UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2002, 3:00 p.m.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKYROOM

Those University Council members present were: Baker, Bilder, Bryan, Burgess, Cassidy, Cearlock, Coover, Curley, Doederlein, Espe, Graf, Goldenberg, Gotthardt, Gravel, Gregory, Gresholdt, Henry, Ilsley, Jennings, Jones, Kafer, Kaplan, Kasuba, King, Larson, Legg, Lin, Martin, K. Miller, R. Miller, Mini, Morris, Mulligan, Musial, Orem, Peters, Ridnour, Schuth, Sorensen, Tolhurst, Wade, Wagner, Wheeler, Willis, Wolfskill, Young, Zar


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.

Those University Council members not present were: Butler, Caldwell, Carson, Carter, Conde, Creamer, Ganesan, Garcia, Griffiths, Harris, Kitterle, Kolb, Kowalski, Lockard, McSpadden, Miranda, O’Kelly, Pavia, Perez, Pernell, Pope, Richmond, Simon, Song, Williams

I. CALL TO ORDER

I. Legg: I hereby call the University Meeting to order. John Peters will be late. We are going to go ahead with issues that don’t involve John.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

I. Legg: I would ask for a motion to adopt the agenda.

The motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda. The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 12, 2001 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING (Pages 5-20)

I. Legg: We need now to approve the minutes of the December 12, 2001 University Council meeting, pages 5-20. We need to approve John’s arrival also. Approval for the minutes, I need a motion. Welcome, John Peters.

The minutes were approved.

President Peters: Where are we?

I. Legg: We just approved the agenda and the minutes.
President Peters: Okay, thank you. I’ve got to catch my breath for a minute. I have a list in my office – sorry I’m late – a list of people whose telephone calls I must take. It’s not a very long list but it includes people like Sue Willis and Judy Burgess and Troy Caldwell and Bev Espe and Barbara Peters and the governor and the trustees; and four of them called me and three of them are here who did not. So I apologize.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I guess it’s time for announcements. All right, I have some critical, critical issues. A lot has happened since we last met and yet very little definitive to report on the budget side has occurred. You probably have read in the paper statements from other universities, dire statements. I don’t know quite how to evaluate that relative to NIU but I do think our budget situation is serious, I don’t know if it’s dire at this point, probably because we are still working in an environment where information and hard facts do not exist. For instance, I informed you and we discussed last time, that the current budget year we’re in, that initially we were asked to help out with a 25 million dollar cut that was our share, and that included all higher education entities, and then on top of that we were asked to contribute – just the four-year public institutions – to the shortfall in medical, health insurance premiums and that was at 45 million. While we knew pretty much the precise figure on the 25 million and prepared, we could only guess at what the share of the 45 million would be based upon how it would be distributed amongst the units. Would it be by actual headcount? Was it a derived number? As we sit here today, we still do not have a precise number on the 45 million. This makes it very frustrating for all of us who have to make budgets and plan to move forward.

Now, let me add some more complexity to ’02. It looks as if, based upon revenue projections, that the shortfall in the current budget is larger than the governor prepared for with the 500 million dollar reserve or holdback. Estimates range from another 100 million to another 250 million. So, therefore, you know, using this euphemism, the hole in the budget may be as much as three quarters of a billion dollars. The governor pretty much put in place cuts to take care of about half a billion with some room to wiggle back and forth. He went to the legislature to try to get authority to cut up to 5% of the base budget and that failed. So that’s where it was left so we don’t know. My hope is that we’re not asked to contribute more than what our share of the 25 plus 45 million will be which I put at between 3 ½ and 6 million dollars. All that still stands. I hope, I don’t expect, we’ll be asked for more but don’t be surprised if I come back to you and tell you that.

All right, we’re in the process of planning for that contingency. We think we’re going to be all right this year. Next week I’m expecting from each vice president a report on how they cut – are going to reduce or holdback in this year’s budget a target amount that I allocated to them. As you know, Dr. Williams and I sat down and we scraped together from central fund balances as much as we could to limit the cut, reserve, to academic and other critical units. When I get the proposed cuts, I will look through them and reserve the right to reject some of those cuts. I think that’s prudent and smart on my part just to take a look to see how people did. In addition to knowing how are you going to cut your budget, I wanted to know the impact. What’s the impact on students, on faculty, on travel, on cleaning offices. My guess is it will take me a week to two weeks to analyze that and be prepared to report to the community, which I will. There are a lot
of people who want to know that, what is the impact going to be. If we get another request on top of that to cut more out of this year’s budget, we’ll do it. We’ll work with it and we’ll figure a way. But right now, I’m moving ahead with that plan. I think that’s the prudent thing to do. In all of this I hope; there’s a limit to how much I can get accomplished, but I keep continually talking to individuals when I meet them to communicate, to talk this out, to make sure people understand how budgets may be cut and what the implications may be.

FY02 is a problem and it’s tough, but it’s not our real issue. That will come when I talk about ’03. I had an interesting meeting this morning with administrative officers – you know, the people who are in the day-to-day charge of operations -- and tried to get a feel for how we’re doing and I think we’re going to be okay, but some people aren’t going to travel as much as they’d like. Some things aren’t going to get fixed. Some maintenance isn’t going to get done. Temporary positions are not going to be filled. So, you know, it’s painful, but is it long-term? If that’s all it is and the budget comes back, are we going to be okay? But I promise I will communicate with you on that. Like the ’02 budget and the ’03 budget, a lot depends upon a critical thing we don’t know right now, and it’s the thing I’m watching and that’s the revenue estimates and the economy. That’s the key variable. When are the tax revenues coming in? Are they more robust than they expected or are they below? That’s the key. Because if the tax money comes in, things will change in a hurry. There are statements people will make about dire predictions, how many state employees will lose their jobs; but the key variable to watch is the economy and the revenue estimates.

Now, let me shift a minute to ’03. As I told you, the IBHE put forth a budget, a requested budget, to the governor that was based upon the ’02 base budget, the one that we’re working on now, to reserve some of that. That was the base, plus money for certain things, about a 100 million dollar increase over the ’02 budget; and that included basically salaries, very little program money, health insurance, some operating money. It’s independent of the capital budget. The capital budget always has to be dealt with separately because it’s not recurring dollars. It’s one-time money for capital, and dealt with differently. Although we have had years where we’ve had no capital, I understand. So, how do you plan for ’03? We don’t know what the governor will propose. But, we have the rising costs of health care premiums and if you talk to anybody in government, or even in the private sector, and you listen to people, for the next several years the increase in health insurance is going to be a key driver in any budget, particularly state budgets. It’s going up, up, up, up. You know that as you take care of your own medical bills and you know what’s happening in premiums.

