
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.

F. Jaeger attended for W. Tolhurst; B. Robinson attended for F. Rodgers.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Ackerman, Cabasa-Hess, Dorynek, Lang, Lockard, Loubere, Musial, S. Song, Stapelton, Wiese, Woodin,

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda. Do I hear a second? All those in favor? All right, we have an agenda.

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 11, 2002 MEETING
(pages 3-7)

President Peters: Item III, approval of the minutes of the December 11 meeting on pages 3-7. I’ll call for additions or corrections. I’ll call for a motion to approve. We have a motion. Oh, you have a comment.

D. Griffiths: On page 5, 4th line, it says, “if persons can be identified in tapes”. Actually, if there are personal identifiers, it is considered a human subject. It doesn’t have to be just the tape, but I can work with Sue on that.

President Peters: Give that a – do we have that? Okay. Any other corrections? Now I’ll call for a motion to approve. So moved? Is there a second? All those in favor of adopting the minutes? Okay, thank you.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I want to thank Provost Legg and Sue for filling in for me on December 11. In two and a half years, that’s the first Council meeting I missed and, you know, I can’t remember why I missed it but it was probably a very good reason and I was just so pleased that when I came back, the University was still here. Probably people preferred to have you.

I have some extended remarks and announcements today because of the, you know, the rather interesting times that we live in and I can begin by saying that there’s not a lot of hard information but I want to try to go through some things that we do know with our – the environment, the situation, the political changes, the new governor, the new legislature, budget issues and also federal issues. Not much of it is good news and there – right now, we’re all watching and listening and waiting for directives and it can be frustrating. I thought what I would do for you is kind of go through the things that we know are solid and are fact, those things which are possibilities and that we need to watch out for and then what are we doing – what have we been doing and what are we doing and I want to drill down on a couple of issues so that you’re as informed as you could possibly be at this point in time. Again, remember that the information is a little sparse.

New Governor Blagojevich is still putting together his team of chief advisors and then cabinet level people and that’s what’s occupying his time so we’re getting a late start on the budget cycle for us because of that. Now here is and, by the way – I was thinking about this last night – if I were going to characterize three things that are relative to us with regard to the new Governor and the overall environment that we’re in right now – I call it the three A’s. One is access, the other is accountability and the third is administrative efficiency. Everything I’m going to say can line up under one of those general themes that will be very characteristic of not only the new Governor’s administration, but I think also the legislature and also this is true nationally.

So, here’s what we do know, what the Governor has either announced or said. One is a 4.8 billion dollar deficit that can be broken down as follows: 1.25 billion for this current fiscal year, FY03. In other words, the State budget that we’re in is short as we speak 1.25 billion. It could grow depending on revenue but, that’s a fact right now. Another fact is that projection for ’04 is an additional 3.6 billion dollars and this is on roughly a 50 billion dollar budget but don’t forget that of that 50 billion, roughly half of the budget is what I would call cuttable. The rest are either mandates or entitlements or things that you can’t cut so really only half of that 50 billion dollar budget is cuttable. All right, so that’s one fact that we’re dealing with that’s a reality. We’re looking at a several billion-dollar budget gap. All right? Another thing that the Governor has announced that is fact is a universal hiring freeze on all code state agencies. We are not a code state agency, but the state agencies have a universal hiring freeze. That’s a fact. The third thing that the Governor has announced that’s a fact, is a freeze on the purchase of automobiles for state agencies. Again, I think those are code agencies and not public higher education and yet, you know, you always wait for the other shoe to drop. The fourth thing is a fact that’s relevant to our situation in that there is a new Budget Director named. That may be the crucial position for the Governor. The fellow’s name is John Filan. He has a management and accounting background. He’s talented and we hear very good things about his ability. He’s smart, but he will do his job and that is to find ways to cut budgets. So, that’s a fact. Another thing that you can glean from
the pronouncements and speeches of the Governor is that he is willing to explore expanded areas for taxation. Very quickly, after the inaugural, he and those people who were speaking for him, indicated that given a 5 billion – 4.8 billion dollar deficit – it was not possible totally cut one’s way out of that and so the only other way is through some sort of taxation and lots of things have been mentioned. Taxes on services on sales, possibly gaming. Income tax, I believe, is off the table. The important point here is that the Governor said, the new Governor said, that he’s willing to consider revenue-enhancing initiatives. Another fact that’s relevant to us and we need to put into the mix of things as we plan for the future, is that the Governor believes that public universities have administrative bloat. If you read the campaign statements and I have them all written down, and it’s not – that can mean whatever you want it to mean – but it’s one of the “A’s”, administrative efficiency or administrative bloat. Another thing I think that is a fact, based upon the Governor’s public pronouncements, is that the Governor believes that public university tuition has increased too rapidly. So, from my perspective and my analysis, these are the things that are solid.

