I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’m pleased to call the December 7, 2005 meeting of the University Council to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda for today which is as printed with no changes. Is there a motion to adopt? Second? All in favor say aye.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2005 MEETING (walk-in)

President Peters: Walked in, you will find at your chair, the minutes of the November 9th meeting, another walk-in. Take a look. Yes, John?

J. Wolfskill: Under Item H at the end of the first page for the Rules and Governance Committee, the third item down – it’s indicated as first reading but at the Council last month, the first reading was waived and that item was approved.

President Peters: It’s approved so strike first reading and edit approved?
J. Wolfskill: Correct.

President Peters: Okay, any other additions or corrections? All right. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of November 9? Second? All those in favor say aye. All right, we have approved minutes and an agenda.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: You have the John and Buck show today because our fearless leader, Paul, is somewhere. California? All right is there a motion that we remove – I’d like to be in California – right, San Francisco.

All right, President’s Announcements – this Sunday’s graduation. Can you believe it and the students are finishing up with finals and professors are grading and people are counting. We’re going to have, I believe this is right, about 1500 graduates in total over two ceremonies. I don’t know how that breaks out, graduates and undergraduates but this is this Sunday’s graduation and I want to thank everybody for getting all those students at that stage in their careers.

All right, if you’re in town or you have friends in town I just want to remind people that on December 16, which is a Friday night, from 6:00 to 9:00 Altgeld Hall is sort of open to the community and there will be madrigal singers and other interesting things, some food. I think there are horse drawn rides from the parking lots – sort of a community thing. We did it last year and it was really quite a lot of fun. A lot of local children came and families. You know families have so few outlets that you don’t have to spend a lot of money or arrange for this and that – we did it last year – we opened Altgeld for the first time to the community and I really liked it and I think we’re going to do that again. So, you know, if you have relatives in town or if you know families that are looking for something to do and they don’t have a lot of money, I think it’s a good family thing.

All right, as I indicated in my holiday e-mail to you recently and based upon approval of the Board of Trustees – there assent, not approval – we delivered on the additional 1% of our salary package and I know this is complicated and there’s a lot of questions about how this is going to be implemented and Steve Cunningham is here and he has every answer to every question but I’m pleased we were able to do that. I don’t know how long we can continue to provide salary increases without an increase in our State base because it has to come from somewhere and you know there are things we’re not doing to give salary increases and yet I think it’s one of the most important things we do. So when in doubt, talk to Human Resources. If you’re on the academic side, probably the deans would be the appropriate people to talk to on that. I was very happy to do that and so were the trustees. We wish it could be more.

In that regard, as far as the budget situation for next year, here’s where we are in that process. There have been discussions between the Illinois Higher Board of Education that collects all of our requests and we gave them all of our requests and that process began in July and we had – I
wouldn’t call it a – I think it was a budget overview meeting. That’s what they call it now. They used to call it the big picture meeting; now it’s the budget overview. We made our case and you know what our priorities are. We hit salaries real hard and so forth. There has been a preliminary meeting or two between the Illinois Higher Board of Education and the Office of Management and Budget that does the putting together of the budget for the governor and they made a recommendation for an increase of some sort. I don’t know what it was; they wouldn’t tell us that but I assume that there’s something in there. They didn’t hear negative or positive back from the budget director so, you know, I think that’s probably a pretty good sign. Now what will happen is that sometime in January, maybe early February, the governor has to produce his budget to the legislature. That probably will be the first look we get at what higher education is going to get. Now, going on history, what’s in the governor’s budget pretty much sticks. Very seldom does the legislature change that. So that’s an important event for us in terms of our general revenue. You may be interested to know that this budget session is slated to adjourn April 7 which is one of the earliest dates in anyone’s memory. The reason why they can do that is that last year remember, they fixed the budget by reallocating the way they do pensions which gave the governor’s office two years of a balanced budget – theoretically balanced budget – so therefore, there’s really nothing to talk about. So, the number of issues that will be debated will be very small and the leaders, at least the Democratic leaders, the Speaker of the House and the Senate President and the Governor are pretty much in line with that so my guess is there will be very little in the way of action in the legislature. It’s election year; they want to get out April 7. So, that’s pretty much what we know at this time. Let me add that there is no capital bill yet. They’re working on a capital bill so this would be the third year in a row we didn’t have a state capital bill where we had to do it on our own by raising private money or whatever. This will be the third year in a row of no substantial capital. Everybody wants a capital bill because it’s an election year, but the way the legislature is lining up, if the Governor wants a capital bill, there has to be a revenue stream so no revenue stream, no capital bill. So there is a dance that’s going on right now about that. I think it’s 50-50. Election year, everybody wants a capital bill. You want ribbon cuttings and ground breakings and demonstrate you’ve delivered important things to your district so this all gets tied up with election year politics. That’s where we stand right now. This is traditionally the quiet period when – this won’t really pick up until the first of January. I don’t think any decisions have been made.

