
J. Newman-Ryan attended for D. Cearlock; B. Robinson attended for F. Rodgers.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Ackerman, Barr, Cabasa-Hess, Crumble, DeMoranville, Dorynek, Fox, Hurych, Johnson, Kafer, Kolb, Loubere, Lundeen, Minor, S. Song, X. Song, Stapelton, Williams, Young

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Let me call to order the March 19 meeting of the University Council.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first item of business is the adoption of today’s agenda. Are there any additions or changes? We have walk-ins. We have 1, the CAPCE document should go under the Rules and Governance Committee, that’s VI, H but we are going to hold on that until Bob Wheeler arrives from his retirement seminar. So we may want to move things around a little bit. The second item is a memorandum from the SA President, Kevin Miller, to Suzanne Willis on class syllabi posted on line. Let’s put that under New Business. I think that completes any additions or changes to the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt? Is there a second? All in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, we have an agenda.

The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2003 MEETING

(Pages 3-6)

President Peters: Roman III, Approval of the Minutes of the February 12, pages 3-6. I’ll call for additions or corrections. Hearing none, is there a motion to approve? Second? Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, I have lengthy comments. How many of you were in the Board of Trustees’ meeting today? Because I’m going to repeat some of those comments. I just want to comment a little bit about that. For those of you who are here, I think you should spread the word to the community of how passionate and involved our Trustees are with the issues that are facing the University as we speak in Springfield. The Chair, Manny Sanchez, spoke eloquently to the need to protect the university as best we can while we help share our burden of responsibility in managing what is a fiscal crisis in the state’s 5 billion dollar shortfall. It was truly moving and I want to tell you, and I will in some specific detail later, just how involved they’ve been and what a wonderful group of people they are. You know, I’ve worked with a lot of trustees. I’ve never worked with a group of people like this and a group of people who’s so committed to faculty and staff. For instance, they passed, on the consent agenda without comment, the approval of sabbaticals for faculty and staff next year – in this kind of budget situation. There was never a question of that. That’s pretty remarkable and yet that’s probably something that I’ll be questioned about and probably pretty severely, in the Appropriation Committee. So if you get a moment, drop them a note or an e-mail because it will make my job easier to keep them fired up and that I do pretty well. Well, anyway, I would like to repeat some of the comments I made this morning for the record to the Board and then I’m going to elaborate on this budget process and then at the end of the meeting I’ll be open for questions and I got a little asthma so if I stop every once in awhile and gasp for breath, it’s not because of the magnitude of the potential budget cuts although that will make anybody gasp for breath. I want to take a few minutes to reflect on where we’ve been, where we are now and where we may be heading with respect to our budget and some other issues. You have to look at this in context as you know and you know the context, 9/11, the war with Iraq, 9 billion dollar budget, new administration, uncertainty in the world – United Airlines going belly-up, people losing their jobs. This is a challenging time in the world and particularly for those of us in the U.S. So, let’s always keep that in perspective.

Nearly a year and a half ago, we received our first official word from Springfield on what we now know is an unprecedented fiscal situation. We immediately established reserves and adopted a set of principles that still guide us and I always like to repeat them because I think they’re good. Do everything possible to avoid compromising the integrity of academic programs – it’s harder and harder to do. Do everything possible to avoid lay-offs, furloughs and salary reductions – it’s harder and harder to do. Absolutely no compromising the safety and well-being of our students, faculty and staff, particularly in this period and, you know – believe it or not – I don’t know what the classification is, but DeKalb and our situation is a pretty high level terrorist risk, if you read all those documents. We have – I have to say – a Chief of Police who after 9/11 put together a wonderful plan and we’re about as safe as we can be. Well anyway, we’ve lived by those standards and they’ve served us well. During the last fiscal year, 02, we suffered a mid-year rescission and the imposition of new health care premium responsibilities for a combined reduction of more than $4.8 million. That was in 02. We handled that. Worse, that cut was then made permanent so we started FY03 with a reduced base budget. With unavoidable cost increases associated with utilities, liability insurance and so and you know the list, and no increase in state funding to cover those increases – we started FY03 with a total shortfall of
about $10 to 11 million. All right, so we’re walking backward for the last two years. Actually, we’re back to the FY99 level is where we really are. We were unable to give general salary increases last fiscal year which pains me dearly, greatly, and this year it does not look promising although it’s still my top goal. We’ve frozen all but essential hiring. We’ve drastically curtailed equipment purchases – you know all that – you live it and we have had to abandon all but the most critical emergency repairs and maintenance projects and yet I think we’ve done pretty well. We’re still operating at good capacity. At the same time, we accepted 1100 additional students this past fall, the largest single year enrollment increase in our history. Eleven hundred more students with 11% less state funding. The metric we’ve been using in Springfield is that for every percent of GR we lost in our base, it takes a 3% tuition increase to make up for that, and therefore you cannot raise revenue through tuition to get yourself out of a mess nor can you take more students where more students provide the income to take care of that. We took those 1100 students because NIU has historically been a university of opportunity, of accessibility. Accessibility isn’t just a word around here. It’s a core value. We believe it’s what a public university is supposed to be about. Remember in this uncertain age with more students and families wanting to stay in close contact, NIU’s service region is where 80% of all Illinois high school seniors reside. That means that the service area, above Interstate 80 – that’s our service area, to the borders – that’s 80% of all high school graduates come from that service area. We’re close, and we’re even closer because of the road systems.

That said, we must continue to monitor and balance between student numbers and available resources and we’re watching that very closely. Protecting the integrity of the academic program means making sure students can get classes, professors and experiences they need to succeed and at some point, we can’t take any more students. We’ll have to accept people on a first-come, first-served basis, admit them and then delay their acceptance until a semester where we have space. I don’t know when that is yet and that depends on what the budget cuts are really like. But I want you to know that, as the fiscal year progressed this year, we took more steps to cut costs and set aside more money for potential future cuts. We have not been sitting by, as you know. We prudently planned. We participated recently in a study of administrative costs, the results of which will be made public next week. But we have not seen, and likely we’re not going to see, those results ahead of time. Nor do we know whether this study and its recommendations will be viewed apart from other budget exercises or integrated into them. It’s difficult to know how to prepare for those recommendations, knowing nothing about them or the methodology used to arrive at the conclusions. We have heard they’ve included, in pure administration, custodians and grounds people and librarians but nothing, and I mean nothing, could have prepared us for the request two weeks ago that we put in reserve $8.6 million for “review” by the Bureau of the Budget. That 8% of our adjusted GRF – they backed out the health insurance premiums – I thought that it might be prorated since three-quarters of the fiscal year is gone and that would really translate into about 2%. But just to give you the magnitude of the difficulty of that – and as you know, outside of this university I’ve been through four rescissions but they usually come in January or early February – they don’t come in April. In order to make that 8%, we would need – that’s 55%, two weeks ago, of all our unexpended fund balances. In other words, half of what we have left in the kitty would make up that $8.6 million. Of course, that would leave no money for anything. At this point in our fiscal year, again, that amounts to half of what is left to pay bills in March, April, May, and June, not to mention the fact that more than 90% of that money is already obligated to either personal contracts – service
contracts – or contractual obligations where somebody is doing a service for us. A rational response to that request, to set aside 8%, continues to elude me. We suggested a 2% reserve and, as you know, we were told that would not suffice. At this point, all our negotiations are focused on saving as much as we can of our current fiscal year’s budget but as each day goes by and we don’t know, it gets harder because we have to dip into that remaining fund balance to pay for energy and – I told you last year we may not have energy savings – well, we don’t and we’ve had to dip into reserves because it’s been a cold winter and we’ve had to remove a lot of snow.

