
L. Jennings attended for S. Clayton.  Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan also attended.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:  Barr, Becerra, Bisplinghoff, Crisler, Graf, Larson, Loubere, Peterson, Richmond

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters:  The first order of business is the adoption of today’s agenda. I believe we have a walk-in correction/addition?

S. Willis:  Yes, this was supposed to go on the agenda and in the packet and it went to the Steering Committee but somehow, in the last couple of weeks, it wandered away. So this is to go on the Consent Agenda to be referred to Rules and Governance. I just wanted to point out, in the second paragraph I have a typo. The first number in the second line of the second paragraph should be “51” not “15”. I also spelled SPS as SOS someplace but I figured you could figure that out yourselves.

President Peters:  All right, so this item will be inserted in the Consent Agenda and we’ll vote on that when we get to item V. All right, is there a motion to adopt the agenda for today? I hear a motion; is there a second? All right. All in favor of adopting the agenda as printed with an add-on for today, please say aye. Opposed? Abstain. We have an agenda.

The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2003 MEETING

(Pages 3-6)

President Peters:  On pages 3-6, we have the minutes of September 10. I’ll call for additions or corrections and give you a second? Motion to approve the minutes? Second? All those in
favor say aye.

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, I’m glad to be here today. I have not been here since the end of the game on Saturday. I’ve been flying around doing things so I’m not as prepared as I might be. I will say that I have spent time yesterday talking to policy makers at the IBHE meeting in Edwardsville, which is a very pretty campus. I’ve never been; it’s just a gorgeous 2400 acre campus near St. Louis. Pat will have more to say about the meeting from her perspective, but I spent time talking about the theme of my university address - that we really need to focus on how we are going to provide for this new wave of students that is coming. I’m not sure if I made any dent in terms of the policy makers because everyone is so focused on what the budget is going to be like next year - or this year - and were not necessarily in a frame of mind to hear that message. Yet I’m going to use that speech in several different formats to make the case in Springfield and in Washington and around the country about how we are going to accommodate all these students. I’ve been getting from alumni, interestingly, some interesting reactions. I want to make sure – sometimes in reporting, things get emphasized and other things get de-emphasized and I thought I was pretty clear both in the speech and in particularly in my comments that our line in the sand – I didn’t write that in the speech but that’s what I said – is we’ve got 25,300 students and I don’t know how, without additional state resources or resources of some sort, we could accommodate many more than that. Maybe that was too subtle. I think people got the message now that where the rubber hits the road is how do you implement such a policy if it comes to that. That’s why we have people working on that around the clock in the Provost’s Office and so forth. I just wanted to make sure people were really clear about that.

Okay, let me see, other things I wanted to announce. The other reason to go to the IBHE is to find out about the status of the budget and let me say there is no budget news, period. The Governor’s Office of Management and Budget has yet to formulate an FY05 plan. There is no news because the FY04 budget is still a question – is it in balance? So, building next year’s budget – no one is talking about that. There is a request, as you know, that we put into the IBHE. The IBHE has taken the campus requests and usually by this time has submitted them to the Governor’s office. Then it’s worked and it comes back in early November in what is called the “discussion budget” and we have input. This year the IBHE has not submitted a budget yet to the Governor’s Office of Management and Budget, on the Office of Management and Budget’s directive. They are not talking about budgets so we can’t really plan because we just don’t know. I’ve looked at the revenue estimates and the new revenue that’s coming in is on top of expectations and it’s not a totally bleak picture. Last month’s revenue was a little better but not at expectations, and the next taxes are not bringing in quite what they thought they would bring in so I think it’s a wait-and-see game from the point of view of the revenue side. Clearly, everyone in the whole state is involved in this difficult, difficult situation. So my view is we keep listening and getting prepared but there’s no news; there’s nothing to prepare for.

A. Change in title of Vice Provost for Student Affairs to Vice President for Student Affairs – see memo from Ivan Legg (Page 7)
Okay, there are two things I want to talk about today. I had mentioned this in the speech, the State of the University Address, and thanked Gary Gresholdt for his years of service; he’s retired but he’s working for us again until we can replace him. I indicated at that time that we needed strong leadership in the Student Affairs area and Provost Legg is going to talk in just a second. He had a pair of very senior people come in recently to take a look at Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and make some recommendations. Ivan has been reviewing the job description and the title of the Student Affairs person and has recommended to me that we not create a new position, but that we change the title of the current position to Vice President of Student Affairs. There would be no money involved in this and no new position. There are a couple of reasons for this and I’ll let Ivan talk about it. It’s pretty standard in land grants to have the senior Student Affairs officer be a vice president and more than that, to sit on the President’s Cabinet and in this regard, the Student Affairs person would sit on the Cabinet but report to the Provost much as our Vice President for Research, Rathindra Bose, does. I brought this for information purposes to the trustees at the last board meeting and they enthusiastically endorsed this concept. With that, I’m going to turn it over to Ivan to talk a little bit about that. He’s done some due diligence and checked with people on this. So, I guess what I’m saying is that I’m fully supportive of it and the trustees are fully supportive of it.