On the legislative front, if you’re interested, at the state level, the one thing that probably will be dealt with is some attempt to fix-up unintended consequences of the pension law that passed. I see Steve Cunningham is here and I don’t think there’ll be an overall rejection or change but there will be a willingness to fix certain things that were unintended and that is moving forward. We’re involved in an analysis of that. There is a bill that has already 60 co-signers, House Bill, I think it’s 4166, which is a pension tightening up bill that gets at a lot of things that concern us. I don’t want to get technical on the pensions but, you know, and the 6% that they calculate in the last years is summer pay of faculty improvement, its annual vacation payout included, those sorts of things and we’re making progress on all of those issues. I’ll keep you informed. It’s a fluid situation but I think there is a willingness to consider – not wholesale changes – but fixing up unintended consequences because in the public eye, pension reform is a positive thing and it got a lot of legislative support so they’re not going to want to throw that out. They’re willing to quietly fix-up unintended consequences.
We’re also trying to fix-up some of the unintended consequences of the Ethics Legislation. I don’t know how far we’re going to get with that. Like you, I passed my test and it’s – we’re all ethical.

???: Actually not – there’s a question – if we share research that we’re being unethical.

President Peters: Well, I just passed my test; I got my sheet of paper. I’m not going to get fined $5,000 so, you know, we’re trying to work on that. That’s a tough one to – once it passes ethics legislation – legislators are not eager to open that up again because you don’t know – you lose control over it. So, we’re working on it and we’re making some progress. It’s part of being a public institution.

Okay, the Provost Search Committee is off and running. Paul isn’t here but we’re all empanelled. I’m going to exercise my duty and prerogative to add a member or two with Paul. The Committee does reflect the diversity of this campus. It’s an artifact of following the Constitutional process but we’ve resulted in some under-represented groups so – this happened last time as well so I’m going to exercise my right and work with Paul and we’re going to name a couple of members to make it a committee that represents the community. It’s a good committee, that being said, it’s a great committee and we had a four or five hour meeting last week to work on the criteria which the Faculty Senate reacted to. Our executive search firm interviewed a lot of people and I just talked to her today and she’s going to give me a report on what she found. We’re off and running. We’re on schedule. The Trustees have been informed. They’re really always quite amused at how long it takes us to go through these processes but our estimate is that if all goes well, the latest that we will be making offers is early May. You know how these things work. We’ll be advertising in January now but we’re off and running and, you know, this is a matter of contacting people. These sorts of searches you never really get the person from an ad but we go through all of that and, you know, we’ll get a hundred plus applicants and probably out of that about thirty bona fide applicants for our job when you think about it. So we’re really excited about it. It’s a great job for somebody and that will really be a very important activity for me and the committee in the spring.

Okay, the other thing I just want to mention. The Washington scene is difficult as well. It’s getting very difficult to get earmarks because of the lack of discretionary spending as the result of Katrina and the war. This is momentary because I think there’s always money in Washington but for this year, it’s going to be a little difficult but we have no complaints.

