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I. CALL TO ORDER

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

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first action is the adoption of today’s agenda. Are there any motions for change? Yes?

D. Wagner: I would like to move that Unfinished Business be moved to follow the Consent Agenda. When I made the motion last time I thought there was kind of unanimous agreement this issue but it turns out there isn’t. I think it should be debated early when we’re still alert.

President Peters: So there’s a motion. Is there a second for the motion? There’s a second. Any discussion? And I think you gave your explanation. Any discussion? All right. All those in favor of moving Unfinished Business, the Thanksgiving break issue, up to after V Consent Agenda on today’s agenda. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, so now also, we would like to include a walk in and it is a memo from Dan Griffiths on responsible conduct of scholarship. We’d like to move that to the Consent Agenda, as C and we would like to refer that to Rules and Governance. So we would like to move that to the Consent Agenda. Do we need a motion for that or do we need a motion to remove it?

S. Willis: No, we need a motion to amend the agenda.
President Peters: All right, is there a motion to amend the Consent Agenda to include Dan’s memo? All right Kevin. Is there a second? Any discussion? All right, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, now I think we need a motion to adopt the full agenda. Is that right? So moved? Second? Any discussion? All right, all those in favor to approve the agenda as amended say aye? Opposed? All right, so we have an agenda.

The agenda passed as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 22, 2003 MEETING (Pages 3-5)

President Peters: I call for any additions or amendments to the January 22 minutes. Where is Jerry Zar when we need him? Is there a motion to approve? Second? All those in favor? Opposed? This is easy.

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, good afternoon everyone. Let me give you an update. It seems that the distance between our meetings for me gets shorter and shorter. I remember the last time I was here I gave you a rather extensive and perhaps numbing monologue on the status of the budget; I want to give you a little update on what I’ve been doing since then. I guess in a nutshell I could say that there is really not much in the way of clarification to report but I can update you just a little bit and tell you what I’ve been doing. First of all, Governor Blagojevich sought and has received approval from the legislature to present his budget on April 9, which effectively means that appropriation hearings will occur after that. So, by the time that the various appropriation committees do their work, my guess is that appropriation hearings will be in mid to late April to May and, all things being considered, it’s reasonable that the legislature will blow right through their June sign or die date. Hopefully, we’ll have a budget by July. So that’s one thing that we need to remember. We may not be hearing a great deal about the Governor’s budget until April 9. The second part of that is that we have not heard anything at this point from the Governor about a possible rescission in the FY03 budget. But, you know, we have planned prudently and we’re in as reasonable shape as we can be to accommodate a moderate rescission if it comes. Obviously, the later in the year it comes the more difficult it is for us and all state agencies, and we don’t know whether there will be one or not. Now I do want to indicate that, in terms of the budget, a piece of hard news that we have on the revenue side that goes into the mix - because obviously the more revenue we have the less this reputed 5 billion dollar budget gap is - is that January revenues were $103 million below January receipts of last year according to the fiscal group that does this. So far in the first seven months of this fiscal year, State revenues are up just $77 million over last fiscal year. I know $77 million sounds like a lot of money, doesn’t it? Just $77 million, and that might be masked by the fact that last year they suretized inter-fund transfers from tobacco at about the 250 million dollar level and so we’re really down even more for the year. The projections are that the sales tax and the corporate tax for the rest of the year can’t rebound enough to make up much of that gap and, of course, the revenue could go down.
So we’ll have to wait for the next month’s receipts and then March. The March receipts are always the ones that give them their last feel for what the budget is going to be like. I guess that’s a long-winded way of saying that there’s not going to be a lot of help on the revenue side. So the Governor has an issue that needs to be grappled with. Meanwhile, as we speak, there are no policy directives or pronouncements from the Governor about higher education beyond that which was contained in his public statements when he campaigned, and some recent statements. I went over those last time for you but it does boil down to “hold the line on tuition”. I don’t know what that means in operational terms. Hold the line, I’m not sure about that.

Administrative cost and administrative bloat - I don’t think that’s particularly aimed at this university but it might be aimed at another university; and the question of access which is cost. So that’s still out there. Meanwhile on the legislative side, the new legislature is organizing and there are some things that have happened that are specific to us and this budget process. First of all, the new chair of the House Higher Ed Appropriations Committee is a representative named Ricca Slone from Peoria; our local representative on the minority side, Dave Wirsing, is on that committee as well. There are hearings set by Representative Slone fairly early on - but not appropriation hearings - where she wants the presidents of the public universities and others involved in public higher education and the chairs of the Board of Trustees to come before the committee to talk about certain budget reduction scenarios. You know, what would happen if your base budget was cut by this percent, and so we’ll be working on that in the next few weeks.

On the Senate side, we have a rather unusual situation in that the Senate Appropriation Committee has been divided into two parts; one chaired by Senator Donne Trotter from Chicago and the other by Senator Pat Welch who I believe his district, years ago, used to include NIU in DeKalb. Now, they split the universities with Senator Trotter taking U of I, Chicago State, Governors State, the Illinois ISAC, Capital Development Board and Math and Science Academy, and Senator Pat Welch taking the rest including NIU. I don’t know what that all means but it’s rather unusual and we’ll go forward. By the way, Brad Burzynski on the minority side is a representative on that committee as well so we do have local representation on those committees and in a sense, I guess, Senator Welch knows us very well. So, we are going to be doing a lot of preparation for these committees, in great detail, justifying our expenditures from any source and also coming up with scenarios as to what would happen under certain budget reduction scenarios which – I’ve been through that many times before. This is sort of a classic legislative response to a budget situation. We have to make the best case that we are efficient - and we are - and what will be the impact if we have to reduce our base budget. So we have all of that going on simultaneously.