Now, there are many things that are speculative, that have probabilities attached to them that I’ll discuss in a minute. But on the legislative side, in the legislature, there is one fact; one hard piece of data and that is that there has been legislation filed to cap public university tuition. That’s Senate Bill 10. Now, almost every year a similar bill is introduced but that is a fact that has to be contended with.

Now, let me move on to other concerns, potentially raised in Springfield within the next few weeks and you can attach probabilities to these. None of them are facts as we speak but I’ve heard these things and you have read about them and they may occur. One is that there could be legislation introduced to return public university tuition payments to the State Treasury for later re-appropriation. The way that system worked in the past is that we collect the checks from the students and their parents for tuition and its deposited in the State Treasury and not available to us that fiscal year. Now, some years back, universities received the right to control their own income fund. Now, I have to tell you that our ability to serve our students and to handle things in a tough budget time requires flexibility to control the income fund because those are the dollars, those local dollars, that go directly into instruction for peak demand, for emergencies, for whatever it takes to run the academic engine of this University and the number is over 60 million dollars a year. That’s a crucial one for us. Again, that is out there, but it isn’t a fact but it has a possibility attached to it of I don’t know what. That is of great concern to us. Another thing that is out there is administrative cost cutting or efficiency. I don’t know what form that would take. It could be some sort of a mandated percentage cut. Remember, that, and I’ll talk about this a little bit later in my extended remarks, that we’re talking about administration all the way up and down. I mean, administration doesn’t just stop at a certain level. When you categorize what is administration, I mean, it’s all the way down to the unit level. That has a probability attached to it. It’s talked about. There are some in the Legislature who are talking about instituting a budgeting process at the legislative level of line item budgeting. We have a line item budget, Dr. Williams, literally of thousands of line items. It’s voluminous. There are some in the Legislature who would like to review line item budgets down to the departmental level which means individual staff lines with salaries. That’s out there as a potential concern. Another potential concern, which has a higher probability, is a budget rescission for FY03. Remember, I said that the Governor identified in a statement, and I think it was stated in his inaugural, 1.25
billion shortfall in this year’s budget so that has to be accommodated in some way and the classic way to do it is to cut state budgets mid-year. Now, as you know, we have planned for some of that or we having planning in place for that as a contingency. Then the last thing that I just want to mention as a possibility and I know that Pat Henry is here and she’ll give her – Patricia, you’re going to give your report on the IBHE – there is a high probability of a significant revised IBHE FY04 budget and decision roles and there’s a high probability that will be revised.

So, there may be others but I thought I wanted to give you those things that are most significant, that impact us and the things that I spend my time on.

