President Peters: I call the September 13, 2006 meeting of the University Council to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first order of business is the adoption of today’s agenda and I want to call your attention to a couple of walk-in items. You should have before you a stapled two pages that are to be added to the Consent Agenda. So these are items that are going to be referred to committee; one on academic dishonesty cases and the other on observance of religious holidays. Those are on the Consent Agenda to be referred. There are two documents. And then the other addendum is under reports, under B which is a written report on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – that’s just to be added as a written report. Those are the walk-in items. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as amended? All right, there’s a move and a second. Any discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2006 MEETING (Pages 3-6)

President Peters: Our next item is approval of the minutes of May 3 following on pages 3-6. I’ll call for any additions or corrections at this time. Yes?

A. Rose: Under Amy Rose under completed in the President’s Announcements, the Department of Counseling, Adult and Higher Education, not Health.
President Peters: All right, change Health to Higher. All right, that’s accepted. Any others? All right, motion to accept? Second? All those in favor say aye. All right, we have approved our minutes.

The minutes were approved as amended.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well it’s a little late to say welcome back. I think we’re into our, depending on how you count, our third or fourth week of classes or activity although it appears that the academic rhythms are not what they used to be, you know, it seems to never end. I hope those of you who were off campus doing things had a productive summer. Welcome to our new members of the Council and best wishes for a productive year.

I’m not going to say too much about things at the university because my State of the University address, get it down on your calendar, is October 5 and this year – remember last year I did sort of a very extensive five-year review of university accomplishments and issues, pretty much going through unit by unit. This year I’m not going to do that. I’m going to be focusing more on some strategic thinking for the future, talking about some planning activities and talking a little bit about kind of a shift in some of our fund raising activities and priorities. So it’s going to be a shorter speech and one less laden with data and statistics although we’re going to put a lot of that on the web this year. We want to try to put, you know, some of the good news and the kudos out on the web. We’re going to see how – well, I want to get modern this year and technological. No I-pod downloading though. Maybe next year but not this year I’ll join that revolution. I urge you all to come to that and I’ve been working on that now all summer and I want to keep it fairly short. I’m going to focus on some directions and kind of a call for a campus dialogue so that’s pretty much on my mind for the next couple of weeks.