I’ve been doing a lot of that but I’ve also been to Washington because this is the time of year when I begin to take the proposals that have been developed by our faculty with the help of Dan Griffiths and Graduate Studies and the Provost, we take a certain number of proposals to the federal government to see if we can get funding. Family Violence Center would be a good example of that and there are many others. Some of the NICADD support. Now interestingly, this is the time of year where our federal lobbyist and state lobbyist, Kathy Buettner, who is really – I must admit – is very remarkable. She is just very, very good at this and Dan, she’s learned science, hasn’t she, so we have to, in a very short period of time, communicate these proposals to various members of the Illinois delegation. What’s interesting is we’re working on our ’04 agenda but we do not have the federal ’03 budget yet. So those proposals that we promoted last year, we have yet to hear whether any of those will be funded, because the Senate
and the House in Congress have not passed the '03 budget. Maybe they have as we speak. I know they’re working towards a compromise but they have an Omnibus Bill and in that Omnibus Bill we hope, say your prayers tonight, there are some things for NIU. There’s a possibility that there will be a stalemate and there’ll be a permanent, continuing resolution which will fix the '03 budget at '02 levels which rolls everything into '04 and makes my life extremely complicated, but let’s hope we have a budget. Needless to say, having spent several days in Washington - and I have to fly back this weekend, which I’m not looking forward to doing, not because I don’t love Washington but I’m worried about red alerts and all that - at any rate, as Alan Greenspan would say, the geopolitical realities of the situation are dominant when you walk the halls of Congress. I mean the war and homeland security are uppermost and, as important as our priorities are to us and to them, they do have something else on their minds right now. I must admit we get a tremendously warm reception and I always try to see the 19 members of the Illinois delegation and the two senators, and I did get half of that done. I got both senators and, of course, Speaker Hastert and so I would say from my way of speaking, even though things are very, very difficult right now in Washington, I think there’s a receptive ear towards our programs. I’m really pleased at that, and hopefully I’ll have some things to announce in a little bit. So that’s the federal agenda.

Then last night, and I had to throw this together very, very quickly, let me just say our staff – Rena Cotsones, Melanie Megara and the wonderful people in media services, we had to put together a quick presentation to the Mayor’s Growth Summit on what are NIU’s views of growth and plans for growth and vision. I did that, and maybe some of you saw me on TV. I thought about making that presentation to you today but my consultant, Herb Rubin, and I – Herb’s on the Summit with me – he said, you know, the University Council would love to see that but it’s a little too long and you’ve got to add some things so next time, I’m going to maybe in twenty minutes give you a redacted and a little updated for an academic audience view of what I presented and basically – well, enough said on that but I think you might find that a little bit interesting. As a sideline, on March 27 I’m going to present to the DeKalb County Economic Development Council. It’s a luncheon and it’s going to be at the Farm Bureau. That’s March 27. I’m going to be presenting the basic findings of a new study that our Governmental Studies unit is doing that is assessing the economic impact of NIU on the local community. We’ve done that in the past, but what’s interesting about this particular study is that it’s based on the 2000 census, so it won’t be the same old updated data from 1990. This will be new data; I’ve only seen some preliminary results, but I think that will be very interesting because we do have a significant impact on the economy. I think the basic approach that I used at the Growth Summit is to make the point that we’ve been here for a hundred years and our progress and our future progress is codependent on the progress of what happens in the DeKalb/Sycamore area. That we are intertwined and that decisions in one area affect decisions in the other. I tried to lay out a set of principles that guide our growth thinking; we define growth more than in terms of numbers – growth in expectations, growth in how our changing student population puts expectations on us, changes in technology, need for infrastructure, for better transportation, for public transportation, for green space – all of those design elements. I think you’ll relate to it because I tried, in a very short period of time, to summarize many of the things I’ve heard from you. I said there are two meanings to the word summit; one was a gross summit, and in that context a summit is a group of leaders that come together for high purpose, but the other meaning of summit is the one I prefer, which is the pinnacle or the highest point attainable. I believe that DeKalb and this
community can be a university community that is vibrant, fun to be at, and challenging, and has a good industrial, technological, and cultural base, and yet maintains the charm of the traditional small town DeKalb atmosphere. I hope it was well received. I’m sure not everybody agrees with me but I thought that that was a fair reflection of most of what I heard from faculty and students. I had fun putting it together; I wanted to share it with you today but it wasn’t in the right form. It is about an hour long and we didn’t want that today, did you? You want to talk about Thanksgiving. All right, so that’s the end of my remarks. So, before we go to reports, we have to act on the Consent Agenda now.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

**President Peters:** We amended the Consent Agenda. Now we have to adopt it. Do we have any motions to – yes, Bev?

**B. Espy:** I’d like to make a motion that we remove the Office Privacy Policy (B) from the Consent Agenda.

**President Peters:** All right. There’s a motion to remove B, Office Privacy Policy. What is the parliamentary procedure? We need a second and a vote. All right, is there a second? Is there any discussion? Question?

**B. Tolhurst:** With regard to the privacy policy, it just has the effect of forwarding it to the Rules and Governance Committee. That’s not something we discuss here.

**S. Willis:** Right, but Bev and I had talked about this earlier, and we’ll talk about it under New Business, but the idea is that before it goes to our Rules and Governance Committee it would be good to have the SPS Council and Operating Staff Council look at it first so we’d refer it to them instead. That’s a sneak preview. Now you know.

**President Peters:** All right so we got ahead of ourselves there but now you know the plan. So right now what we’re doing is removing it from the Consent Agenda and putting it on New Business. All right? All in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, we’ve moved it to New Business. Now, are we ready to move the whole Consent Agenda as amended? All right, all in favor? Opposed? We have a Consent Agenda.

A. Inclusion of changes in the IRB committees in the Committees Book – see memo from Dan Griffiths – refer to Rules and Governance. (Pages 6-7)

C. Inclusion of the Responsible Conduct for Scholarship Committee in the Committees Book – refer to Rules and Governance – walk-in

The Consent Agenda was approved.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**President Peters:** Now, we do Unfinished Business.
A. **Thanksgiving Break** – see responses to Sue Willis (Pages 14-16)

**President Peters:** All right. Under Unfinished Business, we have the Thanksgiving Break issue. Sue?

**S. Willis:** All right, I sent letters to various groups and organizations around campus and asked for their feedback as to whether it made sense to hold classes on the Wednesday morning before Thanksgiving or not. The responses that I received you will find on pages 14 through 16. They are, as David noted earlier, somewhat of a mixed bag. There is not unanimity – why am I not surprised? In any case, that is the issue, whether we want to vote to not hold classes that Wednesday morning or if we want to just keep things the way they are with Thanksgiving break beginning at noon. David, I don’t know if you want to address this at all?