The other thing I want to mention – a couple of things about NIU. At the IBHE meeting yesterday, as part of the annual report on the progress on the Illinois Commitment which was the strategic plan of the IBHE that was put in place several years and most of you are familiar with that, there were four presentations from universities that have done some things that were kind of interesting that helped move the Commitment along. One presentation was from Joe Grush, the Interim Dean of Liberal Arts, and what Joe reported on in a very succinct way without an overhead, was our just-in-time scheduling for our core highly impacted courses and I must admit it’s one of the best presentations I’d ever heard at the IBHE. I’ll have to calibrate that but it was darn good and I’m going to ask Joe to give that presentation to the Board of Trustees. It’s amazing how we ensure that every freshman has a full schedule and how we level and I know
Gip is here and he’s involved in that and Fredrick Schwantes. I see that Virginia Cassidy is all the deans work on it and then the people of the highly impacted departments like mathematics that are constantly opening and leveling, has really caught the attention of the IBHE Commission. There’s many of them who are new and they came up to me and said “wow, that’s really fantastic” and I said “yeah, that’s NIU”. So I was very pleased at that and I know that there’s a report on IBHE later on but there’s been a changing of the guard – there’s a new Executive Director, Judy Erwin, who we know very well, she’s a former legislator. But there’s been a turnover in almost all the members so in any regulatory body, and I consider it a regulatory body, there’s always – when you get new membership – there’s always a certain period of time when they adjust and they get educated and you have to re-educate them on the same old issues that are tiring – but I do it – that’s what I do for a living but I’ve watched now and observed. You know, these boards go through phases and they go through stages at the state level and the national level and the states and it’s clear to me that we’re in a phase now where the three “A’s” are primary in their thinking – access, affordability, and accountability. Those are the things that they are very, very much interested in. It isn’t PPA, although that may be an aspect of it, or PPQ; it isn’t program approval or elimination – it’s access, that’s everyone getting an education who needs one in the state at a cost that’s reasonable. Are we as efficient as we can be? This is okay by me because we are pretty efficient although everything is cast in that. You don’t hear a lot of investment in our research structure to stimulate economic development. You don’t hear a lot of that. You don’t hear a lot of excellence in quality and all of that. What you hear is, okay, the state’s not going to put money in post-secondary education; they haven’t, there’s too many competitors so we’ve got a demographic issue we have to look at. We’ve got affordability; tuition is raising and accountability – is the state getting its money out of their post-secondary. So that’s where we are; I think you already knew that. With each meeting, I’m begging to see more and more that that’s the way we’re going to have to craft what we do. We’ll do what we do but we’ll craft it a little bit differently. So that’s my impressions and I don’t mind that at all. I think sometimes I would prefer that to movements like PPQ where regulatory bodies try to evaluate whether or not institution “x” should offer this kind of degree or this kind of program or not offer this PhD and I don’t think that gets you anywhere to tell you the truth and it just ties you all up so I just wanted to let you know that.

All right, I think we’ll hold questions until the end and I will entertain any questions that you have.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Let’s move on to V, the Consent Agenda. Motion to accept? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The Consent Agenda was accepted.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness – review of script – Refer to Academic Policy Committee (Page 3)

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES
President Peters: Now to reports. First the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Sharon or Jody, do we have a report? I know we have a written report; is there an oral report?

S. Holmes: I’m Sharon Holmes.

President Peters: Sharon is back there.

S. Homes: Jody is here as well. I think she will have a brief report as well. I attended the joint meeting of the IBHE and the FAC on October 18 in Urbana-Champaign and just to give you a highlight of some of the activity for that day, we had a report by Stanley Ikenberry and it was titled “Higher Education and America’s Future” and he started by posing these three questions: Is higher education in trouble in this country? Does it matter? If we believe that it is and that it matters, what can we do? It was a consensus that it does matter. Higher education is important to everyone and primarily because it provides people with standards of living and upper mobility and things of that nature. One of the things that Ikenberry said was that he believed that we are in a potential area where we may lose the American dream as it relates to higher education. He put that out there and then I’ll address what he said later. He indicated what we can do to overcome some of the problems that we’re having with higher education is understand the importance of IBHE in giving voice to these issues and others that we face in higher education in the state and then he indicated that we need to open up a dialogue with the American public as well and I understand that is taking place beginning the first of the year. I think they’re going to be going around in a committee talking to the general public on different issues to ask their input on where we should be going in higher education and education in general in the state of Illinois. Comments from the Board included that they believe that faculty and administrators need to make significant changes in how we think about higher education and our methods of delivery and Kaplan, the Chair of IBHE, said that he did not believe that we were in an area where we might lose the American dream because we said that how we view education has changed since the beginning and now, because we have life-long learning and people attend college or can engage in education in the 50’s and 60’s and on up, that we’ll never lose the American dream as it relates to higher education. Then we had a question from the Board – “How many years of involvement in education ‘really’ make a difference in a person’s life” and it was assumed that certainly a person needed a high school education but they also felt that four years was probably adequate for most people. Another question from the Board was “Is two years of education beyond high school as significant as four years” and again, four years was deemed to be the most significant and most important to peoples’ lives.

