
R. Self attended for J. Grush; M. Pritchard attended for S. Richmond; D. Wade attended for S. Webber; L. Jennings attended for M. Dick.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I want to call the March 8, 2006 University Council to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item of business is adoption of the agenda. I note a walk-in report that’s referenced in the agenda; that’s the Facilities and Operations Committee of the Board of Trustees Report and under New Business, Paul would like to add an item, “appointment of or search for a Faculty Personnel Advisor announcement”. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as amended? Second? All those in favor say aye. We have an agenda.

The agenda passed as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 25, 2005 MEETING (Pages 3-5)

President Peters: On pages 3-5 are the minutes of January 25. Remember, we did not have a February meeting. I’ll call for corrections or additions. I’ll entertain a motion to adopt the minutes. Second? All those in favor? Good.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
President Peters: Yes, the last time due to two things, a lack of critical business and the fact that date the university, myself and my staff, were in Springfield at the Senate Appropriation Hearings, we canceled University Council. I sent an all-campus e-mail the day or so after those committee hearings on the status of the budget and so we don’t normally like to cancel University Council meetings but Paul and I thought that made some sense.

I have three things; at least three things. This month of course is Women’s History Month. Today is International Women’s Day across the world and maybe most importantly, this year NIU is celebrating the 25th anniversary of our Women Studies Program and we sort of kicked that off this morning with a breakfast in the Holmes Student Center and it was a wonderful event. This year the theme of this program, the 25th anniversary, is called “Re-imagining Sisterhood”. As I told the group this morning, I thought about what “re-imagining” means. It means that it was one thing and now we have to imagine and re-imaging it and I guess move forward. I think this is a very, very important topic for NIU and I’m really appreciative of Barbara Peters who has spent a considerable of time in the last few months reading about the history of NIU as it relates to women and I really found it invaluable and her research has touched me deeply about the role of women in building this institution. Let me just say that there are two adjectives I would ascribe to it; fundamental and profound, the impact that women have had. If we look back to the beginning of NIU, a hundred years ago, women played a major role in shaping NIU as well as – not just the institution and what we do academically – but the cultural life of NIU and the community of DeKalb and Sycamore. Women played a formative role and brought culture to these plains in every decade. Because we started out as a teachers’ college, early enrollment was predominately women, you know, around 80% when we first started out. Also, from the very beginning, there’s been a heavy representation of women on the faculty and, in the beginning, not administration but that has changed. That doesn’t mean that NIU has escaped the challenges of achieving gender equity; those things were fought for hard and we continue to fight hard for that, but rather we have wrestled with these challenges from the very beginning. I just love the stories about NIU and NIU women. Throughout the twentieth century women stepped in and acted here during the times of crises. One of the most poignant examples of this was the action taken by the women of the class of 1918, you know, when American entered to war to end all wars. Most NIU men enlisted in the service or returned home to work on the farms. As a result – and women also left for work – so our enrollment really dropped in that period of time. By the fall of 1918, enrollment had dropped dramatically to 223 women and 0 men in 1918. Here’s where it gets interesting. The women of the class of 1918 decided that rather than spending the time and the money preparing an annual yearbook, they would do something for the war effort. What they did was they raised money by working in peoples’ homes, you know, cleaning, doing landscaping, washing windows, doing wash, whatever it took; sponsoring dances and plays and bake sales and they raised $800. I don’t know what that would be in today’s dollars – maybe 8 million – and you know what they did? They used it to purchase a fully equipped ambulance which was sent to France. The ambulance had a nameplate which read “The Norther” which is the name of the annual, “The Norther” and, you know, the interesting thing is and I want to find out more about this, many Northern men served in the hospital corp in the 129th Infantry which was part of the Prairie Division. They did a lot of hospital work and it was sent to France to honor them. What a tremendous story and, after class and work everyday, the women of NIU, students and faculty and staff, went to the 3rd floor of Altgeld and wrapped and prepared bandage packages and sent them off to our troops in France. Now there are many, many other stories like
that at NIU that, you know, are probably long-since forgotten and in and of themselves, they may be small, but not really. I think it’s kind of with that spirit that I think we all should congratulate the 25th anniversary of Women’s Studies and wish them good luck because they know that they have the support of everyone at NIU. I hope someday we can capture all these stories in a book or, well actually, we do CDs now and DVDs. All right, that’s the first thing I wanted to talk about. Oh, speaking of that, NIU women continue to do good things because the NIU Women’s Basketball team tonight is playing in Cleveland in the second round of the Women’s Basketball Championship and our men, they’re back from the war, have won the West Division Championship of the Mid-America Conference and play tomorrow at 11:00 against Toledo and that’s the first time they’ve ever won the MAC West Championship and so our congratulations to them.

