UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2002, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CETER SKYROOM

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Baker, Bilder, Burgess, Cassidy, Cearlock, Coover, Curley, Espe, Ganesan, Graf, Gravel, Goldenberg, Gregory, Gresholdt, Henry, Hudec, Ilsley, Jennings, Jones, Kafer, Kaplan, Kasuba, King Kitterle, Kowalski, Larson, Legg, Lin, McSpadden, Martin, K. Miller, R. Miller, Morris Mulligan, Orem, Perez, Richmond, Ridnour, Schuth, Spear, Tolhurst, Wade, Williams, Wolfskill, Young, Zar

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Butler, Caldwell, Carson, Carter, Conde, Creamer, Doederlein, Garcia, Griffiths, Harris, Lockard, Mini, Miranda, Morris, Musial, O’Kelly, Pavia, Pernell, Pope, Simon, Song, Sorensen, Stalker, Wheeler, Willis

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’d like to call the April 10 meeting to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item of business is the adoption of the agenda. I want to call your attention to two walk-in items. The first fits under VII, A, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the BHE. It’s a walk-in courtesy of Ken Anderson. And the second item goes under New Business, IX and it is a memo to the Provost from Dean Zar on clarifying sabbatical leave policies. I will note two other things. We had two items that were tabled; Bylaw 3.63 is in your packet and a change in our Constitution, 3.23. Those are on pages 38 and 39. So with those walk-ins and that notification, is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 20, 2002 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (Pages 6-30)

President Peters: Item III is Approval of our March 20 Minutes. I call for additions or corrections. Hearing none, is there a motion to approve? Second? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed? We have minutes approved.

The minutes were approved.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
President Peters: We are now going to move into Executive Session for the purposes of evaluating the President of the Faculty Senate and Executive Secretary to the University Council. Just let me say that Sue came through her surgery in good form. All the tests that came back came back the right way. She is at home chomping to get back to business. So there’s a card circulating and for those of you who prayed, I’m sure she appreciates that. So now I would ask all present who are neither voting members nor ex officio members to please exit so we can go into Executive Session.

A motion was approved to go into Executive Session at 3:10. At 3:15 the Council returned into regular session.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Since the last meeting, the Board of Trustees met and I spent a lot of time in Springfield; and I want to talk a little bit about that today. I don’t have any prepared remarks because I spent too much time in Springfield for the past two weeks but I want to give you sort of an assessment of where we stand.

First of all, let me congratulate our new Student Association President who’s here with us today, Kevin Miller. The new elected Student Trustee is with us today too, Jesse Perez. We always look forward to working with the student leaders in the challenges we’re going to face in the next year. Congratulations to you. I always enjoy and appreciate, and I know the faculty and staff do, when students take the time to offer themselves up for elective office. It’s a very important part, we believe, of the college experience and we’re proud of you.

