I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first item, Roman II, is the Adoption of the Agenda for today. Is there a motion to adopt? Second? All in favor say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The Agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 1, 2002 MEETING

President Peters: Now Roman III, before I call for a motion to approve the minutes of May 1, 2002 our Executive Secretary would like to comment in general about minutes.

S. Willis: Okay, yes, thank you. You may have noticed that your packet is a lot thinner than it used to be. Basically, this is a budget cut. You may also have noticed that the cookies are a lot smaller as well. We’ve downsized both our packets and cookies because of the budget. In any case, what I am doing now with the minutes is a couple of things. I have written in here - what you see on pages 3-5 are actual minutes in the sense of being a recording of the actions of the body. We will still be making transcripts as we have in the past. The transcripts will still be available there on the web. The only difference is that the minutes will be – these minutes will be created and we will not be copying the transcripts and handing them out to everybody on pieces of paper. So the transcripts will still exist, it’s just that they will be on the web so that you can look at them there. It is my intention to have them available about a week before the meeting so that when you get your packet with these minutes in it, you can go and look at the transcript and see if you have any comments and so on and so forth.

President Peters: All right, does anyone want to – it would be appropriate if anyone wants to ask any questions or applaud or shout or – I think it’s a great move. We are now in the 21st century. All right, now I will call for a motion to approve the minutes of May 1, 2002. Second? Any additions or corrections? One correction.

S. Willis: By the way, this is a good opportunity. We are still making transcripts so would you please make sure that when you speak that you use a microphone because otherwise your statements will not be on a tape and I cannot extract them into the minutes. The other thing is will you please state your name because otherwise we don’t know who you are on the tape.
M. Spires: Michael Spires, SPS ex-officio. On page 1, under Roman IV, the paragraph beginning with the words “the budget” the third line says we must be careful not to “with it in ways”. There seems to have been something left out. I don’t know what it is we’re supposed to be careful not to do.

S. Willis: This sentence no verb.

A. Kaplan: Deal.

President Peters: Does anybody have any suggestions?

A. Kaplan: I think deal. Deal with it.

President Peters: Deal with it. All right. We’ll accept that? Revisions or corrections? Now, all for approval say aye. Opposed? They are approved as corrected.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: All right, President’s Announcements, let me – well, first let me welcome everyone back. It’s difficult to be cheery on 9/11 but, nonetheless, I am glad to see you all back and welcome to all of our new members. We have had a difficult year last year and we anticipate challenges this year as well but we came through in fine form by and large last year and we will do so again. So new members, particularly the students, a lot of good work is done in this Council. Now I am going to just try to give a brief kind of update about the things that have been happening and I’m going to reserve my more detailed comments about the state of the university for my address. The annual State of the University Address will be held Thursday, October 3, 3:00 p.m. in the Sandburg Auditorium. That’s where we normally hold it and I will have a lot to say at that point about the direction and the dreams of the University at a time of crisis and the plans we have, the options we have and the critical choices that face us because, as you know, there will be some difficult times ahead but then again, it’s not as if we’re alone in this situation.

Let me just touch upon a few things. The budgeting process last year for FY03, the appropriated budget – the state budget, that whole process was difficult on all of us because our budget was reduced. It was first reduced, the FY02 budget was reduced by rescission so we couldn’t spend all the money we were appropriated last year, in that fiscal year, and then as we set the FY03 budget, we were reduced by about 7.4 million dollars and add to that, we had mandated expenses and increases in utilities that were about $5.8 million. So we had to make about a 13.1 million dollar adjustment in our base budget and we did that and we did it according to the principles that I laid out. It wasn’t perfect. There are always anomalies in that you don’t cut that much money out of a budget without having anomalies but to the best of my knowledge because of the budget cut, very few, if any, people were laid off. We have as best we can, maintained our instructional power and FTE and I’ll talk a little bit about the impact of the budget cuts in a minute but we, the University, understood last year at this time it was going into a tough time.
We made adjustments. We were very, very careful in our spending and it paid off. There are some other state institutions that didn’t budget the way we did and there were a lot of lay-offs and reduction in staff power but we did not do that. One reason we didn’t do that and I didn’t think that was necessary – number two, our indications were that we expecting an increase in enrollment and the students had to be accommodated. So, at any rate we – there are ripple effects to all of that.

Well, before I get into that, we did receive from the state 4 million dollars for furniture and fixtures for Barsema Hall, which was a match for the 20 million dollar private gift from Dennis Barsema. That came through. The furniture had been purchased on that hope. We were nervous, but we got the money and paid the bills and the furniture is there and if you get a chance, non-business faculty and students, walk through Barsema Hall. Just what a wonderful thing that is. I’ll talk about that in a minute. We also received a 5 million dollar appropriation to complete, begin the completion, of the significant alternations and renovation in Altgeld Hall and that is much appreciated and I’ll say more about that in a minute.

I won’t say much about the federal budget agenda. Every year we get monies that are in the federal budget that are not research and development money but money that we propose to Congress and to members of the Illinois delegation and they help us out. We are going to, at some point this fall, we will be announcing some of those appropriations and you will be pleased. I can’t say much more than that because the representatives involved always like to come to campus and make those announcements but there’s always a lag. We got those last year. We haven’t announced them yet and we’re working on this year’s already and that will happen in October. Although the federal budget is getting a bit difficult because of the war on terrorism, homeland security and some other things that are – revenues – that are impacting the federal budget so we won’t know on that. I think there may be a ray of hope in those announcements for us.

We were able to do a lot of reallocation, within the context of that budget, our approach was to take as much as we could centrally and reallocate toward instruction and this year programmed really out of income about a million extra dollars to take care of the students plus we reallocated within Arts and Sciences, I believe Ivan, about three-quarters of a million dollars for instruction. Nonetheless, I’m not going to paint too rosy a picture on that because in my long experience, nine budget cuts, there are always ripple effects no matter what you do. Student services will be hurt. That’s advising and counseling positions that may go vacant. Technology positions will be delayed and have been delayed and we work in a technology-rich environment. A university that is not – you don’t necessarily have to be on the cutting edge or the bleeding edge – but if you’re not up-to-date with modern technology, you will soon lose your edge to other educational institutions and that is very expensive.

By the way, you can trace the – those are always classified as administrative positions. You have to be very, very careful when you talk about administrative growth as to where that growth is. At least that’s my experience in higher education. We did have a retirement – we had a lot of retirements so we were able to take the retirement dividend I call it, maybe that’s a perversion of the term, but the difference between an entry-level salary and a retirement salary and that by and large went to the budget reduction. That’s unfortunate. Universities normally do not replace
senior people with senior people. As a matter of fact and I think, Ivan I don’t want to speak for you, but I think we are of the same mind from our institutions that you rarely do that because you want to replenish the professorate from professors that are coming out of the best post-doctoral experiences and so forth. Once in a while you will hire senior people for a specific purpose and then what you do with that retirement savings is invest in new programs and operating and enhance the campus but he had to use the retirement differential for budget cut.