Speaking about budget matters for just a moment, tomorrow another benchmark in the budget process occurs when we will present testimony before the House Appropriation Committee. I don’t expect there to be much eventful there. As I said in my letter, the Governor has proposed an increase for the first time in four years, in our base budget – our general revenue budget and personnel budget – of about 1.2%. We’re very, very appreciative of that because it signals a turn in a couple of things. One is reinvestment in higher education hopefully and the other is, there’s a turn in the economy and so I look upon this as perhaps the turning point and the promise for investment in future years and it’s within that spirit that we’re going forward. At this point, there is no funding for a separate capital bill; that is being debated on a much larger scale than just the universities and we don’t know whether there’ll be any action this session or not on that. We have not had a higher ed capital bill in three years so all our priorities remain in place and march forward so there’s a backlog of capital projects in higher ed for new projects and renovation, like Steven’s Hall, top of our priority list, and there is a little money for capital, deferred maintenance, which is very important to us and that’s why I’ve established a small fund, an emergency fund, hopefully we can add to that in future years, to deal with critical academic building issues so that students can have a good classroom and faculty can have repaired classrooms and smart classrooms and that sort of thing. Dr. Williams is going to be setting that up and administrating that, working with Frederic Schwantes of the Provost’s Office. I’m very pleased at that. If all holds and the legislature signs this bill, the appropriations bill for NIU and the Governor signs which I think he will because the presidents have made a deal with the Governor on this, then it looks as if we’ll be able to devote the lion’s share of that money to a much needed salary increase for faculty and staff. More on that later, you know, I am a very superstitious person and I never spend money until I know it’s in my bank account but I think – certainly, that amount of money is not enough to recover from the approximately 35-40 million dollars we lost either in base budget or add-ons but it is a beginning of positive movement.

All right, the last thing I have for you is an update on the search for executive vice president and provost to replace our Ivan Legg and we had our third meeting last night of the search committee. I see a couple of you who are on that committee are here. I was characterizing it by saying that great progress has been made. We’ve received expressions of interest from a number of sitting provosts; they could be standing too but they’re provosts at other institutions – a number of provosts, as well as very successful college deans from across the country. The breadth and experience representative in these applications is impressive. We’ve heard from people who are internationally respected researchers and scholars; people with tremendous
experience in strategic planning issues and people who have built great programs to attract external funding, people who are student oriented and people who are national leaders in the teaching/learning movement. In short, we’ve attracted the very sort of people to this search that we’d hoped to attract. The challenge is going to be finding that right combination of talent and skills for this position at NIU. I told the committee last night and I’ll repeat it here, we need instant leadership; no on-the-job training. This is a critical position; probably the most critical position in terms of NIU’s immediate future and we need experience and excellence. Our search firm which is, by the way, I’ve been associated with a lot of search firms – this is the best one I’ve ever worked with. They are basically “blown away” by the quality of the applicants that NIU has attracted. In addition to the 35 or 50 what I would call “serious applications” we have in hand right now, there are many more applications but I’m talking about “serious applications” where people fit the criteria, we have those in hand right now, our consultants are working with or are in communication with at least a dozen more top candidates who are watching and waiting as is often the case in high profile searches like this. Michael Baer, who is the principal, told the committee last night that the top level people he’s courting are very well aware of NIU and regard this position very highly so that’s always good hear. Now I can’t say enough about our search committee. They’ve been absolutely diligent about their responsibilities and here’s my co-chair, and very serious about their charge, very serious. As a result, we’re on schedule and we’re moving forward very quickly and we expect to be at the pre-interview stage with a dozen or so top candidates in the next three to four weeks and eventually we’ll have campus interviews with four people, about four, and as you know, these things move very quickly after that and we feel confident that we’ll be able to present a recommendation to the Board of Trustees in May and before we adjourn for the summer session. We’re on-track. I’m very pleased; it’s a very good search.