Now, what have we done and what are we doing? The Chairman of our Board of Trustees, without the benefit of perks and on his own time – his own nickel – has been very active as has our Federal and State Relation’s person, Kathy Buettner, and I – we’ve all been involved in some level with the Governor’s transition teams for higher education and that was a very welcome opportunity. There was a lot of inclusiveness on that and it resulted in a lot of suggestions that go to the Governor’s team and then the Governor’s team is putting together a position paper, which no one has seen. We were part of the input process. But it was a good – I actually enjoyed the experience and that it was very, very worthwhile and we did our best to get our position known and differentiated from others. We’ve been meeting and continue to meet and talk with legislators because there are a lot of new legislators. There are three new leaders, new budgeters and there soon will be Governor key policy and budget staff people and we have been and we will continue to meet with them, request time with them, to explain our budget and our needs and I will be spending a lot of my time doing that. As always, our policy makers really do – they may not agree with us all the time, but they always receive us and hear our message.

The University business vice presidents met last Friday to draft responses to various issues and questions based on a lot of technical things about budgeting. They’re involved. I’m in close contact on an individual basis with all of the presidents and chancellors of public universities and some of the private chancellors in Illinois just to keep track of what’s going on and to exchange information and that is invaluable. As we did last year in terms of what we’re going to do, we’re going to put up a website, a link on our website, on the home page with basic budget information. You know, the facts and then any clarifications or interpretations to those facts we need to offer and then my statements that I make or pronouncements or any other budget messages so that you’ll have a place to monitor, with links, the budget situation as it unfolds and other issues like governance issues or some of these other administrative issues about how higher education will be governed. Now, I’m going to set up a series of leadership meetings as I always do with various groups, operating staff people and others, students and between our shared governance heads as soon as the information on the budget process starts to unfold and that could be any day or it could be awhile because the Governor has asked for more time as I think he should because it’s complex. Meanwhile, this is the period of time where I’m heavily involved with our federal agenda and that’s a different set of issues, but this is the time of year when I make our case to our federal representatives and this year has been – the FY03 budget is still not approved. We’ve been running on concurrent resolutions and so we have some requests in from last year that are still hanging fire and so we have to attend to that plus we have to make the case for some items for next year. So, I’m doing that as well I believe, next week.
So, in all of this, we’re going to need your support and we’re going to need your help when we call upon you and that depends on the strategy that unfolds based on these possibilities and it is a fluid situation but we’re going to have to call upon alums, students to tell the story – faculty, staff. Our Trustees are involved and our friends because I do believe we’re in for a challenge and I want to drill down a little bit more on some of these issues. I know I’m taking time but I feel the need to communicate with you on this because this is how I spent my holiday hours is working on these issues.

Now, you have to admit that the economic news is grim and it’s getting grimmer. I do believe that there is a growing focus on higher education in the State and in the nation and it is about the three A’s. It is about cost and access. People are wanting to know – I get calls from parents and e-mails, letters – why are the costs so high and how is it effecting access for students and their parents. This is an important issue, I mean, and many of the politicians who ran and were successful ran, in part, on the issue of cost and access to higher education – to a quality education. Sunday’s Tribune article, if you read it, top of the headlines about administrative spending at the U of I is an example of the microscope we are all under and I challenged my good friend, Dean Kitterle, today to spend $800 dollars at Johnny’s Char House. That’s a lot of steak.

F. Kitterle: We let our candidates look in the window.

President Peters: I must find a way to differentiate us from others, not to criticize or blame others. NIU is administratively lean and efficient in everything we do. We have good workloads for our faculty. We have a good story to tell. The downside is that it’s difficult for the average citizen to differentiate. A negative story about one public university is bad for us all. It’s a challenge. In this environment, it is critically important for us to get our story out. Now, another thing is that, in my experience, when times are difficult – maybe when your back is against the wall – that’s the best possible time to reach deep and identify who we are, what we believe in and where we’re going. I would not be so foolish as to say we’re going to go through this difficult period and come out better. But I do think we were at a crossroads anyway, trying to define what the future of NIU is so I think this is a good time to do that because when we make resource decisions it should be in line with our mission and therefore, in the coming weeks and months we’re going to be engaging in a comprehensive all-campus dialogue about our mission, our vision, our image and identity. I’ll be leading that discussion and I really do look forward to it. I’m excited about that.

