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I.    CALL TO ORDER

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

II.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters:  Our first item of business is the adoption of today’s agenda as printed and distributed.  Is there a motion to adopt?  Second?  All those in favor say aye.  All right.

The agenda was adopted as written.

III.  APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2003 MEETING
(Pages 3-5)

President Peters:  The next item is the minutes of the Council of October 8, pages 3-5.  First I’ll call for additions or corrections.  Motion to adopt the minutes?  Second?  All those in favor of approval of the minutes say aye.  Opposed?  This is how the whole meeting is going to go.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV.   PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters:  I’m a little disjointed here because I just arrived from my favorite vacation spot, beautiful Springfield, Illinois.  I always make sure that in the glove compartment I have a bottle of Maalox but this time I didn’t need it because not much is happening.
I do want to report a little bit. This is the time of year when the rhythms of making the case for the university begins in Springfield although it never ends. This is the first week of a two-week veto session. There’s a week of recess between the two weeks so really it’s a three-week period and the first week is more of an organizational and usually, at this time of year, we’re getting a feel for the budget building process for the next fiscal year and we begin to zero in on that and talk to various people about the shape of that, trying to make our case to the right people who may listen. As I reported to you before, the budget building process for the state for fiscal year ’05 has been put back so there is no information. Usually about this time of year, we are getting back from the Illinois Board of Higher Education their reactions to the proposals that have been made by universities to the IBHE which are due in July and then are sort of discussed in September and then around – between now and Thanksgiving – you usually get back from them what’s called “the discussion budget” where they make some recommendations and we react and then that goes to the Governor’s office and then the Governor twists and turns and announces his budget, usually in February. Well, that’s all been pushed back so I doubt we are going to get this “discussion budget” before December. So, at least building FY05 we’re in a state of uncertainty. We’re also in a state of uncertainty about ’04 because the revenue picture is not supporting the budget as approved by the legislature so everyone is sort of walking around the capitol hating to hear or utter the “r” word, you know, rescission for ’04, for this year. There was no talk of that this time. I did meet with – I’ll tell you just for your information since I don’t have much substantive to report, I could at least tell you what my activity was. I spent a lot of time talking to members of the General Assembly and leadership to get a feel of what they were thinking but, you know, they didn’t know either but, you know, no one is optimistic that we’re going to have a great budget year in ’05. I did meet with Brenda Holmes who is, and I’m going to get this title wrong, but she is like the Deputy for Education Policy”. I think it used to be called the Deputy Governor for Education; Hazel Loucks was the previous incumbent but I think that position doesn’t carry that title. She’s a very professional individual who’s been involved in government and I found her very receptive to at least discussions of higher education issues. I think her experience has been K-12 so she is receptive to learning about us. Interestingly, I had sent – what would be the word – an executive summary of my state of the university speech. I call it the “title wave” speech. I know the Northern Star in their headline about that speech made it sound like I was a meteorological expert and said “President predicts tidal wave” it wasn’t clarified so I’ll add that to my vita, meteorologist. Anyway, I had sent an electronic version of that greatly reduced talking about the tidal wave – that, people were interested in at every level. That seemed to catch their attention, I mean, as if they didn’t know it that we’re going to have a tidal wave of students come in to our higher education system. I made the case to Brenda Holmes for a need to accommodate more students with more state money and she wrote it down and I also pressed on the capital side which is a much more achievable goal, particularly our need for Stevens being a health/safety issue and a need for students and classrooms and faculty offices and we have our Anthropology Museum over their in department and we have theatre and we’re hopeful. At that level, at the level of the governor, that’s the kind of persuasion that works on capital projects; not necessarily on base budgets because the governor’s staff will involve themselves in capital projects and will have something to say directly about that. We also met – I met very briefly this morning but our group met extensively with the Deputy Director of the Bureau of Budget in the Governor’s Office that’s in charge of building the budget and had a long and kind of detailed meeting. Basically, there was no information about what the budget would
look like and that’s because I don’t think they know yet. There are still too many issues undecided in the bigger revenue picture. At this point there’s just not a lot of news coming out of Springfield. I don’t expect much budgetary coming out of the veto session. They’re dealing with other more policy-type issues. So, we just don’t know. I think everybody is hoping the economy turns around and the revenues increase and pour into the state coffers so they don’t have to deal with any of these real difficult policy issues that they face and I think, if good will means anything, almost all the legislative people I talked to and many of the executive people are – I know the legislative people across the board and across the aisles think higher education has suffered enough during this three-year budget downturn. But, that being said, the whole budget picture is so bleak and hazy that they’re, you know, they’re not saying we can do anything. I think they want to. I think they will if there’s money available. So, let me see, I also – one of the major reasons we went down was to meet with the members of the Latino Legislative Caucus and last night we had a meeting with the Latino Caucus. Manny Sanchez, the former chair of our Board and current member of our Board, was there with many members of the Latino Caucus and with us was Professor Michael Gonzalez, our professor in History and Latin American Studies, and Sylvia Fuentes, the Director of our Latino Resource Center. Basically, it was a meeting to present to them a preliminary draft of two and a half years of work conducted by NIU basically but drawing upon some of the best minds in the country about – to analyze and try to come up with some recommendations and an action plan on the issues of Latino students and their rates of going to universities, their rates of success and identifying what we can do to help. This is a rather extensive report that we presented to them. It will be released momentarily and it has some policy recommendations on what to do and I really can’t talk about those recommendations because the Caucus is going to release these. It was much appreciated and I much appreciate Manny Sanchez and his leadership and all the people who were involved in this. Provost Legg was and people from our Admissions Department were and just a whole bunch of people. I think the end result of that is going to be some policy recommendations and legislation to try and focus on that issue and try to do a better job with spreading the word and trying to fill the college knowledge gap on the part of Latino families so that they can have the benefit of either a community college or a four year education. So, I spent a lot of time doing that and while I was at it trying to build support in general for the university among a rather cohesive and growing caucus in the legislature. It’s a very together and coherent caucus. I’m very much impressed with their passion. While we’re not – one can never rest on their laurels, NIU is recognized as a place that cares about its Latino students and its family and wants to do something about it; wants to help so I was pleased with that.