With that, we will move into the agenda.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: I need a motion to adopt the consent agenda – oh, we have none; I don’t need a motion.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: All right, let’s move to reports.

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes – no report


President Peters: We have a report from Buck on the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee.

J. Stephen: Yes, it’s a verbal report. I’ve got mid-terms for 270 and projects for 240 in the last week. I’ll just cover the highlights. The Academic Affairs portion of the sub-committee of the
Board of Trustees met on March 1. One of the most important things they considered was the recommendations for sabbatical leaves. Both Ferald Bryan and I spoke to think the Board of Trustees for their understanding of the importance of sabbatical both to the professorial staff and the supportive professional staff. All of the sabbaticals were endorsed by the sub-committee and will be sent to the Board of Trustees on March 23 for final approval. One thing I think it’s important to mention is the incredible support that sabbatical leaves had on the standing members on the Board of Trustees and in addition the expression of support for the sabbatical policies that were put forth by the new members of the Board of Trustees. So, I think we can be confident that our Board of Trustees does support this and we don’t have to worry about it being in jeopardy. There were a couple of other items that will appear in the written report. I just have two things I’ll talk about.

The new minor in Interdisciplinary Studies and Cognitive Science was endorsed and forwarded to the Board of Trustees. One other high level piece of action was taken and that was that Denise Schoenbachler’s appointed as the Dean of the College of Business was endorsed and this endorsement was met with expressions of approval of the Board of Trustee members and very high praise from President Peters and following their vote to endorse, there was actually applause from the room so it appears that the College of Business has finally found a dean but the final approval of that will come on March 23.

The final thing is the IBHE’s study on under-represented groups this year is focused on people with disabilities. So, if you have a disability and you have that form and haven’t filled it out, I imagine that would be helpful to the administration if you did fill it out. I’ll get mine filled out and send it in.

That’s it; thank you very much. You’ll have a full written report with some other minor details at the next meeting. Any questions?

**President Peters:** Questions?

A. **BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song** –

   **report** – walk-in

**President Peters:** Very good. Next report – I think Paul is going to give it on Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee.

**P. Stoddard:** Right. This is the walk-in you have. Also the action items are summarized there. The ones of particular interest are the approval by this committee of the student fee structure for 2006/2007. The total package will increase a little bit under 8%. That includes another large increase in the health insurance of over 13% which is beyond NIU’s control and a 7% increase for the Huskie Bus system. Again, that’s an external increase that we really don’t have much control over. Things that NIU can control, the increase will be just under 4%. As always, these increases are made in close consultation with the students so hopefully, these reflect their priorities as well. Room and board rates are going to go up; the number looks rather high, 9.1%. This in large measure due to the state mandate but not funded, installation of sprinkler system in each room. The Board was very supportive of installing sprinkler systems in each room. It’s a serious safety issue so at least something that’s very worthwhile is being returned for the
increase in the rate. Even with this increase, NIU is still near the low end of room and board rates for Illinois and within the MAC.

The other items of interest I think are some small capital; relatively small, capital improvement ventures were approved. Again, for the sprinklers, College Avenue reconstruction, Davis Hall clean room and organic lab, housing – at least that’s just preliminary – funding for housing for students with dependents, and Neptune West roof replacement, Swen Parson heating and air conditioning upgrade and new elevators for Zulauf Hall which should leave Davis with the oldest, worst elevator on campus.

President Peters: There always has to someone.

P. Stoddard: Somebody has to be the worst and we’re getting a clean room and a lab so I guess it’s a good trade off.

President Peters: All right.

P. Stoddard: Any questions?

J. Meyer: Dr. Stoddard, you stated that the 13.21% increase in health insurance is something that’s by and large out of our control. Could you maybe explain that in a little more detail?

P. Stoddard: Well, this is a service provided by an outside agency. The university does try to find the best deal that they can but health care costs are rising nationally and I am told that this is – I know last year we changed companies I believe and this is an increase that they are passing along to us. My understanding that this is the best we could do.