I. Legg: John pretty well outlined the case and I would just summarize it totally in context. In 1996 Student Affairs and Academic Affairs were combined into one unit, recognizing that the overall success of a student academically was very much dependent on the environment in which the student functioned. That is recognized across the United States. The person who’s in charge of this role has various titles but usually Vice President of Student Affairs; that’s the most common title. In 1996 when they made the change, they changed the title Vice President for Academic Affairs to Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to bring it into the Provost’s shop more directly. About a year ago, a year and a half ago, I began to consider the possibility that I was going to have to replace some of the people in both sides of the operation, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, because there were retirements coming up. I have had three retirements taking place over the last year or so in key positions in Academic and Student Affairs and I thought it would be a golden opportunity to assess what had happened over the past six years in terms of this marriage, or bringing together, of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. As a result, as John pointed out, I brought in two nationally recognized experts in the fields of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs who spent the equivalent of two days on campus. They interviewed directors and leaders from both sides of the program. They talked with students, quite a few students, and came to the conclusion number one, that the marriage that we had assembled back in ’96 was a healthy one and was very strongly supported internally and should, on their recommendation from their external review and view of the program, be kept together. Number two they said, however, the students really needed to have presence at the President’s Cabinet level. That the Student Affairs needed - the students of the university -should be back in a more direct way represented to the President and the President’s operations and although John is very good at doing without this being official, they recommended that we change the title back from Vice Provost of Student Affairs to Vice President of Student Affairs, with the one exception that the reporting line would be still to the Executive Vice President and Provost. The title of Vice President would officially allow that person to sit on the Cabinet and give the students a voice at the Cabinet level. Finally, it was recognized, just as when we ran the search
for the Vice President for Research, that the title would be a more attractive title in garnering someone of national/international distinction to come in and fill that role and it will help us in the recruitment and the search for this individual. So, I am presenting this to you as a matter of information which you are free obviously to question or to make some comments on if you’d like to.

**President Peters:** Did you talk to the Deans and the Faculty Senates?

**I. Legg:** Yes, I’ve talked to the deans. I’ve met with the deans in a retreat and they are very supportive of it after considerable discussion. We know it’s a good move and there is support throughout the campus. I have not yet detected any person objecting to doing this.

**President Peters:** I think the important thing, the condition that I lay down on these things, is that this cannot be accompanied by an expansion of administrative expenditures or – this is basically a title change in a position – an organizational change.

**I. Legg:** We have an opportunity to take care of these issues because of the resignations that are taking place.

**President Peters:** All right. I think since we have time and we have a thin agenda, does anyone want to raise any issues or concerns? Comments? It was what I was used to at my previous institutions. When I was provost at my previous institution, there was a Vice President for Student Affairs who sat on the Chancellor’s Cabinet, was the terminology, but reported to me as provost. In fact, we operate that way because when you sit around the President’s Cabinet, take for instance, an issue that I want to talk about in a minute like fan behavior at our football games, so much of what I talk about is directly related to student affairs and you need a senior person sitting right there even though Ivan does that. The scope of his responsibilities is so broad that he often has to say “well, we’d better get Gary Gresholdt up here” and so this is just logical from my point of view.

**I. Legg:** You remember that I lived in the student facilities for a year and a half.

**President Peters:** That was different.

**I. Legg:** So I had student affairs smack in my face.

**President Peters:** Yes, you knew about laundry and dining for dollars or whatever.

**I. Legg:** I needed instruction on how to do laundry. I’m good at it now.

**President Peters:** All right. Students, are you all right with this? You ought to be. All right. Very good.

I want to talk about fan behavior for a moment but first I also want to talk a little bit about something that happened last week that I think is pretty important for the university. So many things came together late in my preparation for the state of the university address, some issues
and some grants came through that I wanted to include and we had a lot of eleventh hour pasting of things. One thing that had happened was this partnership with the DeKalb schools that unfolded very, very quickly through the leadership of Dean Sorensen. Dean Kitterle was involved, and I was involved on the edges; that had to do with a NIU/DeKalb school partnership at the Malta High School which is right down the road here on 38 towards Kishwaukee. I think it’s about three or four miles down the road. The DeKalb School Board and administration were trying to figure out how to utilize that facility, which needs some upgrading and was a high school I believe, and because of the growth of the district and some redistricting they’re doing, we began a dialogue with them. They approached us but we had been talking about this for a while anyway, about the possibilities of partnering with some kind of a professional development school, and a concept emerged. This is not a lab school. By the way, I saw that reported in the press; we had one at one time but as a concept, that’s not what we’re after here; and it’s not necessarily a professional development school. Dean Sorensen is here today and I wanted her to just brief the University Council for five minutes. Come on up, Chris. I’ll tell you why. I think it’s important for this university and, as I’ve tried to say three times, this university can be limited if the schools in this area are not good – if they’re not of high quality and I think they are of high quality. They have been historically. Remember, we wouldn’t be here if Clinton Rosette, who was a great public educator, had not had the idea back in the 1890’s that there ought to be a college here. So I believe we need to reconnect a little more strongly to the schools and help them out where we can and lend our expertise in an inclusive sort of way because to attract and retain good faculty and staff and graduate students and post docs who happen to have children that need an education, you want your children to go to quality schools and I think this community, DeKalb and Sycamore and the university, they’re not separate. I mean, they are really knitted together. Sometimes it’s a little tough, but that’s the way things are in life - our destinies are together. So I was really glad we could seize upon this. Chris, would you just outline a little bit of what we’re going to do?