Negotiations for the FY04 budget have not really commenced yet, but I think it would be safe to say that we’re seeing a pattern here. At this late date, in order to accommodate anything beyond the 2% level that we’ve saved in reserves, we’d probably have to flip over some way on the 04 budget. You know, there are some techniques that one can use but that just makes the 04 problem worse. So, am I depressing you yet? Now, Manny Sanchez, our Chair, this morning made a very important point in his remarks. He said we must continue to insist that NIU be evaluated individually and on its own merits. An independent study conducted last year and being used by the Governor’s own staff shows that NIU has the lowest administrative costs of any public university in Illinois. I wasn’t surprised by those findings and as I’ve said many times in two and a half years here, I’m very impressed by the leaness, efficiency and student-centeredness of the campus community. Nearly 90% of our operating budget is in personnel and contractual services. Of that amount, 70% is in academic and direct student support areas. That’s always where the big dollars are. The remaining 30% do their best to keep our physical plant running, pay our bills, provide a host of student services that contribute to the overall NIU student experience. Let me add that at NIU we value our employees. They’re family. Up to this point, we’ve done everything we can to avoid layoffs and other drastic personnel actions but ladies and gentlemen, I feel compelled to say that I can no longer with certainty guarantee we can avoid such layoffs. It all depends on the magnitude of the ’04 cuts. The ’03 cuts I think we can manage no matter how deep they are through various strategies but it’s your base budget cut in ’04 that causes me concern. This year we’ve eliminated more than a hundred positions by not filling vacancies. Given what we’ve learned over the past two weeks, it seems likely that we’ll lose more jobs. If we have to lose jobs, let’s hope it’s through attrition and while we’ll do our best to look at those open positions rather than existing employees - and I’m not minimizing the hurt of not filling open positions - I no longer feel confident we’ll be able to find all the rescission dollars we need without some reduction in force although we’ve got a few strategies left. Now, in the context of a devastating state budget deficit which will take the collective talents of all of our leaders to resolve, in the context of a fiscal disaster, we know sacrifice will be required on our part. Against the backdrop of national economic recession, we’re going to continue to fight and be an advocate for higher education. There are all those issues that are very, very crucial but we have to continue to fight for higher ed, particularly Illinois higher ed and very specifically NIU. It is still, as Manny Sanchez said so very eloquently this morning, the key to success in the modern world. It’s the key to so many of our problems. We can and will continue to tell our story and we’re very fortunate, again, to have such leadership from our Trustees. I want to mention too that some of our students are here and they’ve been great. Students make a difference in Springfield. They can get in doors that I can’t and that faculty can’t. Some of them are here today. I see Kevin Miller, SA President, and Kevin O’Kelly – where is Kevin – he’s got class, and Sean and a couple of others during their spring break, rather than be in Fort Lauderdale as I was in 1965, they put their coats and ties on and they worked the
halls. They observed as I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I introduced them. We had a little fun too because I got to be political science professor again; after every action, we’d talk about what had happened and why it happened and that was great. Thank you. You made a difference and I know you’re going to continue to do that.

Now, I have more. Where are we going, and how does this all fit together? I spend many days in Springfield and nothing is as comforting at 1:00 a.m. to be coming back from Springfield on those many nights and to see the light of DeKalb, the safety of DeKalb. You take your pleasures where you can when you’re in a battle like this, but the campus, when it’s 1:00 a.m. and I see those dorm rooms with all those students studying in there – I just get fired up. Let me just say, we have many friends in the legislature. We have many friends in both chambers, on both sides of the aisle and among the four leaders. Nonetheless, the state is facing a 5 billion dollar problem for ’03 and ’04. I’ve appeared and given testimony at the House and at the Senate Appropriations Committee. I’ve been to Springfield for NIU Day with the Trustees. All the Trustees save one were able to make it and we’ve talked to most of the leaders and we even got a chance to talk to the then Deputy Governor, Doug Scofield, and immediately the day after we met with him, he resigned. I mentioned our student leaders have worked the halls. This past Monday there was a special meeting called by the IBHE. It was really a hearing for the presidents to talk about their response to the 8% reserve and at that meeting the Bureau of the Budget Director was there to give his view of the situation. I really do have nothing but great admiration for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget who has a monumental task, to find 5 billion dollars without tax increases and that’s tough. So, what are we to anticipate in the future? Well, today, as we speak, you’ll notice that Dr. Eddie Williams and our governmental affairs person, Kathy Buettner are not here because, as we speak, all the public universities’ chief financial officers and government relations personnel are meeting with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in Springfield to discuss two issues: a resolution of the FY03 reserve and beginning of discussions on building the FY04 budget. Hopefully, we’ll have some resolution soon because planning cannot really commence in great earnest, although we’ve done tremendous planning, unless we know the number. We really need to know the number. So, first let’s discuss the FY03 rescission. Remember, if the Bureau of the Budget Director has his way, he wants the full 8%, $8.611 million. What we’ve done, as you know, is we’ve set aside and we’ve offered 2%, the logic being we’re 75% done with the fiscal year. That’s still a pretty big number. We had that collected, as you know, basically vacant positions and equipment money – anything we could get --- we’re holding that, we’ve got it, and are ready to give that. If it’s more than that, we’ve got some contingency plans and I want to indicate that we’re going to finish the academic year so our students can complete their courses and that those that are certified by the faculty are going to graduate even at that 8% level. I think it’s immoral if we didn’t do that. We can do that. We can get that done. We’ve got some strategies. It will hurt us in ’04, but we’re going to do that, students. It will have an impact on next year but let’s get this year done. Then the other thing is there are things that are really low on the priority or high on the priority depending on how you want to look at it. For instance, one of the last things we’d look at is summer school because basically we do run summer school pretty much as a business operation here where it pays for itself. There are some courses that need to be subsidized so we’d need to look at that but essentially it makes no sense that we need those and you lose money, however, if push comes to shove and you have to balance your budget, it’s the only place left with un-obligated GR money and so therein lies the reason that almost every university
president put that on the table. There might have been tactical reasons as well if you know what I mean. All right, so I hope I’m clear on that – that’s the worst-case scenario. Then I think we would restructure that in some way. We have ten thousand students in summer school. Ten thousand students. They need the courses and again, it can be at least a break-even proposition. Okay, so that’s the rescission and I think we’re going to know about that pretty soon. We’re really prepared for that unless the number, the percentage, gets up in that 6, 7, 8 range, then we’re going to have to figure a way.

Second, discussions on the FY04 budget, they need to proceed and they are because the Governor’s deadline is April 9. The document has to go to the printer, so that’s coming up, not a lot of time. I am assuming that whatever reduction we got in ’03 will be carried over and then on top of that we may get a further reduction so, at this point, we’re really not sure. The other variable I’m not sure about is this administrative cost study that’s being done. It’s confusing as to how a cut in operations relates to an administrative cut because sometimes it’s hard to separate them. With all my experience in cutting budgets and talking to legislators, I have not been able to get through to people about that. To this end, this morning the Trustees, who know we’re lean, passed a resolution that resolved that Northern Illinois University’s Board of Trustees requests me to review the university’s annual operating budget to eliminate any superfluous or unnecessary expenses and report to the Board of Trustees at the meeting. It’s not for action but when we build the ’04 budget, I have an obligation to go through the list of things and eliminate superfluous things. You start from the core of what we do and you move toward the edges. One of the things that I have started to do, and it takes a while, is going through our budget line by line. It’s a huge undertaking, to try to understand what our budget is and I think I understand it pretty well but I’m personally reviewing every line in every unit in every department. I’m going to take that on myself because I have to defend it, ultimately. All right, so once the Governor comes out with his budget on April 9, guess what, we have another round of appropriation hearings. Do you remember in WWII, the phony war – the war before the real battle started? Well, we had appropriation hearings but there was really nothing to have hearings about and so once we have a Governor’s budget then we’re going to have the real hearings in the House and the Senate. So, April 9, end of April, May, there’s going to be deliberations. The Governor and the Legislature has to get together and, you know, we’re just a small part of that huge 5 billion dollar puzzle. I would imagine there’s going to be a lot of friction so, it’s possible the Governor won’t have a document until June, hopefully by July. All right, but when we see what the Governor’s budget is we really can begin to finish our plans for the ’04 budget and let me just say that I’m going to be heavily involved in that process of building that budget.