**D. Wagner:** Two things. The motion does not include Tuesday evening classes as SC&S drew attention to although it’s rather interesting, in the Fall semester, Tuesday evening classes meet 16 times and Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday only meet 15 times, so departments can accommodate two varieties of meeting times. The only thing is that a number of people have brought up, as the Provost did last meeting, about the near inevitability of creep. I don’t think it’s inevitable. It would only occur with the compliance of the faculty. If the faculty were rigid in holding classes on Monday and Tuesday it would not lead to creep. I meet on Wednesday morning at 9:00. I say I’m going to have triple cuts for anybody who misses that meeting and I have better attendance on Wednesday at 9:00 than my average attendance I think. I tried the same policy at 11:00 and it just didn’t work. I’m not sure what that proves but ---

**President Peters:** All right. Kevin?

**K. Miller:** It’s not going to be a big surprise to anyone here, but I just want to express my full support for this idea – I know, shocking isn’t it – both personally and in my official capacity; I also have to apologize for not having copies available to everyone but we just couldn’t get the paperwork out on time. This last Sunday the Student Senate passed a resolution; I won’t read the whole thing but the end clause is “further be it resolved the NIU Student Senate supports the proposition of canceling classes on the Wednesday immediately prior to Thanksgiving thereby eliminating the half-day as currently observed in the current academic calendar”. So, for what it’s worth, the Student Senate supports it as do I and I would urge you all to vote in favor of this proposition.

**S. Willis:** Okay, now we don’t actually have a motion on the table at the moment, or do we? We voted to postpone discussion, I guess. Okay. All right, so David did you want to reintroduce your motion?

**D. Wagner:** I don’t remember – I got confused because there are differences as part of a calendar or whatever.

**President Peters:** All right, so the item was postponed indefinitely – for two months ---
D. Wagner: No, until this meeting.

S. Willis: Right, and the two months are up.

President Peters: The two months are up. So parliamentary ---

F. Bryant: But we are still asking for the phrasing of the motion, so everyone will know what is going on.

D. Wagner: I move that classes on Wednesday morning prior to Thanksgiving not be held. There’s two different ways of doing this, as I remember from what you told me, and I never did understand that.

S. Willis: All right, well I think the idea would be to have Thanksgiving break begin on Wednesday morning rather than at noon on Wednesday.

D. Wagner: After evening classes on Tuesday.

S. Willis: I think Wednesday morning is clearer.

President Peters: All right, so that’s the motion. Is there a second to that? There’s a second and basically it’s not to hold – to suspend classes on Wednesday morning before Thanksgiving. That’s the motion. All right, discussion. John?

J. Wolfskill: I will speak against the motion. I believe this is a foolish thing to do. I understand having a day off is nice. I like a vacation day as much as anyone here, but we’re here to attend classes and to teach them. I really don’t see any academic reason to do this, quite to the contrary. In my department, and reading the responses, in several other departments and colleges around campus, we’re squeezed for class time. We want more class time, not less, and for that reason I will tell you all quite frankly that I will strongly oppose any proposal to shorten the academic calendar.

President Peters: All right.

D. Smith-Shank: Debbie Smith-Shank, Art. I’m going to speak for this motion and partially because, although there may not be an academic reason to support it, I think there’s a human reason to support it. Part of our mission is to teach our subjects, but the other part is to teach people; many people need to travel and roads are often not that good at that particular time of year. Frankly, families are important for a special holiday in the United States called Thanksgiving.

President Peters: All right, Patricia?

P. Henry: I sympathize with what John was saying but I also think that since we have got the Wednesday afternoon off, that creates an imbalance for people who are teaching Wednesday afternoon classes and Wednesday morning classes; if there is a loss of academic time for the one,
it makes sense to have it for the other and keep the balance, at least in terms in the number of
days. I think the number of days should be the same whether you have a class in the afternoon or
a class in the morning.

**President Peters:** All right. Anne Kaplan wants to comment.

**A. Kaplan:** I would just urge you to make this decision on academic grounds because if we
make it on human resource grounds then any decision we would make would apply equally to
staff, civil service and SPS, and we can’t add another closure day on the total University side
without adjusting one of the closures we already have. That is, we are approved to have eight
national holidays, two floating and two administrative closures and we use those for floating
days to deal with the calendar, as it turns out, for July 4 or for Christmas. You know, it just
varies every year and if we were to need one of those days for the Wednesday before
Thanksgiving, we’d have to take it from someplace. I’m not saying that’s impossible but you
need to have that in mind when you make this kind of decision.

**President Peters:** Let’s go over here and then back.

**J. Kowalski:** Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. Speaking of this in a
academic terms, I’d like
to add my voice and reiterate the fact that I have often taught large auditorium classes, multiple
sections, in a given semester and that in some cases I’ve had one of these taught in the morning,
one taught at 1:00 or 2:00 in the afternoon and I agree that I see no reason why only students
who, through the luck of the draw or poor planning on their part, have the class that Wednesday
morning while I’m not free to teach the same material to the class in the afternoon. On another
note, I would say that from an academic standpoint, different professors may have different
demands they put on, you know, triple threats for attending on Wednesday morning but my
feeling is that the attrition is high and that generally speaking the level of the course content – I’ll
speak personally – tends to be a little softer on that morning because of that attrition in student
attendance. I seek not to penalize students who I know may have valid reasons not to be there.

**President Peters:** Dean Sorenson, did you want to say something?

**C. Sorensen:** I am also going to speak in favor of the motion and I thought for a while the
argument that we lose class time by not having the classes on Wednesday morning to me seems
an odd one since we don’t have classes on Wednesday afternoon. So if you have a Monday,
Wednesday, Friday schedule and you happen to have your class in the afternoon, you’re already
missing it and I don’t believe all our classes are scheduled on Wednesday mornings with none in
the afternoon. So, I think in fairness that equalizes the academic portion of it for students that
have afternoon and morning classes so I would support releasing students on Wednesday
morning.