I want to say a few words about a policy issue that has emerged that you’ve heard about both nationally and in the state and Governor Blagojevich has picked up on this and that is there’s very much talk about P16, or really what is P20, seamless education issues and I know – I think I read in Pat Henry’s report and she’s going to talk about that or it’s in the report – it’s the talk of the country right now. As a result of that and under the leadership of former president of the U of I and a good friend of mine, Stan Ikenberry, Stan pulled together a group of educations, deans of colleges of education, IBHE people, community college people and the other thing he did, given his power of persuasion, he got every public university chancellor and president to attend this summit. Out of that came an eight point agenda that some of you have seen and we can make available as an attachment to this meeting – an eight point agenda on the future of how we
can all work together to try to deal with some of these critical issues of P20, P16. As a result of that, the chancellors – the public chancellors and presidents – unanimously signed a letter and sent it to Governor Blagojevich with the agenda indicating that we were all collectively behind helping in dealing with the P20 issues and that we would do our part. It’s a collective statement and so I committed NIU to this and I think rightfully so. Knowing our traditional strength in this area, all the research, interdisciplinary research and implied research we do on – that may be applied to some of these problems. I think we have a unique contribution to make. But what I really needed to do was, I needed some validation and I needed to get some focus so over the break I have empowered a taskforce – it’s called the P20 taskforce – consisting of a number of campus leaders including Bob Wheeler who’s here, Vice President Anne Kaplan, Dean Chris Sorenson from Education, Dean Fred Kitterle – Fred’s here – Harold Kafer from Visual and Performing Arts, Shirley Richman from Health and Human Sciences and Promod Vohra from Engineering, to get together and to begin to deeply discuss this, to identify NIU’s unique strengths and to formulate a philosophical statement and perhaps an action plan on what NIU could do to help with this problem and part of the challenge for the task and Provost Legg and I both agreed to do this and empowered this committee and what we would like to see that group to collect broadly from the academic community ideas on the role of NIU and how we can best make our contribution and to get me something to get our position, our philosophy, quickly so that I am armed and prepared to make our commitment on behalf of NIU. I put it this way, I want to place – where do I place our stake in the ground on this issue of helping out with P20 issues. Everyone may not be able to contribute, but I do believe – knowing our strength and the basic research we do in so many areas – we do tremendous research on family violence, on learning theory, on methodologies, on early childhood behavior and that’s what a research university does. Now, can we apply that and help with some of these problems. I’ve very excited about that because I think it’s time for NIU to stand up and address that and I look forward to getting that report and then discussing it.

Okay, now, the last thing I want to talk about is what I call local issues. As you know, I’m a member of the DeKalb Growth Summit organized by Mayor Sparrow to engage the leadership of this area in a real discussion about growth and quality of life issues and I’m pleased to be on that panel and there are some other University people on that. Herb Rubin is on it and by – well, we can honor Herb later – but I sincerely believe that NIU cannot continue the tremendous progress it’s made without the help and the support and the cooperation of the community as it develops. I think the two go together and so I’m pleased to be on that. The other thing is I’m on the Metropolitan Planning Organization. Thanks to the work of members of our community, we have a voting membership and that MPO has been designated by the federal government to help determine the transportation needs of this area in the coming decades and, you know, even though we’re in a rural area, now we’re in an urban MPO – we have transportation issues, people movement and trucks, traffic, trains. So, I don’t know if many of you say this editorial and I have a Xerox copy I can put in the record – it was in the Daily Herald and it says “Study – a Transit Link for NIU Students and Suburbs”. Kevin Miller knows all about this and basically, what it argues for since the Metro is coming out to Elburn in ’05, about the logic of providing a transportation link then from Elburn to DeKalb and someday, perhaps, Metro being the terminus here in DeKalb. Anyway, it basically advocates for that and that’s something I’ve been pushing for awhile, not thinking that it would ever come into public attention and I think it has. So, I’d like to see Metro train service expand to Dekalb. I think that’s an important issue for us. I think
mass transit access to the city and suburbs right here in DeKalb has both a practical and symbolic importance. Certainly, anything that makes it easier to come visit DeKalb or to access home, family and jobs in the suburbs is a boon to our students and to staff and alumni but it also makes a stronger statement about the region of which NIU and DeKalb are a part and that is this is the nation’s third largest metropolitan area, the region from which we draw our students and to which we send our graduates. It’s a physical connection that continues to close the gap between DeKalb and the rest of the Chicago land area and so with DeKalb on the west suburban line, the mental disconnect between NIU and the region is serves gets a little smaller and the connection with our region grows stronger. So, stay tuned. All right, that’s the end of my report and I’ll take questions at the end when we get through our program.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: All right, our next item is the Consent Agenda and we have one item, the Committee on Advanced Professional Certification. Is there a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda? Is there a second? All those in favor? All right, we have a Consent Agenda.