Now, let me add more to this – I hope I’m not boring you. Let me add more to this complexity. In addition to the numbers, there are other things out there that are even more ominous than the budget. There are several pieces of substantive legislation that would affect the way we do business and affect our independence. There are many tuition limitation bills. My guess when it’s all said and done is that the Legislature will act on some sort of a tuition package. One that’s being debated and is getting “legs” is a bill that would be a tuition guarantee for an entering student. If you enter as a freshman and let’s say the tuition is $4,000 for a full load, that would be guaranteed for four years. Western Illinois has something like this. They also have a companion to that called “Grad Track”, that you’re guaranteed the courses you need to graduate in four years if you follow a prescribed program. Then, each successive class that comes in,
there may be an increase in the base tuition so that you could end up with a four-year cohort of students, each with a different rate. That’s becoming a popular thing across the country. All right? So, that’s out there. There are others that cap tuition increases to the Consumer Price Index; there’s some that freeze them; they’re out there and each one of them has to be dealt with and testified and that’s what I do.

Then there are several line-item bills. Right now we theoretically are given a lump sum appropriation and we divide that up the way we want according to principles. It used to be we had line item budgeting by categories and I think you will see some sort of line item budgeting. If it’s not too onerous, I don’t have a problem with that although, theoretically, it could be a situation where the Bureau of the Budget or a legislative committee is looking at our budget line by line and making changes. Think of the implications for a minute.

The last thing, which is the most ominous, is the income fund bill. That has the support of some legislators in the Bureau of the Budget. When we became independent a few years ago, NIU and other universities fought hard to control our own tuition. That is, when a student or a parent writes a check for tuition, that check comes to us and then we can hire faculty if there’s excess classes that need to be covered; we can buy equipment; we put it in the bank – we handle it. It’s called the income fund. It used to be before this, the check went to the state, the state held it, and then we got back all, part, some of it the following year. What it led to was really bad management. So, for instance, last year when we had 1100 more students, we were able to anticipate control over the income fund and get that from the Provost to academic departments to hire faculty for courses or buy equipment. If we didn’t have that, I think it would be irresponsible of us to make the hires or to buy the equipment. The other thing is the income fund drives summer school. More than the rescission, the income fund has the potential of shutting down summer school and outreach programs. We’re fighting that. The students are testifying Thursday against that; Manny Sanchez is worked up and he’s going down tomorrow to testify about the income fund. That’s a serious issue.

All right, I don’t have very much more if you can take it. So we’ve all been working very diligently on the budget and when you don’t see me, you know I’m in Springfield or Washington or stay up at 1:00 and see my car go by. Now, we have done very well in Washington this year; we’ll be announcing those grants when we get official notification because members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation are involved and they like to announce them. We’ve done very well. That’s the good news. I wish I could tell you what it was but it’s good, it’s big. All right, so when I am on campus, I’m going to be making an extraordinary effort to work with the UAC leadership, the leadership of all the employee groups, the deans, the faculty, all the committees to communicate, to seek input as we build for the FY04 budget and beyond. We may have to make quick decisions but you know we are prepared and you know we’re a pretty thin university. There are not an awful lot of options and I’m going to look for every bit of waste. I will be making hard decisions. I’m going to need your support.

Finally, let me say how important it is for me to know that we’re all together. These are going to be tough times. NIU could be a target because we are historically outspoken and we’re speaking our minds. The other thing I say to you, to students and to faculty, is it’s very important that you stay the course and do what it is that you do. Last night I was in Rebecca Butler’s class to give a
guest lecture, and it was the first time I had anything pleasurable happen to me in months. It reminded me of what we are all about. Those students in her Instructional Technology Foundations course need to stay focused on their studies because they’re going to go out and use assistive technologies in Chicago public schools to help kids. It was just great, Rebecca. Thanks for having me.

So, all right, now – let me say a word and this is even more serious – let me say a word about the war on terrorism and about the imminent war with Iraq. First, I want to again assure the campus that we’re as secure as we can be; we are ready. I imagine that we are going to have some forms of protest; we’re prepared to protect our freedom of speech but, if that happens, destruction of property is not to be tolerated. Of course, we are best able to do this if activities are contained to the campus. When our activities leave campus we are less able to protect people. It’s just something that Ivan and some of you learned in the ‘60’s. When it goes off campus we can’t protect freedom of speech and other things. Finally, I urge the academic community to continue, and I talked to an art professor right before who’s doing this, discussing and examining the political, social and religious issues that are at play here. They’re complex in today’s world and I believe it’s only through this sort of scholarly approach and reflection and discussion that real peace and a lasting peace and understanding in the world can be achieved. That’s our role and we should get to it. We can do that. We may not be able to stop tanks and be a human shield, but I think we can do that.

All right now, let me end on a positive note. There are some great things that have been happening academically all the time; one of the other things that has happened is that our basketball team did a very nice job for us - we got to the MAC tourney, and I was there. It was really great because it was my hometown. We’re getting a lot of awards, academic awards.

We’re going to have just a short little presentation here now; Ivan and I got together and decided the following. NIU has at its core and its tradition the preparation of educators, and I was getting tired of hearing that universities were not doing their job. So, what I did was ask this task force to come together; I gave them hardly any time, and Bob Wheeler chaired it with Anne. We had Fred Kitterle, and we had Dean Sorenson and Dean Kafer, and there were a few other people. I said here’s what I want, I want you to give me a crisp, philosophical statement, a stake-in-the-ground statement, as to what is NIU’s philosophy and what piece of this are we going to bite off. The second thing they did was to give me very specific examples of where we could collectively make a commitment. I reasoned that even though someone is not in the College of Education or one of the other colleges or faculty that are involved in the preparation of teachers or educators, they could still take this on as an issue. There’s a lot of brain power out there. It’s something we can do. We have a history of it. The P-20 Initiative was a result of that; I’ve sent that around to every legislator and said here’s what NIU is doing and here’s our stake in the ground. You can’t believe the response to that; it’s something that’s not going to cost us an awful lot except our commitment and our will to make a difference. So Anne, I don’t know how you and Fred Kitterle and Dean Sorenson are going to do this, but I just want a brief five minutes of what you’ve done.

A. Kaplan: You want to do it from back there?
C. Sorenson: I’ll do it from back here.

President Peters: We have a spokesperson? Oh, that’s great.

C. Sorenson: Yes, John did call the call the group together, Shirley Richmond from HHS, Harold Kafer, Fred Kitterle and myself as well as Anne and Bob and some others. We’ve been meeting quite a lot; we’ve seen a lot of each other in the last several months talking about the issues of P-20. P-20 is actually an NIU term. The term that you hear more often is P-16. However, at NIU we looked at it and said P-16 is talking about the education continuum from preschool through the baccalaureate degree. Here at NIU, we have a huge stake as well in the continuing professional development of educators and the preparation of folks like school counselors and administrators and so we extended that term to P-20 to encompass as well the graduate preparation that we do for educators. We’ve had a number of activities that have been kicked off already. We have met with IMSA and established some ideas and partnerships with the Illinois Math and Science Academy. We’ve met with Chicago public schools and there are already projects in the works, working with them to deal with some of the issues in Chicago public schools. We’ve met with folks in Rockford to work on some things. This is a collaborative effort among the four colleges plus the College of Engineering, which has also been involved to work on these issues. We feel it’s our collective responsibility to help address the issues in K-12 education in this country. It’s a national issue, it’s a state issue and we need to be part of the solution and work collaboratively with our partners which includes the K-12 schools as well as the community colleges, the other colleges, public universities and private in the state of Illinois. Fred’s going to talk briefly about one of the initiatives. One of the things that is happening this month is that NIU is hosting a two-day retreat for deans in the public institutions Illinois who are involved in the preparation of educators. That includes liberal arts and science deans as well as education deans, deans of health and human sciences, deans of visual and performing arts, deans of engineering. Right now, I believe all twelve publics are represented and will be attending this two-day retreat. So we are beginning that and hopefully that will lead to some collaborative efforts across those institutions.