**S. Ackerman:** Sean Ackerman, Engineering student. I’m a representative for the Student
Association. I am also in favor of this motion, and I don’t think if this is done then the following
year or two years later you’re going to see attrition levels increase on Tuesday. I think it’s a
matter of how the professors handle it and approach the material and what’s going to be covered
and what’s the expectation of the students at Tuesday’s courses; since all sections that meet on
Tuesdays will meet on that Tuesday prior to Thanksgiving, there will be equal course material and expectations of students in those different sections. That doesn’t take place on Wednesday, and typically professors, I think, put the idea into students that class on Wednesday is not essential, so it’s in the professors’ hands. Let’s not forget that at some point, and I don’t know the history of when this took place, but at some point the University decided that Wednesday afternoon classes were not essential and that it was important to give students and faculty time to travel, so it seems like the University put itself in this position already; I think if you’re going to be on one side of the bill you should ask for all day classes on Wednesday or be completely in favor of no classes on Wednesday.

**President Peters:** I would observe that the Thanksgiving afternoon break has been a long time tradition in American higher education, particularly public higher education, to permit those students who had to travel great distances to get a bus or a train or a plane or a car ride so they could be with their families on Thanksgiving. Let’s be honest, 90% of our student body live within an hour and a half of DeKalb, so that’s not a concern; I can honestly say, just as a faculty member, any time you reduce instructional time, that’s a very precious commodity. Every professor handles their course routine differently, and for some this will take an element of their course repertoire and flow. I’m sure there are a lot of professors who have a lenient policy; any time we reduce our academic schedule we have to be clear that it’s in the best academic interest because the public is watching.

**X. Song:** I just wanted to make a comment. I agree we must make the decision based on academic reasons, however, we are under the assumption that the more time, the better academic achievement our students will get but do we have hard evidence to support that assumption? If they do we act one way; if they don’t we may not necessarily act that way. So that’s my comment. I haven’t made my decision on the vote yet, but that’s my thinking.

**President Peters:** Very rational.

**B. Tolhurst:** I agree that the time for academic pursuits is important, and now is a bad time to cut, but it seems to me any argument that could be given for not passing this motion is going to be, by its very nature, a good argument for abolishing letting students off on Wednesday afternoon. Since most students live within an hour and a half the need for travel time is not apparent and that’s not an academic reason for letting students off. I think the reason we wouldn’t have a creep is that the creep is likely to occur when you give a half-day off. But if you don’t have it split up halfway through so that sections of a course given in the morning meet and the sections of the course meeting in the afternoon don’t meet, if you’re there the whole day or none of the day, then you’re not going to get the creep, so why not just have a full day of classes on Wednesday?

**President Peters:** My suspicion is that the creep will occur on Friday when students will try to arrange their work and cover their work on Monday and Tuesday. I’ve seen that other places.

**D. Wagner:** Is there evidence that there’s creep on Friday in the spring semester where we have a whole week off? I mean, by your logic, then there should be creep on Friday. If there is, I think it should be opposed, and make it clear that students are supposed to be there on Friday.
That’s why I haven’t come on Wednesday at 9:00 because it’s part of the calendar – I like as much time as I can get. I chose Tuesday evenings in the fall so I can have sixteen weeks but I can accommodate my teaching to reduce it by one day, it’s not that difficult to do and it’s just terribly awkward if you’re having a class on Wednesday morning when at least half the classes are not meeting.

**President Peters:** All right, where are we? Any more comments? Yes?

**S. Ackerman:** I would just like to reiterate one thing and that is the University supposedly choose to cancel classes in the afternoon on Wednesday prior to Thanksgiving due to a non-academic reason, and now we’re saying we’re going to push that break four hours earlier – now that would have to be for an academic reason. I just think that’s not following the same logic. Also the creep only occurs when faculty members allow it to happen. I don’t think you see it occur with students first. I think it’s one of those, you know, you give them an inch they’re going to take a mile. If the room is there then they will push the envelope.

**President Peters:** Okay.

**L. Kamenitsa:** On the creep issue, I would argue that the creep is an artifact of students saying “well, I only have one class on Wednesday morning, why should I stick around for one class”. Presumably on Tuesday they will have their whole complement of Tuesday classes. That’s what students tell me “well, I only have one class on Wednesday so I’m just going to go ahead and leave”. That, I think, is the main argument against creep, as well as faculty standing strong on the issue.

**President Peters:** John?

**J. Wolfskill:** Several people have brought up the awkward nature of the current structure with classes meeting Wednesday morning but not in the afternoon, suggesting that different sections of the same course or different courses in the same department would run on a different kind of a format. I agree that is extremely awkward and undesirable. However, the solution proposed is only one possible answer to that problem and, in my opinion – not the best one – we can let that go. To say that’s the problem, therefore, cancel classes Wednesday morning just does not seem like the rational thing to do to me.

**President Peters:** Yes?

**D. Rusin:** Dave Rusin, Math. Is the post office open only half a day, driver’s license bureau open only half a day, I mean are we imposing an unusual hardship by asking students to be here even half of the day? It seems to me the whole day before Thanksgiving is a reasonable time to get work done. Thanksgiving Day itself is a holiday, and I believe most places are closed the day after Thanksgiving, but the day before Thanksgiving is time to get work done.

**President Peters:** So that means let’s go the whole day.
D. Rusin: I’m usually still here grading papers, I don’t know. I mean I usually give tests on the day before Thanksgiving just to insure that there’s attendance and that means that I have papers to grade.

President Peters: A man after my own heart.

S. Graham: Sharlove Graham from the College of Business. I think the question should be how many teachers cannot accommodate the Wednesday’s class being dismissed. I think that’s an important issue that should be addressed.

President Peters: Sara.

S. Clayton: I’m president of Operating Staff Council, and I know that civil service people are going to say if faculty aren’t here and students aren’t here, why are we here, and then we’ll have to go back to Anne and say what are we going to do? I got it for December 23.

President Peters: Okay, back here and then we’ll get Pat.

M. Lundeen: Megan Lundeen from Health and Human Sciences and the Student Association. I would just like to echo the point about how yes, many of the students we have here do travel, maybe it’s only 10% but if it’s only 10% of faculty that can’t accommodate their classes without that one half a day then we’ll have to look at the percentages there too because that’s inconsistent if we don’t look at both perspectives.

President Peters: At this point before I get Pat, let me ask a point of information. All right, let’s say we pass this, where does this go? Are there any other approvals and when does it take effect? Does anyone know that? Anne or Bob? Just so we know “what if”.