We have delayed many deferred maintenance issues and, you know, if you were around this summer, if you think the dirt’s flying now, in the middle of July I didn’t know, Dr. Williams, if we’d get the campus together because there’s so much construction and renovation going on. On top of that, we are committed to deferred maintenance. We have buildings that need upkeep and roads and bridges and ADA compliance. Not just ADA compliance but making the campus friendly for physically challenged and handicapped people. Minor classroom renovations, the simple stuff like new table and chairs, not to mention smart classrooms. We are on a very good upward trend in introducing smart classrooms. Well, we’ll not stop that totally but we’ve deferred a lot of it and cut back and so, you know, only the bridge that really needs repairing is going to get repaired and only the road where your Volkswagen disappears is going to get repaired. That’s the way it will be this year. You know, we have a lot of aging computers and equipment that needs replacing. It’s interesting, when I came in June of 2000 they gave me a new computer and that’s fine with me because I’m basically – I’m not crunching numbers or – but I am crunching e-mails, 150 a day. I guess my technology is out of date now. You know, it’s three years old; its half-life is over but I’m not replacing my computer. There are computers that are much older than that that need replacing. We’ll have to hold on that.

There are other externalities of this and ripple effects that go to heroic efforts and self-sacrifice and it’s on the part of the faculty and staff. Many classes are either marginally larger or significantly larger, with sections consolidated in a larger lecture format. The curriculum has been focused toward core competencies so that means the curriculum isn’t as rich as it might be in any given semester or year. There’s had to be flexibility across semesters. I mean, students are getting full programs but they may not get it when they want at the time they want and the semester that they want. All of that, however, and I know there are tough stories out there, all of that is the result of an institution that has responded and cares but we must attend to it and watch it. I will have much more to say to this in both writing and in committee meetings and in the State of the University address. We have to turn - knock on wood, cross our fingers - the FY03 budget is intact. It may be that the state calls and says we need more. We’re hoping not. We’re hoping that that’s it but we are in an election year and there’s not a lot of policy action going on but bills still have to be paid.

Now, let’s talk a little bit about FY04. There’s not much to talk about. This is way too early; we don’t know. It’s very ambiguous. I’ve seen revenue projections of about $830 million in state revenue more than last year and remember last year was way down. Those could be optimistic. I don’t know. It’s all about the economy and how it responds. Now, assuming higher education gets its fair share of that, we would be in for some increases, however, we do know that looming for the FY04 budget will be, because of the market and as it relates to the state university retirement system portfolio that pays the retirement and has to maintain certain margins, that the state will – someone will have to come up with about $65 million to get it to where it must be by
mandate. That has to come off the top in the higher education budget. Then there are other things that will be debated that are outside the basic operating budgets for universities and community colleges and so forth and that is – and one thing that is of concern broadly to students and to us – was that last year, the 5th year of the MAP money was eliminated which – that number is $38 million and there is some sentiment to put that back. Now if that goes off the top, you’ve got 65 plus 38 and then you have increase in health care costs and how that will be allocated. Will it be allocated centrally by the state or passed down to the universities? So, you know, you’re quickly getting out of the normal increase we could expect. So, I just want to let you know that right from the top, it’s not going to be the best budget year but we’re hoping for not a budget cut year and we’ll have to wait and see what happens.

We have sent in our preliminary requests and our priorities are good but our top priority is our salary package and we have already indicated to the IBHE who was here yesterday for their first budget meeting – they have to prepare a discussion budget by November 1 – I let them know in no uncertain terms that salaries were my top priority. As far as capital requests for this year, that’s buildings, and remember, and this is awfully hard for particularly people new to this like students and so forth, that there is appropriated capital requests and then there are things that we build from bond revenue or student fee money or when somebody like Dennis Barsema gives us 20 million dollars. I’m merely talking now about what we get from the state to fund new or renovated buildings. Our top capital priority is the renovation of Stevens Building. That is our top priority and we would like to get both the planning money, which is about a million and the whole project, all of it, right now. That’s $17 million. The right people have seen it last year. They’ve seen it this year. That’s our top priority and remember, we’re talking about a budget year where we’re not sure how much money there’s going to be but we’d like to think since bond rates are favorable that it’s wise for any state to invest in capital. It’s not like appropriated recurring dollars. Even in bad times, many states invest in capital because it helps the trades, it helps the economy and you’re borrowing money at low rates for the long term, paying it off with whatever. So, the second priority and again it’s unrealistic to expect us – we have eight or nine priorities – to expect too many of these but we’d like to get Stevens. The second priority is the renovation of Wirtz and some major electrical work associated with that and that end of the campus. You know Wirtz has been vacated by business and we’re moving in elements of other academic units and we’d like to – we’re not asking to completely renovate it but to spruce it up, to paint it up and make it pleasant. The third priority on our list is the request for a new Computer Science and Technology building. Our Computer Science and Technology units are very, very vibrant. They’re spread out all over and that building will have classrooms that we anticipate are very high tech. That has a price tag of about 26 million dollars. We have other priorities as well but those are the top three.

All right, let me quickly move to enrollment. Before I do enrollment, just let me say that Barsema Hall is now open and again, you should look at it if you have time. It’s great. That’s an amazing project. Why is it amazing? First of all, there were no state dollars at all in the basic construction. Twenty million dollars. The other amazing thing about it - from dream and concept to opening the doors, eighteen months. That’s unheard of and thanks to Eddie Williams and his group and our contractor, Pepper Construction, and all the architects, that is unheard of. On time, on budget. As a matter of fact, it was a little under budget and two months early. It’s amazing what you can do when you have 20 million dollars in the bank. I predict it will win
architectural prizes. It is just a great building. I was over there the other day, yesterday, with the IBHE people and they were amazed. It’s so good to see students studying down in the cafeteria and faculty and staff having such great office space and the technology is just super. So that’s done. I can’t tell you the monumental feelings I had when we opened the Convocation Center. We had over 5,000 people for the Huskie Bash and then we had a real crowd for Bill Cosby. That was fascinating to share this resource with the community and especially when he opened by saying it was the best convocation center arena like that that he’s ever been in that was built in a cornfield. He was funny. He did appreciate it. That landscape is changing out there and it’s really a great resource. Tonight we’re sharing it with the community because some of the local clergy, churches and firefighters are holding a community September 11 memorial in the Convocation Center. I don’t know how many people are going to come but we can accommodate more than any other place could have accommodated before that was built. Altgeld is moving along. It’s a very complex project but they’re picking up steam. It will probably be next year at this time when it will be completed. That is a capital development project.