So, there is a range of possibilities here. How should we plan? There are some that say the base budget for ’03 will be the ’02 base budget minus the reserve that we’ve given back this one time. All right? And no new money. In other words, we start out with less money than we did last year with no increase. All right? There are some that say that. There are some that say it might even be worse than that. I again think it depends on that key variable, the economy. So, the other thing is I think it’s important that we not delay any longer in instructions on preparing ’03, even though we’re in an ambiguous situation and I’ll tell you why. On the academic side, I know that this is the time of year that faculty, departments and colleges begin to bring in their recruitment class for next year to fill that vacant assistant professor position, and the last thing we want to do is bring people on campus, expend our resources, get excited about a candidate
and then not be permitted to make an offer because of a budget cut. I think that’s destructive. I think it’s better not to do it and I think the quicker we know, can plan, the better. I’m not saying we’re going to get that far but I think we ought to know. The other thing is in talking to people – I’ve been doing a lot of talking to people and some people have been talking at me – that strategies for cutting the budget vary depending on how deep the cut is. For instance, if you had to reduce your base budget for last year by 1% or 1½%, that cutting strategy or that reduction strategy would be very different than if you had to cut your budget 6% or 7%. You would employ different strategies.

I understand that one institution of higher education in the state is already collecting 4% right now, permanent reduction, right now, to plan for this contingency and to do some anticipated and planned reallocations. So, somebody is planning. I’ve talked to Ivan Legg and I’ve talked to Dr. Williams, and Ivan and I have had several conversations about this and Anne Kaplan as well and the Senior Cabinet. We think it’s probably crucial that I send out some budget instructions, simple budget instructions, soon, and it will probably take this form: that we’ll be asking the vice presidents and then, however they handle it, to prepare scenarios. A scenario that would say what would your budget look like if your budget was based on ’02? Submit a budget based upon ’02 minus a percentage and we would have no more than three scenarios because after that it begins to be an exercise in futility and, right now, I’m trying to determine what the right numbers on those scenarios happen to be and if anybody has a crystal ball you want to send me, go ahead, but obviously I think we’re going to be planning for something in the range of flat budget to 5, 6% negative. I’m sharing my thinking with you right now and the thinking of a lot of people I’ve talked about this with. This would be a lot easier if we knew what our target was then we could go to it. Now, I will also be issuing guidelines and instructions for the preparation of these budgets and the guidelines will incorporate many of the things that were incorporated in my holdback requirement.

Let me say a little bit more about the other side of the equation and that is the revenue side. Some of you remember this, some of you on the search committee that brought me here remember, and from time to time I say it and I never know what people listen to or what they choose not to listen to or don’t want to listen to or what makes them angry – no, if I say something that makes you angry I hear about it. But I’ve said that public American higher education, particularly our kind of institution and all the Illinois publics, are in a process where we have to realize that the basis of our funding is shifting. I don’t know if that’s ever going to change; we’re all working for it not to change, but in every state if you look over time at the econometric data, the budget data, a smaller and smaller share of state resources goes into higher education as public policy and more and more is going into K-12, Medicaid and those other issues. I mean it’s dramatic. It’s irrefutable. Then the other thing is if you look at universities and you look at their sources of revenue over the past twenty years, you see the reciprocal of that, that we have become dependent less and less on state resources and more on grants, contract fees, tuition, private fund raising, federal earmarks or whatever other services, fee for services; and I think that’s inevitable so – and I’ve said this, this is a desirable outcome, and we need to think about that. We need to do more for ourselves.

Now, that gets to the issue of fees and tuition. We’re a bargain. I think we’re a great value and if you’re a parent and you’ve sent a son or a daughter to Oberlin, you know. I mean, what value.
I constantly tell parents the value to have a four-year education here. Students go on to graduate school, to medical school. They have had great teachers who care, and a great education, and they aren’t burdened with huge debt and they probably can afford their professional school or to go on to do what they want. Nonetheless, tuitions have been increasing. We happen to have two processes. One the tuition-setting process and one the fee-setting process; what I’ve learned about our fee-setting process is wonderful. It is constituency based, it works from the ground up and people have input into that. I would expect that this year we will not have great increases in fees. I don’t know that. I received the recommendations but I hope – there are always increases, but from what I hear from the various groups we’re not going to see tremendously shocking increases in fees. There will be some. Last year we raised tuition 4.5% and we really worked very hard to keep it at a minimum. Now, I don’t know where we’re going to end up with tuition but I can say this, that our trustees and I keep in touch regularly on this issue, and – as most trustees across the country – they lean on the affordable side of tuition. In other words, to them tuition is something to be set with the greatest care. This is one of their major responsibilities, setting the fees, and they’re very pleased at the way we run this institution, the way we teach, the role of the faculty, the role of tenure, the role of academic freedom and the fact that we try to keep the cost down and run efficiently. I’ve recently heard and seen some data that show how efficient this institution is benchmarked against others in terms of teaching, cost, and administration. You know that. You know how thin we are.

So, this a long way of saying neither I nor the trustees want to shoulder a budget reduction on the backs of parents and students, and yet the cost of quality education goes up; we have to be aware of that, and I would understand the complexity of the implications of not having enough resources. I mean, it’s really tough. More and more students are choosing to study with us and we embrace that and yet we’re stretched in the classrooms. Next year, for instance, to give you an example from the business side, we’re bringing on a tremendous amount of new square footage and yet because of budget reductions, will we have the resources to service – clean, get the lights on, change a light bulb, – this is tough – this is a complex place. It is. But we’re up to the challenge. My message to you is we must work together and we will come out on top of this. So, that’s my report. I’ve been long-winded on it but I thought I needed to share that with you because this budget situation has been occupying almost all of my time and will continue to occupy my time as we go through the budget season.

Now, just one other thing. Reporting on buildings. I got a lagoon report yesterday, and the lagoons are taking shape. We have two lagoons, east and west. Did you know that? For those of you who never get to west campus, there a west lagoon and, remember this is a capital development project, and I’ve been informed through our liaison that it looks as if the structural work, the removal of the stuff, the bridges, the structural part – we’re headed toward the end of February; and then in the spring we’ll be doing our landscaping and planning on both the east and the west lagoons. Students sometimes get frustrated because, you know, they’re here for four years, sometimes five or six or seven, but they like to see things happen in their lifetime where those of us who have been around, you know, the seasons come and go, academic rhythms come and go, and we know the lagoon will get filled; but it’s going to be fantastic. Then the next phase is that Watson Creek is going to be cleaned up. So that’s a plus. All of our projects are moving along. People are working inside all of them. They’re enclosed and as you know from
our press release, we booked our first act in the Convocation Center, which is a farm act and will bring a lot of people here. Most of us will be on vacation during this time. It’s next January.

So, now that leads me to the last thing and that is soon the Provost’s Office will be communicating to the academic community and the deans the results of some major studies that have been going on now for months with the help of an outside consultant, and many faculty and academic units have been involved and others, but I’m talking about the academic side now, on what are our space needs and what are our opportunities as a result of Barsema Hall, which makes a lot of things possible. They’ve gone through a lot of detailed analysis and I think they’re about to start communicating some of the initial findings. Is that correct?

I. Legg: Yes.

President Peters: I think you’re going to like it. Not everybody is going to be happy. I’ve never known that to be true in space. But let me tell you when you have an opportunity like Barsema Hall, it makes a lot of things open up. Now, we have to be flexible, because a lot of that space needs to be renovated and can only be renovated if we have the dollars to renovate, and a lot of the dollars that were just cleanup dollars, to make things nice and freshened up so new tenants can move in, are going toward the holdback. You know, the money, the one-time dollars that we have for renewal and freshening up are going to disappear. That’s one implication of the budget cut but I think we’re in good shape. All right? That’s my report, long winded that it was. All right? We’ll have time for questions later, too.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Is there a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as it appears? Second?

The Consent Agenda was approved.

A. Amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws substituting “Vice Provost” for “Associate Provost” and “Associate Vice Provost” for “Assistant Provost” – refer to Rules and Governance Committee

B. Changes to the International Programs Advisory Council – see memo from Manfred Thullen – refer to Rules and Governance

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: We move to Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees. Patricia Henry, a report from the FAC to the IBHE.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

P. Henry: Yes, thanks.

President Peters: Is this a walk-in?
P. Henry: Well, it’s sort of a double walk-in. It walked in last semester, but I did not walk it in the last meeting of the first semester in December for which I apologize, but if you were at that meeting you received this then and I believe in the minutes that you noted that anyone who had questions should e-mail them to me, so I think you’ve had a chance to look it over, but I’ll just hit on a couple of the high points. It was a two-part meeting, informational and business. Informational we met with Keith Sanders who had a number of points to make. He had mentioned before that he is interested to get support for requiring college prep for all high school students. He sees this as a project that would be important on all sorts of levels including requiring less remedial work at the university level, but he wasn’t terribly optimistic that it would, in fact, get to the legislature.

He also commented on some reports that the FAC had made to him that he was in turn going to pass on to the IBHE. One of them was on assessment and there was an attachment #1 that deals with that. You can look it over at your leisure. Mostly I would comment that it attempted to impress upon the IBHE that the faculty saw this as a very complex undertaking and that it did need to be taken into account that it took resources to do it but that we weren’t whining and griping about it.

For budget matters, I think there’s much more up-to-date information on that. The picture was not optimistic at that point. That was in December.

He also discussed the question that people were rather upset about Phoenix University having been given permission to have on-site courses. The bottom line was that there really was no choice in terms of the way the law is now that there wouldn’t have been any basis, statutory basis, to deny their request; and he felt that our universities could compete with Phoenix University.

In terms of the business meeting, again, there are just a couple of attachments here. One of them is the assessment which I already mentioned. There is an attachment about technology, speaking to the issue of best practices for electronically offered degree and certificate programs, speaking of competing with Phoenix University. There was also a discussion on the budget which is on attachment #3 and here the report form the FAC addressed a number of issues not all of which ended up in the final version. The one that was particularly noteworthy was a desire to balance current funding practices in both capital apportionments and IMAP disbursements, which the subcommittee felt favored private institutions, and that there needed to be more balance inasmuch as, for example, tuition at private institutions is much higher; therefore it was easier for students there to make a case that they needed financial aid and IMAP funds were available to them to a greater extent than is usually the case I think in most states, at least according to people on the FAC. Keith Sanders had addressed this issue, too, and said that basically it’s not going to change and that the politics of the IBHE for a number of reasons made it highly unlikely that any change was going to come, and so we decided not to tilt at that particular windmill and that did not go forward in the budget subcommittee’s report to the IBHE. Eventually, we may discuss it further and if you have thoughts on that, feel free to share them with me. There will be another meeting next Friday and I’ll report on that next month.
President Peters: Very thorough as usual. Just a comment on the University of Phoenix issue or independents coming in, which is a threat to us. My position is that even though the IBHE can do nothing to keep them out, they can make them play by the same rules that we play by which is need assessment, demonstrated need for new programs and so forth. Likewise, that met with the same kind of reaction you got on your IMAP award thing. All right. Questions?

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths

President Peters: Let’s have a report from Dorothy and/or Dan from BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Okay?

D. Jones: Our report was given at our last meeting and there’s a summary of it in the minutes on page 11.

President Peters: All right. Any questions?

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard

President Peters: Let’s move on to Sue and Jim Lockard from BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.

S. Willis: The committee has not met since our last meeting

President Peters: All right.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen – report (Page 24)

President Peters: Judy and Jenine, the BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee.

J. Burgess: My report is on page 24 and if you want to read it, it’s pretty much what you said about the budget. You covered it all. The only thing you didn’t cover was the SURS and pension-related item. The thirty and out proposal is ending and it would have to start all over again. Otherwise, it’s going to sunset this year and there are just two more paragraphs there that anybody can read. It’s been so long since the meeting I would have to read it again myself.

President Peters: Pretty much the meeting was devoted to the discussion that I had with you. I don’t know if Steve Cunningham is here or not, but I continue to monitor closely thirty and out as something very important to us and I will continue to watch that. I heard a statistic this morning, and those of you who were at the Administrative Cabinet meeting can help me; in the next five years, 50% of our faculty are eligible for retirement. That brings up a lot of issues and the thing we’ve all been anticipating, or not anticipating, expecting, is the replenishment of the professorate. Where are the new professors going to come from? Then the other thing is, do we have the human resources in place to help people make get the right kind of information on
their retirement plans? You know, in human resources I understand it’s one of the most difficult aspects to learn and to know and we rely a lot on SURS, and so I think the directive is pretty clear this morning for me that we need to do everything we can to help people because a lot of us go through life and, like myself, you start thinking about this and we don’t usually think in those terms and then “oh my God, am I prepared?” “What about my medical and what am I going to have to live on” and things like that so, you know. I’m watching the SURS thing, thirty and out, very carefully.

E. BOT – Sue Willis

**President Peter:** Sue, do you have anything from the Board of Trustees.

**S. Willis:** No, again, they haven’t met since our last meeting.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Mary Larson, Chair

**President Peters:** Okay, let’s move quickly on to Academic Policy Committee, Mary Larson?

**M. Larson:** I’m here, yes. We are undertaking a study of the possibility of a fall break and I have been in contact with the National Communication Association and have got a pretty good stack of information from people about a fall break. Jerry Zar forwarded a number of them to me and so we are meeting February 1 at 3:00 in Watson Hall 233 for this discussion and, is Mike Gotthardt here?

**M. Larson:** Mike, Donna has this whole stack of e-mails for you to pick up. We don’t have an e-mail address for you. Please join us February 1 and Herb Rubin is on sabbatical. Is there a substitute for Herb on the Academic Policy Committee?

**President Peters:** That’s not possible.

**M. Larson:** So true. Okay. If there is not, in any case, I’ll look forward to seeing the rest of you on the 1st of February.

**S. Willis:** Bill Baker, I believe, is replacing him on this council. [Note: D. Wagner will be replacing H. Rubin on the Academic Policy Committee]

**President Peters:** Well, that will be an interesting report. You let us know if you need any technical help.

**M. Larson:** It will probably have to do with how much lead time we need to implement things.

**S. Willis:** Let me just draw your attention to the other walk-in which is a resolution from the Student Senate which also supports a fall break.