B. Wheeler: I believe if the motion is passed it would be technically possible to implement it for Fall 2003 if the body so specified.

President Peters: But is this the final action?

A. Kaplan: I think it’s the final action on the academic calendar but I think if we get into the question of should the entire institution be closed, given that we are out of holidays, I think that would have to go to the Board which would then be rather a hot issue and probably not a good idea.

President Peters: We’d have to swap out another holiday. All right. That’s a different question. Let’s divide the issue. Let’s not complicate it although that is an issue. All right, Pat?

P. Henry: This is to that issue, but is it not the case that civil service and SPS now have a half-day off?

President Peters: No, they do not.
P. Henry: But --- and we don’t have a half day off either and that is exactly the point. Releasing the students does not mean that the faculty has a half-day off.

President Peters: That is theoretically, Pat. Bill?

B. Tolhurst: As I spoke before, I don’t think it makes sense to have what we have now. One alternative would be – I’d just like to ask – I know we talked about the fall break and that’s a no-show, but how hard would it be to start the academic year one day earlier, not using up one of our closings, and give the full day off? Would that be unfeasible? I mean, is this the best thing we can come to, just trashing another half day of the semester and not doing anything to make it up? I’m not proposing a fall break. Could we make room for this without causing difficulties politically or otherwise by starting the academic year one day earlier?

President Peters: I guess that’s possible. I think probably the way we schedule things there’s a routine. General registration on a Wednesday and then we start on a Monday.

A. Kaplan: It’s not impossible to do it, I think, but you have to go back and look at each year’s calendar because it all comes down to where different days fall.

B. Tolhurst: I mean especially since the first day of class is housekeeping, handing out syllabi – it’s really ---

A. Kaplan: I don’t know if we’ve done this but we could, of course, count and see how many classes there really are on Wednesdays in an average year. I know that information is available. It’s obvious from the notes that accompany the minutes that there are some departments that are quite vigorously opposed to this and other departments that are very much in favor of it. I don’t know if there’s any ---

B. Tolhurst: I know the U of I didn’t start on a Monday, or didn’t this year.

A. Kaplan: Yes, so if you’d like a count we could certainly do that.

President Peters: But any sort of scheduling in the academy is going to bump up against somebody’s norms and traditions on how they do their teaching and their advising and their orientation work. Yes?

E. Johnson: Eric Johnson from Liberal Arts and Sciences for the Student’s Association. Unlike the post office and the driver’s license bureau, education is really a two way street. You have to have students in class, willing to learn, or else a professor may be better off just talking to a wall on those days. With most students, I think, debating whether to have sweet potatoes or mashed potatoes the next day instead of worrying about their physics or political science homework, you may be better off just canceling the entire day.

D. Rusin: Yes, but then we might as well cancel Valentine’s Day too because ---

President Peters: Let’s have some order. Sue Willis?
S. Willis: I just wanted to make a couple of comments. One is that I understand the difficulty of teaching multiple sections, some of which meet in the morning and some of which meet in the afternoon. I’ve also done that. I suspect that there are fewer people in that boat than people who teach in the morning in the first place who would lose their classes if the morning classes were cancelled. The other thing I would say is that it’s a lot easier to not hold classes, or not hold your own particular class, on a day which is nominally scheduled than it is to hold it on a day which is not. So, it seems to me that if there were unanimity on this point I would say okay, fine, but I think if there are departments and people who would be seriously inconvenienced then I would be very hesitant to say this is something we should do.

President Peters: Kevin?

K. Miller: I have a couple of points and excuse me if I kind of wander around for a minute here but a lot of these arguments that I hear coming up, I don’t know why they haven’t been addressed in the last two months when this has been in everyone’s individual college particular committee or council because it just seems all of a sudden today we’re venting all this stuff and I don’t see many of these in the replies. Granted, some of them are there but some of them are not. The proposal, as I understand it, is to eliminate mandating students to stay a half a day to maybe go to a class that their professor or instructor might choose to hold and might choose to actually use the class time to do something serious and constructive. I have had classes on Wednesday mornings prior to Thanksgiving and attendance has been required and to my recollection in my three years here, I believe and I could be wrong, but in only one class did we actually have a full class period and do something constructive. Now that’s not really an argument necessarily for or against it, but why are we requiring students to come if they’re not actually going to learn? I’m not saying this goes through to all departments or all professors; I know it definitely does not. I know there are a lot of excellent faculty members and instructors who are very serious about teaching and I appreciate that and I know the students appreciate that but the issue at hand is why are we having these morning classes when there are these problems that are created with the classes in the morning and in the afternoon with the illustration that’s been brought up about professor/instructors teaching two different sections, how is that then dealt with? You know, I’ve never taught a class; I’m not a teacher but I would imagine it’s very difficult to be teaching two classes, same material, and having the two classes on two different pages because of two different days. I think the idea of holding class all day Wednesday is completely ludicrous – my opinion to be honest – because some of us, like myself, do live six hours away and I like to be with my family on Thanksgiving and, you know what, I’d skip class all day on Wednesday if I had to drive six hours because I need to do it to be with my family and that’s what’s important. There are some academic reasons behind this; there are some human reasons also and I think we should vote in favor of this.

President Peters: I was at an institution that cancelled at noon and started at noon – the start back – and that covered this issue of sections, morning and afternoon. You see what I mean? You’re out at Wednesday and then you came back noon on Monday – that’s when classes started. All right. I just throw that out as an observation. Yes, Dan?
D. Griffiths: I was just – Kevin was asking in response to your comments, I was looking at the comments that Sue received and there’s a very strong comment from the School of Nursing opposing this. I wondered if anyone is here or if they’d talked to you about it because they seem to really need that Wednesday morning. I wondered if you knew any more about that?

S. Willis: I do not know much more than what they have written but perhaps we could have a comment from the Dean?

President Peters: There’s the Dean, right there, looking for a microphone.

S. Richmond: That’s rather a unique situation with us with some of our clinical courses but it is addressed in the Affiliations Agreements and the agreements with the students – the senior students – are to be on practicums. They are considered – not as far as liability things – but they are in the work force, and they keep the hours of that facility. We have looked at that in our college with the various places that would have seniors out; that is their understanding when they go out in those courses. We did talk about that after Marilyn had submitted this to Sue, so I think we’re okay with being able to handle that.