Then there was a presentation by Gary Alexander on faculty salaries and fringe benefits in Illinois colleges and universities. The report represents a two-year – I’m sorry – an analysis of full-time faculty salaries and non-salary benefits at Illinois public and private universities and colleges. According to the salary report, the average faculty salaries at public universities in FY2005 – weighted for all ranks of faculty – was $69,000 which represented a 7.1 percent gain over 2003 and a 13.4 percent increase since 2001.
When compared to peer institutions in other states, salaries were only marginally more competitive in 2005 than four years earlier. In 2001, Illinois faculty salaries were 95.3 percent of median salaries paid at peer institutions; and in 2005 Illinois salaries were at 95.7 percent of peer colleges and universities.

Considerable discussion followed the presentation of the report and a number of questions came up whether or not the IBHE should be responsible for disseminating this type of information and they countered by saying this information is public knowledge; it has just been comprised in a comprehensive report and that they would continue to provide information like this in the future.

Then Judy Erwin was introduced as the new Executive Director of IBHE. I had an opportunity to interact with her on this past Friday. We had a FAC meeting in Springfield and one of the things that she said was that she intends to work very closely with the FAC and she appreciates the relationship and she looks forward to it.

Then we had a luncheon with the members of the Board and James Kaplan, the Chairman again, started the conversation with questions to the FAC and the first question was “tell me what the faculty intends to do to change the current state of the university and what allowances or concessions are faculty willing to make and are we willing to make to work more hours?” and naturally, as you can imagine, a lot of conversation pursued that. Okay?

That concludes my report.

President Peters: Tell us about that.

S. Holmes: It was very heated. Yes. Thank you.

J. Stephen: Cheryl? When they say faculty and administrators need to make significant changes in how they think about higher education and their methods of delivering services, does Ikenberry or the IBHE offer any guidance on what those changes should be?

S. Holmes: You said Cheryl – are you saying Sharon?

J. Stephen: Sharon, excuse me.

S. Holmes: No, there were no suggestions provided but I think more so than anything that he threw that out there just to raise the tension in the room. I got the impression that he likes to have debate and a little controversy at times but it also appeared with some of the things that he said, that there is a disconnect with some of the members of the Board and the university environment in terms of what faculty actually do. Some of the comments that were made was that there appears to be a lack of appreciation for what we already do and some of the concessions that have already been made and he said but he believes that we have created some of the problems that we now have and so at that point the tempers got so flared that you really couldn’t catch what was being said.

B. Stephen: Okay, thank you.
President Peters: Yeah?

B. Tolhurst: One of my impressions, I hope that it’s false ---

President Peters: Microphone.

B. Tolhurst: One of my impressions concerning the IBHE is that when we tell them how much we work, they don’t believe us because they don’t believe we are working outside the 8:00 to 4:30 time and so when they talk about us working more hours, right, they’re first of all not willing to grant that we are working outside those hours and they want us to work more hours within that traditional framework because they only think we’re working when we’re in the classroom and is that what the heated conversation was about?

S. Holmes: I think President Peters alluded to it and certainly Wayne Evans had a discussion with Kaplan on yesterday and if I’m not mistaken, Kaplan was a lawyer and he did not come from a higher education background and so sometimes I think that what we have to do is educate people who are outside of higher education on what we really do and we have to give it to them in a language that they can understand. We did stress the point that a lot of times faculty are working around the clock when your regular people from business and industry may be sleeping. People don’t understand that you do maybe a – you teach two or three classes and that might represent maybe three hours or four or whatever on campus but then you have to go away and you have to do the prep for the classes as well as the research to remain, you know, relevant for what you’re doing in the classroom and so he seemed to be a little more sensitive after he heard that. Again, yesterday he had a conversation with Wayne Evans, they rode over to wherever the meeting was being held, and he said – he did apologize – and Wayne is the Chair of FAC and so he naturally sent out this e-mail to all of us today and said he got an apology from the person – from Kaplan – who said and wanted to go on record saying that he really didn’t have an understanding of what the university environment was like because that wasn’t his background and he says that it has been an education for him and that he is more sensitive to the needs of faculty and people on the university campus now.