In addition, we have another event that will be taking place, a regional forum that I’ll let Fred talk a little bit about.

F. Kitterle: What we’re doing is passing out to you an overview of NIU P-20 Initiatives. What’s very important also is that we are carrying this out, as John has just talked about, with regard to stringent budgets. What we have done is to identify five areas of strength in this university. Also, these are five areas of national concern, and five areas where there is funding. So that as we are looking at the issue of responding, we’re trying to do this in a smart way where we already have a leg up. There is a political agenda that we have as to how we are responding to issues in the public schools; we feel that we are doing an awful lot and we’ve highlighted areas where there also are resources and the potential for more resources. If we are going to do that, we need to look at that area and NIU is well positioned. Chris mentioned the meeting that we had with the deans. Just so you understand what the strategy of that meeting is, it is our belief that the way in which we are going to respond to a statewide problem is in a statewide consortium. Every single dean is going to be called upon by every single president in the state to help the institution respond and we are all cutting budgets. The only way we’re going to do this
is to look at how we can coordinate, how we can collaborate and how we can operate in a coherent fashion and that’s really the purpose of this meeting. The outcome of that meeting will be some form of a white paper in which we have put our heads together; then what we hope to do is go forward in our region where we have made great strides and talk to superintendents. That will be occurring some time in April. Hopefully, what we will do is have something that a) responds to state needs, b) puts NIU in a leadership role where it should be in this, and c) positions us well as a model for the way in which we can foster state-wide collaboration on major issues that face the nation such as the public school systems. That, in essence, is the strategy, the overview, the way in which we’re looking at garnering resources at a time when resources are diminished. I hope that gives you some flavor for what we’re doing.

President Peters: Good. Okay, thank you very much. You can see that that’s really great leadership on the part of that group but also there’s been interaction with the faculty and it’s made a difference.

All right, so I apologize for the length of all of that but I felt it necessary, while I had you captive, like you do with students, to let you know everything that’s on the table; the complexity of the variables and the decision points. All right now, let’s move through the agenda. Then we can have a good discussion when we are done with the agenda, if you wish.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Proposed changes to CITC Bylaws – see memo from Robert Wheeler. Refer to Rules and Governance. (Pages 7-10)

President Peters: Is there a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda that includes this referral of the CITC Bylaws to Rules and Governance? So moved? Second? Any discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed?

The motion carried.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 11-14)

President Peters: Let’s move to reports, Pat?

P. Henry: You have the report on the meeting on February 28. I’ll let you read through most of that on your own, just a few things to point out. Under number two, and this relates to what President Peters was saying about the issue of administrative costs and how they’re being looked at, the President of the FAC, Ken Anderson, sent a letter to the IBHE, excerpts of which begin on page 14, the last page of my report in what you’ve got there. He also sent a revised letter to the Governor. He’s not altogether sure it will reach the Governor’s eyes but the case that he is trying to make sure is understood is, indeed, issues of definition of what is an administrator. What is being counted in administrative costs can make some real differences in terms of the quality of education, and past budget cuts, especially in rescissions that have happened, have also impacted
this to a very great extent on many universities. This will have a real impact on students; the rather over-simplified view of cutting administrative costs is something that is being combated with these kinds of communications. We did, in fact, meet at Parkland Community College and had a lovely time. The ongoing concern is still trying to get a faculty voice on the various boards. There is the ICCB, the Illinois Community College Board which exists as a separate entity from the IBHE which also does have community college representation but in no case is there a faculty member on these boards. There is a student member and we keep lobbying to get a faculty voice as well.

Under number four, if I could just mention briefly, I did, in fact, discuss these six questions listed here on the second page of the report, concerning how legislators perceive higher education, with both David Wirsing, our representative, and Senator Burzynski, both of whom are very supportive of NIU and are equally appalled at some of the problems that the budget is having in terms of higher education. They had a couple of suggestions in terms of how faculty can get their case made in addition to the usual ways that we have; one of the things that both of them mentioned is that it’s not always very clear to legislators what faculty do, and a lot of the negativity that comes around has to do with the fact that we’re perceived as not spending enough time with students or that the time that we don’t spend with students somehow doesn’t benefit students indirectly. It’s very much student oriented. I think there’s a case to be made; we have to do a better job in making that case as to how and what we do is good for students. The fifth year MAP funds and the cutting of them – this continues to be something that is a concern to the legislature. The people that are in charge of cutting this feel that people taking five years to get through a baccalaureate degree are doing it because either they aren’t working hard enough or they’re not getting advised well enough. Bringing up things like they have to work part time and they may have to drop out of school for other reasons, doesn’t seem to make a point. To the extent that is the case, the case needs to be made better.

Finally, on number six was the action item that the Quality Committee has presented, and this we’ve discussed before, the addition of the seventh goal for the Illinois Commitment, which is at the bottom of the second page. We have passed this in the FAC and will pass it on to the IBHE. When and if the IBHE revises the Illinois Commitment, perhaps they will consider putting this in there. It has to do with how the collective efforts of Illinois colleges and universities will enhance and enrich the quality of life for all Illinois citizens. You can read the complete memo there as to what that actually involves. I know there are concerns; some of these were raised at the Faculty Senate meeting, and had been raised at the FAC as well, as to how this actually will get evaluated. I think, to some extent, this is trying to bring out that there are things that can be talked about that may not be quantifiable but still are important. However, this is all a very abstract thing at this point anyway.

I think the rest of it is fairly much stuff you can read on your own or have a chance to look at. I’m not going to be going to the next meeting. Suzanne is going to the next one so she can tell you about the next time. Are there any questions?

President Peters: I think one other issue that has been added to this is a review of the Legislative Scholarship Program. That has now expanded. There’ll be a review of all waivers
given, graduate and undergraduate, by universities. I forgot, that’s another substantive one we’ve got to deal with.

**P. Henry:** I’m sorry, I think Fred had a question?

**President Peters:** Yes, Fred, I’m sorry.

**F. Kitterle:** There’s a very, very serious issue that you just raised that illustrates an extreme disconnect between the reporting structures of institutions and who they go to and how they promulgate it. Each year we put together a report called the Illinois Commitment that clearly delineates what we are doing in work force preparation, economic development, partnerships, P-12, just to mention four of the five. If I had more water I’d remember the fifth one. Before that, we filed results reports with the IBHE, and one of the results reports that I happened to discuss with Lynne Waldeland, when she was putting it together when Carole Moody was the provost, had to do with faculty workload. In that we talked about the worst of the worst, presidential research professors, because “those people have nothing to do with students”; what we showed were the credit hour generation, the number of credit hours at the undergraduate level, independent studies, all of that plus their ratings in teaching and we did the same with presidential teaching professors and showed that they are symmetrical, in fact, we used this on the radio. So, my question is - and perhaps this would be useful for you – what is the evidence that we need to put forward that will make a difference, because we do this annually? We respond to state needs, we indicate how we’re shepherding money and we also talk about faculty workload. In fact, when President LaTourette was here, we had state legislators here and one of the things we talked about was faculty workload, the implications of involving students and all manner of stuff like that. So somewhere, somehow, there’s a communication breakdown.

