State University Annuitants Association will be there in the Sandburg Auditorium from 5 until 7 today. And tomorrow is the one for current employees. We anticipate the Sandburg Auditorium filling up and over flowing into the Regency Room. We also arranged for it to be streamed so that you can see it on your computers or on the NIU television station. When I left for this meeting, the arrangements still had not been made by those people outside of Human Resources who set up such technical things. Look in the morning to see, or this evening, to see what the arrangements are for the link, but I’m anticipating a lot of interest and concerns and hopefully some answers too. We’ll keep you posted.
Benefits choice is happening. I don’t have the details yet, but very few changes are going to occur. And I will be composing the memo to you this Friday summarizing what’s happening with Benefits Choice which starts next week May 1. I don’t think much is changing.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, questions for Deborah?

J. Novak: What time is that meeting tomorrow?

D. Haliczer: Tomorrow is 10 until 12, Sandburg. I will be there early managing traffic and irate folks.

A. Rosenbaum: Other questions? Okay thank you, Deborah.

D. Computing Facilities Advisory Committee – George Slotsve – report

A. Rosenbaum: Computer Facilities Advisory Committee, George.

G. Slotsve: I’ll make this real quick. At the last CFAC, Brett led the discussion and there was discussion about communication between ITS and Central IT versus the rest of the university. Basically, he has been putting together a plan so that he can collect information and find out what it is faculty needs. Part of that is going to be through CFAC, but also a distributed computing around the university. He is putting together groups that he’s calling Tech Talk where he’ll try to get together with different technical groups within departments and within different colleges so that ITS knows what they want to be doing and they know what ITS wants to be doing so they can get together and work. There’s been a lot of communication problems over the last many years when dealing with ITS. He’s been, I think he really is trying to collect the information and set up a structure to collect that information. Finally, I just wanted to note that he’s also indicated that he wants Central IT driven by the functional needs of the university rather than the technical needs of ITS. That’s a big change. I’ve been on that committee for four years. That’s a big change and I take that as a good signal. Hopefully, IT will become more responsive to the end user and what we actually need.

A. Rosenbaum: Questions for George?

E. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Gebo and Andy Small – no report

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

G. BOT Legislation and External Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Rosita Lopez – no report

H. BOT Compliance, Audit, Risk Management and Legal Affairs Committee – Deborah Haliczer and Alan Rosenbaum – no report
I. BOT Ad Hoc Committee on Sponsored Research Activity and Technology Transfer – Greg Waas – no report

J. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Pages 10-11

A. Rosenbaum: We have no subcommittees. I do have a report on the BOT meeting. This is the BOT meeting of March 27. There are two things that I want to call to your attention. One is the board approved the president’s request to use $4.5 million of local funds to demolish the Douglas dormitory complex. This is part of that charrette which is an informal master plan which was constructed for us. The idea is to make Lucinda a main street for the university. And Lucinda, if extended through now what is the Douglas dormitory, will give us a straight road that goes clear through to the west campus and the convocation center. The Douglas dormitory apparently has lots of asbestos in it. So that makes it particularly expensive to demolish. This is going to happen rather quickly and so I wanted to call your attention to that.

The other is that the president is trying to get much more detailed drawings and proposals for the master plan for the campus and the purpose is really to have something concrete to show to potential donors who might want to support one or another component of the master plan. They’re working hard now to support the piece of it that involves the little electric busses that are going to run up and down the campus in front of the Holmes Student Center and will hopefully make it easier for people to get around on campus. So that could be happening rather quickly. They have plans, the busses have been designed, it’s just a matter of getting the funding in place.

So a lot of changes on the campus are going to be happening. You already know about the Goosinator, so we are not stepping in as much material as we have in the past and so there is a whole bunch of changes that are happening. That was the main item of interest at the Board of Trustees meeting. Any questions about anything else? The report is pretty self-explanatory.

IX. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Richard Siegesmund, Chair – no report

B. Academic Affairs – Sarah McHone-Chase, Chair – no report

C. Economic Status of the Profession – George Slotsve, Chair – no report

D. Rules and Governance – Robert Schneider, Chair – no report

E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Pages 12-14

A. Rosenbaum: All right, next report is from Resources, Space and Budget, Jim Wilson.

J. Wilson: Yes, I understand that many, if not most, of you have already been introduced to our last statement here so I’m not going to go over it in any detail. It’s on pages 12 through 14. Only to say that currently there are budget hearings going on from the 16th through the 30th and,
A. Rosenbaum: Great and I’d like to add to that that this is really an amazing development in that they are actually going to far as to come back to us for input on the plans. So it’s not just they took out our statement. They took our statement, they are going through their hearings, and then they’re coming back to us again and sort of saying, “okay what do you think about this?” So this is like a brave new world so to speak. Any questions for Jim or the Resources, Space and Budget Committee? Okay those of you who haven’t filled out your forms of preferences for committees next year, Resources, Space and Budget is where the action is. So that’s a really good committee to be on. It’s not the only good committee to be on. It’s a good committee.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Tonks, Chair

1. Nomination of the Executive Secretary of the University Council for 2014-15

*William Pitney* – Page 15

A. Rosenbaum: Next we have some elections, I’m going to turn the floor over to Stephen Tonks who’s the chair of our Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, so we have to do some voting. Stephen.