Let me say that at the Board of Trustees meeting a couple of things happened and it was the day after our last meeting. The Trustees unanimously, but not with any pleasure, and after some considerable discussion, approved an 8.75% increase in tuition which is $125 a semester for a full load which, unfortunately, we define as 12 semester hours rather than 15 but that’s more of a standard for federal aid. It was part of our shared response to meet our budget criteria for next year and I’ve been very, very pleased at the reaction of students. No students like to pay more and they shouldn’t have to pay more; parents shouldn’t have to pay more. I believe we’re still in the affordable category but we have to remember the kinds of institution we are and the kind of opportunity we give. Other universities in the state are having a difficult time figuring out how they’re going to balance their budgets and so at some institutions, you probably read, there are estimates of 20% tuition (increases and as a matter of fact I think, one of the institutions is proposing 20% this year), then 15% for each of the next three or four years and, you know, this sort of thing is happening all around us but I have to admit it’s a great concern to me. It’s a great concern to students, particularly student leaders. It’s a great concern to the Trustees and it’s a great concern to our State Representatives who do provide us with considerable general revenue support and they are concerned about the cost and accessibility. So we’ll continue to monitor that. I met with every member of the Appropriations committee that I could get a hold of. Before the appropriation hearings I always go down the week before and meet them personally and ask them if they have any questions and sell NIU and talk about our budget. The tuition increase did come up but, while they’re not happy about it either, they are understanding and they appreciated our approach so that is, I suppose, good news that they have faith in us. The
Senate Appropriations Committee meetings were held on Monday and they were an all-day affair. The way the Senate Appropriations Committee runs its hearing is all higher education institutions are on one day and it begins with IBHE, the retirement system. I think we were lined up seventh so we didn’t go in until about 4:00 in the afternoon, or 3:30. There was a lot of severe questioning about how we are good stewards of our money. And teaching loads – what are faculty doing? Administrative costs, you know, the full gamut of things you would expect; and I think we came out well. We had answers to all the questions. I think we’re a hard working, efficient university and I think most state senators understand that. The House Appropriations Committee that I had reported on to you last time has voted out a budget now, and basically they accepted the Governor’s budget for higher education as a lump sum. That’s the one on which our FY03 budget has the 9-10 million dollar shortfall – let’s call that the Governor’s budget. The conventional wisdom in Springfield right now is that’s the best it’s going to get for 03. In other words, if we get the Governor’s budget, that’s the best we’re going to get. That was passed out by the House. The Senate Appropriations Committee has not passed their budget out and that will take some time yet. I don’t imagine that is going to happen until late at the end of the session but, if you’re reading any reports in the newspapers, the bottom fell out of March tax receipts and state revenues and no one can quite explain why that happened but now in this year’s budget, the year we’re in, 02, the deficit is now is estimated at 1.1 billion dollars of the 51 or 52 billion dollar budget. I don’t think they’re going to ask us for any 02 money yet, from this year’s budget. Of course, that has an impact on 03. It is possible, or probable, that we will have to cut our budget even further for 03. But I don’t think we’re going to know that definitively until sometime in May, way at the end of the session. We’re watching that. We’re making an argument against that. We’re being vigilant but right now the numbers don’t look very good. It could very well be that we go into the next year without a budget then it gets worked out in the fall. I mean, we’ll have a budget obviously; we’ll be operating but we won’t exactly know what the level will be. I don’t know if I technically said that correctly. Eddie, do you wanted to add anything to that? I don’t want to give misinformation, we will be in operation but our budget number won’t be set. So, who knows what’s going to happen? I’m trying to find something positive to say all that. You don’t want to hear clichés like “everyone is in the same boat” and “we’re all suffering”. It’s true. But, if you’re waiting to see a state senator on the Appropriations Committee, and you’re waiting to go in to fight for the university, and coming out of that senator’s office is somebody from a community mental health clinic that has just been completely cut, you have to be pretty darn good to make an argument that NIU should be funded. I try, but that’s what we’re facing. That is as frank and as up-to-date as I can be right now. We’re working on it and we’re going ahead and we’re setting our budgets. It will take a couple of weeks, three or four weeks yet, to get the final approach to how we’re going to set the 03 budget and I’ve looked at it and there is pain out there. There is definitely pain. We’re in a tough time. I still do not at this point see a way to have annualized salary increases, and talking to the other presidents the situation seems very clear that that’s the same on their campuses, except those positions for which there is some sort of a contractual obligation which are few and far between. So that’s where we are right now. Programmatically, I think people appreciate what we’ve done. I think they appreciate our stewardship of the university. The other thing I would like to add if you’re interested is that there is a change that will occur in the leadership – macro-level leadership -- of higher education because some key individuals who have been supportive of higher education are leaving the scene. Representative Judy Erwin who on the House side was head of the Higher Education Committee and a strong advocate for quality in
higher education. She got it, you know. You could count on her to go to someone, if higher education was threatened in some way; or if we needed an idea promoted, she was very good. She is not running. Senator Stan Weaver, for those of you who know the Urbana area, has been a key figure to help higher education; U of I, but we all benefited from it. He is not running. Senator John Maitland from the Bloomington area helped at UIS, but still we had a benefit from that, had a stroke and now he is resigning. Keith Sanders, the Executive Director of the Board of Education, has resigned and has been replaced by a person I’m going to go see tomorrow, Dan LaVista, who is President of McHenry Community College. I know him pretty well but he’s new and we’re going into a tough period. And Phil Rock, the appointed Chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, has announced his resignation in May. Jane Williamson, the Vice Chair, has announced her resignation in May. So, the question is who now will speak for higher education and we’re working on that. Then we’re going into a situation where the political environment, the structure of who chairs committees and who will be the governor, has the potential for changing and we’re in a bad budget time. So we need a couple of doctoral dissertations on this. Anyway, you will find me spending a lot of time in Springfield the next year. I have to be vigilant for all of us. I am very optimistic. We’ve got a great crew and we’ve got a good product to sell and I always say when people ask a question, come to campus and see what we’re doing. Come to campus and spend a day with professors and see what they do. Spend a day with our students, and that’s what we’re going to try to do this year. We’re going to try to bring more and more people to campus.

One other thing. I promised you an interim report; I promised the students and this group. You remember last time, at my request, I asked Provost Legg, Dr. Williams and Dr. Kaplan to review the student concerns relating to the university use of Social Security numbers and I must add to that faculty and staff concerns although, you know, I’ll deal with that at another time because that’s an issue too. They’ve been, I understand, discussing their concerns with appropriate staff. Now, they’ve informed me that an interim solution has been proposed but they’re working on details and they’re checking with some people – like deans, department chairs, faculty members, staff – to see if this thing will work and I’ll have a full report at our last meeting which I think is May 1. I’ll have a full report. Is there anything any of you three want to add to that? You know, I asked them to do short-term and long-term analyses. I can tell you right now long-term is millions of dollars of problems and we will get to that because all the vendors we work with, the federal government, the state government, the underwriters, they still use Social Security numbers and so the whole enterprise system in the country has to change to get this thing fixed so you have to program a system where you take a Social Security number and you generate a random number and then that becomes the student’s personal identification number. That has to be done, but if we did that right now we’d have to take our whole IT staff and assign them to do that and it would take a whole year. I’m not going to do that because I want you to have your email. So, the good news is I think there’s going to be, by fall, some of those short-term solutions about grade rosters and things like that. Now, there’s another problem I understand with the privacy act, because if you need that personal code – what’s it called, the Z code or something – if you say that’s the personal code, that becomes covered under the Buckley Amendment on privacy of student records, and so we’re working. What seems simple, in fact, turns out to be a bit of a problem. But we’re smart; we’ll figure it out. All right, those are my announcements and then we can have questions at the end if you want so we can get through our agenda.
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Do I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as it appears?