**President Peters:** I’ve been battling this for twenty-five years and I’ll be battling it, hopefully, for another twenty-five years. No, there’s a limit. Last year the Provost put together a philosophical statement on faculty workload, that I helped with, that makes a lot of sense. It goes something like “we subscribe to the AAUP guideline on faculty workload which assumes that if all you were involved in was direct classroom instruction, that would be considered twelve credit hours per semester, four undergraduate classes of size thirty, lecture, discussion format”. That’s the classic AAUP. If you go to the 1940 Red Book, that’s the classic and it’s the only benchmark that’s really out there. Then you go back from there, saying in a research university, there are other things that need to be done, advising and research and so forth. We have such a statement and it’s a good one. We’ve got it honed and I think it’s probably been widely distributed? I’m not sure. The other thing I did at Tennessee that we may want to consider here that gave us some protection in this is that every department and college needs to consider a workload policy within that context. Then on June 1 of every year, the deans and department heads had to certify to the provost that every faculty member’s activity was evaluated according to this statement and that adjustments were made where as necessary; and they certified that. Then when I went to the legislature, I was able to say we have a policy – which we did – people have been evaluated and they are all fully engaged and we assess it and make adjustments wherever necessary. Case closed. That usually worked because if you get into the twenty-seven things that faculty can do, you’re gonna lose ‘em. I can do it, but I lost them. So, I think we’ve got an answer. Now, it doesn’t matter what the answer is because I was asked, and our student
leaders were there, how many hours does your average faculty member spend in the classroom and they refused to hear anything but how many hours in the classroom. Well, if you’re teaching seven oboe students and, they wanted to hear that because that’s the issue. There are some that philosophically believe that the only thing the state should pay for is direct undergraduate instruction and if you want to do research or graduate or professional students, you have to pay for that on your own. Now no amount of describing the complexity of the faculty role is going to break through that so you just make your statement, take your lumps and move on. Okay?

P. Henry: That reminded me of another thing that Senator Burzynski mentioned as something to point to that helps to bridge this gap and that is, and I think departments probably do this already, but mentoring new faculty in terms of what their duties are vis-à-vis face time with students and making it clear that we are letting people know that it’s important, that is something that they’re evaluated on, that is the thing that is considered really important.

President Peters: Very good. Anne Kaplan you wanted to say something?

A. Kaplan: Yes, just a note, as exasperating as this is, I think we have to remember that we are dealing with an unprecedented number of new legislators and, even more important, new staff in Springfield and let me tell you, ten years ago Senator Burzynski was nowhere near where he is now. You do have to keep at it.

President Peters: Good point.

P. Henry: Keep educating.

President Peters: I think it’s less of an issue this year too because that issue gets to be a partisan issue. Fred, and then we’d better move on, although this is very good discussion.

F. Kitterle: Yes, I do want to make a comment, John. I think that the issue that you have about workloads for departments, something like ten years ago in our college as a response to the IBHE, we instituted what are called the Morris Targets. We have, and I doubt that any other institution has, teaching load targets, department by department. They have been enforced, resources depend upon it, faculty positions depend upon it and the fact is, is that I’d like to see any other Illinois school that has had the consistency and the monitoring and the watchdog behavior on that. It’s protecting our college very well.

President Peters: Well, very good. You know, I’m convinced – I talked to the Provost and Ivan looked at it – that we’re okay on this. The problem is you get about twenty seconds to explain this to your average legislator. All right? Yes, David? You have a question for Pat?

D. Wagner: Yes, number two is terribly arcane. What does faculty erosion leads to erosion of faculty governance – can you explain that in two minutes?

P. Henry: Yes, that specifically is talking about part time faculty or non-tenure track faculty; the extent to which they take over tenure track or full time positions means there are fewer people to serve on committees.
D. Wagner: Okay, that’s different though than faculty-type people being lifted up to administrative-type people. That sounds like what number two is about.

P. Henry: Okay, I take it back; that’s actually about as faculty support staff get eroded and faculty have to take over more time or more things that are otherwise done by SPS or other support administrator-type people then they have less time to serve on committees. Okay?

President Peters: David, is that ---

D. Wagner: Yes.

President Peters: All right, I see that our perspective retiree, Bob Wheeler, is here and Bob needs to return to his retirement – are you okay? Then we’re not going to deal with you. All right, now Pat, are you done? All right.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – report (Page 15-16)

President Peters: Paul or William on BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee?

W. Tolhurst: I don’t see Paul here so I guess it’s me.

President Peters: I guess it is.

W. Tolhurst: I’m afraid that because of a death in the family, I was unable to attend this meeting so I’ll have to let Paul’s report speak for itself since I really can’t answer any questions on it.

President Peters: All right, pages 15 and 16? Let’s take a second to look through.

S. Willis: I was there in case anybody does have any questions on it.

W. Tolhurst: Perhaps anyone here who was there could answer questions that I’m afraid I can’t.

President Peters: All right.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – report (Page 17)

President Peters: Next, hearing no questions, the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee, Sue is going to give that report.
S. Willis: Yes, I have a written report, which is on page 17. Most of this was uncontroversial. Let’s see, I noticed there was a letter this morning in the Northern Star about student fees and I just wanted to note that the average increase in the student fees is about 2.5%. The dollar amount by which the fees increased for next year is about $50. Almost two-thirds of that is due to an increase in the health insurance premium. The health insurance has gone up something like 17% which, on the scale of how health insurance premiums have been going lately, is actually pretty good. So I think the student fees are being kept very well in line. Then I just listed all the other things. The only other thing I wanted to mention was the last one which also came up in the Board of Trustees’ meeting and I’ll talk about it a little more there which, I think, is coming up next or almost next, which is the development of an instructional technology surcharge which would be a surcharge to the students to cover various kinds of enhancements to smart classrooms, and all that kind of thing but I’ll talk about that more.

President Peters: You’re going to talk about that more?

S. Willis: Yes, because I’m going to talk about the Board of Trustees.

President Peters: All right, questions on the Finance and Facilities Committee.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe – report (Pages 18-19)

President Peters: All right, then let’s move to Sara and Bev on Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee. They have a report on 18 and 19. Sara, are you handling that or Bev?

B. Espe: Both, and Sue was there too. On pages 18 and 19 is our report. President Peters has already alluded to many items that were discussed in that committee meeting which was held March 11 at Hoffman Estates. You will find the President alluded to some of the substantive legislation. I did list some of those related to tuition, the line items there if you want to read through that. There was some discussion in regards to capital, the FY04 capital budget and what might happen with that. We do have an item on that list, the Stevens Building renovation, number fifteen on the priority list but with the lack of funding, not sure what’s going to happen at all with the capital funding and if there is money, whether coming down the line for NIU, if number fifteen will even survive. Steve Cunningham reported on SURS and pension related issues, I’ll let you read through that. Some of this we’ve heard before and he was just giving us an update on that. Let’s see, NIU is currently in full compliance for the new SEVIS Federal Regulations that have to do with student and exchange visitor information system for international students.

President Peters: But it’s crashing nationally.

B. Espe: Is it really?

President Peters: Yes, it’s just overloaded.
B. Espe: But we’re in compliance, okay. So, unless there’s some questions ---

President Peters: Okay, questions for Bev? Pat?

P. Henry: This is not necessarily for you guys but, in general, do you think it would be advisable for us to contact our congress people with regards to some of these bills that are going through ---

President Peters: You’re talking about the ---

P. Henry: Like, for example, HB1543, the one that requires higher education to be separate line items and there’s the one that is for the income fund. I don’t know if that’s actually ---

President Peters: The Income Fund Bill is one that could stand a little action. I know that the students are testifying tomorrow and I’m not sure exactly how far that’s going to go but I know that other students – Kevin, am I right – that other student governments are taking action as well? Maybe through the Faculty Advisory Committee some collective action on that one, it’s all public universities so if it comes from a broad range of faculty, that’s important, I think. Kevin, do you want to comment on that?