Okay, just a couple of other issues. I want to state this again, even though there’s ambiguity out there, we’re about as prepared as we can be for that ambiguity. We have, as you know, we have some policies in place in case there is a rescission – God forbid - they prudent, they’re in line with the principles that I set forward a couple of years ago that are getting harder and harder everyday to maintain. We want to do it in the fairest possible manner. In my experience in higher education when you’re in the third year of cuts, that’s when your patience gets tested. That’s when you have to stay together because you’re down to, you know, there’s no more fat, there’s no more muscle. You’re down to bone – you’re down to skin and bones and every additional cut, marginal as it may seem, has tremendous consequences. So, I want to again indicate my great admiration for the way the campus has held together. We will get through this. I’m not sure exactly – there are signs the economy is turning and I always like to see the glass
half filled and I just don’t know how long it’s going to take. You know, the Illinois economy because of its manufacturing base usually is the last into a recession and the last out. So there is a lag here but there are some signs that some of the revenue is coming back.

All right, so that’s the – then the other thing, no matter what, remember our 1.5% salary increase in July is there and our 1.5% increase in January will be there. That is – I’m committed to that. We’re always hoping for the plus, a little bit more, but that 1.5% in January is assured for all the categories that that applies to.

The other thing I want to just indicate that as part of our budgetary, one of our tools we’re using, we are going to have an extended holiday closing and basically that means that we will be closed on the 22nd and 23rd of December, which means for all practical purposes on the end of business day on the 19th of December, we’re shut down until January 5th. Now, there are obviously some exceptions, people are working on those because of environmental health, safety, other things. I request your patience with this. You know, for some people it’s fairly straightforward; for others it will create a bit of a hardship but I wanted to get that out. This will save us considerable – I can’t put a dollar figure on it, maybe Eddie can – I don’t know, but it depends, you know, it’s a variable. It depends how cold it gets but this extended shut down really does have an accumulative effect because of the number of days we’ll be able to go on minimum power. So we will be able to, we gotta try everything to squeeze a penny and a dime here, so I just wanted to remind you of that. Okay. Let me see.

The other thing is we continue to get just tremendous nice national and regional publicity about the wonderful success of our football team. I noticed, I didn’t bring a copy of it, but those of you who get the Suburban Dailey Herald; we were a front-page story about pride at NIU. It’s really so important to our students and I want to commend the students and the fans for the way they have – by and large – comported themselves at the games. We have not been used to this kind of crowd but we’re managing and we’re learning. I’m very excited about it. We’ve estimated, by the way, that above and beyond the nice economic income that a football Saturday had in this area last year which we had record crowds last year and this year we’ve broken all records already, we estimate conservatively it adds at least a million dollars more in the economy in the area for, you know, motel rooms and food and refreshment and souvenirs and that sort of thing to the economy and that’s really great. That really, really pleases me and I’ve been so pleased at the way the community has responded to this. It’s really been great.