M. Morris: There is nothing on it.

President Peters: Then we don’t have to approve it. Or do we? Dean Zar, do we have to approve a Consent Agenda if there is none?

J. Zar: No.

President Peters: Which means we don’t consent to anything!

J. Zar: We consent to nothing or to everything on the agenda.

President Peters: All right. Let’s move in to reports.

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – March 29, 2002 report (Page 31) and April 6, 2002 report – walk-in

President Peters: Pat, is that the walk-in?

P. Henry: Well, there’s a walk-in and also on page 31 there’s a report that actually I sent to the FAC in lieu of going there. I wasn’t able to attend and we didn’t have a representative from NIU. This report is courtesy of Ken Anderson, who is the president of the FAC, who e-mailed me his notes. It was at Rend Lake College. As usually, there was an informational meeting and, I’m not going to pronounce this right, Marcia Langsjoen, who is the Associate Director and Staff Council for Academic Affairs at the IBHE, discussed private colleges versus public colleges. I’ll let you read through most of this information. I think just to highlight, it’s interesting that the issue of private institutions having rights and public institutions having responsibilities was probably something that generated a fair amount of conversation. There’s also on the bottom of the page, mention of the University of Phoenix which I think is an ongoing concern and, as she noted, the issue of whether what they offer would fit within the guidelines. And there is a trend, as she noted, for private corporations to buy up institutions in financial difficulty. One owns more than a dozen in Illinois. I think this is quite fascinating and I hope to find out more about it later. On the second page, the other side of the page, as President Peters noted, there is going to be a changing of the guard and the at the next meeting we’ll have a chance to get together with both outgoing Director Keith Sanders and incoming Director Designate LaVista. Finally, individual committees met to discuss various things. The committee that I work with is the Personnel Committee and essentially what we’re doing is generating the kinds of reports that I have here on page 31 which came about from collecting assorted feedback at NIU here concerning the report “All Faculty Matter” which, as you’ll recall, has to do with the role of non-tenure-track faculty. I’ll leave it to you to read over the report and if you are interested in adding more comments to this, I think the FAC is still interested in collecting these. I talked specifically
with Dean Grush who is the Associate Dean of LA&S who specifically works with the instructors and negotiating with the union. I also talked with the union representative from UPI, which represents the instructors. I got a mixture of viewpoints, among which was, I think, that the changing role of instructors and part-time faculty and non-tenure-track faculty is something that is of concern in that it’s no longer just a temporary sort of way-station in academia but has more of a permanent situation and the question is what happens because of that. It can be exploited. It can also undermine some aspects of the program that depend on tenured faculty.

The next to the last paragraph on page 31 mentions, well actually the third to the last paragraph, the conclusions and recommendations of the report which, I think I mentioned last time, are what I would specifically direct your attention to in that those are things that eventually the IBHE will come back to us wanting to have some response to. In terms of NIU, what came about most clearly with discussions with various people is the question of committee work for instructors. Some aspects of that would work; some aspects might not work so well, especially with personnel committees since they are, in fact, represented by UPI.

I think those are the highlights and, again, if any of you have concerns that I don’t address here that you think should be brought of the attention of the IBHE, they are in the process of collecting opinions and reports and various things on this and now would be the time to share them with me or by e-mail later if you wish.

**President Peters:** Any questions? At the last IBHE meeting the commission accepted the final report and had a set of recommendations. They may be collecting more information.

**P. Henry:** Responding.

**President Peters:** Responding to, right, but there is a set of recommendations that, one ought to consider. Because we’re so decentralized, it strikes me that this sort of discussion has to happen at the departmental level and all the way up.

**P. Henry:** The one thing I emphasized was that one size did not fit all, even across the university, and I would hope that that is something they take into consideration across the state because it’s certainly not going to be the same.

**President Peters:** We’ve got to make sure that we would get those recommendations as part of the record. Maybe it will be an information item next time. Dean Zar?

**J. Zar:** I have a question on the walk-in item. In the second paragraph, the latter part of that paragraph talks about the Board of Higher Education’s control over private institutions and it points out that the Higher Board has on occasion revoked operating rights of private institutions whose standards of operations they don’t approve of. At the very end of that paragraph it says that “those rare revocations have not been overturned”. I wonder how they would be overturned? Would that be through a court, a legal challenge, or what?

**P. Henry:** I would assume so. Since I was not at this meeting I would have to check on that for you.
J. Zar: I’m just curious.

President Peters: That or on appeal based upon information that needed to be supplied in the application.

J. Zar: If it was on appeal I wouldn’t call it overturning, but I don’t know.

P. Henry: I’ll get back to you, Jerry.

J. Zar: Just curious.

President Peters: That issue is of concern to the chancellors and the presidents of the public universities, and the private universities as well. We believe that degree programs that are certified for offering in the state of Illinois should pass the same test, needs test and certification, that we have to. The playing field should be level and sometimes in the past, and here I’m getting worked up because I just made this point to someone, that sometimes it’s more difficult for an Illinois institution that is statutorily established by the state to serve the public. It’s harder for us to get a new degree program approved than it is from some other outside educational competitor to come in here and buy office space in Hoboken and put the shingle out and get a Web site and be in business. And I’m getting even more worked up – because education cannot become a mere commodity and I fear that that’s what’s happening. IBHE should protect the integrity of degrees and we may have to have some statutory changes here to give them the tools that they need. That’s one of the problems. They don’t have the statutory tools that they need.