I do want to thank everyone who made – we had such a successful start to the academic year. You know, this is a rather large enterprise and our enrollment report, we’re probably going to release our ten-day enrollment report probably if not this week-end, next Monday, but obviously we’re up a bit in enrollment and the work that goes into – first of all recruiting students, getting them good orientation, getting them class schedules, putting good instructors in front of them – is a huge enterprise on the academic side and then on the fiscal side, readying our classrooms, readying our residence halls, a move-in day that had the potential complication of a closed tollway which didn’t materialize but maybe if you plan enough, these eventualities never happen, maybe that’s it. I kind of observed all that this summer and then redoing of parking lots. I’ve watched at one time that show “Flip this House” or “Flip that House”, you know, where somebody buys a house and then they have ten days to – well, I always drive around campus and it’s two weeks before students come back and the flip has not been flipped yet. The parking lots haven’t been redone and of course we do have a pretty vibrant summer session and the people have to get into the residence halls and clean them, fumigate them, whatever we do with them but I marvel at how everyone pitches in. Up and down, faculty, staff, students, volunteers coming back. I just want to say good job. I don’t know many universities that do it that well and as efficiently.
There’s something that’s on my mind that I want to talk a little bit about and then I’m going to introduce someone. This summer, or for a year now, a commission, a Federal Commission, has been at work and many of you probably have heard about it, the Secretary of the Department of Education, Margaret Spellings, established a Commission on the Future of Higher Education in 2005. The challenge to this commission that had about nineteen members from across the country, was to establish an agenda for the future of higher education – it came out of the Department of Education and it was watched and debated and studied and monitored with a great deal of trepidation on the part of the traditional higher education community. The public universities and the private universities and the community college system, the independents, the proprietary schools, the on-line degree programs, everyone was watching this because the feeling was that this Commission was going to produce a report in the vein of the Nation at Risk Report that resulted in things like “No Child Left Behind”. These commission reports largely try to capture the public sentiment and public attention so there was great concern because of some of the things that were said. Well, true to form, there has been this summer, there were many field hearings last year, and some of you may have participated in those. I know we monitored and I went to one of them and there were about four drafts this summer of the Spellings’ Commission report and the final report is, while better in terms of the perspective of higher education than the initial drafts, the end result is it’s a set of recommendations that are largely critical of higher education and try to make the point that perhaps because of certain things, the public is beginning or has lost confidence in public higher education and obviously, we know this historically, we cannot be sustained as a public university if the public lacks confidence in what we do. Now, I for one happen to believe that the public does not lack confidence in what we do. I think sometimes they question what we do and the way we do it and what we do many times needs continual explanation and, you know, I’m always in that role. I’m always explaining what we do or translating what we do to public officials, to citizens, to parents and that’s something you’ve got to really work at. At any rate, I urge you to take a look at this report. You can get it at, you know, the Department of Education website. It has a bunch of recommendations and basically, I would say the report focuses on a few things that should be of concern to all of us and one is there is great concern about the cost of higher education and affordability. That as a commodity, all higher education has gotten to the point where perhaps we’ve priced ourselves out of existence or could. I don’t know about that. A kind of an industrial model of analysis was used on this. I would say Ford Motor Company would be a good example. A thriving American enterprise, United Air Lines, that had grown and been very successful and perhaps, you know, eased back on that and then over a period of time, competitiveness, global competitiveness, put them at a disadvantage because they were not responsive, they were inefficient. The cost of their product was too much, etc., etc. If you use that kind of thinking, you can guess at what this report said. There was a, you know, concern that our transfer credits need to be more easily, you know, our articulation agreements, critical of the accreditation system that we have, critical that we weren’t transparent or accountable, that it’s certainly hard to figure out what universities do if you look at their financial statements. There’s a urging in terms of accountability on a system of accountability that’s not based upon rankings based on reputation, but based on productivity and that is do you improve the learning of students, and what do you do to add value to a student based upon relatively expensive education. So those are the kinds of things that are in there. None of which are too surprising. None of which are things that we haven’t all thought about. I guess my perspective on this is as that as a report, it’s one of the – it’s a political report and I don’t mean that in a partisan way or that it may have partisan aspects, but it’s a political report in
that it’s geared at trying to change a very important institution to the future of America and therefore, we have to pay attention to it. Now, the higher education community is sort of divided as we speak as to how to approach this. David Ward who is the former chancellor at Madison and is the Executive Director of the American Council on Education which is supposed to be the umbrella organization over the land grants, the independents, the AAU – not necessarily coordination – but the one umbrella organization, was on the Commission and refused to sign the report and has taken a very, very strong stand and has been very critical of it. Some of the other educational associations while they’ve weighed in, they have taken kind of a different posture which is well, let’s take a different look at this and embrace what’s positive in it and in any report there’s a lot to be positive about and, you know, let’s take a wait and see attitude. My own view is I think there are things are there that we ought to take a look at and discuss amongst ourselves because, you know, when you go through that list of things that they’re interested in, I think if you were going to grade NIU, we’d get a real high grade – affordability, access to students, working hard on persistence to graduation, embracing new pedagogies, new technologies and focusing on learning, trying to be as efficient as possible. Maybe we wouldn’t get perfect scores by their standards but I think we’d do pretty well. I think we’re strong in those areas. What I wouldn’t want to see happen in American higher education nor do I think many of you would, is the standardization where you have kind of a “New Child Left Behind Goes to College” and then iPods data collection on steroids. A little dark humor thing. I think still the great strength of the American higher education system is its variety and its diversity of types of institutions and the ability of each institution to develop its own measures of success and accountability and not to be necessarily compared in a book somewhere or a website to every other institution which we certainly don’t have a problem with that but I don’t know if that gets us where we need to go. So, I urge you and your classes and in the hallways, you know, it may be way out of your subject matter area but I think it’s important to all of us.

Now, with as a backdrop, I’ll get off the soapbox for a moment and say that in our own way, I would like this year, the theme of it, to be devoted to a campus dialogue on the future and why is that? I think the time is right. Last year at the State of the University Report, I talked about the five themes that I thought should characterize NIU and people have sort of chewed on those and talked about them all year and I see departments and colleges and departments using that language of being global and accountable and so forth. Well, this year we have the opportunity, particularly at the academic level, but it should encompass the whole university, to talk about what the next five to ten years should be. What should we focus on? You know, we’ve been through a pretty tough time but we’re in pretty robust shape for being through a tough time and I think, I get the feeling, that there are lots of individuals out there now who want to talk about their dreams and aspirations and be heard about where NIU can go.