So, with that, I’m going to end my reports. Does anybody want to ask questions now since I don’t have that much to say? Okay, good.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Then let us adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Is there a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda? Second? All in favor say aye.

A. Proposed Student Grievance procedure – endorsed by Faculty Senate, 10-29-03 – refer to Rules and Governance (Pages 6-10)
VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Let’s now move to our reports. First we have Patricia Henry, Faculty Advisory to the IBHE and there is a printed report on page 11.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Page 11)

P. Henry: Thank you. Yes, that’s sort of a little out of date. As those of you who are also on the Faculty Senate know, I brought this to the Faculty Senate last week. Basically, the FAC is meeting and trying to work out ways of responding to the IBHE. At our meeting in Edwardsville, Chairman Kaplan, Chairman of the IBHE, really challenged us with ideas to come with to increase faculty productivity sort of to parallel the cuts in administrative and the increases in tuition that have already been going on basically as a means of addressing the budget deficit. The FAC has been meeting and e-mailing and trying to figure out appropriate responses to this in a number of ways and some of those are listed under the IBHE’s interim report. The draft of the resolution on reviving PQP when I brought this forth to the Senate, received virtually unanimously negative response as everyone felt this was really not one of NIU’s greatest hours. Those of you who were there can rephrase your arguments if I’m not doing them justice but essentially I think it boiled down to that it was a tremendous amount of work and fairly demoralizing work at that trying to sort of pick what things that could be cut when you really didn’t want to cut any of them and that often those suggestions were ignored higher on up the line. Anyway, I think took this via e-mail to the FAC and had some response to it and – where is it – I just actually got a new version of this that I want to read at least some parts of it to you. This is a draft now which we will discuss at our meeting this coming Friday at Northeastern Illinois University. The present draft is “The Faculty Advisory Council endorses” – excuse me, I’m sorry – there’s one thing I should make clear. I actually was mistaken that I reported on this in the Faculty Senate that the IBHE itself was not pushing PQP. I was mistaken. They actually – they were the ones who brought it up and the FAC is responding to that. PQP, by the way of you – it is written there – Priorities, Quality and Productivity, especially the productivity is becoming the issue. Back to the new resolution “The Faculty Advisory Council endorses the IBHE action establishing a process whereby faculty at individual institutions will utilize the shared governance process to make optimal decisions on restructuring the curriculum by weighing institutions’ respective mission, student needs, needs of the state, and comparative strengths and weaknesses of programs.” It then sort of continues in much the same vane as the previous one with the emphasis again on decentralizing some of this decision making in an attempt to forestall the IBHE from making one-size-fits-all kinds of ultimatums vis-à-vis faculty productivity. The FAC essentially is trying to make the case that those decisions should be made more at the lower levels and be taken seriously by those at the higher levels hopefully and is nowhere is faculty expertise more critical than in the determination of the curriculum offered by the institution. That’s essentially what I’ll be taking – or what we’ll be looking at this coming Friday and if anybody would like to comment further on it or ask anymore question about it or give me some more information or opinions to take to the FAC, I’d be happy to get them.

President Peters: That’s your report?

P. Henry: That’s my report.
President Peters: Okay, any comments? I can say neither I nor any of the other presidents have heard anything about this. Not one word so I – it’s sort of like a smelly uncle who comes around and visits you once every ten years and you can’t wait until – yeah, you have a smelly uncle?

H. Kafer: Several. Having lived through PQP, as have many people in this room, I can’t imagine a more dangerous suggestion for the IBHE than to revisit that process. It was horribly politicized. It had nothing to do with sanity and quality decision making and I would just urge you to be careful what you wish for. There have got to be more compelling methods for addressing the IBHE’s challenge to you.

President Peters: I think Pat wants to respond to that.

P. Henry: Again, I misspoke at the Senate meeting. This is not the FAC’s idea. The IBHE is making noise about bringing back PQP and we’re not happy about it either.

H. Kafer: I would hope that the FAC would have a unanimous negative response and that in no way would they endorse or be party to that and would find other ways. That’s just one person’s opinion but I really do think it would extraordinarily dangerous for higher education in this state to revisit that chapter in history.