President Peters: You’re saying that is a contractual thing that is outside of the class schedule and they know that and sign a paper or something?

S. Richmond: They know that before they ever go out and yes, and are aware of the internship hours they have to be there, yes.

President Peters: All right. Yes?

M. Lundeen: Yes, as with the nursing, I think that’s almost similar to student teaching because, correct me if I’m wrong, but student teachers do follow the school where they’re at schedules rather than our spring break schedule if that should hit.

President Peters: All right. Yes?

S. Ackerman: Call the question.

President Peters: Call the question? All right. So, all those in favor of calling the question? Opposed? All right, so we move to the motion. All those in favor of the motion, which is to suspend classes on Wednesday morning before Thanksgiving. Is that it? Say aye. Opposed? I think the ayes have it. All right. Okay.

E. Johnson: When will this be effective?

President Peters: We will get back to you on that. It may be as early as next fall; it may be ’04.

P. Henry: I think we should do a count.

President Peters: All right, you’ve asked for a division of the house?
S. Mini: May I ask why?

P. Henry: I wasn’t sure who was speaking loudly and who wasn’t.

President Peters: All those in favor raise your hands. All right, 27. All those opposed? Eleven. What’s that? All right, I’ll abstain. All right, so 27 and 1 abstention.

D. Mathesius: Ask for abstentions.

President Peters: Abstentions? 5 abstentions. 27 aye, 12 nay, 5 abstentions.

B. Wheeler: I do think the Office of Registrations and Records and the Catalogue Editor need some guidance on whether this should be placed in official documents as being relevant for the fall 2003 situation.

President Peters: Well, that’s why we’ve got to go to them and find out printing schedules ---

B. Wheeler: They can do it but they need to know if that’s the wish of the body.

President Peters: Well, I’m sure they passed it, you know – I think that’s what they want, right? Yes?

D. Wagner: I did ask this question when I made the motion and I was told it could be done in 2003, and I think I assumed that it was, but if it requires a motion I move that this policy be instituted in 2003.

President Peters: Yes?

F. Bryant: The Constitution says Article 3.5 – now I hear Jerry Zar’s voice – any action approved by the University Council should go into effect immediately or on a date specified. So the Constitution covers this unless we specify.

S. Mini: As sorry sounding as this is, I have had occasion to read the bylaws for the Board of Trustees, and I think we might want to check very carefully and make sure that we don’t have to be in compliance with them first.

F. Bryant: Well, the next sentence says “In the event that the Board of Trustees is required” so we’re still covered by that.

President Peters: We think not. We don’t have our lawyer here but if that is the case, that is a different kettle of fish but I don’t think so. Our assumption is we’re going to put this into effect in 2003 unless there is a technical reason and then we will come immediately back to you. I think that is what Bob Wheeler was saying. We think it’s technically possible but we’ll get on it right away. All right. Now, Pat Henry, am I right?
The motion passed.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 9-12)

P. Henry: This is the report from the January 31 meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council. You’ve had this copy in your packet so I don’t want to go over it in too much detail. I will note that I have a little table of contents here in the very first paragraph, so that items of particular interest to you, you can presumably find them rather easily. In particular, I would like to highlight the issue of getting input into the IBHE’s Committee on Affordability as soon as possible. I know at the Faculty Senate meeting John asked a question about how students needing to take longer to finish a degree impacted affordability. I did not find an answer to that but I would like to say that that’s the sort of issue that needs to be raised. So if you have concerns in terms of what you think they’re looking at as far as affordability is concerned, that’s the sort of thing that needs to go into their view of things as well. The IBHE staff member, Doug Day, summarized a number of things that are going on at the IBHE including budget, affordability, faculty diversity and assessment. I think the budget material is pretty much as we discussed already. The diversity issue, again, also has hearings going on which you can see reports of. Concerning assessments, there’s a number of issues here that are going on and I think President Peters has some things to add as well; there’s two parts of assessment going on that we’re looking at here. One is the assessment of students and of education, of which there is the kind of assessment that we do here at the University. There’s also a new program that’s going to happen, sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trust. It’s a project to develop a test model for collecting and analyzing comparable college level learning information across states for the purpose of benchmarking. I do not know a whole lot about this. I know there’s about four or five state universities, public universities, in Illinois that are going to be part of this and that Illinois is one of a very small number of states that is going to be involved in this. The IBHE is very interested in this as a way of providing some sort of means of comparing institutions and comparing states and comparing through time how much students are learning. The claim is that they’re not trying to work towards one measurement but they will, in fact, take into account a number of qualitative and quantitative measurements but there is a specific, particular emphasis in trying to get an end of two years and end of program assessment of students through multiple qualitative and quantitative measures. That’s what’s new on that part of the assessment front. The other part is that there continues to be discussion of indicators, which, if you will, is assessment of assessment to some extent, to assess how well the universities are doing their job according to the Illinois Commitment; that continues to be an ongoing concern as well.

Number 4, just to quickly go through the issues, the committee of which I am a member is the Public Policy Committee. We have six questions here that we’re going to try to ask local legislators with the idea of finding out what they think about higher education. I should point out we’re not trying to lobby anybody in particular either on behalf of, in my case, NIU or of faculty in general, but we are trying to get a picture of what the legislature thinks of higher education. I did talk to a couple of people; Ken Zehnder is also dealing with this and so I’m touching base to see what I can do to get an appointment with Representative Wirsing and Senator Burnzynski.
Finally, number 5, there’s a couple of resolutions that we formulated to present to the IBHE, which actually happened at the beginning of the month, trying to especially make it clear that some of this assessment essentially is an unfunded mandate in that it does require a lot of time and energy and effort. Given that there does not seem to be a lot of hope for a big budget, it would be nice to have that fact be made clear to the IBHE. There’s also a resolution on campus common and mission specific indicators. This again goes back to the performance indicators for the Illinois Commitment. There are three kinds, state-wide, common indicators for all institutions, and mission specific which are related to each institution’s unique role; I think each individual institution has been working on these. The FAC wants to express its support for involving faculty to the greatest extent possible in coming up with mission specific indicators inasmuch as those are how we are going to be ultimately judged by the IBHE. The addendum gives you some excerpts from Ken Anderson’s report. He’s the President of the FAC and he’s the one who actually reports to the Board of Higher Education; he took the time to forward his report on that meeting so if you’re interested in that, it’s there.