So, I want to introduce some, our new Provost Ray Alden, who came this summer and Ray and I have had a lot of chats about this kind of activity whether it’s called strategic planning or visioning and I’ve sort of given him the task along with other members of the cabinet, but Ray is going to lead this to lead the campus, particularly the academic student affairs side of the campus, in a dialogue about NIU, its role, its mission and its future and I asked Ray – first of all I want to introduce Ray. Let’s give Ray a round of applause.
R. Alden: I just wanted to say a few words about strategic planning. First of all, I know that a number of colleges are already very committed and deeply engaged in strategic planning. I think what we are going to try and do for the next academic year is to get a group together to look at some – maybe looking at the mission and updating it and refining it and streamlining it a little bit so that is very clear what our unique niche is. No institution can be all things to all people but we want to build on our strengths. We want to build on our opportunities in the region and the state and so I think it’s all very important to have some sort of a roadmap for strategic plan, a strategic goal and the action plans that allow us to know how we make progress and the accountability measures, if you will, to indicate whether we are making progress and, if not, how we can improve. I think that’s important for a number of reasons. I hesitate to use the term branding but the professional of public image of an institution is really critical for so many different reasons. Recruiting students, recruiting good faculty and staff, engaging the potential donors in the vision of the university and its uniqueness, developing public/private partnerships with the private section, any number of issues that could be related to fundraising, the political aspect whether it’s the state IBHE or the Board of Trustees, the State Legislature or our representatives in the federal government, they all would tend to respond to a very strong consensus of where we’re going in the future and I think that’s important.

I think it’s also important to help us in a time of limited resources whether the resources are financial or space or peoples’ time to have people develop a consensus of what we should invest in and what perhaps we should take a by on whether than make everything ad hoc and divisive so I think having a kind of a university vision of where we’re going helps in that issue as well. Many accrediting bodies are looking for strategic plans as part of this accountability. How do you know whether you’re accomplishing your goals unless you have specific goals and if the accountability measures are not something that you can directly measure and point to as succeeding, then you don’t know how to correct the problem if you’re going in the wrong direction. We had a strategic consultant that said over and over again, if you can’t write it down, you can’t do it. If you don’t write it down, you won’t do it so it’s kind of getting the ideas, the consensus of the university community on paper. Many of the things we’re already doing. I’m not saying we need to change direction at all. I think it’s more of a case of making sure that everybody has reached sort of a consensus on what the roadmap for the future will be. So I will be working with John on developing a task force. Many of the members of the taskforce may come from this Council and other constituency councils throughout campus. We want this to be very broad-based, have that task force start to draft some of these ideas and have those drafts circulated through various groups for feedback. If there’s time during this relatively short period, maybe have a big retreat towards the end to get everybody’s final feel for not only the consensus making of whether the plan is a good one, but maybe some ideas of how it can then be translated down to the department and college levels where the action really is occurring. So those are just some of the ideas and I would hope that my timeline would start very soon. I would like to have this taskforce identified within the next few weeks so we can start meeting on a regular basis and start working on kind of this draft straw-man document that would be circulated around.

President Peters: Very good. I really look forward to this campus engagement and dialogue. I have great faith that the people of NIU are highly innovative and creative people. I think when we go through this we’ll very quickly affirm and reaffirm what we are but then the idea is to get
some new ideas and some new innovation and then I’ll be working hard with the Board of Trustees, with the NIU Foundation and with others so that we can find the marginal dollars at the end of the rainbow so that maybe some of these ideas can be confirmed and we’re committed to that. I think the important part about it right now is the dialogue and the inclusiveness of the process. So Ray, thank you. We’re glad you’re here; we’re all glad you’re here. I think we’ll take comments at the end and I apologize. That’s kind of extraordinary to do that under President’s Announcements but it appears as if our agenda isn’t as long as it normally is. All right?

V. CONSENT AGENDA


A. Approval of University Council Standing Committees for 2006-2007 (Page 7)
B. University Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees – 2006-2009 (Page 8)
C. Creation of Provost Task Force on Multicultural Curriculum Transformation – see memo from I. Legg – refer to Rules and Governance (Pages 9-11)
D. A motion from UCPC that tenure and promotion to associate professor be combined – see memo from I Legg – refer to Rules and Governance (Page 12)
E. Request from President Peters to change “subject to concurrence by the president” to “subject to concurrence by the provost” on several committees – refer to Rules and Governance
F. Smoking policy change – refer to Rules and Governance (Page 13)
G. Academic dishonesty policy proposal – refer to Rules and Governance – walk-in
H. Observance of religious holidays guidelines proposal – refer to University Affairs – walk-in

The Consent Agenda was approved as written.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Now down to Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees. We have a report from BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs or is that the written report?

J. Stephen: We have two. One from May delivered by Ferald and then we have one from last week that I’ll deliver.

President Peters: All right.