J. Meyer: I know it’s one thing we’ve seen, you know, increase kind of year after year at least in my tenure here. It is significantly higher than when I arrived; somewhere in the neighborhood of 35 – 40% I think if my math is right and I know it was one thing we were kind of hoping to avert last year in the contract negotiation was continuing to see increases of this magnitude. I don’t know if that’s something that can be addressed again in the future; if there’s some way to sort of insulate us from that impact in future contract negotiations or, you know, I guess it’s just difficult to kind of understand why year after year – yes, there’s an increase and health insurance costs continue to increase but that we’re not able to insulate ourselves against that to a greater degree.

President Peters: Let me jump in and Dr. Williams can help but let me put it in context. That rate that we have negotiated for students is a rate that most parents would grab in a minute. It has gone up but it has not gone up relative to what I had to pay for my son and that’s been a point of pride here. It does go up because like all health insurance, it goes up. That’s the uncontrollable part. Now, we’ve negotiated very tough terms because we have a pretty good market. Now, a couple of things about that – we do enter renegotiations based upon services that were provided the previous year and then you’re able to either get better rates or not depending on the kind of treatment that was done, so that’s one thing. The other thing is that students aren’t required to buy this insurance if they are covered and show proof of insurability. So, I’m going
to turn it over to Eddie to but I wouldn’t want the characterization to be left on the table that this is exorbitant. It’s expensive, yeah, but relative to the private market and other contracts that we know of, I think it’s $330. A lot of people are paying that a month. So health insurance is, you know, in your lifetime and the rest of mine, is a key outlay and we’ve got to pay attention to that and I appreciate the fact that you’re vigilant and I know the students, they’re heavily involved in this. All right? Does that ---

**J. Meyer:** Thank you very much.

**D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Shey Lowman – report** (Page 6)

**President Peters:** All right, we’re ready to do Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs, Rachel and Shey Lowman.

**S. Lowman:** I’ll keep this real short. You can read for yourselves. A couple of items I thought you’d be interested in, a question was asked about House Bill 4867 which regarding the textbook pricing which I know we’ve talked about in here before and Ken Zehnder reported that the bill probably would not pass. Finally, Steve Cunningham had reported on the Review of Employee Conduct and Accountability Policies and he said that all the policies have been gathered together and Chair Myron Siegel stressed that the policies need to be communicated to employees through training. I thought that was nice that the Trustees were very concerned that it’s one thing to have all that stuff; it’s another to make sure it’s communicated so that was a good thing.

**President Peters:** Okay, questions for Shey. I think Professor Stephen is reaching for the microphone or something else.

**J. Stephen:** What is meant by the Employee Conduct and Accountability Policies? Is that our fifteen minute – do we have to keep track of our time to fifteen minutes or ---

**S. Lowman:** I believe that it’s all the policies that have been made over the years that just have never been gathered into one thing so that’s what HR has been working on for ---

**J. Stephen:** Like when we sign our contract and we say we’ll abide by this book of rules that nobody has ever seen.

**S. Lowman:** No, these are policies which – let me think. I have to take off my staff hat here. We have policies on you use sick leave and how you report vacation time and things like that. Am I right Debbie?

**J. Stephen:** I wondered if it had to do with that time reporting thing.

**President Peters:** But that would probably fall under that. All right, I don’t like to talk about it but I should talk about the time reporting. This is a very big administrative burden. Time reporting, not necessarily time reporting, but taking the ethics test and everything. We’ve got a state statute here and every year, almost all employees, we all have to take that ethics test and by
law, if you don’t take the ethics test, we have to go after people and take appropriate action and a lot of that is specified in the law. We’re working to try legislatively to try – or in rule making – to try to get a saner approach to it but it is the law right now and we’re working on it.

**J. Stephen:** When I took the ethics training course, there was a question that indicated it was unethical to share or basically give away a research opportunity to someone in another institution which seems to be directly opposite of the idea of collaboration across institutions so I think that this test needs some further refinement. It’s certainly better than last year’s though.