P. Henry: The continuation of the last paragraph on the first page to the top of the second page, I think, highlights that as well. There is a powerful motivation and it’s possible that private companies could exert a powerful influence through lobbying if we aren’t careful about these private institutions that sort of come up out of nothing.

President Peters: Now that I’m calmed down, should we move on? Pat, that’s it?

D. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths – no report

President Peters: No report from Dorothy and Dan on Academic Affairs. Correct?

D. Jones: Correct.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

President Peters: No report from Jim Lockard on Finance and Facilities? Correct?

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe – no report
President Peters: No report from Legislation, Audit? Judy and Bev, they’re right here. No report?

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report (Page 32)

President Peters: Sue’s not here so there’s no report. Let’s take a look at what she submitted on page 32. All right. That’s pretty much what I said. All right. Any questions on that?

F. Academic Policy Committee – Mary Larson, Chair

President Peters: Now, Mary Larson, Academic Policy Committee.

M. Larson: I’m here and I’m going to leave right after my report so I do not cough on any more people than I already have coughed on. It’s not an attempt to charge out of here and avoid the debate.

1. Fall break – Summary of Fall Break Discussion at Faculty Senate (Page 33)

M. Larson: You’ll see that we asked for comments from the Faculty Senate last month and we got a bunch and they’re on page 33. There seems to be pretty good sentiment for including the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as part of the Thanksgiving break, but other than that there seems to be no consensus for any reasons, and there seems to be some sentiment for perhaps readdressing this next fall, but I’m sort of in a quandary as to know where to go from here.

President Peters: Well, what’s your pleasure?

R Miller: We accept the report.

M. Larson: We accept the report?

President Peters: Rationality creeps into the process here.

M. Morris: Ferald, is that appropriate? Yes? Should I move that we include the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as part of Thanksgiving break. I move that we include the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

President Peters: All right, so we have a motion – the motion is that we include that half-Wednesday in the Thanksgiving break.

M. Larson: Well, we presently have a half so it would be the whole Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

J. King: No classes.
President Peters: No classes is what you’re saying. Now, we will have to do some sort of an analysis of whether or not that is legally, statutorily, morally correct. I mean, we’re really going to have to be a little cautious and the Board has to approve that, but that would be a recommendation to the Board. Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: I was just wondering if this was a premature motion because we really don’t know what we’re going to do about the fall break anyway. I mean that’s not even voted on so, whether we want to accept the Faculty Senate’s motion or read it into the record, you are looking at whether we can do it statutorily, and that presupposes that the main issue is passed.

President Peters: So what do we have now? We have a motion now to take that full day off Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

M. Morris: I think, in lieu of a fall break.

President Peters: In lieu of a fall break?

M. Morris: I don’t think we thought a fall break would be approved.

President Peters: No, but what the Dean is saying is that we haven’t addressed that.

F. Kitterle: The fall break has many different iterations and we have not settled on whether we should have a fall break and what the form of that fall break should be. All of that is really up in the air.

P. Henry: The form of the fall break is a big determiner in whether we’re going to decide to have a fall break. I mean, there are people who would not mind having one kind of fall break but wouldn’t want to have another kind.

R. J. Gravel: Maybe it’s possible to table this right now and then maybe a committee of the University Council could get together, formulate an ad hoc committee of some sort to include members of faculty, members of administration and members of the student body, to evaluate this and do all the research in evaluating all the aspects of this. We’ve done it already but apparently if the motion that the University Council wants to make for just this one day is the issue at hand, we need to look into that specifically because that’s the way it’s coming off.

President Peters: So we still have a motion on the floor and we have a suggestion here for a table.

J. Kowalski: I don’t think that Jim King’s motion precludes us from reconsidering the question of a fall break, but I think the reason that he made it was that there was a large plurality of faculty members at the Faculty Senate who felt that, at a minimum, extending the Thanksgiving break to the Wednesday morning should be done. And I may be mistaken, but I didn’t hear anything in the motion that said we can’t come back to and consider an alternative form of fall break or adding additional days elsewhere in the schedule if conditions make it possible to do so.
President Peters: All right, Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: I’m speaking on behalf of the College Council and the College Senate, which were fairly unanimous in the position that they came forward with in regards to the issue of fall break. The process that we have gone through was that the University Council, through Sue Willis, had said we should go back to the college governance committees and bring forward what their feeling is. The College of Business, College of Visual and Performing Arts, College of Education, and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences came forward, as did individual departments. At the University Council meeting when we were ready to vote on this, there was a request that we have the Faculty Senate speak on this, which they have. Now what it seems we may do is refer this to a committee to look at this. Now, frankly I think that we have a faculty governance system that has spoken on this issue through the various colleges and I wonder what sort of message the University Council sends to those groups about the validity of their opinion on this issue. I mean, it seems that we have asked many different bodies to speak about this. One thing that’s perfectly clear is that there is not unanimity on this and if one decides to ask what is the unit of measure that we used, the unit of measure if it’s the Council’s, it’s against this. If we start counting individual people in the report it’s nowhere near overwhelming. So this is an issue that probably should be taken off the table in terms of current reality and brought back again at some other time. As you have said, we have an issue here before us – it’s about budgetary considerations and one really would like to know from studies that perhaps Vice President Williams would carry out is what are the implications that this may have for students? Does this change our competitive edge? What implications does it have for our staff -- not just faculty but our staff -- and is this the time to really be putting the institution in any further monetary or budgetary risk position?