Storm drainage – I want to talk a little bit about that because that’s a complicated system. Think of – get in an airplane and look down at the campus. Take an aerial view, and what are these lagoons all about? Well what it’s all about is the drainage of several thousands and thousands of acres of farmland to our west that moves into the creeks and so forth and it starts out by Stevenson and the dorms in the west lagoon, the Russo Lagoon that’s being excavated. Then it works its way through Watson Creek that we’ve had to clean because Neptune and Cole were flooding because of it and then it ends and has bridgework throughout all the streets and that’s still going on and then it ends in the East Lagoon and the East Lagoon is supposed to flood its banks if it’s working properly. The reason is for flood control, storm control, and to keep the water out of basements in the neighborhoods and it’s going to be very beautiful when it’s done. Right now it’s in a state of repair. But it works, it really works. When we had those heavy rains in August, it worked and so we’re – by the homecoming game the fences will be down by the East Lagoon and we’re waiting to be sure we get a good stand of grass. We tried four times to plant grass this summer and got washed out four times. I didn’t see the need to take the fences down until we had a good stand in the grass-growing time that we’re going through. Be patient. Now I must warn you, pay attention. We have to dismantle the so-called “kissing bench” and clean it, repair it and put it back. Kisses will be available on the bench at some time this year but you’ll have to find another place until then.

The other thing I want to mention is sometime in December our first fully funded federal project building, the Family Violence Center, or as somebody said yesterday, the Faculty Violence Center, the Family Violence Center will be completed and that’s thanks to Speaker Hastert.

So let me conclude again by saying that I intend to address the direction and the paths and the difficult choices facing NIU as we enter a very constrained state financial situation and a changing political and public climate for higher education and I’ll do that in my upcoming State of the University address. Meanwhile, please accept my thanks and the thanks of a grateful Board of Trustees for everything you did last year and everything you’ve done this year to accommodate the students.
We have two kinds of enrollment figures. We have official and final. The final are always more than the official and I don’t know what the final is going to be but the official figures are the following: We have 25,000 students of all types. Last year we had 24,000-some. That’s of this date. We’re up. That was the final figure. We’re up about 1,166 students. There’ll be a press release going out today. The freshman class is 3,032. Last year it was about 2,800. That’s a change of about 8%. I must admit the preliminary indications are that the quality is good and probably better in terms of the usual test score measures and high school rank. We are up about 5% on transfers, new transfers to 2,444. Other notable – we have 18,000 undergraduates, 6,500 graduate students, 330 law students. We’ve had an increase of about 30, 27 law students and that’s a national trend so we have accommodated those students. As I said, recently the rubber band is stretched as far as it’s going to stretch and we must have more state resources if we’re – and we’re pleased that students have made a smart choice, they’ve really made a very smart choice to study with us – who wouldn’t, and yet we have to be careful about that relationship between being able to serve those students in an adequate way and our state budget.

Okay, so with that I’m going to – this kind of segues into something and that is it’s the time of decade again to begin planning for our major North Central accrediting and I want to call upon Jan Rintala who is heading this all up to talk to us about that and what it’s going to mean. Where are you? Oh, there you are.

1. Jan Rintala will speak about the North Central accreditation process.

**J. Rintala:** Thank you, President Peters. I will only take just a few brief moments because I know you have other agenda items to take care of. For those of you who have not been at an institution when a regional accreditation was taking place, I did want to give you a little overview of the process. There is a one-sheet handout, I believe in your packets, that summarizes some of what I’m going to talk about. This particular accreditation is an institution-wide accreditation. I know many of you have been through discipline-specific accreditations in the past. This one focuses on the whole shootin’ match. Academic programs, student support services, campus life. Basically, if it has anything to do with NIU, it falls under the purview of the regional accrediting body.

The purposes of the self-study that will make up this re-accreditation process are really two-fold. Certainly one of the purposes is to make sure we get re-accredited. The accreditation is very important to institutions. It can impact availability and eligibility for federal funding. It can impact – many institutions require that in order for students to go on to graduate work they have graduated from accredited institutions so it becomes important for our students both in terms of their present activities and maybe future academic endeavors as well. So certainly demonstrating that we meet the criteria for accreditation is important. A second purpose, though, and I think one that is ultimately even more important for the institution, is it’s a self-study that can help guide us as we make long-range plans for the institution for the next several years. In order to accomplish both of those purposes, we have organized our report and our sub-committees by units that the organization, the institution, itself is organized by and if you take a look at the bottom half of that first page, the Steering Committee listed there, the center column has the chapters and the Steering Committee organizations. Mission and planning, undergraduate
programs, etc. By focusing on these somewhat functional units, we hope to aid in a long-range planning effort.

The report consists of a couple of major components. One is general institution requirements. There are 24 of these that are fairly objective things – do you have a mission statement, are you authorized to grant the degrees that you are granting, etc. The major part of the report is the five general criteria, fairly global but looking at whether we are consistent with our mission, whether we have the resources and the planning to make our mission occur and does it look like we’re going to continue to have the resources to meet our mission.

The President several months ago issued invitations to people to serve on the Steering Committee and you see those names before you. I see a few of those members here. Also, several of you have been asked to serve as resource persons and members of the sub-committees and I would like to publicly thank those of you who have agreed that already. Many others of you will be called upon by members of the sub-committees as they ask for information to help answer the questions and prepare the report and I’m hoping you will be very gracious with your time and energy in assisting them in this process.

Our schedule of planning here – this fall, the sub-committees will be primarily engaged in gathering their information and preparing the first draft of the self-study report. During the spring semester, drafts of that self-study report will be made widely available across campus for responses from various constituencies. I hope you will take an opportunity to look at those at that time and provide feedback to the sub-committees. As widely as we try to cast our nets, a small committee – it’s altogether possible they’ll miss an item or two and we’re going to hope that many of you will assist us in identifying some of those as well as helping us identify whether some of the analysis we’re doing is reflective of the wide variety of viewpoints we have on campus. In the summer the final report will be written and then next fall the final report will be reviewed and then sent off to our consultant evaluators in preparation for their visit in February of 2004.

The team that will be coming, probably in the neighborhood of ten people or so, is trained to be both evaluators and consultants in this process. They will be evaluating our institution in terms of its meeting the criteria for accreditation but they’re also going to be here as consultants as we identify some of the long-range plans and items we may wish to address in the future, they will also be able to take their perspectives from their own experience as well as from our report and perhaps provide some additional guidance for us in the long-range planning process. That closes the loop of both evaluation and long-range planning. So once again, if you have any questions about the process either now or later, please feel free to get in touch with me. Virginia Cassidy in the Provost’s office is also working very closely with me in this process. Between the two of us hopefully we can answer any questions you may have and, again, thank you for your involvement as the committee is asking for your assistance along the way. Any questions I can answer at this point?

**President Peters:** Questions for Jan? I want to thank the members of the Steering Committee who have agreed to do this. This is not a small task and of course it is an essential task because our re-accreditation depends on it. I doubt that our re-accreditation is in doubt, that’s the kind of
institution we are, but this is an opportunity. We have to show that we are credible and the other thing is that it’s an opportunity for us to use this as a planning, a strategic planning tool, a focusing tool for things we want to do and accomplish. We should make it worth our while. This morning I met with our NCA liaison to NIU, Cecelia Lopez, and she’s a remarkable person and is well know in the NCA as being very helpful so, all right? Thank you very, very much.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Now, without further ado, is there a motion to approve the five items on the Consent Agenda. Is there a second? All right, discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have a Consent Agenda.

A. Approval of University Council committees for 2002-2003

B. Approval of William Tolhurst to serve on the University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees – 2002-2005, and Paul Loubere to finish the term of Dan Griffiths, 2002-2004

C. Insurance issues: Cigna reimbursements; access to medical and dependent savings accounts – refer to University Affairs Committee

D. IRB issues – refer to Academic Policy Committee

E. Changes to Committees Book – refer to Rules and Governance Committee

The Consent Agenda was approved.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Let’s move to Roman VI quickly, Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees. Yes, just a minute.

S. Willis: Okay, I just wanted to say that as far as reports from councils and also with other items that are in the packets, anything which you see in your packet here which we have received electronically, we will be posting on the web along with the agendas and minutes so if you have a report in here, you don’t need to read it into the minutes, it will appear in the web version automatically as we have an electronic copy.

President Peters: Which means if you want to come and talk about something you have to look at the web and get prepared.

S. Willis: Well, we’ll put it in the packet here too but what it means is it won’t disappear after this, because if you look at past things we have the agenda and we have the minutes but we don’t have the rest of the packet in there. Now we will as long as we have it electronically.
President Peters: Okay. So, let’s move to Pat Henry, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

P. Henry: All right and just by way of introduction, the Faculty Advisory Council, what I’m reporting from, supposedly gives input to the IBHE and is trying to be a link between faculty and IBHE so I’ll be looking for input from you and I’ll try to provide some highlights and info back to you as I get it from the various FAC meetings. Also the FAC President goes to all the IBHE meetings and I will a report on things that he finds out at the IBHE meetings as well. The next meeting will be this Friday in Chicago and there will also be a joint meeting with the IBHE on October 1 at Kishwaukee College and so I’ll be reporting on both of those next time. This time I’ll highlight some points of the two meetings that we had last spring and point out that especially the May 31 meeting with Daniel LaVista, the new Executive Director of the IBHE, was highly informative. He’s very much stressing the importance of getting the legislature and the public educated concerning the needs and the value of investing state money in higher education and that’s something that is an ongoing concern for very good reasons. The other matters that were dealt at that meeting had one resolution that we advised or encouraged presidents of colleges and universities in Illinois to sign the Association of Colleges and Universities Presidents Campaign for the Advancement of Liberal Learning and I forwarded that on to President Peters and I believe you ---

President Peters: After consultation with Provost Legg, we see no reason not to sign that.

P. Henry: I think it’s essentially a symbolic gesture of support but a worthwhile one. I have also noted here for further interest if you want to find out exactly what President Peters signed, the actual text can be found at the website that I’ve listed there. Skipping quickly to the June 21 meeting, again, matters of budget were a concern. One thing that was mentioned by Deb Smitely who’s the Deputy Director for Budgets at IBHE was that the FY04 budget issues are probably going to include things like faculty productivity, accountability, accessibility and time to completion of degree which I think has become increasingly an issue especially as the fifth year MAP funds have gotten cut. Finally, the various committees, the Budget, Quality, Technology and Personnel Committee all had reports which you can read there but in particular, the Personnel Committee I want to draw your attention to. The addendum, which is on the next page over, lists several recommendations that came out of this report that the IBHE did last year on part-time and non-tenure track faculty called “All Faculty Matter” and these are the recommendations. Although the FAC had some problems with the overall rosy picture that was given by the report, it basically didn’t have a big problem with most of these recommendations although some of them are pretty broad and not all of them will apply to all universities. The IBHE directed there at the end - you see at the bottom of page 16 - that we’re supposed to establish plans that identify short-term and long-term goals, objectives and strategies for developing and making the best use of non-tenure track faculty and that we should transmit these plans to the Board by December 31. I’m not sure how strict that deadline is but I think the Faculty Senate was interested in getting some sort of thing going as far as working out this kind of plan and I think we should be aware of that.
Finally, the FAC chair, Kenneth Anderson, who attended the August 20 meeting of the IBHE has a short report there that I passed on concerning upcoming issues and in particular a major study of the affordability of higher education, matters dealing with the Illinois Commitment, the goals of the Illinois Commitment and a major focus on the study of faculty diversity and I believe Sue forwarded from me an e-mail about these hearings that are going to be held. The IBHE website which I’ve listed there is a very good place to go if you want to get a sense of what hearings and meetings are happening and what reports are coming out and ways of keeping track of this. Page 17 was passed on to me a couple of weeks ago. Again, the Executive Committee of the FAC met with the IBHE head and had a number of points that they wanted to make. Again, one of the things that keeps coming up repeatedly is the desire to keep control of the priorities, I mean, IBHE has – in dealing with the legislature – is trying to keep its perspective on higher education in general and funding in particular and on the need to communicate to the rest of the public concerning why we need all this money and I think that’s where – we’ll leave it at that.

**President Peters:** All right.

**P. Henry:** And I would be very interested in getting any feedback or questions about issues that you’re concerned with or you want me to bring up at these meetings as time goes on.

**President Peters:** All right, good report. How about comments, questions? We have a new Director of the Board of Higher Education and he was here yesterday. He’s a good fellow. He’s been a community college president and so he is eager to learn about the complexity of a major state research university and shows a willingness to do that. We helped him. Okay.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dan Griffiths – June 6, 2002 report (Page 18) and September 4, 2002 report – walk-in

**President Peters:** Okay, now let’s move to B, BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Dean Dan Griffiths.

**D. Griffiths:** I won’t say much about this except that it’s in the packet. The one thing that I think is important was the change in timing of reporting to the Board to give faculty more time to get the resource – that last sentence which is the underlined portion – I think it is a benefit to faculty to extend the time so that their latest research can be counted. I thank Provost Legg for initiating this.

**President Peters:** Everyone seems pleased with that. The Trustees were happy – were accommodating. My concern was that because the Board meets in June and faculty who are on nine-month appointments may be involved in research or other activities in the summer, that that informational thing would come after the academic year ends but we’ll have our ways of communicating directly. So I think we’re all right on that. Thank you. Any questions for Dan? All right, Bill Tolhurst, we have a walk-in.

**B. Tolhurst:** Yes, sorry we didn’t – the meeting was last week so it took a bit of time. I have perhaps less to report than Dean Griffiths. The Committee met on September 4 and endorsed and asked President Peters to recommend three collective bargaining agreements to the Board of
Trustees. It also endorsed and recommended that President Peters bring to the Board of Trustees two appointments, one of which was the current appointment of Dean Griffiths and the appointment of the Chair of the Department of Industrial Engineering. Both the other representative and I were quite impressed by Vice-Provost Wheeler’s presentation on the Pathways to Success Programs, particularly the success which CHANCE has enjoyed over the past few years. That pretty much covers it.

President Peters: Okay, welcome to your assignment. Are there any questions on that part of the report? All right, hearing none, let’s move to Sue Willis and Jim Lockard. I think Sue or Jim is going to give the report on Finance, Facilities and Operations?

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

S. Willis: Like the previous committee, that committee has met twice since our last meeting, once on the 6th of June and once on the 4th of September. Those reports are on pages 19 and 20 in your packet. Let’s see, at the June meeting, much of that you’ve already heard about – the budget, the Convocation – there was some budget authorization to furnish the Convocation Center and that sort of thing. The Family Violence Center which President Peters also mentioned already. One thing I thought was interesting is these performance contracts which were things that I was not familiar with. It’s a very clever way, as far as I can tell, for the University to realize benefits without spending money. I’m sure I’m going to mangle this, but if I say something totally opaque maybe Eddie can fix it but – essentially to get companies to come in, for example, with these chilled water distribution and cooling towers, we contract with a firm which provides this system at essentially no cost to us. They guarantee that the functioning of it, the operational and energy savings will more than pay for it once they’ve repaid their initial investment out of the savings so that what we would have paid, I guess, what we would have paid for energy we pay to them instead. So once they’ve recouped their initial investment any further savings we split with them. So, essentially we wind up paying what we would have paid anyway for energy and if there more savings we share that and we don’t have to pay for the things to be put in in the first place. So it’s a very interesting and favorable deal that we are able to do.

President Peters: It saves a lot of money when you pick the contractor well because then there’s incentive for both parties to be efficient.

S. Willis: Okay, and then at last week’s meeting, let’s see, the capital budget request, President Peters already discussed the first three items on there. The rest of them are probably not going to make through the IBHE filter anyway, but they’re on there. These things percolate up gradually over a period of years. Let me see, then there are a few other smaller things that we’re doing with bond money. The other thing that I thought was interesting here is the next to the last thing. Apparently, DeKalb County is now officially an urbanized area according to whatever government agency declares such things and needs to set up what’s called a “Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)” which has to do with planning of transportation and infrastructure and what have you so that’s something in which the university and the city expect to cooperate and collaborate and so this was an initial movement on the part of the Trustees to
participate with the city and the county on whatever boards and what-have-you need to be set up for that.

**President Peters:** All right, comments, questions? Yes, Patricia?

**P. Henry:** This is Patricia Henry. Would matters like the increased traffic on Lucinda Avenue be something that would be brought up in the context in such an organization?

**President Peters:** I’m going to let Eddie Williams handle that. I have an answer but I think he has a better one.

**E. Williams:** The answer to that question is yes. I think that whatever is an issue or an improvement relative to transportation in the region becomes a topic for that particular committee to review and make recommendations for. One of the key components of this legislation requires that any federal funds that are expended within the region must appear as a priority of the Planning Group and the Planning Group consists of the city of DeKalb, the city of Sycamore, the city of Cortland, the County of DeKalb and NIU under the resolution from our Board of Trustees would be also a member of that Planning Group so it’s a very important committee and all of the transportation issues within the region will be discussed through that Planning Committee.

**President Peters:** The Trustees are very strongly adamant about this inclusion. Any other questions?

**E. Williams:** Thank you Patricia.

**President Peters:** And thank you Sue.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Bev Espe – report

**President Peters:** Now let’s move to Roman VI, D, BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee, Judy Burgess and Bev Espe.

**J. Burgess:** The Committee met on May 28 and it was a very short meeting because there was not a quorum present so Chair Siegel announced that everything that needed to be voted on would be forwarded to the full Board without being voted on. There are two resolutions on the agenda. The Distinguished Service Award to Higher Education Award to be presented to Congressman Donald Manzullo and also to Commissioner Charles Rossotti of the Internal Revenue Service and they were because of the recognition of support for H.R. 3346 and they were to be presented in Rockford.

**President Peters:** They were.

**J. Burgess:** They were, okay. There’s talk of the budget which is all old news now and the one thing that Chair Siegel announced that I thought everybody might want to know was that all their meetings will be in Naperville from now on, so get ready for a long winter.
President Peters: Or Hoffman Estates.

J. Burgess: Oh, oh my.

President Peters: It’s Hoffman Estates.

J. Burgess: Thank you for correcting me. It is Hoffman Estates.

President Peters: So don’t go to Naperville.

J. Burgess: No, don’t go to Naperville. That’s the end of my report.

President Peters: All right. Comments, questions? If you remember, Congressman Manzullo and Commissioner Rossotti, really Congressman Manzullo, really lead the fight, involved us and Kathy Shinham and our group to help make some very good sense out of the tax credits that would relieve the burden of students and us from reporting. It was really a heroic thing and so we decided, our Board decided, to honor them. All right?

S. Willis: Okay, the full Board met on the 20th of June. Typically, this is the way their schedules work. You’ll have the sub-committees meet and then a couple of weeks later the full Board will meet. They consider all the items which were forwarded to them by the sub-committees and so much of what the Board did on the 20th, which report is on page 22, you can see the reports of the sub-committees on pages 19 and 20. There are just a couple of new items that came up at that meeting. They did election of their new offices, it’s the same officers but they shuffled their offices around a bit so I’ve listed that for you there. They approved the purchase of some property which is called the John Deere property on the west side of campus and they have, due to various federal regulations which are coming down about privacy and having to do with health information, they have designated a University Privacy Officer. This is not a new position by the way; this is just an existing person who gets another thing to do. So, I believe it’s Ken Davidson who is going to do that. Then the Student Trustee was thanked very warmly for his service on the Board. The Board will be meeting again next week so next time I’ll have another report.

President Peters: Questions? All right. Yes, Herb? Move the mike down to Professor Rubin.

H. Rubin: Herb Rubin. This is almost a procedural question. As we move to put the minutes in transcript form online, might we think what parts of these reports also could go that way so, you know, to differentiate the action parts of the reports from the informational parts? Because, you know, once we set it up so we’re all going online, a lot of this stuff we can get in the written part.
S. Willis: Yes, I’m not quite sure about the distinction that you’re making but, for example, the things that I wrote here on page 22 and 18 and 19 and all that would appear online. Is that what you mean?

H. Rubin: Yes, maybe in lieu of having them repeated orally.

S. Willis: Well, I think the idea here is just to point out things that might be of particular interest rather than going through the whole thing, so yes, we’re trying to restrain ourselves in discussing these wonderful things that we’ve written.

President Peters: All right. Okay, any other questions for Sue Willis on the BOT meeting? Let’s move to Committees.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters: Academic Policy Committee, John Wolfskill. There you are, John.

J. Wolfskill: I have no report since our committee was just constituted a few minutes ago. However, I do have a question. I’d like to ask in my ignorance or inexperience regarding the IRB issues, I’m referring to item D from the Consent Agenda. This point or body of issues was also referred to a committee of the Faculty Senate so I’d like to ask if there is a normal or standard protocol in dealing with that or coordinating the two committees.

S. Willis: I would say, often we do things in series where it would go first to the Senate Committee and then the Senate Committee would make a recommendation and then it would go to this body and then it would go to your Committee and that sort of thing. I wanted to get things moving on this rather more quickly than that, which can be quite glacial, and so I asked, with both the approval of both the Executive and Steering Committees to have it referred simultaneously to both Committees. So my hope and fervent wish is that you and the other Committee will either meet jointly or at least work together and communicate thoroughly what it is you’re doing. I don’t think there’s anything that precludes you from organizing that however it works best.

D. Griffiths: I can mention that this has been done in the past and I will be communicating with both Committees. I also want to say that when I was giving my report, I skipped over the very important area, the appointment of Dr. Christine Sorenson as Dean of the College of Education. I’m sorry I missed that. It was very well received.

S. Willis: Thank you, Dan.

President Peters: All right. So is that okay. So we have the technical question answered on the process of handling those sorts of matters. John, do you have anything else?

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Herb Rubin, Chair

President Peters: Resources, Space and Budgets Committee, Herb Rubin, welcome back.
**H. Rubin:** No report. Our first meeting will be next Wednesday at this time and will the students please e-mail me about who the student representative is? We picked the meeting time on the Wednesday on which no Faculty Senate or University Council activity is taking place.

**President Peters:** All right, so it sounds like we need a student – confirmation of a student rep on the Resource Committee.

**S. Willis:** We’re working on that.

**President Peters:** All right.

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

**President Peters:** Rules and Governance Committee, Susan.

**S. Mini:** No report.

**President Peters:** No report. Any questions? All right.

**I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Owen, Chair**

**President Peters:** Richard Owen, University Affairs Committee.

**R. Owen:** I have no report but I want to thank my colleague, John Wolfskill, for asking a similar question I was going to ask. I have been in touch with Jim Lockard who chairs the Faculty Senate Committee that’s also dealing with that same insurance issue so we’ll be discussing that. I did want to say to the members of the Committee if you could stop by here on your way out this afternoon so that we can talk about schedules and likewise we’ll need to know who the student member is going to be on that Committee.

**S. Willis:** If I could just horn in there again. That item, if you look at item C in the Consent Agenda, insurance issues is more of an informational item for us than it is an action item so I’m hoping that those two Committees will keep on top of what’s going on with those things but there isn’t necessarily anything we can do about them directly.

**H. Rubin:** Information?

**S. Willis:** We can gather information and we can keep it on file but I’m just saying – we can’t – and we can lobby and that kind of thing, but it’s a bit of different type of item than the IRB item is.

**H. Rubin:** Sure, it’s something we can’t vote on but on item two we’re watching differential treatment and item 2 in the household is exactly the same items and I suspect that if we had larger ends we would be coming up with all sorts of aberrations, which make very, very good publicity about the insurance.
President Peters: All right?

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

President Peters: So the last committee report is Elections and Legislative Oversight. Deborah Smith-Shank.

D. Smith-Shank: We have no report.

President Peters: Oh, there you are. No report. All right.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: At this time I call for items of Unfinished Business.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Budget, refreshments, and minutes.

President Peters: Let’s move into New Business. There is an item A, Budget, refreshments, and minutes. That is not mine.

S. Willis: That’s mine. I already spoke to this when we did the minutes so I’m not sure I have anything else to say about it, just to point out that the situation – well, one thing I did forget to say is that if you look at the list of Committees which you graciously already approved, I have reconstituted the Minutes Committee which has existed in the Committees Book but for the past several years has consisted entirely of Jerry Zar. Of course, he’s gone now, and now that we’re creating actual minutes instead of just editing transcripts, I have reformed the Minutes Committee and so I will take the take the transcript, write the minutes, send both to this Committee and get their consent before then sending it on to you for approval and I’m hoping that our budget can grow back a little more next year so we can have bigger cookies again.

President Peters: Does anyone have a comment on that? Okay.

B. Make the online version of the Committees Book the official one.

President Peters: B, Make the online version of the Committees Book the official one.

S. Willis: Okay, let me speak to this one also. One of the things that this body does is approves substantive changes to the Committees Book. We have things like this come up regularly throughout the year. Pre-web we would print up many millions of these and distribute them uniformly over the campus every fall and there’s a big push on the part, mostly of Donna or her predecessor, to get all the appropriate information so that this book could come out and be correct. Well, now we have the web. The Committees Book appears on the web and so what I am suggesting here is that rather than have the paper version be the official version, I would like
this body to consent to having the online version be the official version. We will continue to print the paper version in the fall as a convenience but if you want to know what’s the latest description of a committee or who’s on it, the most up-to-date revision will be on the web. So I would entertain a motion to that effect.

**H. Rubin:** I move that the online version of the Committee Book to be maintained by the – is it your office?

**S. Willis:** It’s my office, yes.

**H. Rubin:** Okay, be the official Committees Book.

**President Peters:** Is there a second? We have a second. Discussion?

**D. Griffiths:** I think it’s an excellent idea.

**President Peters:** Hearing no discussion, let’s vote. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We’re getting very electronic in a hurry.

The Committees Book online was approved to be the official copy.

**C. Receipt of Annual Reports**

**President Peters:** We have next a series of annual reports that are posted. Should we just handle questions to specific reports if there are questions? Yes, Dean Kitterle?

**F. Kitterle:** Two points on the report. First of all I want to in due deference to Jerry Zar, point out that number 6 is Faculty Personnel Advisor instead of Advisory.

**President Peters:** So noted.

**F. Kitterle:** Second has to do actually with that specific report and I don’t know how this is handled. On the second page of the report by Dr. Morris the first paragraph beginning “over the last year” it ends with the sentence there “are the advisor versus advocate and accompaniment issues”. These are the two fundamental issues that he reports are unresolved. It actually was the case that the advisor versus advocate was a motion that failed. So we have one thing that remains which is tabled which is the accompany issue but the issue of the Faculty Personnel Advisor being an advocate was voted down at the last Council meeting and it’s reported in here so all I’m saying is I don’t know how that letter, I mean the report, should read – maybe there should be an emendation that simply says that the advocate/advisor issue has been settled by University Council. I just don’t know how you handle that.

**President Peters:** Well, you make an assertion. That may not, in fact, be true. I don’t know – we’re going to have to ---
F. Kitterle: In here it says that in the report of, on page 5, of this it says “proposed Amendment #1, addition of language to the first paragraph, that the FPA may be an advocate” failed. In other words, that action in the last University Council, I mean, that was brought up along with a whole.

S. Willis: Actually, I think I may have to amend the minutes on that point because I was incorrect. I think we actually did not vote on that.

F. Kitterle: Oh yes we did. I thought we did and that failed. The one that we did not settle was – there were two things, the extension of the twelve-month appointment and also the other was the FPA cannot be precluded from accompanying the party assisted if requested. Those were the items that I recall in the last University Council.

S. Willis: Those were tabled.

F. Kitterle: Yes, tabled. That’s right.

S. Willis: The advocate part I think we never even brought up. Is that correct Susan?

S. Mini: The amendment was the word “may”. You divided that paragraph up into two different amendments and we voted on the word “the FPA may be an advocate” and we decided that “may” was what we struck and so we did not vote on the advocate component.

S. Willis: I will get that straight and correct the minutes as necessary.

M. Morris: I will be glad to amend the report upon being told by the – Sue, that in fact it was defeated. I was operating on the assumption that only the one word was and if I’m in error, I’ll gladly amend the report. There are other typos in the report too.

S. Willis: I believe you’re correct but let me go back and examine. I do have a copy of the transcript here but – it’s opaque.

President Peters: Let me suggest that we do some research and – the group in question, come into agreement about what happened and bring the report to comportment and then we have to come back and probably amend minutes or something.

S. Willis: I will take care of that.

President Peters: Want to do that next time? Is that reasonable?

S. Willis: I’m sorry. I apologize for the confusion.

H. Rubin: I would also suggest as we’re moving towards the electronic age that we need a portable with an internet connection since a lot of these records we’re referring to – we need to refer to all the time at a meeting – and we’re going to have increasing numbers of discussions like this. So, having reports online.
President Peters: We can all stay at home with a little video screen too.

H. Rubin: I don’t mean for individuals, I mean quite seriously for the reporters to have such a reference.

S. Willis: I have brought my own copy so I do have it available, which is cheaper than an internet connection.

President Peters: All right, so you know – I think it’s a pretty important matter that we need to get straightened out.

S. Willis: I’ll fix it.

P. Henry: In the same line, I think bringing the transcript to the meetings might be a good plan. Yes, so what did we say?

S. Willis: Do you really want it all? It’s pretty complicated.

President Peters: While she’s looking and maybe finding some clarification, are there other questions for any of these reports? All right, what do you want me to do, wait? Herb?

H. Rubin: I move receipt.

President Peters: What?

H. Rubin: I move to receive them.

President Peters: All right, there’s a motion to receive. We have to do that, don’t we? Is there a second? This is pending, of course, the correction to this – pending that, pending the work we’re doing on that report, all those in favor of receiving these reports say aye. Opposed? Okay

1. Academic Planning Council
2. Affirmative Action Diversity Resources Advisory Committee
3. Athletic Board
4. Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
5. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
6. Faculty Personnel Advisor – (Pages 23-24)
7. Graduate Council
8. Undergraduate Coordinating Council
9. University Assessment Panel
10. University Benefits Committee
11. University Council Personnel Committee
12. University Ombudsman

The reports were received with the possible amendment to #6.
D. Approval of title change: Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

President Peters: There is an item of New Business called Approval of title change: Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. That is – who brought that?

S. Willis: Ivan.

President Peters: Ivan brought that?

S. Willis: I have this here. Do you want to --- Okay, I’m looking at the transcript. The relevant thing is, change that says “the advisor’s role may include such activities as the following” and I believe the following did not include advocacy. The following – it was just the addition of the word “may”. So there was no advocate in there and there is a lot of discussion but it failed but what failed was adding the word “may” and not adding the word “advocate” so the final result is that there is no change to the description of the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s office in – wherever that is. I should be able to find that also. So the minutes are incorrect and we’ll correct them.

President Peters: All right.

B. Tolhurst: For future reference, we really don’t have in these minutes a full statement of the motion that was, in fact, voted on because the motion was a motion to amend certain language in certain ways and at that meeting we had the language as it originally stood and a clear indication of what would be changed and so we knew then exactly what we were voting on. I would think it would short-circuit a lot of unnecessary conversation if the full motion were included in the minutes so we knew what was actually voted on then, rather than having a brief characterization of it that could then be misunderstood.

S. Willis: I agree. You are absolutely right and I will add that. In fact, I will do that as soon as possible and e-mail you a corrected set of minutes which then we can formally approve at the next meeting.

President Peters: My suggestion is that we work this out before the next meeting and get all the parties involved so we have clarity as to what we’re actually discussing. Because, you know, we approved this and I don’t see the wisdom of prolonging this without some rethinking and getting everyone rethinking this situation. Okay? Now, back to Provost Legg.

I. Legg: This is for your consideration and input. The specific issue is a consideration of changing the Vice Provost of Research and Dean of the Graduate School title to Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. This is an issue that over the last year or so has come to my attention from various venues in the university. Quite a few people in one way or another have recommended to me that we might consider this possibility. I did discuss it with the Senate; presented it to the Senate last week and the Senate did favorably respond to the recommendation. It’s summarized for you on page 25 of your agenda and I would just like to highlight briefly the material in that – it’s brief enough almost that I could read it but I’ll just try to highlight it for you.
Over the years, NIU has grown into the category of what is commonly known as a research-based university in the United States. We are a member, or we are designated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, as a doctoral research extension institution. If you looked at the data that’s used for calculating this, we would even be in that classification in the old Carnegie Institute for Teaching categorization. We would be called a Research II University. We are also a member of the Universities Research Association, which is a very elite group of 88 universities consisting of the top known universities in the United States, both private and state institutions. In addition, we are very closely linked to major projects with Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory and the Argonne Laboratory. In fact, Jerry Blazey has recently been elected to be a major leader at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory and this is a real distinction for the University. We also have acquired major funding in various areas from the federal government and this again is recognized as a categorization that gives us this classification in the Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching. As a result of all this, it was without a doubt a clear case for becoming a member of NASULGC, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and this consists essentially of the major state research universities in the United States. I believe that this evolution of stature in the research committee warrants us considering changing the title from Vice Provost to Vice President for Research. It would underline our commitment to the importance of research in the mission of the University, the educational mission of the University. Indeed, Ernest Boyer who is one of the leading academics of our time. Ernest Boyer who was the former president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching underlined that research and scholarly activity of the faculty are at the core of our educational mission, our delivery to the students. If we do go ahead and change the title, we’re considering changing the title now, if we go ahead and consider the title change, it will give us definitely a greater presence in the research community in the major laboratories like Argonne and Fermi and in the federal government where we are constantly present in our efforts to raise support for the University through various grants and contracts.