**President Peters:** Well, I don’t know what question you’re talking about but I didn’t write it and I’m not going to defend it and don’t give away your intellectual property if you have any. Thank you Buck.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

**President Peters:** No report on BOT because that’s coming up.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Colin Booth, Chair – report (Pages 7-12)

**President Peters:** We do have a report on Academic Policy Committee from Professor Booth. Colin, you want to refer to that?

**C. Booth:** There are two items here; it’s on page 7. The first item is really just a status item. The second is an actual recommendation. What was said to the committee was to review the assessment of teaching effectiveness, the sheet which is on page 8. I think the primary objective was to look at what was read to the class in Part A of that. When we reviewed that, we were happy with Part A. We felt that it expressed what it was supposed to but then we found a whole bunch of problems with the rest of the teaching effectiveness sheet and we’re still dealing with those so we’ll report on those later.

The second item is something that was brought up by our student members and that was about the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual wording which was actually revised last year and, in fact, substantially revised last year. Those of you on the Council then will remember that and the wording of the section referring to questions which are to be included on the forms – that would be the top paragraph on page 10 – was questioned because Nick ??? had obtained miscellaneous information that indicated departments were really unaware of the bylaw material which goes behind this wording and so he suggested some changes in wording and we discussed that in the committee and then the committee looked at kind of a revised version of the wording and was quite comfortable with that so we are proposing a change in the wording as shown in the top paragraph here. Instead of saying “the only specific question to be included on all forms is one requesting an overall rating of the instructor’s effectiveness”. The change is to “the only specific questions to be included on all forms are ones regarding an overall rating of the instructor’s effectiveness, skill in presenting material, respect for the student as a co-learner, effectiveness in creating an atmosphere that will encourage and facilitate students’ efforts to learn, openness in the examination of a variety of views, and fairness and skill in evaluating student performance”. That is based directly on the extract from Bylaw 5.216 which is on page
12 of the attachment. Sorry, we’ve given you a lot of material. So that is something that the committee is proposing. I also have a couple of other points which are about the wording later on in the document which have arisen because of some discussions I’ve had with Testing Services as to the procedural approaches. So perhaps we should deal with the first part first. Okay?

President Peters: Okay, thank you. Any questions? Yeah?

P. Henry: I’m just reading at the end of the second paragraph on page 10 and noting that “student responses to questions (quantitative or qualitative) added by the instructor – oh, okay, never mind. I was thinking that this was somewhat different than what we’d heard before, but no – never mind.

J. Wolfskill: Colin, can you clarify is it the intent that there be one evaluation question for each of those clauses in the bold-faced section here?

C. Booth: One question to address the whole package?

J. Wolfskill: Is there supposed to be one question for “Skill in presenting material”, another question for “respect for the student as a co-learner”, and so on?

C. Booth: Well, that actually we did not discuss any further. I think we got the general —

J. Wolfskill: Well, I’m trying to understand if this is really a change from current procedure or a clarification?

C. Booth: I’m open to any comments by committee members about that. The committee really didn’t pass an opinion as to whether that should be one question addressing all the issues or several questions addressing each issue individually. Good question.

C. Sorensen: I think the way the way that it’s worded now – originally, it said “the only specific question that had to be included” was the one on overall effectiveness and then we, last year, having been on the committee, referred departments to Bylaw 5.216 and suggested that they might look at that in constructing a series of questions. The current change in language does say “the only specific questions (plural) to be included are ones regarding the overall effectiveness rating” and this other series. So it would seem to suggest that departments should include at least six questions on their instructor evaluation forms, one including the overall effectiveness and five that deal with these other items that are directly out of Bylaw 5.216.

C. Booth: I’m comfortable with that interpretation.

President Peters: Let’s be clear about it. Are you requesting that we take action? First reading on this?

C. Booth: I don’t know whether we do a first reading or if we do an action straight away. It’s not a bylaw, it’s a ??? thing.
P. Stoddard: We don’t need a first reading; we can vote on this directly.

President Peters: All right, could you state the motion so we have clarity in the record.

C. Booth: Sure, all right. I move that the paragraph #1 on page 10 of your document is amended as soon on the document.

President Peters: All right ---

C. Booth: With the addition of the word “of”.

President Peters: With the addition of the word “of’. All right, is there a second? Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, okay.