K. Miller: Just briefly I was going to say that yes, other student governments I’ve contacted across the state and although they’re not individually going down to testify, they are faxing me and e-mailing me letters of support – supporting me and my cause, not the bill – and also opposition statements of other student governments which I’m going to present so I’m kind of ---

President Peters: So they’re a thousand percent behind you?

K. Miller: Most of them, yeah. Most student governments ---

President Peters: He’s too young to understand my humor. Good luck to you, all right. Pat, does that answer your question? All right?

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

President Peters: Let’s see, where are we, Sue, BOT report?

S. Willis: I do not have a written report because the Board of Trustees met this morning, finishing about four hours ago. Actually, it was quite a long meeting. Let me go over it a little bit. A lot of this President Peters has already said about the budget and all that kind of thing, which is, of course, miserable. Let’s see, one of the things I’ve said is that I’m going to be going to a meeting on Friday of other Illinois public university faculty senate presidents and so I asked what can we do and one of the trustees suggested that the more people we can get to write letters, as Pat was just asking, and not just us – my guess is that if you look at the hierarchy of things – letters from faculty and administrators are probably the least effective. I’m guessing here, but that’s my guess. Letters from students would be very effective. Letters from citizens without obvious ---
President Peters: Parents.

S. Willis: Right, letters from parents are effective. Letters from citizens without obvious vested interest in universities would also, I would think, be effective. To my mind there are three things that need to be emphasized. One is that higher education should not suffer disproportionate cuts. Obviously, if we have a shortfall, we have a shortfall, but these disproportionate cuts to higher education don’t make sense. Keep the tuition income local – I was thinking about that. I can’t imagine running a business the way they’d run it if we send our income to Springfield and we get it back a year later. It’s as if a hundred people descend on a restaurant and you have to serve them by using the money that fifty people paid for when they came last night; it makes no sense. So keep the tuition income local so that we can respond to needs as they arise and not a year after they arise. Then the line item budget that, as President Peters said, if we have to have a very detailed line on a budget that’s appropriated line-by-line, everybody’s going to go nuts. Accountability is another thing and big line items, you know, overarching a few lines is okay, but individual salaries is, again, nuts. Okay, so anyway, if you can talk your students and your neighbors and your maiden aunt and everybody else that you can think of into writing that would help.

President Peters: Okay.

S. Willis: All right, meanwhile, let’s see. Student fees, the technology surcharge. Coming back to the technology surcharge, this was a response of the university to a request made by the Trustees in December to look into initiating such a surcharge. As any of you who teach are probably aware, the student – and I forget what they call it exactly – but the student information system software that we have is, in computer terms, ancient – almost Egyptian – the printouts we get look like they were printed on a line printer. They don’t have lower case letters on them. We are in desperate need of upgrading that and that’s something, and of course there are other things for which there is no money. We also are lagging behind other universities in the amount of things that we are able to do on the web, particularly student related things like accepting applications, getting information efficiently to students on the web and so that’s another thing that needs to be done and so the idea is to come up with some kind of reasonably sensible surcharge that would help provide some funds for that so there was a report about that – that was an information item, not an action item. Finally, this body has in the past few months passed two constitutional amendments. One was what I would call basically a cosmetic one bringing the text of the Constitution into line with changes in titles that have already taken place and the other one changing the start date for University Council members to be July 1 instead of August 16. Both of those were passed by the Board of Trustees without discussion. In fact, they put it on the consent agenda. So those are passed.

President Peters: Okay?

S. Willis: Okay.

President Peters: Questions?
F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters: All right, let’s move on then to John Wolfskill and Academic Policy Committee.

J. Wolfskill: No report.

President Peters: No report.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Bill Goldenberg, Chair – report (Pages 20-24)

President Peters: Bill Goldenberg, Resources, Space and Budgets.

B. Goldenberg: It is getting late and so I won’t read you this whole report; you can read it for yourself I’m sure. I’ll make a very quick summary. We talked about a lot of very important issues and it certainly deserves more time but I think I can let you read it. I will invite the guests that we had, certainly Provosts Legg and Cassidy are here, if I made any mistakes or if anything needs correction or elaboration, you’re invited to add anything you’d like. Then after I finish a very quick summary, we’ll also invite questions from the floor. I’m sorry to see that Vice President Williams is not here so he can’t speak for his part but we had many important topics.

I was substituting for Herb Rubin who had to resign due to time considerations and we had two sub-committees of this RSB Committee. One was to deal with the problem, the happy problem actually, that our campus is growing and extending and we have this wonderful new Barsema Hall and other campus facilities, but it creates a problem for students who can’t get to their classes on time due to transportation and so that was one problem we wanted to consider. When I met with the sub-committee, this was way back in November or December, I had thought perhaps the best way to solve the problem would be to reprogram the computer and the TRAC system just not to allow any registration for adjacent classes or subsequent classes where you wouldn’t have time to get to the next class. I called Registration and Records and was told that due to budget considerations, that would be an impossibility. There would be no way to get this done based on the amount of money available to do it as it would cost a great deal. Apparently, just advising and the knowledge of the students is not working either. So, we did hear though at this meeting on February 19 from some other RSB members who said that the CUAE, which is a standing committee of UCC, actually is working on the problem and having some success and so we decided to leave the solution to that committee which is apparently dealing with it.

We also had a technology sub-committee which just wanted to receive some updates and reports and so we had three guests, Walter Czerniak, who is Associate Vice President of Information Technology Services; Murali Krishnamurthi, from the Faculty Development Instructional Design Center; and Frederick Schwantes, Associate Vice Provost for Resource Planning. First we wanted to hear about the smart classrooms; installation is continuing although with the budget problems, the pace of developing smart classrooms has slowed. They’re funded from the Provost’s Office and the Provost’s Office has been taking a lot of the budget cuts so far, however, at the end of this year we’ll have 61 smart classrooms and within a couple of years we
hope to reach the goal that had been set of 50% of our 140 general purpose classrooms as smart classrooms. So within one or two years we should have 70 out of those 140 as smart classrooms despite all of the budget problems, we’re crossing our fingers and hoping. Walter Czerniak also had a somewhat optimistic report because apparently, I guess, they got in under the wire with what needed to be done to get the campus wired and most of the buildings set up. He said that budget cuts will not hurt our connection with technology because the systems are already in place and they also this year apparently froze rates for technology connections to units on campus and they’re going to do the same thing for next year knowing that there’s a budget crisis and no more money available. So, some good news there.

Also included in your packet is a report Murali Krishnamurthi gave us about the use of Blackboard on campus. It’s a very detailed and extensive report and I’ll let you read it for yourself, but just to summarize, apparently it’s a very popular system although there are no incentives for faculty to put their courses on Blackboard. Many, many courses are up on Blackboard and the students love it based on surveys; the faculty loves it and it seems to be working very well. Murali’s unit, Faculty Development Center, is coordinating with ITS, Technology Services, to be sure that it’s working all the time because, of course, when you have a class in progress, if something breaks down you need immediate assistance and they’re coordinating that assistance, from what we were told, very well.