President Peters: Okay, as usual very good. Are there any specific questions? I did want to add to this report - and we can take questions first or after - and have Virginia Cassidy try to put this in historical context. I think that about 90% of this that is requested can be adapted and extracted from what we do in program reviews and assessment right now, so I think we should determine what of this is new and what of this we already do that we can use. I asked Virginia just to take a few minutes and then questions after. Okay, Virginia?

V. Cassidy: I think Pat’s report was very thorough. I think one of the items on the IBHE Board agenda was confusing both to the Board members and to the audience at that meeting. Actually, there are three parts related to the discussion on assessment. One part is indeed the pilot project that is being funded by the Pew Charitable Trust to develop an index of learning that would be used to be incorporated into the higher education report card. Right now there are five indices but there is no index for learning and so that is the goal of the Pew Charitable Trust project. Illinois, indeed, is involved in that project with four other states - Oklahoma, New Mexico, North Carolina and Kentucky - and it is anticipated that this project will then serve as a model that would be adopted nationally to create an index of learning that would be included in the higher education report card.

The second piece of it deals with what started out as a redesign of the program review process; many of those components have been implemented. The program review cycle has been changed. Campuses have been allowed to develop their own cycle for program review that makes the most sense. The requirements for getting approval by the IBHE have changed. We no longer need to get IBHE approval, for example, for the subunits of degree programs such as specializations and emphases. We simple report them as they’ve been approved by our curricular bodies and, if needed, by our Board of Trustees in our annual listing of changes. So the IBHE has tried to streamline its processes for approval and for reporting. However, there is an expectation in the program review process that the focus of the reviews be on outcomes, both on program outcomes and on student learning outcomes and, indeed, we have revised our program review format to reflect those differences. Another component of it is that, because the program review cycle occurs over a period of eight years, the IBHE has asked us to report annually on all of our programs. That is, on the assessment plans that the faculty in the
department and schools have implemented to assess their programs. We’re being asked now to report to the IBHE but those programs have been in place for many years, in many programs for more than a decade. So the major difference on that part of it is the annual reporting to the IBHE. There is an expectation that, in addition to reporting on the degree programs, we also provide a report annually as it relates to findings on the outcomes of our general education program. So the major difference there is on the reporting, not on the implementation or what it is that we have been doing.

The third component deals with these levels of indicators which were approved by the Board last week at their meeting. There is a listing of the state-wide indicators that have been approved, developed by a committee of university and community college representatives, sent out for public comment and, in fact, it was discussed on our campus with the Academic Planning Council and with the University Assessment Panel. Last summer when we submitted the university results report we were asked for an update on where we were with mission specific indicators. Those indicators had been discussed with the University Assessment Panel and are on the agenda for discussion again this year with both the University Assessment Panel and with the Academic Planning Council. I believe that we will need to revise some of those indicators because part of the requirement in this reporting mechanism is that the mission specific indicators can’t duplicate the core indicators; when we were talking about what we wanted our mission specific indicators to be, we didn’t know what the core indicators were because they hadn’t been approved at that time. So there will indeed be discussion about the mission specific indicators with those two bodies who have responsibility for both program assessment and for the oversight of the program review process.

President Peters: Let me ask you then, just to sum up, what is your quick armchair, bottom-line assessment of the additional work for faculty and departments, colleges and your office from all of this?

V. Cassidy: I think the impact on the faculty and the programs will come from the requirement to report annually on the outcomes of our academic program. We have talked about how we might minimize the time commitment dedicated to reporting but we don’t know what the expectations of that reporting will be by the IBHE. I mean, if they want some type of omnibus statement that 94% of our programs have implemented assessment plans – which I don’t expect will happen. I think we need to wait until the April Board meeting to find out where the expectations for actual reporting are but it is our intent to make that as painless as possible.

President Peters: So there may be some room to cycle that a little bit so those who are up for academic program review do something a little more in depth than those who are past that – an update.

V. Cassidy: Exactly.

President Peters: We’ll work hard for that. Let’s take Dianne first.

D. Musial: My question can be addressed to either Virginia or Patricia. I’m very intrigued with the Pew Study. You’ve introduced this before and now we are part of it from what I can tell
from these notes. One of the reasons I’m interested, of course, is because they’re claiming – that is Pew – to have some model that they must have already there, and now they want to pilot it. Yet here in their own excerpt it is stated that one of the reasons that Illinois wants to join this program with PEW is so that they can help craft what’s in those student learning indices. Now this, I think, is very, very serious. As a faculty member I’m concerned. I want to call attention to this because oftentimes you get something like Rand Corporation or Pew who comes upon some idea, they do a study, well funded by their own funds, they get some insight because their pilot works to some degree, and pretty soon everyone is quoting it as “we must follow this new index of indicators” and this is on student learning. Why I’m calling attention now is I want to be part of the crafting. Not personally; I know in my college we have a department which has assessment in its title. If we’re part of this, somehow Northern should be crafting this with Pew, not just piloting their stuff; they claim that we’re part of this crafting of the image. How do we get involved because we get this in the form of notes? I don’t know who to go to to stir the pot. It’s not me, so I ask, you know, could we just have more info on it from someone so we can take action or chose not to take action. Perhaps my inferences are offbeat but I’m worried about this.

**P. Henry:** Let me just address this briefly and then I think maybe Virginia could answer it more completely. I share your concern and so does many members of the FAC. I assume that the process of crafting could also involve saying “this model is no good” as you try out a model, but I look forward to finding out more information about this whole project. Virginia, do you have more input?

**V. Cassidy:** I don’t have more detail on the project per se. I do know that the IBHE has asked for representatives from each of the universities to be involved in decision making about the project and the Provost has designated me to be the University’s representative to that group but I have not been contacted as of yet. I think the Board’s staff was waiting for the Board to approve participation in the pilot project before they initiated any action or meeting.