A. FAC to IBHE – no report
F. Bryan: I think the report on pages 14 and 15 may reflect news that’s already apparent to most of us. I would highlight a few things that I think are important. At that committee meeting on May 25, 2006 the personnel items, including new appointments and tenure and promotion items were all approved and certainly welcomed our new Provost. Some new academic programs were approved and the information items I would also call to your attention and since much of that has already been ??? over the summer, I’ll be happy to answer any questions you may have about that.

President Peters: All right, questions? It seems like a long time ago doesn’t it?

F. Bryan: Yes, it does.

President Peters: Buck?

J. Stephen: The next item was just last week on Thursday, September 7. For new members of the University Council I might note that when you look here you see four listings for the Board of Trustees. The ones with the longer names are actually sub-committees. When you see an action item by those people, they endorse it. It has to be approved by the full Board.

On September 7 the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee met. They had one action item, they unanimously endorsed a new MS program in the Family and Consumer Sciences that included two emphases, ?? Studies and/or Family and Consumer Sciences. There were several informational items. I’ll go over these a little bit. The fiscal year university performance report was received in summary. The full report will be given at the next full BOT. Provost Alden recognized twenty new emeritus faculty and pointed out that they are a continuing resource to the university. The Professional Excellence Awards for teaching and staff – three members of the Operating Council, three members of the Supportive Professional staff, three instructors, three overall faculty members received awards for teaching or excellence in their areas. Then there are the Presidential Teaching Professors and the Presidential Research Professors. These were all recognized by the Committee and invited to a very nice luncheon where they were invited to get up and tell a little bit about themselves and what they and done. They were well-received and well-applauded. Then the fourth information item was presented by Dean Bose, I guess Executive President in Charge of Research considering this item. It’s the External Funding for Research, Public Service and Instruction Project. I want to hit a couple of highlights here and correct one mistake I made. NIU has a success rate for funding of submitted grants that is higher than the national average by about 8% I believe. Is that right?

R. Bose: Our last five year success rate is about 51-55% for all grants; 29-34% for federal government grants and that is, in both categories, higher than most institutions that I know of.

J. Stephen: That’s pretty good. We broke $60 million last year; we’re a little short of $60 million this year in grants. President Peters has set a goal of $100 million dollars so don’t be surprised if we get some messages to go out there and produce some grants. In particular, they would like us to notice national funding emphases on systems, biology, cyber security, nano-medicine and S.T.E.M. which stands for Sounds, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics,
and then energy and the environment. It was also pointed out that by a number of measures, NIU has an extremely diverse graduate student population and – here’s the correction – NIU has the largest minority population of doctoral students by percentage in Illinois. I don’t know why I typed US in there. Also, President Peters congratulated the faculty and recognized our efforts in research and artistry for which we’ve been upgraded in the Carnegie ratings to research high activity which is the mid-level range for a research categorized university.

That’s about it. Any questions?

**President Peters:** That was a good report. On those Carnegie ratings, they did something very smart, they pulled out those universities that don’t have medical schools because medical schools kind of skewed those ranks if you pull – pick out a university that is a medical school and you take out the medical school funding which is, while comparative is of a different sort, the rankings kind of drop. All right, thank you.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report (Pages 16-17)

**President Peters:** I think the next report is Paul, BOT.

**P. Stoddard:** Actually, the full Board met in June was the last meeting. I was unable to attend that so Dr. Bryant attended in my place. Are you prepared to talk about that one as well?

**F. Bryant:** Indeed. That report is on pages 16 and 17 of your packet. It was approval primarily of committee reports leading up to that. I would highlight the fact that President Peters suggested that it was Provost Legg’s “last class”. Fifty-eight Faculty Promotions and Tenure were approved. There was a very nice tribe to Provost Legg. I also call your attention to the new appointments of administrators, the new Ph.D. program in Art Education, Specialization in Sport and Exercise Psychology, new specializations with the M.S. degree in Nursing, and, at the very end, I would also call to your attention that the Chair of the Board of Trustees Vella requested a presentation from representatives from project REAL which I did not know anything about and found it a very enlightening report and I encourage you to find out about that. I’d be happy to answer any questions about this report.

**President Peters:** Barbara Vella was re-elected as the Chair of the Board of Trustees. Questions? Very good.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

**President Peters:** John Wolfskill, Academic Policy?
J. Wolfskill: Well, welcome to another year. To the best of my knowledge, the Academic Policy Committee does not have any matters hanging from last year or any preceding years for that matter. Accordingly, we don’t have a meeting scheduled for the near future. For those members of my committee, I’d ask you to keep the Wednesdays following the Council meetings open and our first potential meeting would be following the Council meeting in October and if you’re concerned about the lack of activity, you can petition Bill Tolhurst to join Rules and Governance.