President Peters: Bill?

B. Tolhurst: I’m particularly concerned about this because it seems to me truly bizarre that the Board of Higher Education should solicit input from university faculty directly. It seems to me that PQP or whatever they want to call the next round of budget cuts if there is one and God willing there won’t be, that it’s important for the university to give it’s best response and that response has to include faculty input that the idea of asking faculty directly – I mean I know that I for one do not have the kind of global knowledge of this university and its situation that would make it appropriate for me to pontificate about that much as I like to pontificate and so I’m really concerned about what the IBHE is up to. Why it’s approaching faculty directly in this way. I think there does need to be faculty input but I think it’s best provided through a process that involves the whole of the university.

President Peters: I would just try to shed as much – to make as much sense out of this I can. In other words, without characterizing it or taking a position one way or the other but the facts – no one from IBHE, the staff or the executive director, has ever mentioned to any president to my knowledge or in any budget meeting anything about PQP nor have they mentioned anything directly about their involvement in anything in regard to productivity studies although we have been informed by the IBHE staff that the chairman of the commission, the appointed chairman, has talked to the FAC directly about productivity. They are not involved in that; the presidents and chancellors are not involved in that. Those are the facts, as I know them.

B. Tolhurst: This is as much a question for Pat because my impression from the Faculty Senate was that the Faculty Activity – I thought the Advisory Committee was approached and given something of what sounded to me like an ultimatum. We’re going to be making cuts; if you
want to have something to say about it, you’d better give us some recommendations and it looked like they were expecting those recommendations to come from the Faculty Advisory Committee and, you know, it looked as though they were encouraging them, suggesting it was in their and our best interest to respond to this by asking for another round of PQP and you know what happened at the Faculty Senate when that was suggested.

**President Peters:** Pat do you want to respond to that?

**P. Henry:** Yeah. I didn’t put it as strong as being an ultimatum as such as seeking feedback. I don’t think nothing that the FAC is going to do is going to become the policy it’s just that we were asked to provide some ideas. Most of those ideas I can tell you as they’ve been developing are along the lines of describing how very bad it would be to do any further cuts in an effort to increase faculty productivity by taking them away from research or by enlarging classes and other things like that. So it’s more along the lines of trying to explain to the IBHE or specifically to Chairman Kaplan, how complex a problem this is.

**President Peters:** Well, if I were asked, I don’t understand how our faculty can be anymore productive than they are by and large or, if you just look at the data at how productive our faculty have had to be in every aspect of their role in the past three years, I just don’t know how one could squeeze anymore productivity out of that. That’s different than this biohazard PQP thing because that gets to eliminating programs and it gets – I’ve been through this in other states as well and read the history of it here – that gets into whether or not “x” should have a Ph.D. program or how many sand-script programs can you have in one state and then that gets real nasty. Look, I’ve said it time and time again to everybody who would listen, this is the least duplicative state in terms of its higher education system of any I know. We don’t have a proliferation of Ph.D. programs or graduate programs or specialized programs. As a matter of fact, the number of units, you know, the twelve public universities, thirteen public universities, that’s not a great number for a state the size of Illinois so – what do they say – that dog won’t hunt. But right now the presidents and chancellors are out of the loop on this. Bill?

**B. Minor:** I’d like to respond but before I do so Pat, could I ask you to reread the proposal because there was a lot of it I didn’t catch.

**P. Henry:** Yeah and my apologies. This literally came over the e-mail as I was walking out the door. “The Faculty Advisory Council endorses the IBHE action establishing a process whereby faculty at individual institutions will utilize the shared governance process to make optimal decisions on restructuring the curriculum by weighing institutions’ respective missions, students needs, needs of the state and comparative strength and weakness of programs in the effort to cut instructional costs”. I think that’s the main thing. This is the proposal. I am receiving a certain amount of input to the fact that I did not endorse this or NIU did not endorse this and I will certainly convey that if that is the will of the Council.