The Consent Agenda was adopted.

A. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification (CAPC), to be included in the Committees of the University Book – refer to Rules and Governance. (Pages 8-12)

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 13-16) and report – walk-in

President Peters: Now let’s move into reports. First the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE, Patricia Henry.

P. Henry: Yes, thank you. The actual report here is the same one I gave in December because the FAC hasn’t met. It’s meeting on January 31 and so most of you have already seen this report for discussion of it including a very interesting discussion of the P through 16 situation is in the minutes and we want to talk further on that, we certainly can. The lobbyist, as I discussed, that we met with in December indeed emphasized many of the same things in terms of the importance of getting the story out to the legislature, especially the students and students’ families. The IBHE itself, I think, is perceived as being, you know, an advocate for higher education but it is not necessarily listened to with the same degree of interest as actual members of the voting public and I think the IBHE is feeling a little unsure of what’s going to happen and there was mention of the “Super Board” at some point. I haven’t heard anything further on that but I’m sure they’ll keep us posted.

In addition, there are two things that are actually drafts of things that are going to be done at the January 31 meeting. One of them you have in the packet. This is from the Quality Committee Subcommittee of the FAC concerning faculty rights and responsibilities in higher education. This is going to be presented at the meeting. I draw your attention in particular to – what it is – there’s a summary and then to the third paragraph now, this the FAC will present to the IBHE.
after we discuss it. We’re particularly concerned with shared governance and the point is made, again in this third paragraph down there, that various studies that are cited here concludes that faculty perceives the ideal governance process as a system where they were involved thoroughly in the decision making process and were empowered to question policy through a formal process. I think the FAC is, as many of us are, concerned with, especially during difficult budget times, feeling disenfranchised, cut-off of decision making where just cuts come out of the sky and we all prefer not to let that happen. So, are there any questions or problems with this draft that you would want me to raise at the January meeting? If you have any questions, you can certainly – or comments you think I should bring to their attention, please e-mail me on them.

The other, which was a walk-in and I sent you an e-mail about it as well, concerns another draft of a proposal that the FAC would like to bring to the IBHE at their February 4 meeting. We’ve got layers and layers here but this goes back to something I brought to your attention, I think, in October where the IBHE is sort of assessing assessment here and it gets confusing because there’s sort of layers within layers but the survey was made in terms of establishing performance indicators to assess progress towards meeting the goals of the Illinois Commitment. I think this is something that should be taken seriously because the IBHE, I think, will be using the Illinois Commitment as a way of arguing to the legislature that higher education dollars are well spent and they want some way of being able to look to individual institutions to see how well they are meeting the Illinois Commitment and so, what they’re coming up with is a means of assessing our participation, others’ participation in the Illinois Commitment. This sort of all throat clearing that’s going on throughout this page – on the backside there’s the actual draft of the resolution that the FAC will present to the IBHE. Again, the – excuse me for all these letters of the alphabet – the FAC will actually discuss this on January 31 then present the finished resolution to the IBHE at its meeting on February 4 and the resolution reads that “the Faculty Advisory Council calls upon the IBHE, individual institutions and their faculty to assure appropriate faculty participation in defining the institutional common and mission-specific indications called for in assessing progress towards meeting the goals of the Illinois Commitment”. Once again, you can go to the IBHE website and find out many, many things about this. I guess there was a memorandum that went to all of the university presidents and chancellors last year and material was gathered indicating the mission-specific indicators for individual institutions and that went forward, I think, in August to the IBHE. That’s what it looks like from the paper trial, but that’s what we’ll be talking about. I think what the FAC would like is if we could find out what our mission statement said. I think that’s sort of part of what – that’s a narrower segment of what you were talking about as sort of the overall mission of the University.