S. Tonks: Thank you. We have four items to take care of today. They should go very quickly. First is to nominate the executive secretary of the University Council and president of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Bylaw Article 2.1.3 says that we need to do this by secret ballot so we’re going to use our clickers again as we have numerous times today. We have one nominee. It’s William Pitney. When the polling opens, I think we’re voting to accept the nominee, is that right and then the University Council votes.

A. Rosenbaum: Right. One would be yes, two would be no, three would be abstention.

S. Tonks: So, One-yes, two-no, and three-abstain. So we can go ahead and vote.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone need more time? Okay let’s close it.

S. Tonks: 29-yeses and five abstentions.

29 – Yes
0 – No
5 – Abstain

A. Rosenbaum: Bill is elected our next executive secretary, well nominated.

S. Tonks: Nominated.
A. Rosenbaum: University Council elects.

2. Election of the Faculty and Supportive Professional Staff Advisor for a 2-year term

Paul Stoddard – Pages 16-17

S. Tonks: Thank you. And next is to nominate the Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor to a two-year term. We’ll use the same procedure as we just did. We have one nominee, It’s Paul Stoddard.

A. Rosenbaum: Paul is in the back of the room, by the way, if anyone wants to see what he looks like so that you can seek him out with complaints.

S. Tonks: Thank you. So we will vote now again to accept the nomination.

A. Rosenbaum: One-yes, two-no, three-abstain. Vote.

S. Tonks: And we’re ready.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone need more time? Close the vote. Thirty-two. Paul is our new Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor. Congratulations to Paul and Bill.

32 – Yes
0 – No
3 - Abstain

3. Election of UCPC representatives for 2014-16 – Ballots will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; voting will be by college (COB, COE, CEET, CLAS, and CVPA have vacancies to fill this year); votes will be counted following the meeting and newly-elected UCPC members will be notified – walk-in

S. Tonks: Next is to elect representatives to the University Council Personnel Committee. These are two-year terms and candidates must be members of the University Council. Five academic colleges have vacancies and are voting today and I have the ballots here with me. Could I have some volunteers to help pass these out? First one is College of Business. If you’re from the College of Business, please raise your hand and those are the green ones.

A. Rosenbaum: By the way, you will be leaving these at your place along with your attendance form when you leave.

S. Tonks: A couple more Business.

A. Rosenbaum: We have one over here.
S. Tonks: The blue ones are College of Education, so just a minute on the College of Education.

A. Rosenbaum: Those are College of Education.

S. Tonks: Sorry. The green ones are College of Business. So College of Education, now raise your hand. And next orange are College of Visual and Performing Arts, raise hands. Any more Visual and Performing Arts? And the white ones are Engineering. Any more Engineering? And then finally this color is LA&S, Liberal Arts and Sciences. Okay after you mark these just leave them at your place.

4. Committees of the University 2014-15 – Election of candidates who are running opposed and must be selected by Faculty Senate – Ballot packets will be distributed at Faculty Senate meeting; votes will be counted following the meeting and those elected will be notified – walk-in

S. Tonks: And, finally, the last election is for various committees of the university. This was the packet that was at your place when you came in. For these committees, more than one candidate can be nominated to serve. So, if you’re a voting member, please complete each page of this packet and leave at your place as well and it will be collected and tallied after the meeting. I think that is it for elections.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, thank you, Stephen.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XI. NEW BUSINESS

XII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: That, I think, is our last item. The only other thing, well we have two things, is Dave Long still here? Did he leave? We lost him? Do you know what he was going to say?

S. Klaper: Dave wanted to announce that for faculty to note for their students that the Holmes Student Center is going to be open 24 hours a day for study period for finals. So he wanted everybody to know that so you could announce that to your students. I don’t know what day that starts though, so I’m sorry.

XIII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
A. Rosenbaum: Okay. And the last thing I’ll call your attention to is those of you who are continuing on in the Faculty Senate, the meeting schedule for 2014/2015 is on the back page so you can cut that out, fold it up, put it in your wallet so you know when to show up on Wednesday afternoon.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Any other comments, questions from the floor? Okay and with that, I’ll take a motion to draw to a close the 2013/2014 season of the Faculty Senate. George. Second, Jim or Sarah. All in favor.

Members: Aye.

A. Rosenbaum: Anyone opposed? All right we are adjourned. Thank you. Have a good summer.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.