**B. Minor:** Thank you. I would have a few problems with it. There are a lot of key words in the proposal as you’ve just reread it to us which could come back to haunt us if we endorse or if the Faculty Advisory Committee endorses it at this point. While the language of the proposal as it now exists has taken PQP out of the proposal, I’d like to suggest a PQP rationale for not
engaging it at all. First of all, it’s premature. If the IBHE wants to scrutinize faculty productivity they should do so through the usual process of approaching the university administration so they can engage the local shared governance processes that are in existing at each university. Second, the cue part of this is the query and it’s largely redundant with what I just said but the query should go through the administration of the university and not seek a backdoor endorsement from a faculty group before the full ramifications of it can be explored and the final “P” is that it’s potentially problematic or potentially dangerous in that it could suggest some things to be done that we would be locked into prematurely that we would not want. I’m particularly concerned with the phrase about curriculum revision in the proposal because whether the curriculum is revised in response to a mandate from the IBHE should be settled at the university level. I just think it’s much too soon for the FAC engaging in this dialogue. If anything, I’d like to see the FAC argue we’ve already taken our hit and the faculty is productive and push that point to the IBHE.

P. Henry: Actually, I have two things. One is to the second point that you made. Indeed, there’s a fair amount of material to that effect that I haven’t really brought forward but indeed, explaining how we have already taken our hit is one of several parts of this report that’s going to come forth. As to the argument that Bill Minor has made, is there something that we should do to sort of get a sense of the group as a whole or shall I just go forth with this. I mean, I quite see your point Bill and I’ll convey that but should I convey that on behalf of the University Council or should I just – since this is a work in progress should we just leave it at that?

President Peters: You know, I don’t think there’s enough hard information to act. I don’t think – I mean, I’m trying to stand outside this. All you’ve heard are bits and pieces and so we’re reacting with statements and resolutions to bits and pieces and we’re not sure what’s real and what’s not real.

P. Henry: This is a draft. This is by no means ---

President Peters: I think in a situation like this, I mean, Bill had it right. I mean this is very unorthodox to deal directly with a group of faculty that are advisory to a group that have liaison with duly constituted faculty and governance groups on campus. That strikes me as not effective and not appropriate. But no one has ever given you a piece of paper, a document, that says this is what we want to accomplish – you’ve not seen that – so now, people get into a reaction mode about “by God, we’re not going to go down that road” when you’re not sure they want to go down that road. You’re not sure what they mean. So, I mean, I think you should be in an information seeking mode and a listening mode.

P. Henry: That would be fine.

A. Powers: Angela Powers, Communication. I’d just to say a little bit of a clarification from a faculty member’s perspective who lived through PQP and that was it was never a bottom up process at all. It was not a case where we would go in and give our opinion and feelings about what we should do. It was basically a mandate given to the deans to cut programs and so then it was a matter of discussing what programs to cut.
President Peters: Yeah, and if you’ve lived through that – I’ve lived through these kinds of things – you are remembering how difficult that was and how uncertain it was and so here we are based upon what may be – what may be – little more than a conversation overheard or a rumor. We have campuses, good people all across this state, in a lather about something that may not even be contemplated. Now if it is contemplated, we’ve got to get a hold of that issues but right now over-reaction might be the worst possible thing to do. Yeah, Bill?

B. Tolhurst: In light of remarks, it seems to be appropriate that the Council might want to think about taking the position that we just don’t know what’s being asked for and that we hope that our members of the FAC will insist on a clearer explanation, preferably in writing, of exactly what it is that the IBHE would like from the Faculty Advisory Committee. If I understand your remarks correctly.

President Peters: Right and the other thing as constituted, the Faculty Advisory Committee represents institutions that have different norms, different governing structures. Some of them contractual and they aren’t going to be able to respond in an appropriate manner to reasonable requests – I mean, wanting to know if faculty are productive is a reasonable, periodic request that we get and we deal with. Again, the presidents or the chancellors nor, to my knowledge, the IBHE staff are involved in this activity at this point. I’d hope that we’d never have to because sooner or later – I don’t know how you do productivity analysis or studies or program evaluation – without involving departments and faculty groups and administrators and experts in the field. I don’t know how you do that in a vacuum.

P. Henry: I will continue in the information-seeking mode.

President Peters: Remember, I’m your unpaid consultant let’s say on this. It’s also the kind of thing that you want to know but sometimes you don’t want to ask too many questions because somehow in your reaction, you give them ideas and information that they didn’t have – like “oh yeah, PQP, let’s do that again”. See? Don’t stir the pot until you know. Greg from South Florida?