C. Sorensen: Sure, thank you. Actually, we have had a partnership with DeKalb schools for a number of years; I think for about five years now and John is correct in saying that a number of the deans had talked about closer collaboration with DeKalb schools for a while. The superintendent of DeKalb then approached us unexpectedly about the school in Malta and the possibilities that we might be involved in helping to develop that school and we had several conversations which resulted in us talking to their board and we will be proceeding with that. I’ll explain a little bit. In our college we have a Partnership Office that is funded primarily through foundation money. In fact, there’s no general revenue monies in that particular office, and they support a number of partnership schools in our region. We currently have eight, and DeKalb is one of those, so this is not something new. We’ve been involved with them for a while in these activities. When we talk about developing a partnership school we’re really looking at four areas. We’re looking at clinical placements for students from multiple programs in those schools. We’re looking at collaborating with them to develop curriculum both for their school – the K-12 school as well as for our university courses in teacher education. We also include professional development where we would have our faculty working with their teachers to help them become even better teachers and that we would have our faculty engage in collaborative research in the field looking at educational problems. So, when we talk about partnership schools, that’s the components, the four components, that we typically talk about. When DeKalb approached us, we looked at the situation and said “what a wonderful opportunity to be involved
at the ground floor in developing a new school where we could have some input on the educational programming”. This is not a lab school in that this is not going to be controlled by the university. This will be a DeKalb School District school, and the School Board will have control of that school, but we will have an opportunity for some input and for some interactions with the faculty and the staff as they are developing the plan for that school. What we proposed to them was a school that included an all-day kindergarten, which included extended hours so we could have parent interactions and some other kinds of programming in the afternoons, and a school where we could hope to treat every child as if he or she were gifted. Harold Kafer has also been involved in these discussions because what DeKalb had proposed to us was a school that focused on fine arts and technology and so that is the direction that we are heading at this time. So the Visual and Performing Arts faculty and their dean will also be involved in these discussions as we look at developing this school. Dr. Kafer and I had worked over the summer on a grant with many of these concepts embedded in it and so we’re a little ahead of the game there. As we move forward to working with the Malta school we are looking at some of our partnership districts that have not been going particularly well for our college and we’re looking at refocusing resources from those partnership districts back into DeKalb although we already have resources in DeKalb. We also, I know Dr. Peters announced to the Board, we would be looking for grants that might be possible to help us build. We are already doing that, and we’re off to a wonderful start because of our faculty members in our college, Cory Cummings who is here today, just was funded for PT3 grant “Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology”. If I’m not mistaken, Cory, DeKalb is also one of the school districts included in that grant.

President Peters: How much was that grant?

C. Cummings: $1.5 million.

President Peters: That’s not bad!

C. Sorenson: Congratulations to Cory! So, we’re already ahead of the game. We’ve already gotten the grant that will help DeKalb particularly in the area of technology which is an area they are looking for for this school. We’re excited about it. We think this is a wonderful opportunity to get in at the ground floor and build a school with best practices and then we can take those practices into other schools in DeKalb.

President Peters: Thank you very much. Anybody want to ask any questions on that? I think that this is what we do as a university and I’m pleased that we can do this with refocused resources and wonderful grants because we obviously can’t do this with general revenue money. So thanks very much.