All right, then Dr. Williams spoke to us extensively about planning for new land on campus and facilities that are on the campus and I can let you read about what’s already been done. He pointed out something I think we all know, that we’re very blessed to have this Board of Trustees which is local now rather than the Board of Regents because in the past it was very difficult to do planning because the Board of Regents was responsible for several different diverse campuses and we’re in much better shape to do coordinated planning now. The campus grew a little haphazardly, became very long and narrow according to Dr. Williams and that isn’t ideal for our needs. However, now we’ve acquired some new land and the first buildings that you see are the new Convocation Center from some land that was acquired in 1991. From the middle of the ‘90’s, we now have the far west campus, which is what needs the most planning right now, which is basically empty now except for one building that we got through the graces of Dennis Hastert, the Speaker of the House. That far west campus is now under consideration for planning and, as you can see, there’s many people who will have input: President Peters, an outside consultant, all the academic units, the President’s Cabinet, the Board of Trustees. One very strong probable use for it is for research and development for the future and that would certainly be in keeping with our new Carnegie classification and NASULGC membership and so on. The new building that is just the beginning of this development of this west campus master plan is the Family Violence Center. So that’s just the beginning of it and it’s under consideration now for development. Some other things have been done in the past and are also listed and I’ll let you read that rather than review it.

We then discussed academic planning, so we really got into every important area being planned on the campus. Provosts Legg and Cassidy were both with us to describe that, and to summarize what they described, what they need to do always is to ascertain what the needs of the campus are by discussing with academic units what their needs are for planning new programs and new faculty and so on. Information comes particularly by way of program review, the APC
Committee and so on. After campus needs have been determined, then there is an aspect of political expertise that is needed as well because we have to know what possibilities exist to get funding for those so we need to find out what the legislature is willing to support, what the Illinois Commitment and the results reports from the state indicate will have some kind of support and matches are attempted to be made so that we can get funding. That’s sort of the procedure that is followed.

Then we discussed budget cuts, as you can see, at the end, which is very germane to current conditions here. You can see the high priorities at the time indicated were for salaries and funding to hire additional faculty. That might not be possible next year, but perhaps for the following year. They mentioned President Peters’ principles of preserving instructional programs first, as the highest priority. Then you can see the figures there, 3% had been hoped for as the budget cut; 5% would have given us some problems and, as you can see, we now – hopefully not – but may have an 8% this year and an 8% next year so that’s pretty drastic if it happens. It was also pointed out that our administrative costs are the lowest in the state and they constitute 15% of our budget. By comparison, Champaign/Urbana, 28% is the figure for that so we are pretty lean, as President Peters indicated, I would say.

That’s it, first I’d ask for additions from Provosts Legg or Cassidy; I know you are here. If you want to add anything or correct anything that I said. Any questions from the floor?

**President Peters:** All right, a very good report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair

**President Peters:** All right, let’s move on to Susan and our favorite Rules and Governance Committee.

1. Placement of Ethics Statements – see memo from Sue Mini (Page 25)

**S. Mini:** I think I’m the only person today not discussing the budget. The first item I have is an information item. Last year there were three ethics statements that were adopted, one by the Operating Staff Council, one by the Faculty Senate, and one by the Supportive Professional Staff Council. This year they asked Rules and Governance what the dispositions of these statements should be. If you’ll look at page 25, what we’re recommending is that the documents be placed in the bylaws or similar documents that each of these groups might have. I don’t have to move on anything; it’s not an action item.

**President Peters:** It’s not an action item. Anybody want to comment on that or direct a question on these ethics statements placements? All right, I guess we have the walk in item now?

2. Placement of **CAPCE** into Committees Book – walk-in
S. Mini: Yes, the walk in item is a brand new committee for the Committees Book that we’re considering. It’s the Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education. I guess we’re going to call it CAPCE and I move that we adopt this for the Committees Book.

President Peters: All right, there’s a motion on the floor. There’s a second. Now discussion. Question? Bob Wheeler?

B. Wheeler: Perhaps I could comment on the motivation for introducing this new committee. As many of you know, we have a large number of initial teacher certification programs at Northern and they have come together in a body known as CITCE, the Committee on Initial Teacher Certification in Education. That body has been placed for about a decade, I would say, and I think it does a very effective job in providing governance at that level. It’s perhaps less well known that we also have eight advanced certification programs in education. Those are identified about halfway down the first page of the handout, Library Media Specialist, Reading, School Counseling and so forth. In many of these cases, individuals who already have an initial certification are returning to obtain an additional certification. They may not be functioning in a traditional classroom role, but carrying out another important role such as principal or superintendent. When we had our re-accreditation visit from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in 1991, it was made clear to us that we needed to demonstrate some level of university governance of the advanced programs, and what you have before you is the outcome of that. CAPCE has been meeting on an ad hoc basis for over a year now and I believe functioning quite well, beginning to identify common goals and common interests. This is an attempt to formalize the structure of that group which I believe does have much to contribute to the university at the level of the advanced programs. So I would strongly support the approval of this proposal.

President Peters: All right, Dan?

D. Griffiths: I just talked to Susan, it isn’t listed here or at least I didn’t see it, where in the Committees Book it’s going to be, but you’re putting it under I. which is Committees Reporting Directly to the University Council – that’s where CITCE is?

President Peters: All right, David?

D. Wagner: Does this have to be done today to get in the Committee Book? I mean, I oppose in principle adopting a walk-in the day that I read it the first time.

S. Mini: Actually you’re not reading it for the first time. It came through on the Consent Agenda.

D. Wagner: This is the first time it’s been presented to this body.

S. Mini: That’s correct.

D. Wagner: I just don’t like accepting something on such short notice.
S. Willis: The whole text of it was included in a packet a couple of months ago when it was on the Consent Agenda. So you could have read it then.

D. Wagner: But you don’t debate anything that’s on the Consent Agenda.

S. Willis: I understand that.

D. Wagner: I’ll abstain; I wouldn’t vote against it.

D. Musial: In terms of the background – and I appreciate the context – I’m always worried about representation on these committees. I know a lot about CITCE and having representatives and how many you have from what program and so forth; how was the representation for this committee determined? Was there a subcommittee or who made that decision? Have we been consulted?

President Peters: I think Dean Sorenson, you’re moving toward a microphone.

C. Sorenson: The program faculty involved in the certification programs identified their representatives.

D. Musial: So they’re satisfied that they have one member from each of the certificates – I think that’s the way it sounds like it’s going to be – and none of the support program people. For instance, Foundations in Education serves many of these certificates but often does not have any representation. Was that something deliberated about or concerned about?

C. Sorenson: I believe they followed the CITC model.

D. Musial: Yes, that’s what I thought.

C. Sorenson: They used CITC as the model when looking at CAPCE in terms of governance structure and what faculty are involved in those, the faculty who teach the certification programs made that decision.

D. Musial: Then I might just mention as a member of the support faculty for many years, the representation of support faculty is often lacking on these committees, understandably so because it’s a certificate program. We teach many of the courses and over the years, our courses get forgotten and maybe become irrelevant and then our representation is less than exciting. So, I’m going to speak against this for the moment, at least the quickness of having to think this through and being able to discuss this with others, I just have to speak against it and the concern of anyone else doing support courses in this great university – you want to think about representation. That’s all I’m concerned about, not about the committee but the representation.

President Peters: All right, the original motion is still on the floor. Are there any other comments or – yes, Pat?
P. Henry: Simply an item of spelling out what CITC stands for, what the abbreviation CITC stands for. It’s in 1.27 and 1.33.

S. Mini: So this is an editorial?

P. Henry: Yes.

S. Mini: I’m sure that the professor will accept that as a friendly amendment?

R. Wheeler: Yes.

President Peters: All right, David?

D. Wagner: I move that we postpone discussion and vote on this until the next meeting.

President Peters: So I take it the parliamentary ruling here is that we have a motion to postpone and a second which is not debatable and we move to vote up or down on the postponement. If it fails, we go back to the original motion. Everybody understand that? All those in favor of postponing say aye. Opposed? Show of hands? All those in favor or postponing raise your hands. Abstain? All those in favor of not postponing – all the nay’s raise your hands high. 16? I vote ---

D. Rusin: I’m not allowed to vote – I just remembered that. I’m here ex-officio; mine was for the aye, you have to subtract one.