G. Pavaza: I’ve been in a couple of meetings. I think it’s important for the FAC to realize and John has said this very clearly, this is Chairman Kaplan’s idea. I think you need to differentiate that it’s the Chairman’s idea little party as opposed to being the IBHE’s party and if I were the FAC, my resolution would be something very simple like “we look forward to continue to engage the Chairman in this discussion” and that would be about as far as I would go with it.

President Peters: All right. Are our sinuses clearly now? I feel better. Okay. Let me see where we are. Anything else Pat?

P. Henry: No, that’s it.

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

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

B. Tolhurst:  No meeting; no report.

President Peters:  No meeting, no report.  Any questions:  All right.

C.  BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – no report.

President Peters:  BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee, Sue Willis and Professor Song?  No report, no money, lot of operations.  Dr. Williams, how are we doing on our Gilbert Avenue/Street – will we be putting asphalt in there?

E. Williams:  After we get past the mud pies we will.

President Peters:  It will be great when we get that done.  That’s a complex project.

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

President Peters:  BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs?  Sara and Bev?  No meeting; no report.

E.  BOT – Sue Willis – no report

President Peters:  Sue Willis, no report.

F.  Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

President Peters:  I’m sure John Wolfskill from Academic Policy Committee has a report.

J. Wolfskill:  No meeting; no report.

President Peters:  Let’s talk about PQP again.

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

President Peters:  William, Resources Space and Budgets?  What have you been doing.

W. Goldenberg:  Yeah, I have just a variation on that theme.  We had planned you may remember to meet with Provost Legg but he at the last minute was called away to a more urgent meeting so we did not get to meet.  We have rescheduled that meeting for February and on the 12th, next week, we will be meeting with Chief Grady, Security and Safety.  That’s all.

President Peters:  Okay, very good.
H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair

President Peters: Carole, Rules and Governance Committee?

C. Minor: You cannot imagine how jealous I am of these people who have just made a statement. This is a very hard working committee and we have for you good news and bad news and I’m going to start with the good news. The good news – this is a little story from eighteen months ago at the last meeting of the University Council in the spring of 2002 – some bylaw amendments were brought forward with respect to the Faculty Personnel Advisor. This caused great discussion; great meaning large, not fun. A quorum call ended the discussion and there were some votes. Last year’s Rules and Governance Committee recommended that we look at those proposals that had been left with the committee because of lack of quorum. We did that at our last meeting. We had a meeting with the current Faculty Personnel Advisor, Curt Behrens, the former Faculty Personnel Advisor, Malcolm Morris and Bev Espy from the SPS Council, where many of the original issues had originated that had generated those bylaw recommendations. During that discussion, we determined that all the issues that had been raised had been dealt with in other ways and that there is no need for any bylaw amendments with respect to the Faculty Personnel Advisor and so our report is that you will not hear of this again from us.

1. Office Privacy Policy (Page 12)

Our second news is that through an electronic communication error, that is I clicked on the wrong line and I apologize, this caused a misunderstanding in whether or not everyone agreed on the proposal that you’ll find on page 12. So now, everyone does not agree, that was a misunderstanding and we would like to withdraw the proposal on page 12 because it needs to go back to the committee and we need to have some more discussion on it. We had consulted with Sue Willis and with the University General Counsel and there is not agreement and we think that in the interest of using Council time wisely, it needs to be beaten out in the committee. So we withdraw that; we’ll bring it back to you again soon.

President Peters: Anyone want to question that? Well, if you don’t have it right, get it right.

C. Minor: We’ll get it right this time.

President Peters: Good, excellent. That’s it Carole?

C. Minor: That’s the end of my report. Thank you.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

1. Proposed Holiday Calendar (Page 13)

R. Orem: Yes, if you turn to page 13 in your packet you’ll see the proposed university holidays. Let me give you some history here and a prefix that what we’re talking about here is the university calendar, not the academic calendar. Several people were quick to point out that
there’s nothing here that says Wednesday, before Thanksgiving, and that’s because that’s part of the academic calendar. The holiday calendar only affects employees and the office closures. That’s not to say students aren’t affected by this as well, so I hope we have that clear that what we’re talking about is university holidays. This item was given to University Affairs a year ago but we dropped the ball on it and I’m glad to see that Steve Cunningham is in the room too because he can always give a lot of information on this too. I did canvas my committee and no one really objected to the calendar as proposed but Norden Gilbert did point out something today that I’d like him to speak to about the distribution of the floating holidays.