Someone came into the room I want to introduce and I asked him to show up today. He’s never been at a University Council meeting but you should know him. Hopefully, you’ll never need his services but he is our General Counsel and the head of our Office of Legal Services. Ken Davidson, would you stand up so people can at least see who you are. You know, we do have an awful lot of compliance and legal issues and we have a very thin legal staff but Ken keeps the corporation safe as much as he can.
I just want to end by just saying a little bit about—well, obviously we’re all wrapping ourselves in the wonderful success of our football team and we’ve got friends that I never knew we had before and we have friends who want to wrap themselves in red and black. I’ve noticed many of the political candidates outside of our districts have red and black advertisements for their campaigns and it is great and we must remember, you know, that it is an important part of what we do but it’s not at the core of what we do. That being said, we’re all very proud of our team and the way they have comported themselves and how well spoken they are when the national media puts a microphone before them. I guess yesterday or today P.J. Fleck, who is not a singer by the way, was honored by the USA Today college football player of the week. That’s pretty amazing. Sports Illustrated is going to do a piece on us. I don’t know whether that’s good or bad given their reputation. There’s an article in Crane’s about the impact of football economically on the community. We did a little armchair analysis, and these big games we’ve been in when we’ve had 28,000 people have added above and beyond what they normally add to the community—some million more dollars in spending and hotel rooms and buying of liquid refreshments; that’s good for the community. Also, I have to say to the students that by and large, their fan behavior has been very good. Sunday I had to go to Cleveland for the Mid-American Conference Council of Presidents meeting. I chair that this year. We spent two hours talking about fan behavior and sportsmanship. There have been, around the country, some very tragic incidents. Take the University of Toledo, a MAC school, where a young person was seriously injured and in critical condition as the fans stormed the field and tried to take down the goal post. I just want to say how pleased I am that, irrespective of these great victories, the students have just behaved in a great way and I want to compliment the students for that. We have been getting some e-mails about some of our fans being a little boisterous and a little well—not exactly White Sox fans—but, a little rough on the opposition and I would just urge people to follow their enthusiasm with appropriate shouts like “Go Huskies” and “gee, you Cyclones played a real good game”. It’s been very, very good. I know the student leaders and the residence hall people are working on this. We really want this to be a place where when teams come they don’t want to play here because they get beat, but where they get treated real well. Let’s raise that level of fan behaviors. Not that we’ve had problems that I consider out-of-bounds. It’s just that I’ve been there before at a few places and I know how this thing builds on itself; I don’t want Gary Gresholdt to wake me up at 2:00 in the morning after a football game to tell me about some tragedy that happened and then we have to talk to parents and so forth. That being said, let’s all revel in the recognition that our team has brought us and also let’s revel in the recognition that many of our faculty and researchers have brought us with our grants and our academic excellence because now what the rest of the country is finding out—it’s what football and big-time sports can do for you—people ask questions about your academy. Oh, Northern, they’ve got a great political science department there, you know? So, I think it’s just great.

All right, any questions from the audience or comments before we launch into our rather thin program today?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Voting membership of University Council – see memo from S. Willis refer to Rules and Governance – walk-in
President Peters: Let us move to the adoption of the Consent Agenda as amended. Is there a motion to adopt or approve rather. Second? All those in favor of approval of the Consent Agenda say aye. Opposed? We have approved the Consent Agenda.

The Consent Agenda was approved.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 8-12)

President Peters: Let’s move quickly to Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees. I know Pat Henry has a report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE because I saw her there yesterday in Edwardsville.

P. Henry: Here I am. Yes, the report from the meeting last month is included in your packet for this meeting. I don’t want to go over that in much detail since you’ve had a chance to look at it, and some of you have already heard it anyway. Just a couple of things to point out - that indeed, this is item #4 talking about concerns of community colleges working towards offering baccalaureate degrees - this is something that should be on the radar screen. Harper College is looking into it; it’s not clear that this is going anywhere but one never knows. The other point that I’ll just make in passing is in terms of the Seventh Goal of the Illinois Commitment. That was something that came up at the IBHE meeting yesterday in the context of a general look at re-evaluating the Illinois Commitment in general – all six goals and possibly including a seventh. There is one member of the Board in particular who is quite interested in adding the goal about quality and we’ll see what happens with that.

Yesterday was indeed the time once a year in October when the FAC meets with the IBHE and attends the meeting, which was in Edwardsville, and I say “hurray” for cruise control because it’s a very long drive. After the meeting itself, and I don’t want to go into too much detail because there was a lot of stuff covered, you can read about it on the IBHE website. One thing I will mention about the meeting, that President Peters was at as well and can also tell you about it if he has some insights, is that in addition to looking over and reviewing the Illinois Commitment, a couple of other things are coming up. The Committee on Capital Policies and Priorities is going to be re-convened and presumably looking more closely at how those decisions are made. In addition, the Master Plan Policies for Illinois Higher Education are being looked at and revised as necessary. In addition, there was a presentation by Kristi Lafleur from the Governor’s Office, who talked about the Governor’s Economic Development Regions; we’re with Chicago, for better or for worse.

President Peters: I think they took that right off the SMSA – those are SMSA regions so now DeKalb is included in Cook county SMSA. So that’s what that’s all about.

P. Henry: At any rate, they are working in partnership with various bodies including the IBHE in terms of economic development and how higher ed works with that. After the board meeting, we had lunch with various members of the board and the essence of the discussion really focused on the board’s concern with how to express and define and possibly modify faculty productivity.
This was a fairly lengthy discussion, not altogether cordial at times, as the FAC tried to explain in many ways some of the concerns that have often been raised here - that we’re not often understood as to what is involved and that productivity should not be simply a matter of how many hours we spend in front of the classroom. The fact that there have been about three Nobel prizes awarded to people in Illinois was brought up repeatedly as evidence of something going right, and that it couldn’t continue forever if we didn’t have support of higher education. The IBHE, especially Chairman Kaplan, really came down saying we’re not acting as cheerleaders for higher education. Certain members of the board are former faculty members and have insights onto this, but they were coming to us, particularly Chairman Kaplan was coming to us, not wanting us to necessarily explain what we did – although that may be part of it – but mostly really looking at the 5 billion dollar deficit that is in the budget of the state and how the faculty are going to help trim that down. You know it’s not all higher education, that 5 billion dollars, and many of us argued we already gave at the office, and that things had been cut and cut again, and that’s going to have a real impact on quality of the programs and so forth, and they said “yes, but”. The argument that he articulated was that there have been cuts in administration, I think a 25% cut, to cut administrative bloat - one thing we have not really found is exactly what they meant by that, and, the FAC in particular would really like to know what they define as administrative stuff that needs to be cut because I know a lot of us have been impacted by this in terms of advisement and having to pick up extra work there in terms of technical support and so forth. There are a lot of things that are defined as administrative bloat or not bloat but that just doesn’t make sense completely to us and we don’t really know why they are defined that way but we don’t really know what they are either. Nonetheless there is the 25% cut from administration, the tuition has been raised. The argument goes it’s now faculty’s turn to increase productivity in such a way that will result in savings to the state. That is the way it was raised by Chairman Kaplan and we at the FAC are going to try and have an extra meeting or to come in to our faculties and asking for suggestions, ideas, concepts, plans and we will try to work on it and then meet again with the IBHE members in December in Springfield. That is the way it was put to us and I’m not quite sure how to evaluate this. President Peters may have some additional things to say about this, is if we don’t do it, it will be done for us so that this was being offered as the opportunity to have some input at this stage into how faculty can increase productivity and that if we simply wring our hands, it may be taken out of our hands.