President Peters: We could do that, I don’t --- maybe we had a mission indicator that said we wouldn’t send in reports to IBHE ---

P. Henry: Bad idea. Like I say, it’s layer upon layer of assessing assessment here, which gets to be a headache.

President Peters: All right, any questions for – I saw a hand back there. No? All right, thank you Patricia.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

**President Peters:** We do not have reports from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Board of Trustee’s Committee nor Finance, Facilities and Operations, nor Legislative Audit or the general BOT because we haven’t met since the last meeting. Does anyone want to direct questions to those committee representatives?

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe – no report

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

**President Peters:** All right, it looks like we do have a report from John Wolfskill, Academic Policy Committee. No we don’t. I said it looked that way.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Bill Goldenberg, Chair

**President Peters:** Do we have a report from Resources, Space and Budget, Bill Goldenberg?

**B. Goldenberg:** No, ditto, but we will be meeting in February so we’ll have a report then.

**President Peters:** Okay, yes do that now.

**S. Willis:** By the way, you may recall that Bill Goldenberg has not been the Chair of the RSB Committee for the whole academic year. Herb Rubin, who was the Chair, resigned from the University Council and all its associated committees and what have you over the – actually on New Year’s Day, he sent me an e-mail – and so I wrote back and said Happy New Year to you too. In any case, we certainly – he just had too much on his plate with the things he’s involved in with the city and something had to go. Rather than drop his teaching or his research, he dropped the University Council so we will miss him and will continue to read Tom Paine to see what he thinks of everything. We appreciate his years of service here.

**President Peters:** Okay, thanks for taking that Committee Bill. Appreciate it.

**B. Goldenberg:** My pleasure.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair – report

**President Peters:** Rules and Governance, Susan?
1. **Constitution Article 2.82** – change in staring date for all University Council members. **FIRST READING** (Page 17)

S. Mini: I heard that laugh. Yeah, we have a first reading for a Constitutional amendment which is on the last page. This brings us into the same place where the Faculty Senate is on the date change in terms of office of members.

President Peters: This is for ---

S. Mini: This is just a first reading; of course, last time I said this is just a first reading. I think this is a little more straight forward.

President Peters: Is there any discussion? All right.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: Richard Orem, University Affairs Committee.

R. Orem: No report.

President Peters: No report.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Deborah Smith-Shank, Chair – report.

President Peters: Elections, Legislature Oversight Committee, Deborah Smith-Shank?

D. Smith-Shank: I just have a little report. The University Council elections are underway and I will announce who the newly elected members are at the March meeting and thank you Donna.

VII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

President Peters: Any Unfinished Business? I think that’s Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: Yes, I just wanted to make a comment to the walk in item by Pat regarding the Illinois Commitment. One of the things that we really need to do, I think, is to recognize that this institution has been able to create, I think, a very, very impressive tapestry of activities that respond to all eight of the goals of the Illinois Commitment. This is a complex institution and I would hope that as you and your group are looking at it, that we would make sure that we don’t in any way create a template that obviates the ability of individual departments and colleges to be able to present a wide range of activities because, the fact of the matter is that the Illinois Commitment is a political document as well. So, I would say that one of the things that would be good is to coordinate the activity of your Committee with the Academic Planning Council which looks at that data as it carries out program review so there is faculty involvement in this process anyway.
P. Henry: Thank you. I quite agree. Would that be a way of my discussing with the Academic Planning Council?