The motion passed.

C. Booth: Two of the minor items. If you look at the next paragraph, the wording says in the 4th line and 5th line about the instructor’s own questions, it says “such as adding multiple choice questions or requesting that additional comments be written on the back of the answer sheet”. When I was talking to Testing Services last week, they said there is now material printed on the scantron sheets, on the back of the sheets, so you can’t really write on that so I was going to propose a minor change to say instead of – so that we delete “on the back of the answer sheet” and insert instead “on separate sheets” just to make sure ---

President Peters: On a separate sheet?

C. Booth: On a separate sheet, yeah.

President Peters: Okay, that’s an editorial suggestion.

???

J. Stephen: We just put out a half sheet of paper that says “comments to instructor” and those go to the instructor but not to the personnel committee and then we have another sheet for written comments that do go to the personnel committee and it’s clear which is which. Yeah, separate sheet works for us.

C. Booth: Separate sheets would take care of all contingencies at this point. That would be a proposal that we just change the wording.

President Peters: All right, you’d better read the wording then so we can have it right.

C. Booth: Okay, the wording of that sentence in the second paragraph on page 10 – the new wording would read “in addition of the approved form for department use, instructors shall be provided the opportunity to ask questions for that instructor’s own use and may use any
evaluation technique considered appropriate such as adding multiple choice questions or requesting that additional comments be written on a separate sheet”.

President Peters: All right, so that is moved for adoption. All right, discussion? Yes?

J. Newman-Ryan: Can I just ask whether every department asks students to write these or whether there would be some way they would be submitted in word processing or computerized form and if we need something even more general than written on a separate sheet?

C. Booth: What I was told by Testing Services is that first of all, this is actually pretty rare. So – go ahead.

President Peters: Clarification – Dean Sorensen?

C. Sorensen: I just wanted to note that it does say “such as”. This is not restrictive. This is saying “instructors shall be provided the opportunity to collect additional data such as” so this does not restrict.

President Peters: All right. It could be electronic or anything.

J. Newman-Ryan: I just don’t want to revisit it next year.

President Peters: All right, with that clarification, any other questions or discussion? All in favor of the motion say aye. Opposed? Thanks to the committee; that must have been difficult work. You’re still on.

C. Booth: I’m sorry. There’s a third point which also arose from talking with Testing Services and it’s a very minor point and actually I leave it to the Council whether they think it should be changed or not. Where it says “Distribution of results” in section 4, the second sentence says “the student responses to both the department evaluation form and the instructor’s additional questions shall be sent to the instructor involved not later than five weeks after the beginning of the subsequent academic term”. It was pointed out to me that Testing Services sends all their responses just back to the department. They do not get involved with sending individual responses to individual instructors which would be something of a nightmare for them if they had to do that. Whether that is implied in that material or not, that the material goes to the department secretary and then to the instructor, I personally don’t think that it’s significant enough to need a change but I can leave it open if anybody else is concerned.

President Peters: Yes?

C. Sorensen: I don’t think we need a change. I think the departments are responsible for distributing the information back to the individual instructors so this doesn’t specify that Testing Services distributes it to instructors.

President Peters: Is that acceptable to everyone then?
C. Booth: Yes.

President Peters: That’s in the spirit of what we approved. All right, fine. John?

The motion passed.

J. Wolfskill: One question on the first item that we approved on the top of page 10. For what term is that change supposed to take place.

President Peters: When does this commence? Fall of ’06?

C. Booth: Yes, next time around I guess. Whenever a practical time period is but I would think probably Fall of ’06 would work. Do you think Fall of ’06 is too soon?

???:

President Peters: I think Dean Vohra had something to say.

P. Vohra: I think we usually let the Personnel Policies have one year of time before they become applicable so I would suggest Fall ’07.

President Peters: What was the sense of the committee?

C. Sorensen: I don’t think we left it for a full year the last year we amended it; we made it applicable this year so I would say Fall of ’06 is sufficient time for them.

President Peters: Fall ’06 is when we initiate?

C. Sorensen: I would think so.

President Peters: Okay.