PQP was also something that was raised again as something that is going to be re-instituted. I’m sure many of us have found memories of PQP which stands for Productivity, Quality and something ---

**President Peters:** I wasn’t lucky enough to go through that.

**P. Henry:** Lucky you. You get to go through it again. Yes, that’s it – Priorities, Quality and Productivity? Again, this relates back, of course, to the budget. The Governor is dead set against raising taxes and the IBHE is essentially articulating what they believe the Governor’s wishes are in this matter. So, that’s where we at and I sincerely would like to get some input from you either here or by e-mail. We do need to get our heads together, I think, at the FAC to articulate some of this in some fashion, and any help would be appreciated. All right?

**President Peters:** Okay, Carole?
C. Minor: Pat, are you saying that the IBHE wants the faculty to say how faculty productivity can be increased and if they don’t get that by November – was there a date?

P. Henry: December, we’re meeting in December.

C. Minor: Then they’re going to determine how faculty are going to be more productive?

P. Henry: That was the implication. We tried various discussions of how what we do is not just a matter of hours in front of the classroom; that didn’t appear to carry much weight. Other than early retirements or a whole bunch of us quitting or something like that, it’s hard to see how exactly we are to proceed here which is why I’m saying any ideas are appreciated. Grants are obviously a good thing but ---

President Peters: The first I heard of this was I saw Pat at lunch and she mentioned it to me because I had left the lunch early. I haven’t had any time to really make any sense out of this because no president or chancellor has heard about this, and I couldn’t get the Executive Director of the IBHE. This would be very peculiar, that a study like this and discussion would not have occurred over a period of several months with the presidents and the chancellors and others, provosts and so forth. I mean, that is the way things are done. You just don’t announce this to a constituency group. So this comes as quite a surprise, and I was not able to determine from the three or four telephone calls I made what this is about. It doesn’t surprise me, given my experience in higher education, that faculty productivity is an issue that from time to time we need to address and clear away the confusion about the role of faculty and account for the eighteen things that faculty do as part of their role in a meaningful way. Okay. It is also true that I’ve never been in an appropriation hearing on the legislative side where the issue of faculty productivity has not been raised. I mean it’s with us all the time much as administrative inefficiency is with us all the time. So, I think what’s required right is now is for me to find out what this is all about, and I think, Pat, you’re exactly right. I remember I spent a whole summer one time in Nebraska working with a legislative liaison committee and eighteen faculty and chairs at Nebraska coming up with a document that pinned down the complexity of the role of faculty – advising Ph.D. students, M.A. students, the difference between professors who do contact hours, the professor of oboe or viola who has tremendous numbers of contact hours but fewer students, the social scientist who has large lectures, the scientist who’s expected to bring in major continuation funding and run a laboratory and have post-docs, the ag experiment people who are out there soil testing, and our College of Education people who are out there in the field. It is not how many courses do your faculty teach – it’s not even credit hours, Pat – it’s how many courses do faculty teach – that’s the understanding. So, we’ve got a lot of work to do here. I’m the Chair of the Public Universities Chancellors and Presidents this year; I’ve been through this before and I will try to get to the bottom of it. Not that this is not an issue. I’m not saying that. It’s just I think we have to proceed with caution and understanding and November 1st is sort of a ridiculous date for us to do this.

P. Henry: I didn’t mean to give the impression November 1 was the limit. We’re going to try to meet with the members of the board in December. I think December 9 and just along those same lines, I think defining complexity is going to be a key part of this.
President Peters: Remember what I said – go back if you’re having trouble sleeping and you need something to get you to sleep – read my State of the University Address. That part where I said because of the number of students that will be seeking a post-high school education, a post-secondary education, even if we drastically eliminated all administrators and just had voice mail, even if we had faculty who perhaps on occasion could teach more, even if we did all those things, it certainly doesn’t squeeze anymore toward a 5 billion dollar state budget gap and doesn’t come anywhere near taking care of this tidal wave of students. But what is the political reality that’s out there? This is my quick five-minute analysis. The tidal wave is coming. Students will not gain access to this institution and the other eleven in numbers that are anywhere near the demand because we will not sacrifice quality and someone is going to complain and they’re going to complain to public officials and others and I think that’s what they see coming. So, anyway, Dean Kitterle, you wanted to say something.