N. Gilbert: With apologies to the Council and to the University Affairs Committee and to Professor Orem, although Professor Orem asked the committee twice in October to look at this calendar, I didn’t look at it until this morning.

President Peters: That was not an electronic thing ---

N. Gilbert: No, that was not. What I have to say is just an observation and I don’t think given the way Christmas falls this year versus how it falls next year there’s a whole lot of flexibility that Human Resources has on this calendar, but the observation is that to close down for two weeks this year we had to use one of the floating holidays from calendar 2004 during Christmas break 2003. As a result, the break at the end of 2004 is lean. Let’s put it that way. This year we will be shut down for sixteen straight days. Next year the proposal would be to be shut down for ten days although there’s always the possibility that could change passed on energy savings and the like.

President Peters: Extended closing.

N. Gilbert: The concern I have heard from – I’ve consulted with some SPS people and the concern basically is December 23 when we are usually closed and usually there’s a floating holiday to accommodate that but because we’re using that floating holiday this Christmas, that won’t be available next Christmas and that obviously can be accommodated with a mandatory vacation day or in some other way but I just wanted to point out that the Christmas break for 2004 is leaner than our Christmas break usually is.

President Peters: Carole?

C. Minor: I have a question about that. I don’t understand just something that you brought up. You said we have fewer floating holidays in 2004 because of that. Is that reflected on that list because there seems to be the same number of floating holidays in 2004 and 2005?

N. Gilbert: The problem is that the floating holidays are based on the yearly calendar. There are four floating holidays in 2004 but usually three of them are available at Christmas time but because we are using one of those floating holidays this year, it’s not available next year.

C. Minor: Academic year.
N. Gilbert: We’re actually using an extra floating holiday this Christmas break by suing a 2004 one as well as the 2003. Does that make sense?

C. Minor: So that means that people who usually get off on the 23 of December don’t because they get off on the 2nd of January instead.

R. Orem: Right, they will not get off on December 23, 2004 because they’re getting off January 2, 2004. Yes.

President Peters: Steve, do you want to shed any light – that sounds correct what he said.

S. Cunningham: That is correct. There are always tradeoffs like this.

R. Orem: What I should also say too is I think, if I understand correctly the role of the University Council here is simply to indicate approval because Steve is about ready to send out a letter to the university community in which he always states “with the advice and consent of the University Council and President” and last year someone raised the issue that we’ve never discussed the university holiday calendar and they wanted to be able to say honestly that we truly did give our advice and consent.

President Peters: Well, we’re all for honesty if nothing else.

R. Orem: That’s why I’m glad Steve is here so he can shed any light on this.

S. Cunningham: Well, there isn’t a lot of light left to shed but the decision was made and every five years a draft schedule is made actually by the Operating Staff Council and we look at it and we collaborate about it and then our procedure now will be to do this on five-year cycles with the University Council so in 2006, we’ll actually have a five-year plan to look at. So these are the last two years in the current plan and it did provide by moving the floating holiday to January 2nd in 2004 for a long shutdown this holiday season and as the days fall, we just don’t have quite the same opportunities at the end of the 2004 calendar year. We are using the scheduled closing option this year for December 22nd and 23rd however.

President Peters: So, what you’re telling me is when we build these every five years there is input from various employee groups as we move forward because, you know, there’s never a perfect fit in my experience with these and you’re telling me what we’ve neglected to do is give formal approval that is required in the bylaws of the UCC.

S. Cunningham: Yes, and this action will bring those two together.

President Peters: Okay.

R. Orem: So the recommendation of my committee since no one really objected to these calendar holidays is to recommend that we approve them.
President Peters: All right, that’s the motion. Is there a second? All right. Anybody want to comment? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The motion passed.

President Peters: Well, we have a new duty now. Very good.

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

President Peters: Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Deborah?

D. Smith-Shank: We did not meet and I have no report.

President Peters: So no elections and no oversight this month.

D. Smith-Shank: I think you did it in Springfield.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: We do have an item of New Business and I’m going to turn the program over to our Provost, Ivan Legg.

A. Proposed Composition of the Search Committee (Page 14)

I. Legg: In your last page or second to last page you will find the proposed structure for a committee that will run the search for Vice President for Student Affairs. That structure was done from reading the bylaws; from taking advice from several sources and using my intuition which included that I wanted to have as broad a representation as I could of people who directly and indirectly have interactions with the Student Affairs Office and yet I wanted to keep the committee a manageable size and so we came up with about thirteen people or thirteen if we follow through with this recommendation. As I understand it, I need your blessing or approval for this structure if I am to proceed from this point onward on the search.