President Peters: Possibly. Let me just add a footnote. I’ve been through a lot of gubernatorial transitions and in every one; the new governor formulates a new higher education/education plan with new indicators and new goals. That’s not a reason why we shouldn’t very seriously categorize and make our case as Dean Kitterle said but my attention trying to influence what the new Illinois First will be.

P. Henry: Just to follow up on that, I mean – I think – I really agree with what Dean Kitterle is saying about trying to maintain complexity. I think there’s a tendency to, you know, we’ve got the eight points and everything sort of gets simplified down into those and even the IBHE itself, we have to keep making shorter and shorter reports to because there’s not enough time to cover all of the complexity but I think to the extent that we can keep that in the mix, I think it’s going to pay off in the long run because otherwise, a lot of stuff falls between the cracks.

President Peters: Agreed. Unfinished Business? Yes?

P. Henry: I have – actually, one thing occurred to me in this wonderful discussion of metro planning and that is parking on campus and the lack thereof and it seems to me that there was talk when the Convocation Center was build that there was going to be a shuttle bus running from there and I just wondered, is that happening?

President Peters: I’ll ask – maybe Dr. Williams can help – but let me just say I don’t think we have a parking shortage. We have people movement and I’ve been in places that have parking shortages. What we have is – we have to rationalize our parking and our transportation system and needs.

E. Williams: Just to follow up, through our Parking Committee, we have initiated this year off-site parking or peripheral parking at the Convocation Center. In fact, there’s a special sticker that you can purchase for that and the buses do run right by that and if you would go over there during any day you’ll see up to 200 cars parked there or more. So, yes it is being utilized and it’s working. Nothings perfect but what we anticipated happening is happening.

President Peters: Okay? Kevin Miller?

K. Miller: Just a bit more detail, what Dr. Williams said is completely accurate as always. The bus that does go through there – we rerouted the Huskie bus, the right and the left, so there’s a bus that goes through there about every, probably 10 or 15 minutes so it shouldn’t be a problem.

P. Henry: I’ll tell my students.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
President Peters: We kind of slipped into Comments and Questions From the Floor. Yeah?

D. Wagner: Is this the time to respond to your statements?

President Peters: Yeah, this is open season.

D. Wagner: In the first resolution of the FAC it calls for involvement of faculty representation and it wasn’t clear to me in your statement about the Task Force that you established how faculty representation was to be part of that.

President Peters: The Task Force that was empowered is obviously dominated by academic deans. The expectation is and I think it’s already happening, is that those discussions will be taken through faculty senates and academic departments and, you know, the time honored academic way. That’s my expectation.

D. Wagner: I guess that was mine but I think it should be explicit.

President Peters: There it is; it’s explicit and we don’t have a lot of time. But this will be an ongoing thing. There are, I am convinced, knowing NIU the way I do, there are out there creative solutions and contributions to be made and who we are and what we normally do. We are a national, regional, public research university that does both basic and implied research and trains a lot of educators and, to my knowledge, one of the universities in the country that has take a collective view of the training of educators and isn’t necessarily the province of just one college. There’s a tremendous adoption of that commitment. The other thing I’ve found out about NIU that will bode us well is, compared to some other places I’ve been, this is a very interdisciplinary place. We’re not as balkanized in our academic silos as many. That really helps this P20 problem because these problems are multidisciplinary problems. So my clear expectations as yours is, I want faculty input. Yeah?

P. Henry: Should we direct that via our deans?

President Peters: Yeah, go through the academic process on this because we need to get to those faculty experts who are out there doing research and training. That’s what we need to – seems to me that’s what we need to reach. By the way, this is only about two weeks old, this whole idea. Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: David some of the ways in which these responses have been gathered is there’s a lot of ideas, proposals and initiatives that have come through the individual committees on initial teacher certification which, as the President has mentioned, they’re distributed throughout the colleges so that what that does is provide, I think, a really informed context for putting together the message that we hope will come forward from NIU.