C. Booth: The committee didn’t actually discuss the time for initiation. I guess whatever would be ---

President Peters: Okay, this has another level of approval. It has to go to the APPM and Harold Kafer is char of that. All right, he woke up.

H. Kafer: That’s not an approval situation; it’s simply a decision about where it goes and this is a clarification of an existing segment of the APPM. It would just be a correction of what’s already there so there’s not really any decision to be made.

President Peters: We were trying to push the decision off on you as to when we start. All right. John?

J. Wolfskill: Would a motion be appropriate in order to clarify this question?
President Peters: If you want to make a motion, go ahead.

J. Wolfskill: I would move that the change approved on top of page 10 be made effective for evaluations conducted beginning in the Fall 2006 term.

President Peters: Is there a second? Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

C. Booth: We’ll be back next time with the assessment of teaching effectiveness.

President Peters: Thank you. Good work.

The motion passed.

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – Amy Rose, Chair – no report

H. Rules and Governance Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Xueshu Song, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Brigid Lusk, Chair – report

President Peters: Elections and Legislative Oversight. Mike?

Michael ???: Brigid was not able to be with us today so I have here in front of me the list of the newly elected members to the University Council for whom congratulations or condolences as appropriate will be necessary.

From the College of Business, David Wade, Department of Management; Department of Education, Laurie Elish-Piper, Literacy Education; Jean Pierce, Department of Education Psychology and Foundations; College of Health and Human Sciences, Linda Derscheid, School of Family Consumer and Nutrition Sciences; College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, James Giles, Department of English, Eric Mogren, Department of History, Joseph (Buck) Stephen, Department of Mathematical Sciences, and Paul Stoddard, Department of Geology and Environment Geosciences and from the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Lee Sido in the School of Arts.

President Peters: All right, congratulations.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: All right, any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS
President Peters: New business, we call on Ivan Legg our Provost.

A. Extension of Acting Dean for Liberal Arts and Sciences Joseph Grush.

I. Legg: Yeah, it’s working. Okay. About a year ago, I met with the College Council of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College Senate and we talked extensively about what we would do about replacing Fred Kitterle; no one can replace Fred Kitterle. After extended conversation, the recommendation was that Joe Grush be appointed the Acting Dean of the College. It was clear that he had extremely strong support from everybody on the Council and everybody on the Senate. In fact, there were some people who suggested we just make him the new dean and we also realized that it was appropriate because of the nature of the position to wait until the new provost came aboard to give that person the decision of making the new person that he wanted to serve in that very critical role. We understood at the time we would have to extend the appointment beyond one year to accommodate that request and so what we are doing now is coming to you to ask you to approve the extension for another year of the position that Joe Grush has right now, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. I do want to make a remark. When I was talking to the President about it earlier today, the President wanted to know – and I’m paraphrasing John on this – the President wanted to know about how things were going and I said they’re going just great. There are no complaints; nothing that would even cause me to hesitate to make the appointment. He said, 'nothings wrong with the College and everything’s going right''? He said something’s wrong. So, I make a motion that we extend the position that Joe Grush occupies for another year.

President Peters: All right. All those in favor say aye? Opposed? Good choice.

I. Legg: All right. Now I do have another bit of information to give you. It does not require your approval. As I think most people know, Art Young, our chief of the library, our Dean of the Library, is retiring effective June 1 and we need to find someone and we needed to find someone to replace him during the period of transition between the two provosts. I met with the College Council and had extensive conversation with them and left and they did a very extensive survey of the faculty and came back to me in a written report recommending that we appoint Mary Munroe, the Associate Dean to the position of Acting Dean. I met with her and she agreed to take the position and so I’m letting you know that Mary Munroe will be the new interim Dean of the Library.

President Peters: Thank you.

B. Appointment of or search for a Faculty Personnel Advisor announcement.

President Peters: Paul Stoddard?

P. Stoddard: The Faculty Personnel Advisor Curt Behrens’ term is up. He’s not eligible to serve another term or to have his term extended so we’re looking for another Faculty Personnel Advisor. This needs to be a tenured faculty member. If you have any interest or know somebody you think might have interest or would be good at it and whose arm we could twist,
please forward any names to me and we’ll try to put together a good applicant pool for that position. There was a global e-mail that went out but this was kind of tucked into other announcements and you may have missed it; I know I did. Please spread the word to folks you know that we need somebody to fill that position.