President Peters: Is it fair to say that, in your judgment, at least from the shared governance situation that you’re observing in your college, that there is no consensus, no strong consensus for a fall break?

F. Kitterle: In our college I’m speaking on their instruction, the letter to Sue Willis read “it was unequivocal, there is no support for a fall break”. “In addition, what we concluded that we believe that the fall break is ill advised and potentially harmful to the institution”.

President Peters: All right, Professor King.

J. King: I think and it’s kind of scary for me to admit this, that Dean Kitterle is right. We engaged in consultation.

President Peters: Get the oxygen. I’m sorry.

F. Kitterle: Jim, I’m going down for CPR.

J. King: I quickly have to qualify the respect in which he is right. We all learned politeness at one stage, right? The form of etiquette that I got at home as a youngster included this dictum: “Don’t ask people’s advice unless you mean to take it; don’t waste their time”. Accordingly,
when we embarked on this, I’m not too sure that we knew what we were doing. I think we rushed into the business of consultation, and having done it now – or at least made a pretty good pass at a first try at consultation – we have to listen or change people’s minds. There are those two options; listen and change people’s minds. This issue cannot be brought forward to the Council at the present time in my opinion. I hate to back away from Mary’s committee which had recommended positive action on this. That was a motion that I did not make and I have not made a motion on this topic since that time and I want to be faithful and loyal to one of our committees and the work that they’ve done; but I would think at the present time we’ve got to back off this issue – the big issue. Now, the question of Wednesday, the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, I think you could address today or you could not address today. You could table it if you wanted to until the next meeting on the assumption that there’s plenty of time at the next meeting to bring it up, but the Dean’s point is correct. If you’re going to ask people’s advice, you’ve got to play fair. Listen to them and if they’re not in favor, you’ve got to go back and persuade them or sit down and be quiet.

President Peters: If I could make a suggestion then, one thing we might want to do withdraw the motion or vote on the motion and – send it to the Policy Committee to explore the ins and outs, but I think on the major issue, a motion to table indefinitely would be in order. I think we have an issue that’s before us right now.

M. Larson: And it’s premature to talk about the whole Wednesday before Thanksgiving as part of break. I could withdraw that.

President Peters: Okay.

M. Larson: If we need to figure the logistics first.

President Peters: We will do some due diligence on that and come back with something in May on. Does the seconder agree to that?

D. Wagner: I seconded it and yes. There were about five of us who seconded that.

President: All right, so that motion is withdrawn.

J. Kowalski: The thing I want to say is I think at the Faculty Senate I was the person who suggested that we take a straw poll on the question of the Wednesday morning break prior to Thanksgiving and there was strong support for that, and so I think that when we revisit that question it needs to be made clear to college councils that are discussing it that that is a separate, stand-alone issue. It is not part of a larger package, or need not be part of a larger package, of a wider or a more prolonged spring break. We need to find out whether the colleges or other entities in the university favor the addition of the Wednesday morning to the Thanksgiving break.

President Peters: All right. Anne?
A. Kaplan: I think we just want to be clear that this discussion, I assume, is about the academic calendar. That is, the university does not close on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and if it did, we would have to trade off one of the other administrative closure days. So this is really not a staff issue. This is a student/faculty, an instructional, issue.

President Peters: Good point. We are not going to administratively close the university unless we trade another day off.

K. Miller: If I could just add – I don’t know if this would be premature or not – I know that there’s some good discussion going on now. However, it seems to me -- and I don’t mean to be negative towards anyone in particular and I apologize if this comes out that way -- but it seems to me the Council just said, what do you think about a fall break? And there didn’t seem to be a whole lot of talk about what would you think about a two-day fall break or what would you think about a fall break at such and such a date or what would you think about not closing the university administratively? What if the Council were to go back to these bodies, these advisory bodies, either this year or next year? I know I won’t forget and I won’t let the Council forget, either, but what if the Council were to go back and say here are three, four, five proposals? What do you think about these? What are the potential benefits and harm that you see to your particular sphere and, just what’s the overall impression? Instead of just saying a fall break and everyone kind of kicks a bunch of different stuff around. I don’t know if that was actually done. That was just my understanding of the process. That way we could some hard evidence, why is this considered to be harmful, why is this considered to hurt the institution? What is going on here? I don’t fully understand that; I don’t know if anyone else does.