**President Peters:** The Mid-American Conference scheduling is late. I don’t know for what reason; they say it’s because until Central Florida come in, because there was an unequal number
between the East and West Division. They were very late in telling us what the football schedule would be and I guess my word to you and to the wise is that if you wait on them ---

**M. Larson:** You’ll wait forever.

**President Peters:** Yeah, let's decide what’s best for us and then try to work around that.

**J. King:** Will the text of the Student Association motion in favor of the fall break be part of the minutes or will they appear in a committee report in the future? Can you answer that?

**S. Willis:** Well, the walk-ins are always a part of the formal record that we keep.

**J. King:** I mean, we keep them around? So if they’re distributed to the entire readership, the entire university, through minutes, it would have to be as part of the report of Mary Larson’s committee I take it?

**S. Willis:** Yes, I think so.

**J. King:** Okay, thanks.

**S. Willis:** Unless you wanted to read them or something. We could get them into the minutes that way.

**President Peters:** Our understanding was that that letter of support would become part of the material that would come forward as either an appendix or something for the final report. Is that what you wanted?

**J. King:** That’s – I hope that happens. Dean Zar?

**J. Zar:** Just some clarification. I think the resolution from the Student Association Senate is an important piece of input but it’s labeled first reading. Has this been passed by the Senate? Has it been passed by the Student Association? What is the status?

**K. Miller:** Yes, I must apologize for that. That’s my fault in the typing, or the retyping I should say, of the resolution from the original draft. It has been officially passed by the Student Senate. That was done at the last meeting last semester.

**President Peters:** All right? Understood? We move on now. Are you done, Mary?

**M. Larson:** Yes.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Gary Coover, Chair

**President Peters:** We move on now to Resources, Space and Budgets Committee, Gary Coover.
G. Coover: Yes, the joint committee met with Provost Ivan Legg on December 6 and discussions ranged over several broad topics, all of which depend heavily on the Illinois state financial situation. We met with the particular purpose of talking about the plans for Wirtz Hall occupation and renovation and, as you heard today, it’s moving forward but we weren’t really at a time yet where we could discuss it in depth. We also looked at the importance, or talked again about the importance, of increasing faculty salaries and new program monies for next year or rather the likely lack of new monies next year, and then ADA compliance. Some of the good news is that the ADA compliance will make another step forward this year despite state revenue problems because projects were just approved for work to start, that as the capital development board of the state has recommended awarding of contracts. In fact tomorrow there will be a pre-construction meeting with the major contractors to go over the work listed in phase 3 of the renovation plan. Included are some new elevators, power-assisted entry doors in Adams, Anderson, Gable and Watson and ramps along steps in Gable, Stephens and Watson and washrooms in Founders, Gable, Graham and Stephens. That’s at least a dozen male and female bathrooms that are going to be upgraded.

The joint committee will meet again on February 7 with the Provost to discuss the Academic Planning Council. We’ll be joined in that meeting by several experienced members of the APC. For example, there’s an intent to attend from Robert Wheeler, Virginia Cassidy, William Goldenberg and Jan Rintala. I’d like you to please e-mail me or any of the other members of the committee or our guests if you have suggestions for this or related topics for the Faculty Senate/University Council Joint Committee. That’s all.

President Peters: Questions? So that’s a joint meeting?

G. Coover: Well we’ve certainly asked for experts to attend and discuss with us the APC role, particularly in mind of the fact that the Bylaws state that they shall make recommendations regarding budget and that those would then have to be approved by the University Council at which point, I guess, it would be a question of whether the Joint Committee on Resources, Space and Budget would be asked to look at whatever those recommendations are for the University Council.

President Peters: All right. You’ve got the date of that? Thank you. Anything else Gary?

G. Coover: No, that’s it. Thank you.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair

President Peters: Susan, Rules and Governance always has material.

1. Changes to Bylaw article 5.215(C) part 5, regarding “Criteria Upon Which Personnel Decisions are Appropriately Based Include: (C) Service to the University Community and Profession” – ACTION ITEM (Pages 25-27)

S. Mini: We’re looking at an action item which is changes to Bylaw Article 5.215(C) part 5. If you look at page 26, this suggestion came to us from Mike Gotthardt from the Student
Association and it deals with service. If you look at the last sentence in the first paragraph “however, for purposes of tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave, it should NOT be accorded significantly MORE importance than effectiveness in teaching and scholarly achievement”. This is Mr. Gotthardt’s suggestion. My committee looked at this and decided that when you take it with the proceeding sentence which would read “hence, it (service) should be accorded appropriate credit in annual merit evaluations, especially when it is of an extraordinary nature”. However, for purposes of tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave, it should NOT be accorded significantly MORE importance than effectiveness in teaching and scholarly achievement” and we decided it changes the context of the statement when you consider the proceeding sentence. So, our recommendation, you’ll see is on page 27, is to remove the last sentence altogether. We believe that this will strengthen the statement in terms of service without taking away from scholarship or teaching. I should note that currently colleges make the decisions with regard to the importance of service for tenure promotion and sabbatical leave, and this would not be altered by the recommendation, the deletion of this last sentence.

President Peters: So that comes as a motion?

S. Mini: That’s correct.

President Peters: Does that require a second coming from a committee?

F. Bryan: Yes, it does.

President Peters: All right, you’re moving that?

S. Mini: That’s correct.

President Peters: Is there a second? All right, we have a second. So now it’s time for discussion. This has gone through readings? This is the date set for action. Does anyone want to speak to it? Yes?

J. Wolfskill: I’d like to ask first if college councils were apprised of this and asked of their opinions on this proposal?

S. Mini: Not to my knowledge, no.

J. Wolfskill: I would say that that’s a serious oversight inasmuch as all of these personnel decisions pass through the college councils and I believe it would be appropriate to table this motion until information could be surveyed from college councils on this matter.

President Peters: All right. So is that a motion to table?

J. Wolfskill: Yes.

President Peters: All right. We have a second on a motion to table. Dean Zar?
J. Zar: It’s not discussable.

President Peters: It’s not debatable and the decision rule is simple majority? All right, so we have a motion to table on the floor. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Let’s have a show of hands. All those in favor say aye. We get thirteen. Please hold your hands high. They’re going to count one more time. Thirteen. All those opposed to table the motion. Twenty-one. The motion fails. I presume you are all valid voters.

The motion to table failed.

President Peters: Yes.

D. Wagner: If I understand Roberts Rules of Order, it could be moved to postpone discussion until the next meeting and that would be discussible.

M. Morris Can we determine whether there are enough voting member present to carry this change, before we consider it, even if it were unanimous here right now. We may not.

D. Mathesius: We don’t.

M. Morris: We don’t?

President Peters: Where does that leave this parliamentarily speaking – where does that leave this action item? Tabled.

J. Zar: No, it waits until next time.

President Peters: It’s carried over.

M. Morris: Or it fails.

D. Wagner: I move that the motion be postponed until the next meeting and, in the meantime, that this material will be sent to college councils.

President Peters: For comment.

D. Wagner: For comment.

President Peters: All right. The motion is to postpone debate to the next meeting and that it be referred to the college councils for comment. That’s the motion. Is there a second? Is that debatable? The postponement motion is debatable.

M. Gotthardt: I don’t really care how you guys want to postpone this. I’m going to vote no if it goes up for vote regardless so I can bring it up at the next meeting so you guys can do what you want.
President Peters: All right. All those in favor of the motion to postpone say aye. Opposed? The ayes have it. It is postponed. We know what we’re doing. We’re sending this to the college councils for comment. All right. Mike, you could have a graduate degree before we get to this. Do you have any other items, Susan?

S. Mini: No, thank goodness.

The motion to postpone and refer was approved.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: University Affairs Committee, Richard Orem.

R. Orem: Back in December, at the December 12 meeting, there were materials attached to your agenda that had to do with an item that was referred to University Affairs and so I’m reporting on that. I apologize for not having a written report because I wanted to give my committee as much time, at the beginning of this semester, to get back to me. Just a brief history of the item; this has to do with rights to on-line materials. It started two committees ago and I don’t even know if there are any members on the present committee who were on the original University Affairs Committee that raised the issue, but in the spring of ’99, the Intellectual Property Committee recommended changes to the NIU Intellectual Property Policy that had to do with on-line instruction. The recommendations were brought to the University Council and the University Council referred these issues to the University Affairs Committee. The University Affairs Committee discussed them and decided that they would recommend approval, but in a memo dated March 23, 1999 from the University Affairs Committee to the Executive Secretary, University Council they raised some additional questions about on-line instruction and, just briefly, these questions were who determines when on-line courses are to be offered and what happens to the on-line course when the originating faculty member leaves NIU. If the originating faculty member leaves NIU may the on-line course be replicated in another setting? How was the originating faculty member to be compensated for on-going offerings of the course when he or she is not directly involved in teaching the course? When a revision of the on-line course is necessary, what is the role of the originating faculty member and what implications may exist regarding on-line courses developed under the auspices of federal grants? These questions were taken back to the Intellectual Property Committee and they responded in a memo dated November 1, 2001 to the University Council in which they explained how the new policy dealt with these questions and that’s the issue that was referred then to the University Affairs Committee. Is this University Affairs Committee satisfied that the Intellectual Property Committee properly addressed the questions that were raised two years ago? I polled the current committee and asked them to respond to me by noon today and all of those responded to me, which was a majority of the committee, did approve and did say that yes, these do satisfactorily answer or respond to the questions that were raised by the University Affairs Committee of 1999. So that’s my report to University Council that this University Affairs Committee feels that the policy does satisfactorily address the issues that were raised in 1999.

President Peters: All right. Dean Zar?
J. Zar: The report to the University Council from the Intellectual Property Committee noted that the questions raised by the University Affairs Committee were substantial enough that the Intellectual Property Committee actually recommended adding a new section to the University’s Intellectual Property Policy, so may I assume that the University Affairs Committee is agreeing to add that section to our official policy?

R. Orem: Yes.

J. Zar: Then that should be voted on by the University Council. It probably should be distributed with the next agenda.

President Peters: Very good, and my presumption is that we’ve gone through all the proper legal considerations. I know I asked this question the day I arrived having been involved in the development of two of these such policies and it’s critical to the faculty and the institution in this changing technology environment to get it right to protect our intellectual property in the interest of the institution, particularly against outside vendors who basically take our intellectual property.

J. Zar: We have a representative of the General Counsel’s Office on the Intellectual Property Committee. He concurred with the changes and then we had on this campus, a few months ago, a very successful conference sponsored by the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center specifically on intellectual property matters in on-line courses, and I checked with the University attorney after that conference, and he participated in it, and he felt we needed no more changes.

President Peters: Well good. So I take it it will work its way as an action item. I wouldn’t be too upset about the two and a half years. It’s taken many years – the technology changed the legal environment. All right, are we ready for Elections and Legislative Oversight, Winifred?

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Winifred Creamer, Chair

President Peters: I don’t think Winifred is here. No?

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: I guess that’s old business.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval to reappoint Robert Wheeler as Interim Vice Provost until June 30, 2003 – see letter from Ivan Legg (Page 28)

President Peters: We have an item from Provost Legg. Ivan, do you want to speak to this? I think it’s an approval to reappoint Robert Wheeler, whoever he is, as Interim Vice Provost until June 30, 2003. See letter from Ivan Legg, page 28.
I. Legg: The letter succinctly states what I would like to just review with you very briefly. One of the things that I inherited in taking the role of Provost here in the fall last year was the phasing in of a number of people that were retiring or moving and this Vice Provost position in particular is a central position in my office and I wanted to phase in the searches so there was overlap between the various people who are serving in these roles. Right now, I am conducting four searches for people who are connected with the Provost’s Office and, in order to make this run as smoothly as possible, particularly now that we have the budget constraints, and because Bob is doing such a remarkably good job in this role, I ask you to allow me to extend him one more year in the interim position and then I will start the search for the position this coming fall after I have the other four positions filled.

J. Wolfskill: I would be glad to move Professor Wheeler’s appointment.

President Peters: Here’s the way we’re going to do this. We’re going to have a motion and a second and I’m going to ask Dr. Wheeler to absent himself. Is that all right? Do we have a second? All right. Do you have a cell phone? We’ll come and get you. Don’t go too far. The door is closed. Okay. So we have a motion. Ivan, do you want to add any comments or anything? It’s on the floor.

I. Legg: No, I’d be glad to answer any questions.

President Peters: This would be, as I understand, the second extension. We did that right when I first arrived.

I. Legg: Correct.

President Peters: And Lynne Waldeiland asked for that. Malcolm?

M. Morris: I move the motion be approved by acclamation.

President Peters: So be it. He’s a great man. You did the right thing. Anybody who can work with Ivan and me – we want to continue and this is a sacrifice. He wants to retire.

I. Legg: Someone get Bob and tell him he got turned down.

President Peters: Yeah. Tell him he’s free.

I. Legg: Bob, we voted you down.

President Peters: You’re out.

B. Committee on Grievance Procedures needs a replacement for Herb Rubin. Sue Willis is willing to serve and needs approval of University Council – see memo from Jerry Zar. (Page 29)

President Peters: Let’s move on to item VIII, B which is a replacement for Herb Rubin; and
Sue Willis is willing to serve and needs approval from the University Council. Is there a motion? Second? All those in favor? Opposed? How did you get talked into that?

**S. Willis:** I volunteered.

The motion was made, seconded and passed.

**President Peters:** All right. Any other new business?

IX. **COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**President Peters:** Time for Comments and Questions from the Floor.

**S. Willis:** I have one. The announcement of the initiative at Rock Valley College came out the morning of the Faculty Senate meeting last week and there was some, how should I put this, some curiosity at the Senate. First about the ramifications of this, what are the cost implications, what’s the impact on the faculty and also a number of people felt that they had not heard about this and wanted to know how the shared governance process got involved in this initiative.

**President Peters:** I think most of those are good questions. I think I have the answers for all of them. First of all, let’s start from our strategic position of Northern Illinois in that we are the only public university that serves this complex region. My predecessors spent considerable time and energy, political capital and resources putting a stake in the ground on the territory that Northern Illinois claims as its service area. Namely, we have sites, educational centers, in Naperville, in Hoffman Estates, in Rockford – which is the question here – Lorado Taft. We’re involved in the multi-university effort up in Lake County. We did that because it’s in our mission and because it’s the right thing to do and because there’s really a public policy expectation that the state serves that region. We have programming in all of those areas. Faculty, some of you I think, teach in those areas. We have some programs that are almost totally off-campus and so from that point of view, it’s not surprising that we’re involved with community colleges in those regions. I think we have the highest number of articulation and dual-admission programs with community colleges of any public university and maybe by a far stretch.

The other thing that became apparent to me as I did my study of this institution is that this institution, more than any other public university in the state, relies on and receives more transfer students with associate’s degrees – and they’re really good, well-trained because they’re from really good community colleges. Forty-two percent of our undergraduate student body is transfers. Forty-two percent. That ratio is not going to change. The other exercise one might want to do is draw a 50-mile circle around DeKalb and plot the community colleges and plot the number of graduates and then we have the data that show how many come here; and then if you draw a ten-mile or fifteen-mile circle around our educational sites, I think it’s graphically very eye-opening. No other university can show this. Take that same circle and draw it around any other public university and see what you get. It becomes obvious that NIU has a role to play in the region with community colleges.
Number two, there are – we know from all the studies some of you have done and your colleagues at other universities have done, and our own institutional analysis – that the new learner is very different than the traditional learner. Although NIU’s core will always be the four-year experience on this campus, it’s changing rapidly across the country; we talked about the Internet and so forth. There are individuals in this region who have associate’s degrees who are place-bound and who cannot travel to DeKalb, and there are several public policy issues that are important to the state of Illinois and there are two of them – there are actually three – that I can validate, that I hear all the time from the state: access, degree completion at community colleges and the third is teacher prep. Those are the three public policies – I wouldn’t be surprised if they are gubernatorial issues, if any higher education issues are gubernatorial issues. Cost is emerging as another one. So, historically NIU has had a pretty vibrant outreach activity. If you look at the numbers, however, our activity now is less than it was a decade ago in outreach if you look at the sheer numbers. I don’t know why that is. Well, I think I know why that is. See, when I did my analysis for my inaugural and when I was hired I said that one of the things we had to do is claim the region that bears our name.

The other thing about Rockford is that, right now, we offer a considerable amount of programming and have historically. This is not new. We have a degree completion program and this, our announcement which from the point of view of Rockford and state policy makers has received tremendous public support, is I think a logical extension. The other factor, and I’m trying to put this in the best academic terms I can but it gets sort of market oriented, we have competitors. We mentioned the University of Phoenix, Judson, Franklin, other publics; the University of Wisconsin is building a center, an education site, in the center of Waukegan. We need to be proactive to make sure we get our programs out there and so Anne Kaplan, working with people, and Ivan have developed this pilot program which is a first step of offering the potential for someone if we can put together a completion program on a community college campus utilizing those programs for those who have a desire to participate and many do. There are academic units in DeKalb that are not necessarily looking for students, but their student numbers aren’t what they used to be. So, talking to trustees and others and talking to many people, this just made a lot of sense.

Now maybe the planning got a little ahead of us but I don’t consider it, from the point of view of academic policy, anything that was so revolutionary or new, but symbolically it meant a great deal to the Rockford community which has the thirst for more of NIU. Now, it is a pilot program which is funded next year out of Continuing Ed reserves which, I don’t understand what happened with Continuing Ed here, but the funding model was broken apart and that may have been the right decision at the time but it’s certainly the wrong decision for the way you run these things, so we’re working towards a financial model and I know Ivan and Anne are working and this can be a model that’s transportable. But it cannot happen unless we get new state funding. But you come to that point where you have to make a decision to either do it or not do it and I know we have a bad budget situation but sometimes something feels so right that you have to do it because it is the right thing to do and if we didn’t do it and we got caught up in a budget situation we’d be sitting four years from now and Rockford still would be under-served. So, I hope that explains a lot of what we’re doing. Anne or Ivan do you want to add anything to that since you’ve been involved.
I. Legg: I came from an operation very similar to the one that I’m in right now where we developed off-campus programs in areas where there was great need, and really the place-bound problem was part of the driving force, that we had students who really would not get an education unless – in a four-year environment – unless they had the opportunity through our extended programs to do it. It really to some extent, in our case since we did not have a well established off-campus program like we have here, it did involve the redistribution of resources to it in areas that were under-served on campus became areas of high service off campus. But we already have a budgeted line here that can be used and has been used for off-campus programs and to some extent; we’re redistributing those resources to begin our first implementation of the program at Rockford. However, just like every other budget, it’s going to have to come under scrutiny if we are hit any harder by the state reductions.

President Peters: I think that’s well said. I do think that we have to work very hard in figuring out a financial model that makes this a go. This is a start. I do think it is the one area in the state budget picture in the next few years that we might be able to get new program money because of the need. Now, may I be permitted to step out of the chair and go off record so it doesn’t get in the minutes?

President Peters went off record at this time. Then the record resumed.

A. Kaplan: I would just emphasize that the announcement we made in Rockford was an agreement to proceed to develop four-year degree opportunities in areas where we thought there was demand. We listed some possibilities but we didn’t make any promises, and I talked to the President of Rock Valley this morning and he was telling me about the onslaught of phone calls that they were getting and how they were trying to respond to them and so on. And he is, they are, saying these are possibilities. We’ll take your name; we’ll take your interest area. We’ve just begun to work on this so I think it’s important that we not assume here that this is a sort of complete operation that has suddenly been dropped on Rockford. I do think that the pent-up enthusiasm in Rockford, or discouragement in Rockford over the issue of four-year degrees and a four-year institution is such that any movement in the direction of four-year degrees is seen as very major and so, in a lot of ways, the headlines on this were from their perspective, perhaps larger than they would have been from our perspective. But I think it is very important to them. I’ve been serving on a planning committee in Rockford on regional issues for about a year and a half and I’ve taken Virginia Cassidy to some of these meetings and Chris Sorensen and it’s a non-stop conversation in Rockford. You know, what are we going to do about the lack of a four year institution? So I just want to emphasize two things. One how important it is, it’s just part of the culture in Rockford that somehow everything would improve if they had more four-year degree opportunities and two, what we’ve done is said we’ll try to help you. We haven’t said, “here they are.”

President Peters: Professor King?

J. King: Going back to the picture that you drew, a circle, from DeKalb fifty miles around and all the community colleges that fall within that area, we wonder how will you be able to contain the enthusiasm of the community college presidents for four-year completion programs on their several campuses and, if we can’t service them all, have we opened floodgates to our
competitors?

**President Peters:** There’s always a risk in that. All of our studies, and we’ve studied everything, indicate that there is a market out there, but yet I don’t know whether it will materialize or not. There is a preference among all the community colleges that I talked to, and I’ve made it a point to do that part of my job, I think there’s a preference that if degrees are completed on their campuses that they be done by NIU. All right? I’ve tried to set the standards of how this will be done and Rockford is the model, and the academic units offering degrees are in the driver’s seat in terms of quality and who teaches and that’s where the Provost comes in and the deans and the chairs. Outreach takes care of the infrastructure and the marketing and all of that, with me and others determining a financial model that makes it a go without putting a burden on the DeKalb campus and our plans for this campus. Then the condition becomes “we know how to do this, let’s do it right, what do you need, here’s what we can do, here’s what it’s going to cost” and then the state and the representatives in that local area have to go to the state to get some new money to get this to happen. Because we really can’t charge exorbitant prices. That’s not the point, is it? It’s access. But we can charge a differential based upon the convenience of not having to come to DeKalb or Urbana or wherever. Is it wishful thinking? I think it happens to be a darn good model. I think we’re in uncharted waters. I don’t know very many universities that have tried this and yet I think I can turn the spigot off because if we get so overwhelmed then there’s no money to do it, we can’t do it. If we can’t do it, then I guess somebody else will have to have at it and we’ll move on to something else. But I’m optimistic.

Can I expand on one more thing? All right now, from my point of view, remember given the strategic thing of really our claiming the region, you can expect me to be aggressive in other areas where NIU has a mission. For instance, helping communities. Helping with research and service in communities. Providing our expertise where appropriate and when we can do it and we want to do it. I want everyone to know that NIU is a great institution with great experts that care and they should immediately, when there’s a problem in their community – Sandwich – say, “I wonder if NIU has a solution”. Now, again, that costs money, too. But I see that as all part of the whole.

**W. Tolhurst:** If I’m hearing you correctly, you’ve given a fairly clear answer to the question; I just want to make sure I’ve got it right. These discussions are proceeding. Nothing has been decided in any final way. They’re proceeding in accordance with certain ground rules and one of the ground rules is that the costs that are involved in this kind of program have to be generated with new money as we are not going to cut programs on the DeKalb campus and generate higher cuts than would otherwise be necessary in order to make these a go. As a result, those who want to do this have to work with us to generate the additional monies needed to make this happen and that means that any other community college president who comes to you is going to have to work with the same ground rules; work with that community’s local legislators to help generate the additional funds. Therefore, we don’t need to worry about the floodgates because if any institution, one of these community colleges, wants to work with us in this way, they’re going to have to work with us to generate the monies needed and if those monies are not generated, we’re not going to do it. Is that correct?

**President Peters:** That’s a theoretical ideal. In practice, what will happen is we’ll get together
and we’ll each make some kind of a jump-start commitment where we put some resources on the table, or commodities, and they put resources and commodities on the table with a set of benchmarks on how we grow over the program. You know, because I think you have to show good faith to state legislators to then go to the legislature to get some money. But then, you know, we do have a separate budgeted Continuing Education reserve and that’s a self-contained budget. All budgets interact.

**W. Tolhurst:** These monies would be coming out of that existing DeKalb money.

**President Peters:** And I’ve got to figure a way.

President Peters went off the record at this point.

**President Peters:** I’m back on the record now.

**D. Graf:** One of the concerns that I have is that I realize that schools from out of state can lay claims to part of our territory here and offer programs, but do these community-college presidents offer to give us exclusive right to have courses on their campus and with prior agreements to ask the others to have their courses somewhere else in the community instead? Because it always seems that there’s a possibility of having a diffuse group of schools competing for few students all on the same campus. Then that community college can say “well, we offer four degree completion programs”. Is that’s something that’s ever negotiated?

**President Peters:** Boy, you’re a hard negotiator but I just see a negotiating posture that I can take. Now, here’s the thing where I can do that if – let’s take business since you opened your mouth – Rock Valley – if they want a business degree and we can work it out and your faculty are okay on it and it’s quality and you don’t mess up your accreditation and all those checklist of things, I’m perfectly willing to go to the president of Rock Valley and say “you’d better shed yourself of Judson”. But, if we’re not going to offer business, I’m not in a very good position to say, “you can’t have Judson offer a business degree”. I’ll do that.

**R. Miller:** What are the advantages to Rock Valley? What’s their incentive?

**President Peters:** Rubbing elbows with NIU. It’s a prestigious thing. It guards against the development of a separate four-year public institution being developed in Rockford.

**A. Kaplan:** I think there’s another one. As you know, community colleges have three funding sources, the state, tuition and the tax base, and I think that one of the ways that a community college president convinces the district’s taxpayers that he or she is really serving the district is to be able to say “this is what you’ve said you needed and I’m doing what I can to get it here”. The pressure on community college presidents right now from post-associate’s degree students is growing. That’s why they’re looking around at the Judsons and the Phoenixes and the Franklins and this and that. I think that many of them, certainly in this region, would far rather be able to say “I can get you a program from NIU on this campus”. I mean, it helps them in claiming that they are serving their district. It’s the same political issue in a smaller sphere that we have with the region.
R. Miller: It is political and not financial. It’s going to cost Rock Valley to have us there.

A. Kaplan: That’s right.

R. Miller: The question is, do the incremental revenues more than offset the incremental cost of the association?

A. Kaplan: They obviously think so.

R. Miller: Yeah, it will be interesting to see.

President Peters: It will be interesting. We’re in new territory. I mean at the level of program I’m kind of fascinated by it. I find it rather exciting. At the level of operation we’d better be very careful and do it right and we have so far.

A. Kaplan: I did just want to say in response to something Bill said about no new money. Understand we are spending money now on undergraduate programs off campus, some of them in Rockford, and will continue to spend that money. We just haven’t used it to say that this is what we’re doing, but we certainly could.

W. Tolhurst: But if I’m correct, the money we’re using now is money that’s allocated for this kind of outreach activity.

A. Kaplan: Yes.

W. Tolhurst: It’s not impacting other areas of the university.

A. Kaplan: No.

W. Tolhurst: So the point is that we’ve got money that is appropriately used for this purpose and we will continue to use that money as creatively and as effectively as we can to generate this kind of stuff.

A. Kaplan: That’s exactly right.

W. Tolhurst: But one of the ground rules is not to start dipping into other areas of the university’s finances to the determent of other programs.

A. Kaplan: That’s exactly right and also, I believe, there is some potential if we operate in a partnership with Rock Valley, that the class size we could generate for these courses might be more efficient.

W. Tolhurst: So the idea is to use this money which we already have for this purpose as leverage to get additional money from outside sources.
A. Kaplan: That’s right.

President Peters: I want to make one comment and tell you a story about this issue of resources and then I want to broaden the discussion and share with you really what’s in the planning stages about what we need. Okay? When I was Dean of Arts and Sciences, that may have happened here, the Continuing Education situation atomized and they gave me control of the Continuing Education budget with the proviso that I provided outreach. Within eighteen months, all that money was absorbed internally. So, rather than doing outreach, we did other things with it. You know, it was a large college. Just as we have to guard against this new activity – the outreach activity we’ve had for a long time – hurting what we do on the main campus, we have to watch out for the other thing, too. Now, and I hope the Provost doesn’t get upset with me on this, but --

I. Legg: Off the record, John.

President Peters: No, I’m on the record here. I think what we need, based upon recommendations I’ve had in preliminary studies and because of the complexity of NIU, is a professional enrollment manager. Why? There is an NIU within an NIU within an NIU. We need someone who understands the enrollment problem in recruitment that’s associated with all of this. For instance, on the DeKalb campus we’re complex because we have four-year students, they’ve become native students, 2800 per year which is 400 lower than ISU. They’re first-time freshmen. But next year there’s a blip in the high school graduation rates and we’re looking at 2900. We need someone who understands those numbers and works towards the goal that we want to achieve on that part of the NIU student body. Forty-two percent transfers; where do they come from? Where is the articulation? We need someone who understands that. I’m talking about the same person now, an expert. We think this Rockford thing is a new market. We get 200 transfers from Rock Valley College here every year. I don’t want them to stay in Rockford, all of them. We’re talking about a new market we’re serving. The enrollment manager has to know that. I’m talking about transfers from four-year institutions and I’m not even going to begin to add the complexities of graduate and professional schools to that. So, I can’t think of a public institution that’s more complex because our core is complex and now as we develop our outreach, that is complex. We need to watch our numbers very carefully because when we admit a student, the student has to be qualified, prepared to succeed according to the criteria that you set. We’ve got to give those students a full program so that they can graduate on time; quality, quality advising. If they want a room we’ve got to give them a dorm room. We’ve got to make sure they have computing. Then there’s another set of problems about the student who takes things on-line or at an education site, or what would be a blend of activity where someone’s transcript in twenty years will look very different than a transcript now because they'll have all these educational credits and certifications from a variety and somebody is going to have to sort through all that. So, I’m at the point where I think we need an enrollment manager and we’ll probably figure a way of funding that and they don’t come cheap but I think it’s critical. So you just don’t throw darts. You have a plan and you can carry it out. This person has to have authority to cut across a lot of units. Do you want to add anything to that? I know that your committees have been looking at it.

I. Legg: I support this.
President Peters: All right, do we have anything else today?

P. Henry: This is probably a sort of simplistic question but I’m still not really clear on whether people who are faculty members here physically go to Rockford, or will there be people who live in Rockford who are part of our faculty teach these courses?

President Peters: Anne could answer that question better but our people are teaching up there now. In both situations.

A. Kaplan: Well, that’s what I would have said. We have faculty here who go to Rockford and have been going to Rockford for a long time. We have a few faculty who live in Rockford who would rather like to teach in Rockford but that’s a departmental decision.

P. Henry: But they are still part of the department on the NIU campus and all the personnel decisions going through NIU.

A. Kaplan: Yes.

President Peters: That must remain always an academic-unit decision. Now you’re talking about quality. Someone at the press conference asked me if Rock Valley College instructors would teach in this program and I said, “that’s not anticipated”. Thinking about that, if the Political Science Department, for example, had someone at Rock Valley who was certified to teach a course on Congress and everybody agreed that was okay, that would be acceptable, but it would have to be acceptable to the unit but it’s not anticipated. I don’t know if you’ve thought about that but I have.

R. Wheeler: This is actually in the form of an introduction. The Faculty Assistant Chair of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council serves as an ex-officio member of the University Council. That was filled very ably during the fall by Bill Goldenberg but I would like to welcome Bill Tolhurst from the Department of Philosophy who will be the Faculty Assistant Chair of the UCC in the spring. Welcome Bill; glad to have your participation.

President Peters: We had some other questions. We’ll take the student and then Professor King.

R. J. Gravel: Let me first introduce myself for those who don’t know me. My name is R. J. Gravel and I’m a member of the Student Association and a freshman music ed major. On behalf of the Student Association and the choral music students of Northern Illinois University, I am very happy to inform this body that our ensemble chamber choir has been selected to represent the United States and the University at the Fifth International Festival of University Choirs. Out of many auditionees, excuse me, NIU’s Chamber Choir was the only one selected from the United States. We hope to secure funds of approximately 20,000 dollars, so twenty members of the student body will travel to Poland this mid-April to represent the university and country along with only thirteen other selected choirs. During the festival, a commissioned choral work will be performed by all participants and will be broadcast on a nationwide syndicated network. To our knowledge, this is the first time the choral department will travel internationally, and after
the audition and evaluation process of not only the performing ensemble but also the director, Professor Eric Johnson, as well as being the only ensemble selected from the United States, I hope to see this opportunity to its success. I would now like to officially congratulate the Northern Illinois University Chamber Choir and the director, Professor Eric Johnson, on their opportunity and support them wholeheartedly in hopes of seeking funding. Congratulations.

**President Peters:** What is it that you need?

**R. J. Gravel:** $20,000.

**President Peters:** Did you hear that. Did you all hear that? Deans, did you hear that? Is that what you’re doing? You’re trying to raise funding in what ways?

**R. J. Gravel:** Well, right now the choir is applying for a grant and we hope funding will be sought that way. I would like to add, as a student, as a freshman, as a member of the ensemble, it’s a great honor for many of the ensemble members for this to be their first year, second year, third year or graduate year – whatever it be – to have an opportunity like this come up. This festival is internationally known. It’s a very prominent festival and just to be accepted is phenomenal, but it doesn’t even come close to being the only ensemble selected from the United States over many, many choirs that did audition.

**I. Legg:** If you get the money you’re going to have to wear Pepsi sweatshirts.

**R. J. Gravel:** I think that can be arranged.

**President Peters:** Well, if you need a very bad translator of Polish, I know a person who may want to go with you.

**J. King:** While we’re talking about congratulations, I think we should all express them to one of our members, Professor Baker, who as you know from the Northern Star and Northern Today, is the recipient of an extraordinarily high honor, the National Endowment of the Humanities Fellowship. He’s gone, but let the minutes at least reflect that.

Another party who is not here and I will, if it’s allowed, make a motion asking that our secretary – directing her – to write to Jenine Povlsen who just disappeared before we could thank her for her service to the University Council and assuring her that she will be missed by us and wishing her well in her new endeavors. I’ll make this motion.

**President Peters:** There’s a motion on the floor for this congratulatory resolution for Jenine Povlsen. All those in favor? All right, we’ll get that done on nice paper.

The motion was passed.

**J. King:** Last item, okay? Excuse me, this is an advertisement of sorts, not just receiving information after the fact. You recall at our last meeting in the spring, I said that we ought to be rethinking the University Council and this is the kind of issue on which a really active, a really
effective University Council could have been involved. We weren’t, and I think that we have to take another look at ourselves and say what would it take to downsize the Council, to streamline it. I mean, do we need seventy members? To streamline it to make an effective partner with the President in directing the institution and, excuse me for usurping the opportunity to make a pitch for my idea, but the opportunity was available and I couldn’t let it pass. Thanks for listening.

**President Peters:** You’re welcome.

**M. Morris:** Move for adjournment.

**President Peters:** We are adjourned.
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