President Peters: All right. Get those to Paul.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: All right, any questions from the floor? Yeah?

P. Henry: This probably comes under the head of something more to worry about as if we don’t have enough but I heard a report on NPR this morning about federal student aid that is now going to go to schools with more than 50% - or universities with more 50% - on-line classes which will make it basically a smaller pot for all universities and I just wondered if anyone had heard anything more about that or is that something that’s still possible to lobby about?

President Peters: I didn’t hear that report and obviously if it’s on NPR, it must be the truth. We still do not have a higher education act reauthorization after three years. Within the context of the budget this year, the president’s budget to congress calls for a 12 billion cut in student aid and have an impact and then, of course, in the context of making federal legislation, one of the things that always happens is those people who deliver educational courses try to get their programs under the umbrella which would require federal aid and this has been going on for years. Proprietary schools, you know, learning how to drive a truck, things like that and then with the growth of what we call new competitors, the University of Phoenix of the world – there are a bunch of them – I mean, obviously it’s to their advantage to try to get some sort of payment for their students. On the hand you’re absolutely right, the pie is shrinking and this divides the pie even more. On the other hand – and we are involved in that – and our associations are involved in that. The best way to lobby that is that is the national associations of universities that are organized in various ways. The most effective one of that group is one we belong to and that’s AASCU, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, that have representatives, full time lobbyists in Washington, and I’ve been appointed for another term as Illinois’s representative on that group of state representatives so I get called upon to lobby as well because they use college presidents to lobby as well. So, yes we are involved. The more global issue is we have no reauthorization and, I might add, coming up on March 23 at Western Illinois, there will be a field hearing of something that’s more important and that’s the Spelling Commission. The head of the Department of Education has taken a very active role in looking at higher education and its strengths and weaknesses with a heavy focus on access, on costs, on outcomes, on standardized testing and that’s going to be the 23rd. Our office has some – actually, I think it’s probably a small hearing; I think college presidents have been involved. We will be represented at that as that commission comes forward to make its recommendations and it goes in various ways when it’s linking various aid to outcomes. You know, like “No Child Left Behind.” This is something that I think is right problem, wrong solution. I mean the cost of education is something we have to tackle but I’ve never been a proponent of a test of generalized education. I just don’t see that it’s necessary and I don’t even know if one could develop a test
like that and so I think that’s more serious. I think that’s the more serious. It’s not a threat; it’s just something we have to attend to. Thanks for ruining my day. Anymore questions? Yeah?

**J. Stephen:** This falls more under comments. At the Faculty Senate last week I asked about if NIU was looking into the Roth 401K/403B plan. Deb Haliczer said that she was and in a conversation with Steve Cunningham he says that they’re trying to get that going as fast as possible. For those of you who are unfamiliar with that, that’s a rather flexible after tax retirement fund that you can put in and when you draw out, it’s not taxed and the ability and time limits on when you can draw on it and how you can leave it to your survivors is much more flexible than what’s in place right now. So, I thought that when that comes out, you might want to take a close look at that. The people who are interested in that are just ecstatic and thinking “can’t I do this next month”.

The second thing I wanted to comment about was I’m quite proud to be associated with a public university especially one which offers so many opportunities to non-traditional students and minority students. We did not have a meeting last month to recognize NIU’s commitment to the African-American population and one interesting thing I’d thought I’d point out is that I love the name of our newspaper, *The Northern Star*, because it’s so close to Fredrick Douglas’s newspaper, *The North Star*. Just thought I’d point that out since we didn’t meet in February.

**President Peters:** Thank you.

**P. Henry:** Is that something like the Roth 401K?

**J. Stephen:** It is called the Roth 401K or 403B I believe. Is that right Steve? 403B is the one for us.

**President Peters:** All right. Motion to adjourn? Second?

**X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council  
B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board minutes  
C. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality  
D. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Programs for Certification in Education  
E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification  
F. [Minutes](#), Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum  
G. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council  
H. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes  
I. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel  
J. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee minutes

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.