President Peters: Well, one of the things that Professor King mentioned last time struck me as being terribly sensible. Most of the things he says are terribly sensible. You don’t have a fall break just because you want time off. It has to be linked to some higher educational purpose, like a small liberal arts school sending students for three weeks of service learning where they do a project, they come back, they reflect upon that, they write a paper that’s discussed in class. Could we have a fall break at NIU that was meaningful to this institution that helped us to get faculty and students together on some sort of a mid-course assessment? There has been a lot of good discussion, but I think what happened was we rushed toward coming up with a report as to whether or not we should have a fall break. I think you’re saying something similar. Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: Yes, I really appreciate the question that was raised and in the minutes of the of the last meeting. There were many, many considerations that went into deliberations. For example, what happens if the fall break is associated with adding three days to the end of the fall to make it up? Or the beginning of the fall? The kinds of issues that we raised I think are issues that have been discussed. For example, the timely graduation of students could be effected. For example, the ability of final exam scheduling. It might be difficult. Maybe that’s a plus. And difficulty with commencement scheduling. These are just three issues which came up. Also, laboratory courses. My colleague, Harold Kafer, deals with ensembles and they’re doing theatre productions. Those are times that you just can’t make up when it’s artistic. So, those are some of the issues that I want to assure you that we did look at.
President Peters: All right. Dean Zar?

J. Zar: Distributed for the last meeting was a summary, that Sue Willis provided, of the input obtained up to that point. Since then we now have input from the Faculty Senate. I wonder if the University Council office can tell us if there’s been any other input since the last meeting?

D. Mathesius: Not that I know of. If it went to Sue, I’m not aware of it.

J. Zar: I would agree that whatever we do now, or if we do nothing now, it can always be brought up at a later time, especially if there’s new material to introduce. What Dr. Willis summarized for us, though, does show, even without the Faculty Senate’s negativity toward a break, overall negativity toward the idea. There were far more negative opinions voiced than positive if you count them up, and the positive opinions from a few groups were very vague. They just said okay, we’re favorable to it, whereas the negative ones you will note if you read through those, give a lot of specific concerns and overwhelmingly the concerns were the negative effects on students. Dean Kitterle mentioned a few; overwhelmingly the negative effects are perceived to be on students.

President Peters: We have now a withdrawn motion on Wednesday, which we will look into and are we ready to move on?

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

G. Coover: No report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Sue Mini, Chair

J. King: Do we have enough people to pass a bylaw change?

President Peters: Do we have people to pass a bylaw change?

M. Morris: I think if they all vote yes. Don’t anybody leave.

President Peters: Rules and Governance?

M. Morris: I’m here for Sue. I have been told by my boss, Donna, that we do not have enough Council members present to actually effect a change in the bylaws; and since items 1, 2, 3 and 4 are all bylaws items, I think that puts us at a point where we really are precluded from proceeding other than having a discussion which I’m sure many people would just as soon not have.

1. University Bylaws 13.65 Honors Committee (Pages 34-35) ACTION ITEM

2. University Bylaws 12.642 and 12.23 and the Faculty Senate Bylaws 1.13 regarding the start dates of Executive Committee and Faculty Senate (Page 36) ACTION ITEM
3. University Bylaws 1.8 Additional Ex Officio Members of University Council. (Pages 37-39). **FIRST READING**

**M. Morris:** That we can bring up. I stand corrected. Thank you, Bob.

**President Peters:** Then I think it would be prudent to move forward to 3.

**M. Morris:** Okay, then I will do that. A little history here. The reason that I’m sitting in this seat is because we do not have a clear-cut succession for the Executive Secretary when he or she is away from the campus or otherwise unable to serve. What we do have in the Faculty Senate is a procedure whereby the Vice President will take over as the President of the Senate, which would be Jody this year. Unfortunately, Jody is not a member of the Council and so if we have a vice president who is not a member of the Council, that vice president cannot also serve as the Executive Secretary of this body, and it was deemed more appropriate to have one person stand in for the Faculty Senate President/Executive Secretary if the need arose. So what we tried to do is come up with a process to insure that the Vice President of the Senate and the Secretary of the Senate were both members of the Council in the event that the need arose for either one of them to be a substitute for the Executive Secretary of the Council. Now it just so happens I am a member of the Council and Jody isn’t. In subsequent years they could both be members or neither of them could be members of the Council, so what we decided to do in the Faculty Senate was to make both the Secretary and the Vice President of the Senate ex officio members of the Council in the event they weren’t otherwise duly elected members of the Council, and that’s what the change to Bylaw Section 1.8 does.

**President Peters:** First reading?

**M. Morris:** First reading.

**President Peters:** Any questions? It would be an action item for May 1.

**M. Morris:** And I just might add that if that does pass, then we will go forward and in your packet are other changes to the Bylaws and the Constitution that would then effectuate a succession plan.

**President Peters:** All right.

**M. Morris:** I believe the Rules and Governance Committee will work on that.

**J. Zar:** Could I make a suggestion? Perhaps the Council should direct the Rules and Governance Committee to look at the needed language changes that Professor Morris refers to before the next meeting. The Rules and Governance Committee, if it’s going to meet before the next Council meeting, could recommend some language changes in those other portions you referred to.
President Peters: If that’s the sense of the Council I think that is fine.

M. Morris: I think that’s necessary if this actually passes.

President Peters: All right.

M. Morris: I think that’s all we have then.

4. University Bylaws Article 9, Faculty Personnel Advisor (Pages 40-41)  
ACTION ITEM

1. Proposed Changes to the Student Judicial Code ACTION ITEM (Pages 42-44)

R. Orem: I’d like to draw everyone’s attention then to the item on pages 42 through 44 in your packet. This has to do with proposed changes to language to the Student Judicial Code. The University Affairs Committee met last week and we discussed this. Gary Gresholdt, who’s a member of the University Affairs Committee, also has some background knowledge and was able to provide some insight into why these changes came about. These changes were seen as more clarification than anything substantial. After discussion the University Affairs Committee voted that we should recommend to the full University Council that these changes be approved. Therefore I, on behalf of the Committee, move that approval.