President Peters: Okay, I don’t know how much – whether this workload thing has legs – my impression, having been on that issue for many years, it’s morphed and now it – the legislature knows and accepts that we on average, work 54.5 hours a week which is documented in all the national – they don’t care. The issue is how we spend our time. The issue is not that we work hard; the issue is where do we spend our time and you have some in the legislature who will say the only thing we want to pay for is undergraduate instruction. In other words, that’s what they want to pay for; ???, but I’ve not in two years had one legislator ask me about workload. I’ve had no – outside of Mr. Kaplan – I’ve had no IBHE member. Now the IHBE has on it now several faculty members and two former presidents. So I wouldn’t get worked up about this issue. I’m not worked up about it but I also know I can’t win explaining what we do except bring people on campus. I’ve done that before and I can do it again. I wouldn’t get worked up on this but I think at the time, and knowing how Mr. Kaplan talks and I think he does care about higher education – I think his view is he had to convince the Governor that we were worthy of investment and the first step was cleaning out administrative blot and that’s why we had to cut
our administration by 25 percent. We did that. Then I know what his thinking was, his thinking next was how can we make faculty more productive? So then you have two issues to go to the Governor with and say look, they cut the administrative expenses and the faculty are more productive so now would you give us a salary increase. That’s really what it was all about and he all along believed that you could get at this by talking directly to faculty and you know what I counseled him sitting on a bench one time, I said “Mr. Kaplan, do you know the phrase ‘a wolf by the ears or a husky by the ears’”, so Bill?

**B. Tolhurst:** Yeah, I spend a morning serving on a hospital ethics committee in Sandwich. Is that stuff they want us to do? I mean it seems to me we’ve put that on our faculty activity report and it sounds to me that if they’re good politicians they want the community served and it makes them look good that state institutions are doing that. Is it something that they’re not willing to recognize?

**President Peters:** Yeah, I think on an individual basis that they want that very much. But remember when we go out or I go to them, I’m after one thing; I’m after more money and they’re looking at it in a situation where they’ve got all those priorities they’ve got to choose from and then they always look for reasons not to pick one priority over another and I’ve been defending what faculty do for years and it’s hard work. You think you get someone educated into it and then all of a sudden there’s recidivism. It’s a constant thing; I don’t worry about it any more because, you know, I’m not sure it makes that much of a difference. It irritates the hell out of me and makes you real frustrated and made because you just spend all morning doing something that isn’t necessarily your core activity and you’re doing it for the common good and the public good and keep on doing it because I care. So do the people you do it for and that’s what counts. Anyway, good report.

**S. Holmes:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** How’s your blood pressure? Any other questions? Anyway, you know, that fits into my statement. I’m watching real carefully where’s the focus going to land because they’re in transition and remember too, IBHE is a regulatory body. They’re not our advocates. They’re appointed by the Governor to watch – to, you know, fulfill any public policy commitments he or she makes on education and to watch the state treasury. We look upon them as, you know, our advocate; we’re our advocate. Okay. Jody, did you want to say something? Yeah, there she is.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I attended the meeting – the next meeting after, well, between Sharon I guess that was at St. Augustine College and that was not IHBE and FAC, it was just the Faculty Advisory Committee. I have a couple of what I considered important things to mention to you.

The first one is there seems to be some rather substantial changes in the works for the Illinois Articulation Initiative. There’s a preliminary report that was released November 15 so here was very little discussion of it; none essentially at the meeting on the 17 or the 18 because they hadn’t seen it yet but when I came home, I got on the internet and it was posted there. If you look at page numbers, at the bottom of your packet, it’s 11 and 12. It’s a 34 page, I believe, long report that you can find on the IBHE website. Those of you that have been involved in this process for
many years are probably much more familiar with this than I am but it seems like they’re proposing some fairly substantial changes. I just listed the general recommendations, but again there are 34 pages to this report so if you believe that this impacts you or your department or your students, you have one more week to comment on that so – I know that there are people in this room who have followed that process but for those of you who may want more information you should look at that and do it soon because you have one more week to comment on that.

President Peters: Sharon, you want to comment on that?

S. Holmes: Yes, after the recent Faculty Senate I got on the phone and talked with – I thought it would be Paul Crawford but it was not – so he put me in touch with Suzanne Warber if I’m pronouncing her name right ---

President Peters: That’s our person.

S. Holmes: Yes, and they will do the communication back to these two people who have been identified in the report for the university. So, if you have any type of input, you might want to contact them as opposed to the other people who are named in here and they will do it collectively for the university.

J. Stephen: What was the contact name again?

S. Holmes: Suzanne Warber, W-a-r-b-e-r.

President Peters: Paul Stoddard and Buck Stephen indicated to me that this was hearing up initially. I asked Virginia Cassidy to take a look at it. Virginia, do you have anything to add to this? You have to get a microphone. Virginia goes to the Chief Academic Officer meetings of the IBHE and so this wouldn’t come up at the Presidents’ meetings but it probably would come up there.

V. Cassidy: Yes it did come up at the Academic Officer’s meeting last Friday and unfortunately, the report had never been distributed to this group.

President Peters: Well, that’s good.

V. Cassidy: Our discussion was quite brief. But the issue Paul spoke to me about was related in changes in how course approvals would occur and we did discuss that briefly. I think the report is very instructive and I really would encourage you to read it quite carefully. They talked with people who had served on the panels and identified some of the issues related to trying to get courses approved in a timely manner and the impression that you come away with is that it’s a moving target. It depends on who’s on the panel any particular day. There was one individual who was representing the community colleges who had been involved in admitting courses for the gen ed core competencies and indicated that the last course that he submitted was returned to him even though it was identical in its substance and contained all the information that had been previously accepted and the reason that course was rejected was because the panel members on that day were asking for additional information and he talked about how frustrating that was. So,
basically the recommendation was that the panels should not be reviewing the individual courses. What they should do is set the standards, the learning outcomes, identify the content, etc., and that campuses need to set up a process if they haven’t done so already, to ensure that courses that are proposed for submission do in fact meet these criteria that have been developed by the faculty and that the courses would then be submitted for inclusion in the gen ed core and that IBHE staff would review the proposals and if they had any questions or concerns, that they would contact the members of the appropriate panel but the feeling was that there didn’t need to be a review of every, single course every single time in order this articulation agreement effective. That was the substance of our discussion at the Academic Officers meeting.

President Peters: So, what is your read on this, that those are all reasonable things to look at?

V. Cassidy: Yes, it seemed to be very reasonable given the issues that were raised by individuals who had served on the panels or who are currently serving on the panels that it’s frustrating, it’s an inefficient use of faculty time. It takes sometimes more than a year to get a course approved because of this moving target so their recommendations I think are reasonable. It certainly retains its faculty focus and control.

President Peters: That’s the issue.

V. Cassidy: Yes, I agree.

President Peters: Okay, Gip you want to say something?

G. Seavers: Just a point of clarification. Suzanne is actually the Associate Director of Registration and Records so those of you who are trying to contact her by e-mail, she’s available in Groupwise. Those of you who don’t have it and want to forward it, just forward it to her in Registration and Records.

President Peters: All right, we’re going to monitor this one. Yeah?

P. Henry: Just a point of clarification. How do the individual campus committee or boards or whatever communicate with the central committee, I mean, such that they’re not approving courses that might not reach the level that the basic or central committee does?

President Peters: Do you understand that question Virginia?

V. Cassidy: Let me give you an answer and then we’ll find out if I understand the question. The panels will continue to exist. The recommendation is that the focus of their work changes. That the panel should focus on setting the standards for the courses and the content, etc. and the if, in fact, there are courses that are submitted that there are questions about, then the panels would, in fact, review them but that the need to review every single course would be eliminated.

P. Henry: I guess just to clarify again, my question is what if the individual college committees get it wrong and approve a course that does not, in fact – as a first year chemical course as, it turns out, doesn’t work so well as a first year chemistry course for those who want to take a
second year chemistry course at a different institution. Is there any kind of feedback that there can be some correction?

V. Cassidy: Well, that wasn’t addressed specifically, but I assume that the process that’s in place for communicating with institutions that submit courses would remain in place. I mean, it’s not going to go into some black hole and just remain there and people are never going to know whether it’s been accepted or not and if it hasn’t been accepted, I think having clear standards, statements of outcomes, content, etc., I think the feedback will be much better to the institution and the turn-around time then can be shortened so that any changes that need to be made in a course that wasn’t approved initially could then be made in an expeditious manner.

President Peters: Okay, good.

J. Stephen: Maybe they should try to streamline the process rather than just throw it away. I’ve witness many times where core competency courses at various community colleges slowly degrade and the examination of the materials is a necessity to make sure that they’re up to our standards. So, if you talk to them, maybe you might suggest ways to streamline the process as opposed to doing away with it.

V. Cassidy: Well, my perception of it was not that they were doing away with the process; it was that they were, in fact, streamlining it. The standards would be set, the competencies and the content would be identified. It would be agreed upon and developed by the faculty. This would then be available for all to see and that courses would be developed according to those standards and the courses are, in fact, developed by faculty so when the courses are submitted, you know – I mean ---

J. Stephen: Well, we have all those things in those six-digit codes but we still see degradation in certain courses. So, I guess my stand is I think at least for core competencies the external review is still a necessity to make sure that it meets rather than review only on appeal.

V. Cassidy: And that’s something that you certainly can send a comment to this week and next week on to the authors of the document.

President Peters: All right, enough said on that subject. Any other questions? Yes, Jody.

J. Newman-Ryan: I will just briefly mention a few other things that occurred at the meeting. There had been a summit on higher education a week before our meeting and I listed the website here in case you’re interested in looking at that. In my experience, these buzz words show up in things like, you know, PPQ and PPA so I just listed a little bit of the information. You’re free to look at more. The conversation at the FAC was that this book The World is Flat” was discussed a lot so if you’re looking for intercession reading, you might want to look at that and see what we’re in for. So that was mentioned.

Another thing that was mentioned, I know we were told, I don’t know a year or two ago, that faculty were exempt from accounting for our time in 15 minute increments. I still don’t know that that’s not the case and apparently the FAC believed from some attorney or someone that that
would not be upheld and that faculty would have to account for their time in 15 minute increments. So, remember that’s from the state officials and Employees Ethics Act and the unpronounceable acronym of SOEEA, so I don’t know that that’s the case and I’ll let Sharon keep you informed of that as well as our people here so I don’t know that that’s anything you have to worry about yet but, anyway, that happened.

I’ll just mention a couple of other things that occurred when they discussed the summit and other things. We had a speaker who was State Representative, Larry McKeon, and I was not familiar with him until this meeting and he actually seems to have been an academic in another life so I know we have a lot of legislators who we think don’t have much of an understanding of higher ed so he apparently was an assistant dean at one point in time and seemed to have a really good grasp of differences between education and training and he does know what faculty do and he does seem to have a lot of desire to work with universities on some of these issues so I just merely mention his name because we’re used to talking about ones who don’t seem to know what we do so ---

Thank you.

President Peters: I can comment on some of those. I was at the summit and it was about 60 community college presidents and public university presidents talking to a smattering of legislators, listening to national experts on higher education. I spent my whole day doing that. There was a big focus on under-preparedness of students and what are we going to do about it and looking at the new demographics – the thing I talk about in my State of the University address – they’re finally catching up so – but I’m glad they did it because we got a chance to meet and talk and talk to some legislators and I think the intent of the IBHE was to begin to make the case to legislators for investment in higher education so I think that was a good thing. I’ll tell you where we are on the coming into compliance with the very specific language of the Ethics Law which says all employees period, even student workers, have to fill out time cards at 15 minute intervals. That’s in the law; that’s specific. What we did last year was we said, this doesn’t make any sense for faculty – you know the argument – so, we worked out a compromise, an accommodation, we meaning the public universities presents and chancellors, worked out an accommodation with the then Inspector General, Zee Scott, who I think is a wonderful person, tough former prosecutor, she went on to better things. I enjoyed her a lot and she was sensible; she had sense about her. But the new Inspector General doesn’t have that view and what’s happened is that - every year, we have to be audited by the state by an independent outside auditor. Every year we have to do that; we have to pay for that and they audit everything. Every public university I understand, we talked about this, is going to get a finding, an audit finding, whether it’s a material finding or a slap-on-the-wrist finding or a material finding – we’re not sure yet – that says none of us are in compliance with the 15 minute rule for faculty which, you know, think about – well, I don’t even want to get into that. We’re hanging together and saying we have a deal; we have a consensus and we have a way of reporting it. We’ve accommodated that; that’s where we are on that. That is the hottest information, the most up-to-date. We’re hanging tough. Now, if we have to, I don’t know what we’re going to do, you know, because it makes no sense but we’re hanging tough, all of us – all 13 presidents and chancellors – and we’re probably all going to get a finding and have to go and justify but I think we’ve got a good case on that. Again, that’s one of things that I’m not going to worry about until I have to worry
about it so please, you don’t worry about it. Let me worry about it. I’ll let you know if there’s a problem with it. Yeah?

**P. Henry:** Can we worry about it in 15 minute intervals?

**President Peters:** Only if you record it. You know, my thought is look, this is political activity and it gets back to Bill’s point. Some of this is you get lumped in. We get lumped in. A state employee is a state employee and legislators and the public perceives that state employees don’t work real hard, you know, and I always say well, university people are different than that. Well, and then you have the situation where, you know, was this Ethics Act aimed at public employees doing political work on state time or is there something more to it and that is they want to account for your time. I’m not sure. You know, in our situation, a faculty member decides to pass a petition or leaflet or get people to work for a local political candidate, if they do that during scheduled class time, they got to find a way to – or during office hours – then I think what you have to do is say I didn’t hold office hours that day I was out leafleting but then I held office hours the next day and compensated. I think – something like that – they call that negative reporting. That would be negative reporting and it isn’t like putting down 15. So, anyway we’ll get through this. All right? Jody, you got more for us?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** No.

**President Peters:** Thank God. All right.

B. **BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee** – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. **BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee** – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. **BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee** – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. **BOT – Paul Stoddard – report**

**President Peters:** Shey Lowman is going to give Paul Stoddard’s report because he’s in San Francisco. I want to get that into the record for the BOT.

**S. Lowman:** Well, it was a beautiful segue into the BOT meeting which was last Thursday. We got a little late start due to everybody getting used to driving in the snow. In the committee report on the IBHE, one of the board members made the statement that there is a common theme from the legislators on the budget cuts last year and that they didn’t realize how much the budget cuts had hurt us and so it was recommended that we make a little bit more of that because they were surprised that legislators hadn’t really understood how badly they had hurt us.
University Civil Service Board meeting, the ??? testing program now includes 34 tests that are primarily for food service and library positions and there’s going to be a constituency survey conducted early next year which is a new thing as part of this assessment.

Mostly the business that was transacted was the university made recommendations for upgrading and expanding the student parking lots that are north of Grant Towers and the redesign and reconstruction of the Evan’s Field House lot which you folks have discussed at length over the past year so those were approved. All that funding was available through parking reserves from revenues.

Another item of business was that Kathy Buettner was promoted to Vice President for External Affairs and she received commendations from all the Board members regarding that.

The last thing that happened was Felicia Bohannon-Williams who is the Director of Educational Services and Programs gave a presentation on programming for under-prepared students. She described NIU’s work through Upward Bound and A.C.C.E.S.S. which they do with high school and middle school students to prepare them to enroll in NIU. There are currently 21 Upward Bound alumni attending NIU.

President Peters: Good. Good report. Shey, you’re going to give the next report as well, Resources, Space, and Budgets – oh, we have a comment. Sorry, I missed that.

C. Booth: It’s not a comment but it’s about the Academic Policy Committee which is next on there. We don’t have a report but I’d like to give a heads up to the committee members. Because we’ve had an item come to us; the item that’s on page 3, so we will be meeting early in January. We will be sending an e-mail around to the committee members to get your schedules. Please respond promptly so we can set up the time for that.

President Peters: I’m sorry I didn’t ask if you wanted to report.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Colin Booth, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – Amy Rose, Chair – report (Page 22)

President Peters: Now, Shey are you ready for Resources, Space, and Budgets.

S. Lowman: I am. On page 22 of your packet you have the written report on the meeting of Resource, Space, and Budgets. I’d just to point out that about two-thirds of the way down, we had met with Mallory Simpson who’s the President of the NIU Foundation and really the point of our speaking with her was to point out what faculty could do to help with fundraising and she gave us three items that faculty could do and those are:

- Identify potential donors, especially students. You folks know who your students are who have gone out into the world and have done quite well.
- Invite alumni back as speakers as this advances their relationship with NIU, and third,
- When traveling to conferences, you can offer to contact alumni and to host small events.
That’s it.

**President Peters:** Very good. I wouldn’t have thought about that last one but that’s a good idea. You could even coordinate – you could probably get the Foundation to put a little money in that, depending on the level – don’t use that as an excuse to hold a party. Yeah, Dean Sorenson? Grad a mike.

**C. Sorenson:** On the last item, several of the colleges already do the hosting of events in regards to conferences so I would just encourage faculty to coordinate with their dean’s office to do that and sometimes the dean’s office can find a little support for that too.

**President Peters:** I was going to mention that. This should all be coordinated. Don’t go directly to the Foundation; go through your Dean. It’s safer and actually more beneficial. That’s great. I’m glad you did that. What else? That’s it?

**S. Lowman:** That’s it.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – report (Page 23)

**President Peters:** All right, Rules and Governance, John?

**J. Wolfskill:** Nothing to add.

**President Peters:** Your report is on page 23. Thank you John. Looks like that’s it.

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

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Sally Webber, Chair – no report

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** On to Unfinished Business.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** New Business?

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

**President Peters:** Comments for the good of the whole and questions? No? I hope everybody has a very great holiday. Keep warm; burn wood. Drive safe.

**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

J. Stephen: Motion to adjourn? Second? All in favor?

President Peters: Thanks Buck.

The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.