President Peters: Carole?

C. Minor: This proposal looks like it’s been put together with great care and it looks very well balanced and I move that we approve it.

President Peters: All right, there’s a motion to approve. Second? Now, discussion?

A. Nelms: In the past with search committees including the search for the president and the provost, the Student Association has always had both student appointments because we’re the recognized of the students per the University Constitution. So now I’m confused as to why one
of them has been given to RHA, not that I have anything against RHA – the Student Association has always been responsible for students.

I. Legg: And the Student Association still will be responsible. I’ve asked the two of them to work together in making the appointments of the two students. I just want to make sure that we get some representation from across the campus and by putting this particular recommendation in I’m backing that assurance up. I’m going to get Shaun to work directly with the president but it will be Shaun who ultimately make the recommendation.

A. Nelms: But it says one selected by the RHA president but you’re telling me Shaun will make the ultimate decision.

I. Legg: I’m hoping that they’ll work together to come to an agreement that Shaun will back up.

A. Nelms: But as far as – when it comes down to it, I’d prefer it just say “two students selected by the Student Association President” maybe with the advice of the RHA president because RHA isn’t recognized in the University Constitution whereas we are and ---

I. Legg: I could write it that way if you’d like.

A. Nelms: I would move that we amend it to say simply – item “f” to simply say “two students elected by the Student Association President”.

I. Legg: I would like you to include “with the advice ---

A. Nelms: Okay, “with the advice of the RHA President on one of them”.

I. Legg: I’m comfortable with that.

President Peters: You would accept that as a friendly amendment?

I. Legg: Yes.

President Peters: All right, let’s get that into the record then. So “f” reads “two students selected by the Student Association President with the advice of the Residence Hall Association President” something like that.

A. Nelms: On one of them.

I. Legg: That’s exactly how I’ll word it.

A. Nelms: Okay, thank you.

President Peters: Yeah, William?
**W. Tolhurst:** So if I understand it correctly, the Student Association President is perfectly free to ignore the advice of the RHA person who gives it.

**A. Nelms:** In the past he’s never been asked to even accept it though.

**W. Tolhurst:** Okay, so this is real progress then. Okay.

**President Peters:** You see, experienced faculty members know progress when they see it. All right, more comments on this composition? Are you comfortable with this composition? Yeah, William.

**W. Tolhurst:** I don’t see why you couldn’t require that one of the candidates be acceptable to both the SA President and the RHA President if you want to make sure that the RHA President has meaningful input.

**I. Legg:** That would be acceptable to me but I’m not that ---

**W. Tolhurst:** That would have the effect the RHA President the veto ---

**I. Legg:** I’m expecting, knowing Shaun as I do, it will work out fine but if you’d like to make that recommendation, I would accept it.

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, my understanding is that the current President of the SA will cease to be president at some time and any confidence we may have in him may well not be good guidance for future search committees.

**I. Legg:** Well, I mean, that could happen to anybody on this list.

**W. Tolhurst:** We’re here establishing a process for selecting search committees that will be in place in perpetuity until we change this, right? Or is this just a one-shot deal.

**I. Legg:** One-shot deal.

**W. Tolhurst:** I misunderstood. Okay.

**A. Nelms:** So it stands as is then.

**I. Legg:** I’m happy the way it is.

**President Peters:** Even if you believe in parallelism, the Faculty Senate President, the duly constituted faculty body, selects two bodies. The parallelism – the Student Association President really should select but we’ve got provision here to make sure residence hall types get representation. Yeah?

**J. Arcarde:** I’m John Arcarde. I’m Chief of Staff of the Student Association and I’m here in place of Shaun today and speaking on behalf of him in this matter that I can assure the Council
here that he will work with Keith, the Resident Hall President, in this matter for what is written here today.

**I. Legg:** That’s definitely my expectation.

**President Peters:** Good, it’s important that the students have their input into this very important position for their student life. I mean, it’s very important to them so I want to make sure you’re comfortable with this. Any other comments? All right, so we have a motion that’s been amended in a friendly way. Second. Call the question. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? You have a committee Mr. Provost. Go for it.

The motion passed as amended.

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

**President Peters:** Anything for the good of the order? We’ve got some information items. Anything for the good of the order? All right.

**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 4:10 p.m.