President Peters: All right. So we did have a first reading on this?

J. Zar: We don’t need it.

President Peters: We don’t need it. This isn’t a bylaw change?

M. Morris: Right, it’s not a bylaw.

President Peters: So that’s a motion from the Committee. I hear a second. Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Passes.

The motion passes.

J. Zar: I would just point out that, according to the Student Judicial Code, the President makes the final decision on changes in the Judicial Code.

President Peters: So after two years I finally get to do something! All right. I will take it under advisement and run it by our legal people and will inform you May 1.

J. Zar: I can point out that what’s here was drafted largely by Norden Gilbert in consultation with others.
J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Winifred Creamer, Chair

President Peters: Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. No report.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Unfinished Business.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sabbatical leave policy clarification – see memo from Zar to Provost – walk-in

President Peters: New Business is the walk-in clarification of sabbatical leave policies and Dean Zar do you want to speak to this, or Ivan?

Provost Legg: It’s a fairly simple issue, but I’ll let Jerry back me up because I know no matter how simple I make it Jerry will find a flaw somewhere. Anyway, in our consideration of sabbatical leaves this year we ran into a situation – at least one, possibly more than one – in which defining what we meant by a six-year lapse period between sabbaticals came up. What we’re proposing here is a change, a modification of the Bylaw 8.48 which would make it very clear that we would have to have six years between the end of one sabbatical and the start of the next sabbatical; and if you define that as exactly six years, seventy-two months instead of using the academic year, it comes out very clear and we are just putting that on the table for your reading for the next meeting. Jerry would you like to amplify on that if necessary?

President Peters: So this is a first reading. Any questions? All right. Comments?

J. Kowalski: When I read this I did have one question because I noticed the addition of the word “full-time service” to the new wording. Just for clarification, in an instance in which a faculty member had written and secured funding for a grant that permitted him or her to take a leave of absence, a research leave, would that then add an additional semester or semesters to the time they need to wait or is that still considered full-time service?

Provost Legg: Up front – if you officially buy off time that’s a separate act.

President Peters: So it’s not countable or it is countable as full time service?

Provost Legg: That would be my initial reaction to it. Maybe Jerry could amplify on that. The faculty buy time all the time. You’re serving the university but somebody else is paying for it. You’re just serving it through a special contract with the dean that bought your time.

President Peters: Maybe a dean who has to administer these things has run into this. Fred?
F. Kitterle: If faculty get a grant and buy their time, that is not a disincentive and it does not give back on the sabbatical, because what is happening is that person is, in fact, providing funds to have things taught in exchange. They are in a sense being reassigned time.

Provost Legg: Yeah, that’s precisely correct.

F. Kitterle: Fully employed, if you will, but it’s just reassigned time for research.

President Peters: What if I take a leave of absence to be the Director of the NSF Mathematics Program for two years?

F. Kitterle: I was, and I did, and it never affected my sabbatical at time at the University of Toledo, which is a MAC school.

Provost Legg: I would applaud if anybody had that opportunity.

President Peters: But if you took a leave of absence to do something non-related to your academic work?

F. Kitterle: No, we wouldn’t do that.

President Peters: We’ll have to discuss that issue. But it was at Toledo so it’s all hypothetical.

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Comments and questions from the floor?

K. Miller: I’d just like to publicly say I know that student attendance is getting a little bit better. I’m still disgusted with the level of student participation and I am completely committed to having every student who serves on the University Council in attendance at every meeting next year.

President Peters: And welcome they are.

J. Wolfskill: I was led to think of this issue by the opening remarks you made, Mr. President. I’d like to know, hypothetically looking into the future, if we’re looking at some bad budget times. We are looking at maybe some cuts going down? I’m wondering at what point does it make sense, rather than passing an across-the-board cut and say each college cuts 5 or 10% of the faculty and so on – at what point do you, instead of cutting everybody, we just pick a small number of things and cut them out completely?

President Peters: Well, Ivan and I have been there many times. You really have to know what you’re getting into when you get into that. In fact, what happens is this budget cut that we’re going through will have lasting effects, and then as you go through your strategic plans and you make decisions for the future, you will be – as you repair your budget, let’s put it that way – you will be making across-the-board decisions, because right now it came upon us so fast. A dean,
for instance, would have to take vacant positions that existed in a college but perhaps they
wouldn’t take them. They are based on priorities and shared governance and so they’re put back.
I’ve looked at some of the cuts that are being proposed and I’m surprised that they are less across
the board than I thought. They are targeted, and I’m pleased with that, but I’ve had a lot of
experience trying to eliminate programs, in the beginning of what might look like, a couple of
years of bad budgets and making horrible mistakes and never being able to make the cuts. So
you have to have a very clear idea of where you want to take the institution before you start
doing this, because I guarantee you any program you look at now and say that can be cut, there
will be a constituency and you have to be prepared, and I can give you plenty of examples from
my experience. Now I could go through the budget book with my red pen and start circling
things and say we can cut this, and that would be an interesting exercise. I’m not saying we’re
not going to do that but I am more optimistic than that. What I see is this economy is going to
come back. The budget may not be great next year but I’m hoping that it comes back. A lot
depends on the economy and other considerations but I don’t see a deep trough here and
therefore we shouldn’t panic. Those people who get their priorities in line and think through this
are going to be ahead and I think this is the kind of institution that this is. Ivan, do you want to
add anything to that?