**President Peters:** Let me see if I can shed some light on it. I don’t know very much more than what has been said, but obviously in the report card every state got an incomplete on the learning outcomes part. That became a national issue for the Pew Charitable Trust, which is not a shabby organization, all right, we know that. So in shopping around, Pew put its money where its mouth was and went around and contracted with a reputable testing organization; they have an instrument and I think someone passed me a copy of it. It looked to me as a rather ingenious test of critical reasoning, one of these really in-depth things. I know a bit about this and so does Professor Legg because we’re from Tennessee and we went through this test of general education for all of our students every year; we’ve been down this road before. I think the answer is, this is a limited pilot where a few of our students will be tested in camera with others in the state as part of a test base for this instrument so we’re on the testing side and not the crafting side. Okay? I think that, but let’s find out some more and I must admit it was a point of contention among the commission because the commission did not want to easily commit the resources and the time of universities – bless their hearts – to this project if we didn’t want to participate. I think we’re morally committed at this point but I don’t think – how many are they going to test? Not very many students at all.

**V. Cassidy:** Only a thousand students in four years in the state.
I. Legg: John, I’d like to point out in the very process of being a volunteer to have it piloted, we will have input and to some extent, almost by definition of getting involved at this stage, we will have impact in the ultimate crafting of the document.

President Peters: I think it’s always better to be involved than not involved and Urbana is involved. Urbana is really interested in this.

D. Musial: Since we know so much already, that’s a lot more than I knew from this report and I thank you for that, then all I would say as a member of this Council is that if we want to have a part, we don’t want to just then have our students tested and not quite know who is going to now follow up on interpreting those results. Questioning whether they’re critical thinking items. Just because Pew wrote it doesn’t mean that our College of Education or other colleges are going to agree that that’s how they define critical thinking. I’m telling you, to me this is a very serious move toward a national test for some sort of undergraduate something or other and I don’t want to sit by and not really know; but I feel helpless and powerless as a faculty member. I thank Virginia for being willing to take on our assessment coordinator role; I’m happy to know that she is involved. I encourage all of us to take action. I have my own Dean here, and I’m sure she’s hearing this, so maybe our Department of Research and Assessment will want to get involved – this is not a small matter to me.

President Peters: I’m really with you on that and it sounds like, Virginia, you have a member of a committee.

V. Cassidy: I’ll call you.

X. Song: I really like the idea of students being tested. That measures how efficient we are. I think we can wait until we see the test scores to figure out whether we disagree or agree with the testing philosophy or standards. We don’t have to worry about it now until we see the scores.

President Peters: Well, I think we’d all like to see the test. All right, Pat?

P. Henry: What I’ll do is I’ll go back to the FAC and see if I can find out more information about this as well.

President Peters: I think the staff of the IBHE heard the concerns of academics and professors and professions and presidents and the commissioners on this so I think they’re going to take a “go slow” attitude. I think what happened is Pew really wanted a state like Illinois involved, and so the staff committed. All right? Any other questions for Patricia? All right.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

President Peters: We have no report on BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs Committee – those meetings are coming up.
C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

President Peters: No report on Finance.

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

President Peters: No report on Legislation and Audit.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

President Peters: No report on BOT. I think we’re meeting March 28, something like that, but there will be committee meetings between now and then.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters: Okay John, Academic Policy Committee.

J. Wolfskill: No report.

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

President Peters: Bill Goldenberg. Where’s Bill on Resources – does not have a report. He’s not here today.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair

President Peters: Susan, Rules and Governance.

1. Constitution Article 2.82 – change in starting date, for all University Council members ACTION ITEM (Page 13)

S. Mini: This is a Constitution change that we’re asking you to look at so I think we need to call a quorum. I don’t know if we have enough warm voting bodies. We do? Donna’s telling us we do. Yes, please. It’s three quarters right? Not the two thirds? For a Constitutional change I think it’s three quarters.

President Peters: All right, we have a question here. What do we need here to pass this change in the Constitution?

S. Mini: Ferald says two thirds, okay, good.

President Peters: We’re all right with two thirds if no one leaves before we vote. All right? Susan, go ahead.
S. Mini: We’re looking at a change in the Constitution of the start date for members of the University Council from August 16 to July 1. The Faculty Senate has already approved it.

President Peters: All right, we’ve had Faculty Senate approval of this so there’s a more logical break. Any discussion? I think because it comes from the Committee we don’t need a motion or do we ---

S. Mini: I can make a motion. I’d like to make the motion that we accept this then.

President Peters: We have a second. Now is there any discussion? All right? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? We do have the two thirds. All right. Anything else Susan? Thank you.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: Richard, University Affairs?

R. Orem: No report.

President Peters: No report.

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

President Peters: Deborah, I know you’re here.

D. Smith-Shank: I just wanted to say that the nomination ballots for University Council have been counted and everyone should be receiving the final ballots later this week or early next week so fill them out, send them back.

President Peters: Okay.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Office Privacy Policy – refer to Rules and Governance (Page 8)

President Peters: We have New Business now. We moved the privacy policy off the Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to do something with the privacy policy?

B. Espy: I’d like to move that the – since the private policy does affect faculty and staff – I would like to move that Operating Staff, SPS Council have an opportunity to look at the document and make comments.

President Peters: All right, so you’re asking to refer it to your bodies for comment.

B. Espy: Correct. For comment, right.
President Peters: It came from the Faculty Senate to us and so we’re asking now to send it to your groups for comment then put it on the agenda – is that the sense of it? All right, so that’s the motion. Is there a second? Discussion? Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: May I ask, do we have a time frame in mind for when this would come back possibly with some editorial modification to go to Sue’s Committee?

President Peters: What is reasonable?

B. Espe: March 6 we have Supportive Professional Staff Council. Operating Staff has it tomorrow so would it work if, let’s see, University Council is March 19. After March 19?

President Peters: March 19? John, that will be the proviso – a friendly amendment – that we will report back for the March 19 meeting. All right, now are we ready for the question? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The motion passed.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Anything for the good of the order? Yes?

P. Henry: I would like to suggest that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving be named “Wagner Wednesday”.

President Peters: How about “Wagner’s Fall Break”? All right, I guess that’s in order. Anything else?

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. ADOURNMENT

President Peters: Motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned.