I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first action item is to adopt our agenda and I would like to substitute under New Business, VIII, A, which was a request for the Council to empower the Steering Committee to approve the Search Committee for the Athletic Director to substitute the actual proposal, composition of the Committee. I didn’t think I’d have time to get it done but I got it done so I would, without reservation, I’d like to substitute that.

All right, and we have a walk in item which is an addendum to Pat’s report, IBHE report, Faculty Advisory Committee, it’s an add-on. All right?

So, those are the two changes in the Agenda. Is there a motion to adopt? Second? Any discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have an Agenda.

The Agenda passed as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2004 MEETING

(Pages 3-6)

President Peters: On pages 3-6 following in your packet, we have the minutes of the March 17 meeting. I’ll call for additions and corrections? There’s something strange with Jerry Zar gone. Motion to approve the minutes of 17 of March? Second? All those in favor? Aye. It’s passed.
The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I want to talk a little bit today, I don’t have too much, and I want to talk about budget if I can find my notes. Yeah. But first let me talk about the elephant that’s in the room. I think everyone – and Barb wants to thank everyone – and how patient the community has been with us as we explore an option at the University of Tennessee which is unique and highly personal to us because of the years we spent there and it’s a very unique search. It has to be very open. Maybe that’s the way things ought to be. I certainly have nothing to hide. I’m very honored – actually, I’m very pleased to have been able to, in private conversations and not so private, talk about Northern Illinois University and I have not decided yet as I indicated in the Star whether I’m going to go for my interview which is sometime next week and Barb and I will sit down this weekend and our family will sit down and we’re taking this one step at a time. So, I just wanted to say I’ve been so overwhelmed by people who have, you know, expressed their support for me during this time and those who are encouraging me to leave. I love that part; I always love that part but I realize that would cause a little disruption in your life perhaps but, remember what I always say, an institution has a life of its own. It’s made up of many individuals. There is momentum here and it does not now, never will be dependent on one person. It’s dependent on you. That sounds like some kind of – don’t read anything into that – but I say that all the time. Remember that.

Okay, that said – we’re working. State budget issues. Let me give you a little perspective. You know we’re going into – Easter break is coming up with the legislators – I’ve talked to our legislators, actually today, I’ve talked to both of our people and got an update and they’re really doing a good job for us down there.

So here’s where we are right now. I want to talk a little bit about context and what’s slowing all this down. What’s slowing it down is revenue projections for ’04 and ’05. Otherwise, there’s no agreement on what the budget is; what the revenue is and you’ve got to have an agreement on revenue before you can make the budget, so there’s various figures being tossed out there. So there’s still – number one, there’s no final word from the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget on potential rescission for ’04. There is still no word about ’04. We know there is a deficit in the ’04 budget but there is no word to say don’t spend money, don’t spend everything that was appropriated and it’s getting – it’s getting down to the wire. We did reserve some money. We have emergencies and we’ve released much of that money. There’s very little left in that kitty and if we had a rescission, I don’t know what we’d do. We’d figure something out. Well no, I don’t think we could. We’d have a problem because we had to, you know, buy special equipment, special services, fix things, get some extra money into needed classes so – I can’t see right now – I can’t, and I know the other presidents in the state feel the same way – I have no idea how we would make the rescission. It’s getting very late in the game. That’s number one and it’s a little tricky. General revenues for the state are up 1.5 billion. But, most of that increase is due to federal revenue and transfer payments so thus when we have to take a closer look at the thing. Absent the federal funds increase, revenues are flat. Now, preliminarily ’05 general fund estimates are down for next year and you remember you’ve got something that
might roll over this year as well, are down between 500 million dollars and a billion dollars. The estimates are off that much from previous '05 estimates. So we have estimates from '05 to build a budget on – the Governor built a budget – but now those estimates are off between 500 million and a billion and that’s according to data from the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission as of March 31st ‘04 so that’s pretty apparent. You know, policy makers watch those estimates every month; they come out every month and so those are pretty fresh and they don’t have a lot of time before they start building this budget. Now, as I said before, budget negotiations cannot start in earnest on the '04 state budget until the General Assembly and the Governor agree on the revenue estimate for '05. So, if you can’t agree whether it’s off a half million or a billion, you’ve got to agree on that so then you can build the '05 budget. So, that – we estimate that to occur in late April which is about the time of the next revenue forecasting update. That’s a guess but there’s a lot of analysis behind that but it’s still a guess. We think by the end of April. Now you know our hearings in the House are on April 22 and then I think I think April 27th is the Senate – 29th – okay, so that’s coming up and so even then we’re not sure but we’ll be getting, you know, obviously all of higher education is beginning to make the case and as I always tell you, timing is everything and, you know, as you move toward that May 1st date, that’s when we’re really going to start making the case and there’s some activity going on right now. I sense there’s at least, for the first time in really three years, I’m beginning to pick up that the legislature is very concerned about the damage that has been done to higher education. I can feel that. Whether they can do anything about it if we have a billion dollar shortage, I don’t know but I can feel it. So I think – we will continue to make the case with vigor and build to a crescendo and we’ll be asking students to help and faculty and they have been and the staff have been down rallying and all that helps definitely, but timing is everything. All right, so once that revenue estimate for '05 is decided, then the state budget, including our university budgets will be negotiated in May. So that’s really when you start putting – so late April/May is when we’re going to focus our efforts. We are now but that’s when it builds to a more public stage. I don’t anticipate that this thing is going to be resolved until Memorial Day weekend. Okay, so we’re going to start as we always do this time of year, updates on the website. You know where to look for those and as budget negotiations begin in earnest, check that website for that budget link, you know, as we move toward late April and May and I probably will be writing all-campus e-mails when I get frustrated in the evening from the Hilton Hotel. But you know I only do it when I have something to say because I don’t, you know, when you see one from me, you know you’d better take a look at it because I’m imparting some wisdom or frustration or whatever. We’re still waiting. The Governor’s now has pushed back announcements on capital. I know that reading in the Star, they did a pretty good job of reporting on that. In the higher ed capital budget, there wasn’t much for higher ed at all. The Governor is going to announce some capital or some economic development items through his new program about economic development zones and we are kind of in two. One is the state-line area that goes from here north and west and you know, remember under that program we got half a million dollars in recruiting funds for delivering business programs in Rockford. Well, then we also in Cook County Enterprise – Economic Zone and that’s huge and the Governor has reserved, for all of these eleven zones, 100 million dollars in capital funds and we’re working and hoping that some of our projects may pop up there but everybody else is also working and hoping. There’s a lot more need than 100 million dollars. That would be basically for job creation type activities. All right, so that’s everything that’s hit the print. I talked to Bob Pritchard today and Brad Burzynski and some of the people up north and, you know, they’re breaking now for Easter and they’re working and
we’re working in tandem.

All right, how about some good news for a change? Federal budget. Every six years the Congress authorizes a new transportation plan for the country, the Federal Highway Bill. It sunsets every five years. It’s huge; it’s paid for by highway earmarked funds and, you know, it’s large. Over the last two and a half plus years, Kathy Buettner and I have been really working hard on a routine basis – really over three years now – with Speaker Hastert and Congressman Lipinski from Chicago who is on Transportation Appropriations. He’s a wonderful guy on baseball. He knows more about the 1954 Cleveland Indians than I do and I thought I was the world’s leading expert on the 1954 Cleveland Indians but he knows more than I do. At any rate, and other members of the Illinois delegation have been working hard to obtain funds for road and infrastructure for the eventual development of our west campus. Really, the west campus begins after the Convocation Center – where John Deere is then it keeps on going 200-plus acres – west of the Convocation Center. That’s marked for future development to be determined. We have a few ideas. You see the Family Violence Center is out there. At any rate, the Transportation Bill has been subjected to literally hundreds of hours of negotiations – maybe you’ve been reading about it in the paper – over the past several years. I mean they negotiate this thing over two or three or four years. It’s now just passed the House of Representatives in Washington last week and – you may have read this in the last few days in the paper – somebody did some good journalistic work. The legislation contains 14.4 million dollars in road funding for the development of a road system on the west campus. That’s pretty huge. It means that our development and infrastructure is set for the next thirty-five years because we’re ready to go. These funds will be spent, however, over the next six-year period because it’s a six-year bill so we will get allotments now – no cigar yet because the House and the Senate must negotiate one more time to draft a conference report for the nation’s road plan in late April and this is the time when you, you know, keep your powder dry and you keep calling. I’m hopeful that our road will remain in the final conference report that will be passed and sent to the President for his signature and, of course – President Bush because of the total size of that bill which is at 300 billion dollars – it’s huge. He’s threatening a veto. So, these roads again will form the basis upon which the university can start the development and don’t anything. You know, but it’s a start and this is not only a start; this is a huge start because without roads you can’t do anything. It will be a range of things we can only dream about and I’m very, very – once again very happy about the support this university gets from the Illinois delegation and obviously particularly Speaker Hastert and also Congressman Lipinski who is a great friend of the university and also other members of the delegation and on the Senate side, our two senators have to help us now in the conference. I just want to depart here and have another president make an announcement and that’s Shaun. Where’s Shaun? Are you here? Okay, you have an announcement to make and an introduction.

**S. Crisler:** For those who are interested and always staying abreast of student issues, I wanted you to know this past week the SA had its executive elections and what I’d like to do is take a moment to introduce the new President-Elect Craig Marcus and, if you can, stand up for us real quick and I would like to also introduce our next Student Trustee, Eric Johnson.

**President Peters:** Sir Eric Johnson, if you ever need anything please come and see me. What are your majors and years?
C. Marcus: I’m a junior in Communications.

President Peters: Junior, Communications. Lois Self will be happy.

E. Johnson: Junior, Political Science.

President Peters: Ah, junior, Political Science. Welcome. Glad to have you. Just one last thing. You know, we’re tracking any number of pieces of substantive legislation and the House Bill 4073 has a lot of interest among faculty, which was going to create a higher education commission, which would establish criteria for tenure for public university professors. That has been tabled by the sponsor. So, that – it’s been tabled by the sponsor. Those of you who are parliamentarians know what that means. Because usually you can’t find anybody the second with you. But, we’ll continue to watch that. The other thing is I gave some testimony in opposition to a bill that was going to amend the school code to create a separate panel – a teacher certification panel and it would have been – it would have greatly diminished the role of our Colleges of Education in the certification of teachers and this was not a very good thing. All of the public college deans testified against it and I testified against it on their behalf and basically on behalf of all Illinois presidents and chancellors and I’ve got a two-page statement on it and if anybody wants that, call Jo Abbott and you can get a copy of my testimony if you want to. I thank Chris Sorenson for helping tell me what to say. No, I knew what to say, didn’t I? I appreciate that very much.

Okay, with that are we ready to work? All right.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We have no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 7-9) and addendum – walk-in

President Peters: Reports from councils, Pat Henry? I’ll bet you have a lot.

P. Henry: Yes. You have in your packet, pages 7, 8 and 9, the report from the meeting was at Blackburn College on March 26, pretty far down state, and on the way to that, members of FAC, me and another guy from Northwestern plus the FAC Chair had sort of amateur hour at lobbying in Springfield and it was really very interesting and I must say that a good deal – I really want to thank Ken Zehnder who provided a lot of help and tips and stuff. Basically, it was a very bad time to go with the General Assembly in session. I think this was the day after the big higher education day so we were just sort of – this is behalf of the Faculty Advisory Council, not on behalf of our individual institutions. We wanted to go and basically make the case that indeed the IBHE’s budget was better than the Governor’s budget that cut 2% and that we were very concerned with the damage that was being done to higher education and it would be very hard to recover from this. That higher education is a vital resource. We also realize since we were
“preaching to the choir” that we asked individuals that we talked to if we could do anything to help better make the case for higher education. First of all, we need T-shirts guys. We need T-shirts that say “higher education – cheaper than prison”. Equally snappy because there were plenty of other people with T-shirts.

President Peters: It’s always a lot of fun following someone that says “save our prisons”.

P. Henry: You know, that’s why I say, we can tie it in there. We met with three people. One of the senators who actually represents the Northwestern – where Northwestern University is, Jeff Shoenberg, Representative Ricca Slone, who’s the Chair of Higher Education Appropriations Committee and Representative Kevin McCarthy who’s the Chair of the Higher Education Committee in the House. They were all supportive. One thing that was pointed out is that if we make a big fuss about objecting to line item budgets, this was not seen as helpful for NIU’s problem but we all seem to get tarred with the same brush. In particular, Representative Sloan suggested sending letters to express our concern to the Governor and to John Filan who’s Director of the Governor’s Office of management and Budget, with copies to Speaker Madigan, Senate President Emil Jones and herself expressing our concern and there’s some of this stuff that the FAC would like to do also is provide some talking points which are basically on page 9 here. So I think especially with issues that the state tax structure may be inadequate to our present needs. Those are the kind of things that I think it helps them make the case that other people are also saying and I would urge individual faculty members to consider doing that. One thing, and this is noted also at the top of page 9, if you do send letters to anybody, do not do it on official Northern Illinois University stationery and use your own stamp because otherwise there may be an ethics problem there. That I think was some of the things I think I came away with was the sense that they appreciated – that is to say obviously that we’re pretty busy – but, it is appreciated that faculty are sort of involved in this process and not just sort of sitting in isolation being crabby and on the same sort of idea that one of the things that came out of the meeting at Blackburn College and I’m not going to go into a lot of detail there because you’ll have a chance to read the report, but one of the things that has come up time and time again is that it really would be a good idea to have some sort of system of bringing members of the legislature on campus. Not just people who are representing our district, Representative Pritchard and Senator Burzynski, although they are valuable allies, but the group that we serve, the are of Illinois that we serve in Chicago and Rockford and Aurora also have representatives and senators and it would be, I think very useful to have some way of showing them what it is we do. I think there’s a lot of feeling that they don’t always understand all these productivity things that come up but I think – as I talked there and listened to various college presidents at various institutions – they all emphasized the fact that having brought people on campus just to show them around and see what’s going on, has always been a very positive experience. So I would urge members of this Council to consider maybe how to do that. I think someone in the Senate is also looking into that – Faculty Senate.

President Peters: Let me just say that we have a very, very active program where all those people are brought here in the summer and whatever we do, it should be a coordinated effort because what happens in politics is public officials come and they hear a certain thing and it may not be our message and so you know, as I always say, in the game process of government relations, you have to have – your message has to be clear, it has to have the facts that stand
behind it and everyone has to be on the same page and it has to be coordinated and it has to be timed. Otherwise, that great effort can be dissipated so, you know, that’s why we have the best government relations people in the state working here, Kathy Buettner and Ken Zehnder.

**P. Henry:** I just want to underscore that I think that what we – the interactions with students and faculty are both really important aspect of making that communication.

The other discussion that came up and here also I sort of would like to – this is in somewhat the same way – the – yeah, it was Illinois State University brought their senator to a Faculty Senate meeting. This might be something we might want to consider as well. I think again, it’s the information coordinated yes, but coming from several different channels is I think often a helpful thing and, of course, contacting alumni as well and speaking to the idea of being specific to the extent that we can find particular bills to say “yes, we like this” or “no, we don’t like this”. That’s very much an enhancement of our lobbying effort. In terms of the ---

**President Peters:** If I can stop you ---

**P. Henry:** Please do.

**President Peters:** Because this a moment – a moment for education. We have an active – we keep an active list of all bills that would have any impact on our core mission or in the professions whether it’s health care certification, teacher certification and we actively encourage people – we need people who can sometimes read this legislation – like if it’s teacher certification or something in public health – to read that legislation and then give us advice on it and then we take official university positions and so if a faculty member writes on a bill, the first thing that happens is they’re going to call us and what’s NIU’s official position so that you can really help us by letting us know about any bills you see out there that maybe needs some work one way or another but, you know, we’re pretty active with that so I would encourage that.

**P. Henry:** Where on the website – is that clearly noted?

**President Peters:** We keep that, you know, in a file. We don’t – we get a call and we tell people where we are on an issue.

**P. Henry:** But if people want to do this, what would be the ---

**President Peters:** Oh, if people want to do this, if they hear about it, just call Ken Zehnder or Kathy Buettner because we have an active tracking system. So if you hear about a bill, just call and we may have already analyzed the bill.

**P. Henry:** But if we’ve heard about a bill and we want to respond to it, would you want us to let ---

**President Peters:** Yeah, still because maybe we’ve already been to see three or four representatives on that and you may want to go with us.
P. Henry: Well, and again I’m not – I think from the Faculty Advisory Council’s is maintaining separate channels so that it’s not just the university but a more active faculty per se. Is that going to be a problem do you think?

President Peters: Well, the FAC doesn’t represent NIU or NIU faculty – I’m talking about NIU faculty, or students or staff that have an issue. Then we’ll get called immediately. What’s NIU’s position?

P. Henry: Okay. But again, if NIU faculty want to write a letter to their representative about a bill would it be wise for them to touch base first.

President Peters: It would be prudent because, you know, we’ve got people that that’s what they do for a living and they’re darn good at it and they can give context because in public policy, sometimes what you see is not really what’s going on.

P. Henry: Carrying on, the various committee meetings – or the various committees of the FAC have various activities going on that I’ll report on as information becomes available and, as I mentioned earlier, the Public Policy Committee is drafting this letter which is on page 9 bringing up certain issues that we consider important from the faculty’s standpoint and, as President Peter says, I think if run this pass the people here – we won’t be working at cross purposes but again, it does I think bare repeating that – we’ve heard this from the legislators as well – that hearing from different sides of the same subject is something that does sort of enrich the experience for them so it give them a better idea of some of the particulars.

Finally, my walk-in is sort of the latest hot-off-the-press item from the IBHE agenda, which is everybody’s favorite, the Higher Ed Productivity Committee. This is an excerpt which the website gives you the full agenda, but there is going to be a committee formed on April 13 and they’re going to be charged with the bullet points listed there – reviewing the match between each public university’s mission and the array of academic programs it offers; examining the nature and the scope of faculty work – focus, better understand and define faculty productivity, that’s good; scrutinize state level regulatory and other reporting requirements for ways to streamline the process, also good; explore current accountability measures at the state and campus levels to determine what works, what needs improvement, what can be eliminated, what might be added; prepare recommendations for the Board of Higher Education for consideration in the FY05 budget in the second stage of the study. So, this is just the preliminaries. The FAC has a response mostly emphasizing that one size does not fit all; that we really do have to focus on individual institution’s issues. They also bring up the matter that although we don’t have very good associations with PQP, at least it mentioned quality. This is PPA, which is Priorities, Productivity and Accountability. Quality isn’t in there anywhere. We kind of didn’t like that and that, indeed, it cannot be stressed too often that the reporting requirements should be streamlined and kept form adding to the pile of things that have to be done by administrative staff which there are charges of being too much administrative. Accountability measures are something that noone is trying to weasel out of but it really is important to keep in mind that reporting on accountability does require someone to do it and that takes money and time away from other things. So those are the points that we’re trying to make.
President Peters: That’s one to watch. Good. We have a question? Whose hand is that? Dean Kitterle?

F. Kitterle: Just one quick question on your report. That committee, is that just an internal committee to the IBHE or are there faculty members going to be on there?

P. Henry: There is going to be a member from the FAC, Ken Anderson who’s from the University of Illinois, who’s going to be a member of that committee. That’s as far as I know the window into the faculty, so yeah, but that’s another concern as well. But we do have one.

F. Kitterle: At least you might think about in making your responses back to the IBHE as a useful thing, that universities – and ours in particular – have benefited by peer influence on processes, procedures and recognition of criteria for excellence in education for things like the North Central and the Higher Learning Commission which seeks not to be judgments within and among themselves but to rather seek input from knowledgeable people who exist within the university.

P. Henry: Okay.

President Peters: Yes?

J. Acardo: Is there a student on that committee at all?

P. Henry: You know, I don’t know. There’s a student member of the IBHE. Kevin, do you know if there’s a student member on this committee? You’re not Kevin, I’m sorry, I keep making that mistake. I do not know.

President Peters: I think there’s one. There’s going to be a discussion of this Monday at the Illinois Council of Presidents and Chancellors and there is a discussion on Tuesday. The IBHE is meeting in Chicago at the Art Institute and so we’ll have a little more clarification then but ---

P. Henry: Do you know if there’s a student?

President Peters: All I know is there’s no quality. Okay. Does anybody read these minutes? Thank you Pat. Any other questions? Stay focused now. We have no reports from the BOT sub-committees correct? But we do have a Sue Willis report on the BOT.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – (page 9)

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe – report
E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

**S. Willis:** I have a brief report. The full Board met on the 18th of March and much of what they discussed as usual were items that were referred to them by the sub-committees and so many of these things you’ve already heard about but then are a few new items.

The report from the NIU Foundation – they are still doing well in both the total amount of donations and the number of people who are making donations are up. This bodes very well for the future.

For the fall, student fees are going up 6%. The part that was the health insurance and the bus contracts, both of which we have no control over and both of which went up 9%, so if you look at the part that we do have control over, that went up 3%, so the average is 6%. Room and board is going up 9%, which sounds like a lot, but if you look at room and board charges at the other state universities, ours are quite low so we’re still a bargain.

The sabbaticals for faculty and potentially for SPS – I don’t think there are any SPS applying for sabbaticals for this year. It was noted that there are fewer and fewer of these than usual which presumed is something to do with the budget on one end or the other or both. My theory is that there wasn’t enough money for someone to really go somewhere and couldn’t get a grant to be somewhere else and it could also be that departments can’t spare anybody. But that’s all speculation. We do know the numbers are down.

Let’s see, there are two bylaw changes which – both of which, the second one is very minor. The first one is moderately minor which says that any trustee can be a temporary member of one of the committees if they’re needed to make a quorum. So sometimes on these committees they have trouble making a quorum so this allows any trustee not on the committee who happens to be there to become a temporary member for that meeting making a quorum and that person can vote and then there was another change, bylaw change, also for first reading that sets up a system of vice-chairs of committees and also lets the chair appoint replacements for the vice-chair of the board and also the secretary if they leave before their terms are completed and a little cleaning up of language. Those are first readings, presumably will come back in June and then finally there was a resolution thanking Cary Groth for everything she has done for the university and she was very pleased by that.

**President Peters:** Good report. Questions?

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

**President Peters:** All right, John you have Academic Policy?

**J. Wolfskill:** No report.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – William Goldenberg, Chair – report

**President Peters:** Resources, Space and Budgets – William, are you here? Is there a written
report attached? No report then.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report

President Peters: Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor.

C. Minor: Short report.

President Peters: What?

C. Minor: Short report.

President Peters: Short report – we’ll be the judge of that Carole.

C. Minor: At your behest, after the last meeting I sent, with Donna’s help, a message to each College dean with a request to send feedback on the proposed grievance procedure from the Councils and Senates. I also sent a similar request for feedback to each member of the University Council. So far, we have received suggestions from two Colleges, Business and Engineering and two distinguished members of the Council. We will work with each of them and each other College or individual that makes a recommendation to the Committee to try to incorporate their suggestions into the procedure as is possible. Some of the suggestions we received are very easy to deal with. They only involve clarifications or language changes and others will require more work as they’re more comprehensive. I tried to respond to those who’ve made suggestions already and I apologize to those who I haven’t gotten back to. I’ve been out of town for a week and since I’ve been back, my e-mail has been attacked I think by a Microsoft product. I’m told that by the tech people. It happens to me about once every six months but I will get back to everybody and try to work with you to incorporate your suggestions. As a reminder, feedback is due back to the Committee, to me, via e-mail on Monday the 12th and on the evening of Monday the 12th, I will send all of that feedback to the Committee members and hope they will review it before the Committee meeting on Wednesday the 14th at 3:00. We’re looking forward to the future suggestions.

President Peters: All right. Okay, you followed up nice on that ---

C. Minor: Short report.

President Peters: It was short. All right? Dean Kafer?

H. Kafer: I would just like to recommend for the record that I know the issue of expediency was raised at last Council. I think there are enough conceptual concerns about the document that we ought not to rush forward with it and feel as though it has to be brought to closure this semester. I’ve continued to review it on my own and so I’m sort of speaking personally and not for the College, Senate or Council at this moment but I’ve got some additional things that I’ll send to you that I think are more conceptual than just housekeeping and this is a very, very important document for the institution and I think we shouldn’t rush it until we’re all really
comfortable that it’s going to serve all of the constituencies that it represents in the best possible fashion.

**S. Willis:** If I could just address that briefly. I agree that we should not rush something into place, which we know has serious flaws in it. I think that needs to be balanced with the need to get something in place eventually because the procedures that we have in place now, particularly towards staff, are really incomplete so I would say, you know, we will go until it looks like there’s no big deal that’s going on with it but that, you know, if you want to wait until it’s perfect, it’s never going to be perfect so at some point you have to say “okay, it’s good enough and if we have some things later, we’ll change it”.

**H. Kafer:** I guess just having said that the Committee at some point is going to come back with a re-write and I think we ought to have enough time to look at the re-write and think about it. You know the difference between getting it done this semester and perhaps early into the fall I don’t think is going to be a huge impact on the institution.

**S. Willis:** I would just not like to see it drag on for a year. It’s been four years already.

**President Peters:** We’ll take Bill and then Fred.

**B. Tolhurst:** I agree that expediency is a good thing, especially because I’m a chair of the current grievance committee and will be out of that job once this is in place but if there are really fundamental problems with this draft, I mean really fundamental problems, then it would seem to me that we might have to reconvene a task force to do it over. I hope that doesn’t happen; I hope this is a reasonable structure within which we can make some revisions to make it appropriate. But if there are really, really major structural problems with this I really wonder if it’s proper for the Rules and Governance Committee to try to tinker with it to get it in shape. I think we need to keep that in mind as well.

**President Peters:** Frederick and then Carole.

**F. Kitterle:** I would just like to say that again, as I had mentioned last time, is that I think there has been an awful lot of hard work in an attempt to come up a unified grievance procedure. That is not an easy process and I think it is a testament to the quality of the work that was done. Nevertheless, this is an institution that depends critically upon integrity and that integrity is manifested in things such as academic freedom. And grievances leveled at academic freedom without sort of looking criteria, without looking at careful definitions, can drastically harm this institution and we could become fodder for the front page of the *Chronicle of Higher Education.* This is an institution that is still seeking the highest level and I think that we need to be very, very careful that we do not do anything to damage this institution at a critical time in its development towards really institutional greatness. We are a Carnegie Research Extensive Institution and we have been one without blemishes and let’s hope that we have policies and procedures that unfold in such a way that do not damage that.

**President Peters:** Carole?
C. Minor: I agree that we need to balance expediency and comprehensiveness and responsibility to the institution and for that reason, I urge you that if you have suggestions about this policy; if you have concerns, to please send them to me in writing and send them to me by Monday so that the Committee can make a responsible decision about what needs to be done.

S. Willis: Could I just make a comment? The revised procedure that we’re considering is going to enforce parts – Articles II and III – I’m sorry, part – yeah, Articles II and III, Bylaw 10 which is the existing grievance procedure for faculty. It includes a bunch of other stuff as well but Article I of Bylaw Number 10 is the academic – well it covers violations of academic freedom. We’re not changing that. It may be that it needs to be changed, but that’s not relevant to this particular document.

President Peters: All right Carole. Thank you Carole.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

President Peters: Richard Orem, University Affairs.

R. Orem: No report.

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

President Peters: Deborah Smith-Shank, our Election officer.

D. Smith-Shank: No report.

President Peters: No report.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any Unfinished Business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Search Committee composition for Director of Intercollegiate Athletics – walk-in

President Peters: Walk-in item – I guess that’s my item. If you turn to the back of the Pat walk-in, you have my walk-in that I was able to complete this process. Let me tell you how I came about this. When we knew Cary was leaving, I started to do a research project and I went back and I read the files and Mike Korcek from Sports Information provided me with his files which were much more interesting than previous presidents’ files and I read ’87 and how the search committee – you know, from beginning to end – and ’94 and so I had a good feel for what, you know, happened and I will say the Athletic Department is much different today than it was in ’94 and very, very much different than ’87. Very interesting history if you want to read it. So then what I did was I spent two weeks and I offered every member of the athletic staff a chance to talk to me privately in 15 minute meetings or in group meetings if that wasn’t
convenient and I think probably everybody who wanted to, and that must be about everybody, talked to me and we focused on the future and I wanted to know characteristics of the Athletic Director, what are we looking for, what do we need and I wanted to get some recommendations for a committee and process and I wanted to get recommendations on an interim director and, of course, we’re very, very lucky to have George Shur available and he’s working already and that’s going to make the transition seamless. I mean, we’ve not missed a beat because we’ve got a lot of scheduling issues and other issues and George was on the Athletic Board for twenty years and I think he was involved in all the timeline issues so he’s just a great choice and then based on that, I did two things. I developed this process which I’ll go over in a minute and also I decided we needed a consulting firm to do two things. One was to quickly come in and talk to the same people and others and do a little analysis of where we are in the athletics program and make some suggestions so that as we go out and do a job description, we would have some pretty good information. This is not an uncommon approach as I understand it for athletic directors. Then the second part of the request – proposal, would be a search firm and you really do need a search firm to do this sort of thing. This is not a – these processes are not long – athletic director search can take as less – as soon as eight weeks. Ours is going to be a little longer than that. We expect to have someone on board – I said July 1; it may be more August or September. Anyway, I feel that we’re – with that I then went back and I tried to put together an advisory committee that was representative of all the constituents and that would be able to serve us well as we try to run our national search to get our next athletic director. Also, because I’m involved in this, I’m cognizant of NCAA standards and that’s why – we might as well get into this – I’ll run through it if you want. Number A – the President and really the Chair of our Board wants to be involved in the sense of knowing what’s happening – not involved in the sense – but, and that really does fit the control issue for the NCAA and I want to be involved because ultimately I have to make the choice.

So, here we go. We’re going to appoint a chair of the committee who will be an academic administrator serving at the level of vice-provost or above who has a record of substantial interaction, an administrator familiar with the athletic program and Gip Seaver chaired it the last time and did a good job and I’d like to ask him to do it again and he knows the process and we’re going to have a search firm so a lot of the work will be done and he’s well respected and he has – I made him an offer, or I will make him an offer if you approve this, that he can’t refuse. One Athletics Board representative selected in consultation with the Chair of the Athletics Board and I’ve been to seen them; I’ve talked to them. One faculty member selected in consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate. We’ll have to do that if this is approved. One student member selected in consultation with the Student Association and you can all arm wrestle about who the president is. Two coaches, one representing men’s the other women’s athletics selected by the President. We have some really good coaches. Two student athletes, representing men’s and women’s sports respectively selected in consultation with the President of the Student Association. That’s important – to me that’s very important to get the student athlete’s view on this. One senior diversity officer selected by the President in consultation with the Affirmative Action Officer. One senior member of the Development Administration selected by the President. It’s very clear from everything I’ve analyzed that we need a – one of the characteristics is someone who’s a fundraiser and a marketer. This we need. We need to raise funds for athletics that are outside our normal revenue streams. One senior member of the administration representing areas that interact with Intercollegiate Athletics selected by the
President in consultation with the Executive Vice-Presidents and one community member who is involved with Athletics’ fund raising and leadership selected by the President in consultation with the development area. So that’s a twelve-member committee. I know it’s an even committee and you’re not supposed to do even committees and I would have preferred an eight-person committee but it’s just not possible. The selection, when you select these people, it will cross cut across employee categories and, you know, diversity. We’ll have a very diverse committee and one that’s representative, a microcosm of the total university with an emphasis on those people who do athletics and I may – maybe there’s a gap here and I’d like to reserve the right to appoint another member if we’ve made a mistake. This is going to the committee work is going to be May, June so I warned you about that. So with that, I will seek approval for this process and this configuration of the search committee. All right, it’s been moved and seconded. Discussion? Yeah?

B. Espe: I agree from the employee categories there’s a cross especially for SPS and faculty. I am concerned from operating staff. The only place where I see where they might be able to have a member is on the Athletic Board representative if they were to be chosen there but I don’t see any other place where they may be able to. Would that be correct? Is that correct? Just to keep that in mind.

President Peters: I’ll definitely keep that in mind. I intended to have operating staff representation. Maybe it won’t fit and that’s why I would reserve the right to add that kind of thing. Glad you brought that up but I intended to cut across the operating staff. Any other comments/questions? All right, if anybody wants to serve, well let’s vote. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? If anybody wants to serve or has some nominees, get them to me by e-mail quick.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: All right, anything for the good of the order?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Motion to adjourn?
The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.