President Peters: 15-16. And we didn’t vote, any abstentions? All right, so the postponement fails. We have the original motion, any more discussion? All right, call the question. All right, all those in favor of the original motion to establish the Committee on the Advancement of Professional Certification in Education (CAPCE), please say aye. Opposed? All right, the ayes have it.

The motion passed.

President Peters: Susan, are you done?

S. Mini: Oh, definitely.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: All right, let’s quickly move to Richard, University Affairs Committee. No report.

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

President Peters: Deborah, I saw you here – Elections.
1. Results of University Council elections.

D. Smith-Shank: Okay, the elections for University Council, I want to just read very quickly the winners of the election. The College of Business will be Sally Ann Webber; Education – Richard Orem has been re-elected and Amy Rose; Health and Human Sciences – Ken Burns; Liberal Arts & Sciences – Colin Booth; Patricia Henry comes back to us; Fahui Wang, Paul Stoddard, Angela Powers and David Gorman and for Visual and Performing Arts, Larry Gregory.

President Peters: Congratulations to all of them.

2. Results of Faculty Referendum

D. Smith-Shank: Secondly, the results of the Faculty Referendum, which changes the times of the beginning of University Council terms, passed.

President Peters: All right, so we’ll order that. Any other questions or comments for Elections?

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any Unfinished Business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Class syllabi posted online – walk-in

President Peters: Under New Business we have the walk in item from Kevin Miller, SA President. Kevin, do you want to frame this issue?

K. Miller: I apologize that you just got this today as a walk in. What you have before you is a memo from me on the front and if you turn it over, there’s a Student Senate resolution which I authored. My intent behind this is to make life a bit more productive and easier for students when it comes to looking into classes. What I would propose is that the University Council, if it can, request that departments somehow transmit or forward digital copies of syllabi to the Offices of the Student Association some time before a semester begins so that we can go ahead and put those up on our website to therefore enable students to have some sort of on-line syllabi repository which they can go to. I know a lot of departments already do post syllabi on their websites but some of these websites are difficult to find in my opinion so, I put this before the Council for consideration.

President Peters: All right. My suggestion is to refer this to the Academic Policy Committee. That’s a suggestion. I can’t make a motion. All right, moved and seconded to refer to the Academic Policy Committee to explore this. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? You know, a new student information system would make this very plausible. That’s the way those things
work. It’s still a lot of work getting a syllabus up and digitized. All right, Kevin thank you for bringing it and refer back to your group and say we’re going to take that on.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Anything for the good of the order, comments or questions? All right, let’s take John first and then Kevin.

J. Wolfskill: I just have a minor question about an editorial comment that was added to the minutes on page 4. I’ll ask for a little clarification on this to make sure that I am not misunderstanding this. This is near the bottom of page 4 in connection with the change in the Thanksgiving break and the effective date of this change. So do I understand correctly that in the Fall 2003 term we will have our traditional schedule with Wednesday morning classes but beginning Fall of 2004, no classes on Wednesday before Thanksgiving?

S. Willis: Yes, that’s correct. We looked at the Board of Trustees’ regulations and they specify that this body, indeed, is empowered to make changes to the academic calendar but then we need to give twelve month notice to the Board of those changes and so it would be Fall of 2004 before that would happen. Notice has been given but ---

President Peters: And I’ll ask the Provost to make sure that the records people make that widely publicized for next year. Thanks John, all right, I think Kevin you had a comment.

K. Miller: I’ll speak briefly because I’m leaving for Springfield in about nine minutes. Regarding the letter writing campaign that has been spoken about, please do encourage your fellow faculty members to do it and also their students to do it. The SA will be running something in the Northern Star hopefully on Monday regarding this and pointing students in the appropriate direction, where to get information and whatnot. Also please alert your students to that and fellow faculty members. Also, one quick thing with all the ethics statements that were discussed today, I think it’s a wonderful idea and after meeting with Dr. Legg, the Student Association is actually exploring a similar proposal I guess you cold say, although I would term it more as an honor code. One of the departments, I believe the Accountancy Department in the College of Business, the students have already taken it upon themselves and done it and I know I’d like to congratulate them for doing that and I think they set a very good example for the rest of the students and it’s something that I hope to wrap up before my term on May 15th. Hopefully, that will be done but that’s just kind of an FYI.

President Peters: All right. Provost Legg?

I. Legg: Anne and I were just observing that – I’m almost sure this is true because it’s been true in every state I’ve been in – that you cannot use or not use any identification of the university when you’re making any kind of lobbying effort so you cannot use stationery or preferably not call from or use e-mail that might be identified as originating from NIU. Other than that, it’s a good idea.
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President Peters: When in doubt, check with Kathy Buettner of Governmental Relations for the proper interpretation because you can get in a world of hurt, get me in a world of hurt.

I. Legg: By the way, he’s the president, right?

President Peters: Dean Pernell?

L. Pernell: Actually my comment goes to something else, it goes back to the President’s earlier comments on the budget. Comment and a question really. First of all in terms of comment, I want to express my appreciation - and I think I probably speak for others - on the level of dedication and articulation that the President has made in regards to the interests of this university. I think that’s much appreciated and certainly we encourage and support him in that. The question I have, and it’s associated with the clear case that we view and have presented on these issues, as I look at the press coverage of the reaction to statements from the presidents, I’m struck by the just short of open hostility and at least combativeness in rhetoric that’s reflected in those stories and my question is, is that perception unwarranted on my part? If not, where is that coming from and how might that impact at this junction FY04 negotiations?

President Peters: Those are excellent questions. I think some of it is reportage that emphasizes the more bombastic aspects of these issues. So discount a little bit. The other fact of the matter is that again, the big picture, we have a situation in the state where’s a 5 billion dollar problem and everybody needs to play their part and frustrations come when people who are in charge of balancing the budget can’t get to the number that they need to get to and don’t see a rational way to do it. That’s part of it. Part of it is the fact that higher education is not a code agency and, therefore, it’s not that the Governor can directly order a cut, although we want to go along reasonably. The other thing is code agencies are different than universities in that so much of our money is sunk into personnel and contracts and we can’t quit doing traffic or shut down a building. That’s part of it. Then I think part of it too is the newness of the administration, which I appreciate and understand. I will say this on the record that I think this Governor, when this economy turns around, will be good to higher education. I believe that and I think the values are there but I think right now the state is facing this issue. The other thing is that the presidents have a uniform stand on this and they are experienced individuals and the cause is good and so I think that that’s part of it. I wish I could be more definitive but if I had my druthers, I would prefer these statements not to be made and I’d prefer to get on with it and decide how we’re going to handle this rather than have newspaper reports. In the final analysis, the Governor said it in his State of the State address, that you could eliminate all of public higher education and all the prisons and not begin to solve the 5 billion dollar issue and had someone put a microphone in front of me I would have said and the state subsidizes a student at the level of about 3,000 to 4,000 dollars apiece and a prisoner at the level of about 22,000 to 25,000 dollars apiece. So, will it affect the ’04 budget – I think the ’04 budget is going to be affected no matter what the bombast is, and at about the same level. I appreciate your comments too. You know the whole higher education community is concerned. All right?

S. Willis: I wanted to make just one very tiny, short comment which I meant to say in the Board of Trustees report and forgot since I’m doing it off the top of my head, but that is I wanted to
echo the President’s appreciation of the efforts of our Trustees. They are very, very impressive. They are on our side at least 100% and so I just wanted you to be aware of that.

**President Peters:** When it comes to things like sabbaticals and tenure and workload, it’s pretty remarkable.

**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:** All right, motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.