Provost Legg: What you said is true. We spent a lot of time looking at all the programs, talking
to the deans and exchanging information. Cuts were not across the board by any means. In fact,
there were some small programs eliminated.

President Peters: But if you’re going to do what you’re saying – you’re going to have to go
through a process, and it all starts with knowing what your priorities are and that takes a while.
It is a good time now and we’re going to do this. We have got to make a budget. We’ve got a
10-million-dollar problem. But it’s a very good time now for us this summer to begin to look at
every business operation, every unit, the patterns of expenditures, our policies and practices, and
try to be more efficient. There is a whole range of things you look at. I know the list and I
appreciate the question because it’s always on my mind, I hate cutting across the board. It leads
to mediocrity. We, I guarantee you, are not at the point where one year’s budget cut is going to
lead to mediocrity. It’s not going to be easy and there’s real pain out there.

D. Wagner: Is the faculty involved in these considerations in any way or how?

President Peters: If we ever get to the point of eliminating departments or academic programs,
the faculty have to be involved. We’re not anywhere near that.

Provost Legg: I think it’s fair enough to point out faculty are definitely involved through the
normal course of how we provide leadership at the university, through the chairs, through the
deans to the provost, so the input comes in that fashion on a normal operating basis.

R. J. Gravel: Just a quick question. A few students have been asking about two long ongoing
projects, specifically the lagoon project by the music building campus and Altgeld Hall. I know
earlier this year you said that all academic buildings and all buildings will be open beginning fall
semester. Is that still applicable?
President Peters: Well, okay, let me go through the list. Dr. Williams is here and others.

R. J. Gravel: That would be great.

President Peters: Barsema Hall is on time, on budget, and we have a request in for 4 million dollars that is high on the capital list for equipment and we will be opening in the fall. That’s an academic building. The Convocation Center -- and God bless the students who helped us build that wonderful thing, you’re going to love it -- that’s opening in September. Altgeld Hall is about sixteen months away. A very complex project. It is not, quote, unquote, an academic building. The art museum is going back in and that’s very dear to my heart. There is going to be a first-rate unbelievable faculty and student instructional development design center as you walk in. The Faculty Senate is going to have offices right in the beginning. Student Affairs is going to have offices right in the beginning. But, right now we need academic space and that’s been a very complex project. I mean, everything that could go wrong with the project did and it’s a state project. The Capital Development Board is in charge of the project and we had to go back and, as you know, get extra money which we did. I spent more time on that than I cared too. You will all be proud of that. You know, I always believe you under-promise and over-deliver, and so sixteen months is an under-promise. Dr. Williams, do you want to add anything to that?

E. Williams: I like your promises. No, it’s looking good and I think the President has really given you a pretty good summary of what it is. I think we all can be very proud of the fact that the state has once again shown its support for Northern Illinois University and its recognition of what we’re trying to achieve here because we were funded even in a tight situation budget wise. We were funded to complete buildings and correct problems and move the institution forward.

President Peters: Now the lagoon projects. There’s an east lagoon and a west lagoon whether you know that or not. The east lagoon is where we were today talking to our alums, and two of them got married on the bridge or something or get engaged on the bridge. That project, very complicated, is a storm water project, WPA project, where thousands of guys on shovels dug that thing out. It silted in, it’s cleaned up, structurally ready to go. Plantings are beginning. That’s done and when you come back in the fall it’s going to be beautiful. The second phase of that – well, there’s the west lagoon, Eddie where are we on that?

E. Williams: When you come back in the fall that also will be done. So, we’re moving forward.

President Peters: And then the other thing is we’re finally getting around to through the Capital Development Board, is dredging Watson Creek; and former President Monat came up to me and said thank God you’re cleaning up that mess; but we’re widening it and channeling it because Neptune used to flood and Art used to flood. That’s a flood-control project and we’ve been very careful. You will see that we went through and marked any tree, there’s a red ribbon on it, that’s worth saving. There are some that are not worth saving; they’re scrub. They’re buckthorn and noxious weeds and things, but we’re hoping that will be done by the time the fall rolls around.

R. J. Gravel: The last thing, it’s been brought up that the observatory has not been functioning for a while, is that being looked into?
President Peters: I have not observed the observatory.

R. J. Gravel: Okay, if someone could look into that it would be great.

President Peters: I have no information on that. You mean no one wants to go up there and look at the stars?

R. J. Gravel: No, I don’t think that’s the issue. I guess that the window doesn’t open or something like that.

President Peters: I never have been up there. I will go up there between now and May 1 and I’ll give you a personal review.

R. J. Gravel: That would be great. Thank you.

XI. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. 2002-2003 Meeting Schedule (Page 45)

B. Article from Chicago Tribune, “SIU to seek 20% tuition increase” (Page 46)

XII. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: All right? Motion to adjourn? We are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.