F. Kitterle: I just wanted to comment that we ---

S. Willis: Could you get a mike please?

F. Kitterle: We should not allow to slip aware the fact that the IBHE has been gathering data for a number of years from universities throughout this state on an agenda that came from the citizens of Illinois, which was what universities are doing to meet the needs of citizens. I would just say that from Rathindra’s office, two colleges account for 1.5 million dollars in public service grants. Not research grants, just two colleges and that doesn’t even scratch the surface. So, in other words what exactly do we need – not just serving students but serving the citizens of Illinois and I think that a data warehouse that documents exactly what we have been doing and that the IBHE should be looking at the reports that we have, the results reports. Those are excellent things that universities should be doing. They garner funds for doing it, public support for doing it and we shouldn’t ignore it or allow it to slip away.

President Peters: So I guess my counsel right now is our sinuses are cleared here, and let Pat and me find out a little bit more and I’ll be working with people to try to get this in some orderly way and get back with some hard information. But thank you for ruining my lunch today, Pat. All right? Okay, anybody want to clear their sinuses? All right, where are we now. Pat, are you done?

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

President Peters: Now we have the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Paul and Bill Tolhurst.

B. Tolhurst: No meeting; no report.

President Peters: Love ‘ya.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operation Committee – Sue Willis – no report
President Peters: BOT Finance, Facilities and Operation Committee. Sue Willis? No report? We have no facilities, no money, no --- no the dust is flying; we’re trying to make the place better.

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

President Peters: BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee, Sara and Bev. No report.

E. BOT – Sue Willis

President Peters: Sue, do you have any report from BOT?

S. Willis: I do. Yes, the full Board did meet on the 18th of September. You already heard at our last meeting about items that were considered by the sub – well, the two sub-committees, Academic Affairs and Finance and Facilities sub-committees. Their action items went to the Board as they usually do. I just wanted to go over a little briefly about some things that didn’t go to the committees and then remind of what the main action items were. Let’s see, maybe you can explain to me what this means?

President Peters: All right.

S. Willis: Since I have no clue. The Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee, which actually didn’t meet but had a report anyway, saying that two hundred to four hundred million dollars of higher ed appropriation won’t be released. That doesn’t sound good, but I don’t know what they mean.

President Peters: There are many projects even going as far back as FY2000 that have been appropriated for various things. They’re federal matches on grants for energy savings or water quality that were authorized and appropriated but not disbursed. Okay? They’re being held in various accounts and because of the new Governor and because of the budget deficit, all of those accounts – and they’re minor accounts, but they add up to 200 – you know, a nickel here and a nickel there and you have 200 million dollars – have been frozen while the Governor’s people systematically go through every one of those to determine if they’re public health or safety and put them in terms of a priority. Put another way, the Governor put a political brick on pork barrel projects until he could go through and determine which ones were really needed and which ones were not. I think we’re okay on that but there are some we’ve got to watch. Is that clear enough?

S. Willis: When you say our budget from facilities – “x” amount of dollars, that doesn’t include these dollars, or it does?

President Peters: Well those dollars were probably included. I think we have one project that is 100 to 200,000 dollars – I’m not sure which – and that’s still remaining on a federal match for
our lagoon project. That one will clear, it’s just when they get to it; it was in our 2000 budget. There’s still a lot of Illinois First money out there that has been appropriated but not expended and there was a – Edgar had Build Illinois? There’s even money in the Build Illinois project that hasn’t been disbursed yet which has been appropriated. So, that’s what that’s all about. We’ve got enough to worry about.

S. Willis: It’s just that there are so many ominous things going on.

President Peters: Like the ladybug invasion.

S. Willis: There was some good news particularly from the Foundation which had a fund raising goal last year of 9.1 million dollars and actually raised $10.1 million so that was a good thing. Let’s see, the action items primarily had to do with the budgets, budget requests for next year and the budgets for this year and just how they’re breaking down. There’s one of these performance contracts where they contract with a company to provide some kind of service that is going to reduce our energy costs and the way it works is that the company does whatever it is they’re doing at no cost to us. We then pay them what it would have cost us if they hadn’t done it for ten years and then after that they go away. Essentially what the company is doing is saying we can save you enough money in ten years over what you would have been paying to pay for this and we’re willing to take the risk.

President Peters: Yes.

S. Willis: So the university takes no risk which is – how can you say no? I think those are very clever. Let’s see, there’s an update on the Convocation Center, which I think I mentioned last time; it has come out $900,000 to the good even after paying all expenses and their first payment on the bond. Let’s see, there’s a report on external funding which is going up and which, it occurs to me, could certainly be part of the measuring faculty activity productivity – I mean, that’s actual dollars that are showing up here. Finally, there is a memorial resolution for the former president, Rhoten Smith, who passed away just recently.

President Peters: Very good. Any questions on that for Sue? All right.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters: Moving on, John Wolfskill, Academic Policy Committee, any report?

J. Wolfskill: No report.

President Peters: No report.

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

President Peters: William Goldenberg, Resources, Space and Budgets?
W. Goldenberg: Yes, we have a very brief report. I just wanted to say I concur with the President and I’m sure my Committee would also that I’m very delighted to see the football team winning and I’m even more delighted to see the good sportsmanship that everyone is showing and I hope it continues.

President Peters: I can’t emphasize that enough. William, thank you – it is very, very important because you can get a bad reputation in a hurry because all the fans that are there are not necessarily our faculty or our students or our staff so there’s a certain group that we can’t control. Thank you.

W. Goldenberg: That’s right and we have great achievements in every area and I am also equally delighted to hear that we get so much grant and outside funding that we’re considered very valuable. So, that’s probably more valuable, in fact, to the university.

All right, we have a few issues that we discussed at our RSB meeting. It was mainly an organizational meeting and just to inform you of what will be coming up, on October 15 I’m very happy to tell you that the Provost has agreed to meet with us to discuss various issues but especially the high level of enrollment and the low level of budgeting and what are our priorities. On November 12, Chief Grady will be meeting with us to discuss security and safety issues so we have a couple of very important meetings coming up.

At this past meeting, Dr. Williams especially informed us with answers to a great many of our questions. One question that came up was, and I’m sure you’ve all thought of this, we all have when walking around we see lots of building and road repair and building repair and Altgeld will soon be finished. We were informed, for example, that it will probably be finished in December and we wonder where the money is all coming from if we’re in such a big budget crisis and the answer is as, I think, many of us already knew but budgets cannot be transferred from personnel lines to capital funding lines and so those budgets are completely separate and that’s why there is the ability to fund the capital projects. For example, if capital projects are funded by bond holders, they have been given a prospectus which tells them exactly what the investment is invested in and that can’t be transferred to faculty salaries or that sort of thing. So, even though there’s a possibility, I hope not, that there maybe faculty fired during the future if the budget is drastically cut, we cannot get money from the capital projects to fund faculty salaries.

Another happy result was that the Convocation Center was profitable in its first year. This is a rare result. Most convocation centers similar to ours are not profitable for several years so that was a good investment and good planning by the Convocation Center planners.

We were also told that as far as funding goes, health and safety issues are the number one priority. That is when elevators are broken, they must be fixed and so on and so forth.

So those are the issues we discussed and in the future we will be talking to the Provost and to Chief Grady about security issues.

President Peters: All right, thank you. Good report. Very good. Are you going to have me? I feel left out.
W. Goldenberg: We’ll invite you; I’m sure the Committee would love to have you. I guess we felt that you had a lot of ---

President Peters: I don’t have any answers.

W. Goldenberg: That you’re very busy probably.

President Peters: It sounds like you’re doing good work.

W. Goldenberg: I don’t think the Governor has any answers either. We’ll see how the funding goes.

P. Henry: We try and explain to the legislature that if we counted their productivity in terms of how many hours they were actually on the floor, but apparently that still isn’t ---

President Peters: We shouldn’t make light of this. This is a very difficult situation the country is facing and states are facing. All the costs that are there, economy – take a look at the anger of the popular backlash in California. If you want to gauge any state in the union that would have an open election right now, it would probably not look kindly on any elected officials regardless of how fiscally conservative they are. You know, our officials do a good job and they need our support and our prayers and our understanding and our cooperation. Yet, at the same time, we have to defend what we think is right and what we do in our institution as well. So, I don’t envy the job that are public officials have – our Governor – and they really are trying to do a good job but they have a constitutional mandate to balance this budget and it has to get balanced. So, all right.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair

President Peters: Rules and Governance, Carole Minor?

C. Minor: We have a recommendation. There was a proposed amendment to Bylaw 17.41, Expansion of Representation on Campus Support Service Searches. This was referred to the Committee in December 2002 at the December, 2002 meeting. The Committee discussed this very thoroughly and the Committee does not think that further action on this issue is warranted.

President Peters: All right.

C. Minor: So we will not be bringing you a recommendation about this.

President Peters: Okay.

C. Minor: We are considering three other issues that have been reported and are having various people come and meet with the Committee to discuss them and we expect to have some of them back to you in November.
President Peters: All right. Thank you Carole. Any questions?

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair – report (Pages 13-14)

President Peters: Moving on to University Affairs Committee, Richard Orem?

R. Orem: I want to direct your attention to the back page of your packet. At the last University Council meeting this item at the top was referred to us. This is the recommendation that was approved by the Faculty Senate on September 3 and it was a recommendation for the creation of a new advisory board for technology services and the text of that recommendation is there at the top. The University Affairs Committee then met on September 17 and if you look on page 13, you have a report of that meeting. Members were present and we had as our guest Wally Czerniak who is Vice President for Information Technology – Associate Vice President.

President Peters: Associate Vice President for Information Technology.

R. Orem: Yes. I think what was important here was that we were reminded that there does exist on campus a Computing Facilities Advisory Committee. I’ve added the language that is part of their charge on that back page and, as you can see if you read that charge and if you read the structure of that Committee, it pretty much says what this recommendation articulated. After considerable discussion the University Affairs Committee decided that we were not in a position to advise or to recommend a new advisory board, but rather that we would fine-tune or add language to the current charge for the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee by taking language from the proposed recommendation. I’ve got a three-point recommendation here. One, that a new advisory for technology services not be created; two, that the current description of the functions of the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee be amended by adding a third function using language from the current recommendation under consideration and that is “to review and make recommendations about major changes, deletions, and new technologies that have a broad effect on campus information technology practices”; and three, “that the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee initiate procedures to improve communication of current policies and notification of proposed changes in information technologies to faculty most likely to be affected by such policies and changes in technologies”. It was our general consensus that we do have a committee in place but we need to be more effective in communicating the changes – or the current polices or changes in practices to the faculty that are most impacted by them.

President Peters: So this is a --- it’s a Committee Book change so we need a motion and a second.

R. Orem: I’m moving on behalf of the Committee.

President Peters: And we have a second. Now, we need discussion. This is not a first reading, second reading situation because it’s a handbook change and not a bylaw change. All right? We have a comment here from Bill.
**W. Tolhurst:** Now the Faculty Senate has not responded to the proposal of the Committee. Right. But you don’t go back to the Faculty Senate again so we just vote on it here and we’re done with it? Okay.

**President Peters:** So we’re clean on our procedure I take it?

**S. Willis:** I will report back to the Senate and tell of the disposition of this.

**R. Orem:** Right and this Computing Facilities Advisory Committee is a committee of the University Council so it reports directly to this body.

**President Peters:** All right. Ready for the vote? All those in favor of this motion say aye. Opposed? Abstain? All right, we’ll make those changes then. Good work. I think that’s a good compromise.

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

**President Peters:** And now our elections and Oversight Committee, Deborah Smith-Shank.

**D. Smith-Shank:** No report.

**President Peters:** All right Deborah.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Any Unfinished Business before the house?

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Any New Business before the house?

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**President Peters:** Anything for the good of the order, comments, questions? Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** Who is on the Committee, the Computer Facilities Advisory Committee? Is that listed on the website?

**D. Mathesius:** Yes. Murali is chair.

**P. Henry:** Okay.

**President Peters:** All right? We’re waiting for a mike for you.

**P. Stoddard:** If this is a committee of the UC, how come they never actually make a report here?
S. Willis: There are – that’s an excellent question.

President Peters: You’re making a slip into rationality now.

S. Willis: I believe that it is one of the committees whose correspondence with us consists of submitting an annual report which people may or may not read. I am trying to improve communication with some of those committees which supposedly report directly to the Council and from whom I never hear directly, in particular the Graduate Council whose meetings I now attend as an observer so we can improve communication there. So, I will – it would be better to have direct communication. I’ll talk to Murali and see what we can set up.

President Peters: Do advisory committees ever make routine reports? This is an advisory committee and it’s advisory to the standing committees rather than the full – I think maybe that’s the reason.

S. Willis: Donna is telling me that this is a committee that reports indirectly to the University Council which means that it reports directly somewhere else and we sort-of hear about it. So we would not even get a report from them.

President Peters: We certainly can call for reports.

S. Willis: True. I will in any case talk to Murali and see if we can set something up a little more formal. I don’t think committees reporting indirectly are prohibited from talking to us.

President Peters: Does that fully answer your question?

P. Stoddard: It does, it just seems that if they’re making recommendations on decisions that are moving ahead without getting appropriate feedback from staff and faculty and students, that’s where problems are beginning to come in so anything we can do to ---

President Peters: Good point.

S. Willis: Clearly communication is key.

President Peters: Let’s take Promod unless this is a follow on to that. Is yours new or a follow on? I did not hear you Promod. It was on the Consent Agenda.

P. Henry: Just to follow up on the Technology Committee. Is there some way we can get our concerns to them? I mean, it’s not just them communicating to us but us communicating to them.

S. Willis: Well, their names are all on the web and in the Committees Book and you can certainly contact them directly; there’s no rule against that. Or, if you want to send things to me, I can get it to them. Whatever method you prefer.
President Peters: All right. Norden?

N. Gilbert: It is a representative committee with a representative from each college – faculty members from each college.

President Peters: So the representation is built in.

N. Gilbert: Yes.

S. Willis: Right but that doesn’t necessarily mean that there’s communication. Just because there’s one person from LA&S there, doesn’t mean the other 400 of us have actually told him what’s going on.

R. Orem: One of the things we talked about in the Committee was that the people who are on this particular committee are going to be people who are sophisticated in computers and computing and the people who are complaining that resulted in the Faculty Senate action, are probably the people who are least sophisticated.

S. Willis: Some of these complaints came from Engineering. I don’t know exactly how unsophisticated they are. I would hesitate to characterize them ---

President Peters: Don’t go down that road. Anything else for the good of the order? All right, then let’s stand adjourned until next month.

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.