Too, a by-product of this would be our ability to attract a top-notch nationally ranked person into this role. In fact, there has been a trend nationally now to go to this. The Vice Provost title has gone back. A number of institutions around the United States, Southern Illinois for example, have done it recently. I believe Indiana is another school to reclassify these as Vice Presidents for Research. The Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School would still report to my office; still report to me as the Executive Vice President and Provost and this person would be a member of the Provost’s staff as part of our meeting structure, the Dean’s Council as is the case now, but also would have input as a member of the President’s Cabinet. This person would still retain the title and function as the Dean of the Graduate School and I would be very interested in getting your input. As I pointed out to you, I had a discussion with the Senate about it and they did an informal vote on it and it was very strongly supportive.

President Peters: Okay. Professor Rubin?

H. Rubin: It sounds like you’re angry at me. When you call me Herb, you know I’m going to support it when you say Professor it means you know I’m going to disagree. You’re just like my mother. No, no she’s dead so --- I did offer some objections in terms of enhancement to the
administrative title last time but Provost Legg answered well. I am still, you know, if it was Vice President for Research I have less objection to it philosophically than the combined title. I know we have personnel problems but it seems to place the Dean of the Graduate School as number one among the deans and that bothers me. I mean, did the Council of Deans discuss it?

I. Legg: You mean by association?

H. Rubin: Excuse me?

I. Legg: By association with that title, is that what you’re saying?

H. Rubin: Well, yes, because now we have a dean with another title having direct access to the President and Council.

I. Legg: We had extensive – in fact, it was the deans who first recommended to me at a retreat we had that we consider doing this.

H. Rubin: Okay.

President Peters: Remember, my constitutional responsibility is for any new position at the dean or vice presidential level, I have to seek the concurrence of the Board of Trustees and even though this is only a title change, I feel compelled if I get a recommendation from the Provost on this, to seek their concurrence. So, basically this is an item of information and you have some sort of a indication from the Faculty Senate about this position and it’s brought to the attention of the Council so, that’s it?

I. Legg: That’s it.

President Peters: Okay, all right. We’ll keep you informed. All right, where are we? I think we’re about ---

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: All right, Comments and Questions from the Floor.

S. Willis: I have one. Just to point out to you, this is really an information item but I’m going to comment on it, on the backside of today’s handout is the alternate list. This will become more relevant probably later on in the year when our attendance seems to drop off but we have for a long time now struggled occasionally to reach a quorum. Let me point out to you that is – if you cannot come there is a procedure for getting someone to come in your place. It is on the back of that sheet so please, if you can’t come, please follow the appropriate procedure and find someone to come in your place. If you lose your sheet or you can’t remember what it is you’re supposed to do, you can call me, call Donna and we will be happy to assist you.

President Peters: Okay. Yes?
M. Larson: Mary Larson. Dan, I have a question for you. The change in the deadlines for tenure and promotion packages, when is that going to take effect?

D. Griffiths: I think it’s already taken effect.

M. Larson: For people who are going up now?

D. Griffiths: Yes.

M. Larson: Oh, good.

President Peters: All right. Dr. Williams?

E. Williams: I just wanted to make a comment. I observed that we have so many student members here today and maybe that’s usual, I don’t know, but it’s certainly impressive, and I wanted to commend the SA and Kevin and all of the students involved and I hope that you follow-up through the committees and I know you will.

President Peters: I might add that – Kevin Miller, raise your hand, Kevin, so everybody knows who you are – the SA President has been very effective with the legislature during the budget situation. He’s been a very good spokesman for students’ interests first and NIU combined with that. We appreciate what you did Kevin. Kevin, the President always has to have the mike.

K. Miller: Thank you. I do want to say just to the members of the Council we are committed to getting students out to all the committees this year. I’m working closely with my Chief of Staff, Kevin O’Kelly and Jennifer Camp. They’re the ones who deserve all the credit for such a large turnout as well as the students themselves who have come. If anyone contacts you requesting information, please try to help us out because we’re going to try to get everyone out here this year and do what we’re supposed to do.

President Peters: Herb?

H. Rubin: Yes.

President Peters: Give the mike back to him again. We ought to put that on a trolley.

H. Rubin: Maybe a question actually on your initial report because the way it was given with the wealth of information it really seemed inappropriate to ask questions then. We’ve recovered money from retirements because of the cutbacks. We’ve been basically in a flow of no-hiring position and student enrollment is up. What does that say about our ratios? Student/teacher ratios.

President Peters: Oh, I haven’t calculated that. But remember, well, you can do the statistics yourself. I would imagine we moved from our average of 1-20 to 1-21 or 22. I mean, that’s an armchair --- I think it’s a serious issue. I’m beating the drum. In my experience it’s always
difficult to get state resources for increased enrollment on the surface but we will make the case that we need new state resources to serve these students in an enriched programmatic way.

H. Rubin: I’m less sanguine than you – your job is to utter in public but I’m looking at the monthly data that the Department of Revenue is reporting that next year might be again, fairly awkward. Do we have any committees or anything looking into freezes in terms of student enrollment since the rubber band, you said is stretched as far as it can stretch.

President Peters: We’re always doing scenarios but I have never been a person for capping enrollment unless dire straits require it and I think it’s too early at this time to make that assessment and although we’re always planning – we had plans last year. Our approach has been more – and the Provost’s staff has been wonderful with admissions and the departments and that is to watch these things very, very carefully. Also, I am one who believes – why are we in business? I always, even though when I was at Tennessee we did cap enrollment, it proved to me to be a bitter thing and I think that the kernel of Northern Illinois University is service to the students and the young people of the state and that means admitting those who are prepared to succeed at this institution and its our job to find the resources to give them that quality education and that’s what I’m going to keep upper most in my mind. But we will watch very carefully as that rubber band gets too far – you can be sure of that.

D. Wagner: There are at least two ways of capping enrollment. One is arbitrarily cutting it off and the other would be raising entrance requirements and since even the Northern Star has called for raising entrance requirements, that at least should be considered as a way of maintaining.

President Peters: I reject raising admission standards to control enrollment. You raise admission standards because of the issue of quality.

D. Wagner: Well then maybe the whole question of raising standards should be considered.

President Peters: And it is being, I understand.

I. Legg: Yes, it is.

President Peters: Yes, it is being considered by various committees, particularly adding math as – another year of math as a requirement which I think makes eminent sense. All right? More? Move to adjourn.
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The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.