President Peters: All right? Comments – more comments and questions. All right, yes?
D. Rusin: Okay, so it looks like with the State budget the way it is, we won’t see any more teaching power in the fall. Does that mean that we likewise won’t see any greater number of students in the fall?

President Peters: Well, that’s a complex question. We are, under the leadership of the Provost, appropriately exercising deadlines for applications and other mechanisms that are published in order so that we – we can handle with a lot of sacrifice and stress – no more than what we have. This is an issue that every university, public universities in particular is facing. It gets to how we allocate our resources, how we focus and the point it gets to is, access is one thing but access without the ability to provide a quality education for everyone you admit is just as critical and sometimes that side of the equation doesn’t translate easy to public officials. That’s what you’re talking about and so we’ll be working very, very hard on that but we’re not the kind of institution that goes for higher selective enrollment or capped enrollment. We have to remember what is at the core of our mission which is providing a quality education for all students who are prepared to succeed at this kind of institution. That’s why we’ve been chartered and the pressure that the Provost has and I have and you have is to try to figure a way of making that work. I have been trying to make the case that NIU has grown and provides that quality education and, therefore, we need some extra resources. The argument was beginning to take hold when the budget crunch hit and, of course, memories are so sort. I mean, memory in a legislative cycle is a session and then everything is clean. We start all over again. I do get asked and this goes back to the other “A”, accountability, what are faculty teaching, how many students are taught, how many courses, what per cent of full professors teach in basic courses, you know, all those traditional kinds of questions that I’ve answered my whole career. But that’s the other side of accountability, how are we spending our resources. You know, there are some in the legislature who believe that state money – we should only be paid to do teaching and that research stuff, you can do that on your own if you want – I’m overstating the case to make the point. But, just as we are administrative lean, I am convinced that our faculty work loads are also very appropriate to fulfilling our mission while at the same time turning out quality but I can’t tell you – there hasn’t been a day in the past month when the Provost and I have not had a discussion about the issue you’ve brought up and are kind of scratching our heads about how we’re going to handle this. Right now what we’re doing is we’re trying to stick to our printed guidelines for admission and yet at the same time, you know, look at deadlines.

P. Henry: If it comes down, for example, to class size and we’re asked to make a class bigger than we as teachers think is appropriate for the educational goal, what do we do?

President Peters: What have we done for the past hundred years?

P. Henry: I don’t know.

President Peters: That’s so dependent on the independent situation isn’t it? I’ve seen - when I was at another institution and had 7 years of flat budget, the comp ed courses went from 23 to 25 to 27 to 28 but then we hit that point where we couldn’t do it. Where we either had to think of another pedagogy or you had to find some resources or you had to eliminate enrollment and you had to have a preference system. We do all that. I mean, Northern Illinois is very good at doing that.
D. Wagner: I think I’ve been on the Faculty Senate for about 4 years and every year discussion of the ACT requirements come up and there’s some puzzles about it and the questions that can be asked and it’s always said well, we’ll get around to doing it but we’ve never done it in 4 years. I would think it would be appropriate at this time to examine that in the Senate and probably in the University Council also.

President Peters: I do believe there are discussions going on about what I would call the “broader issue” and that is how do we admit students and are the students we admit as academically prepared as they need to be to succeed at this kind of place and take advantage of it and so it, you know, across the country the talk has broadened from test scores, certainly, to include the high school core, preparation in the core, whether one has taken honors or advanced placement, that sort of thing. Whether or not – I think there’s a discussion now whether we should add another year of math to the requirement – and those things are moving forward. All right?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board
C. Minutes, Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
H. Minutes, University Benefits Committee
I. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Motion to adjourn? So moved.

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.