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – Linda Derscheid, Chair

President Peters: Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee, Linda Derscheid?

L. Derscheid: No report yet; we haven’t met.

President Peters: All right. Is there a meeting planned or any information?

L. Derscheid: I think we can meet after the UC meeting in October.

President Peters: Okay, very good.

P. Stoddard: I’ve been asked to make an announcement, a reminder for those of you Returning and for those of you coming. When you speak in front of the Council, please use a microphone. We do have transcripts of these meetings and if you don’t use a microphone, even though everybody in the room might here you, your words are lost forever and we don’t want to see that happen. Also, if you’re new on the Council, it’s very helpful if you identify yourself when you speak. Thank you.

President Peters: Very good. Good words.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – William Tolhurst, Chair

President Peters: Rules and Governance. William Tolhurst.

W. Tolhurst: Well, we don’t have anything to report now, but given the number of items that have been referred to us, I expect you’ll be hearing from us on a regular basis.

President Peters: Yes, you do have an agenda don’t you?

W. Tolhurst: Yes. Hopefully, it’s not hidden.

President Peters: No transparency here.

I. University Affairs Committee – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

President Peters: Jody, University Affairs Committee.
J. Newman-Ryan: I was going to say we don’t have any affairs, at least any we wanted
to announce but we do have a pending issue. I’d like to just meet afterwards and solicit from you
a couple of potential meeting times so the committee can just meet for a few minutes after this
meeting. I would appreciate that. Thank you.

President Peters: Okay, excellent. Everybody get that?

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

President Peters: Brigid Lusk, Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee.

B. Lusk: We don’t have anything to do at this point either. No, I’m in good shape.

President Peters: All right.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any unfinished business before the Council?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Is there any new business to bring before the Council? Professor Stephen?

J. Stephen: I’d like to reiterate concerns expressed by the faculty about the SPS increments
given to people in administrative and supervisory positions. I know that Provost Alden is
looking at this and we’re looking forward to something of a response and I’d like to
communicate one new concern and that is the worry that people in college supervisory positions,
deans and such, could come from non-faculty fields because of the SPS ranking not necessarily
requiring a faculty rating.

President Peters: Could you repeat that. I didn’t quite get the first part of that.

J. Stephen: There’s been expressed a worry that with the classification of people in
administrative and supervisory positions in the deans’ offices that with a SPS classification, that
it not be required in the future that these people come from the faculty or be eligible for tenure or
whatever in an appropriate department even though, in the past, it has been our traditional
language to candidates that you must be eligible to be tenured in a residence department.

President Peters: Has the inquiry been directed to the proper people?

J. Stephen: It was communicated through me. I think perhaps that it has been directed to ---

President Peters: So it’s an item of new business. Does it need a referral?

P Stoddard: Actually, the Faculty Senate did take this up last week and the matter was referred
to that body’s Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. They are encouraged to talk with
the people being potentially being affected as well as with people in the administration who are responsible for decisions of this sort. My understanding from everybody I’ve talked to is that there’s an ambiguous situation that everybody wants to see resolved and I think everybody, from my take on the situation so far, is looking to get it resolved in the same way so I am cautiously optimistic that this is an issue that will be dealt with to everybody’s satisfaction.

**J. Stephen:** I guess I should have waited for comments instead of new business President Peters.

**President Peters:** Well, we’re cautiously optimistic that this ambiguous situation will find its way to the proper shared governance outlets and then I’ll be really interested to find out what this is all about. That’s great.

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

**President Peters:** Now Comments and Questions from the Floor. If anybody wants to ask questions of Dr. Alden about his strategic planning efforts or anything else.

**J. Stephen:** A quick question about the Shellings report. Did they touch upon the declining national and state funding of the publics as a mitigating factor for affordability? Was that something that they shied away from because of the political nature of it?

**President Peters:** No, but they case it – can I take President’s hat off and put my congress scholar hat on? The way I read that is that they recast that debate into – they recognized that but then they called for a massive restructuring of student aid at the federal level. So, usually what’s happening in American higher education is whenever there’s been a need historically, the shock to the system has usually been external but it’s usually been positive external, the Moral Act and the Land Grant System, the growth of the professional schools at the turn of the century, the GI Bill of Rights, the huge injection after Sputnik and, you know, the investment in technologies that support the defense industry although that can be considered a little controversial. What accompanied all of that, pretty much a huge injection of federal investment. Well, I don’t see a huge investment strategy here. It is recognized but the answer is, we’re not efficient or we’re not innovative and therefore, we have to – like Ford Motor Company – shed its unproductive product lines and shed, you know, I think that’s what I read into it. Now that’s not a – that’s what some people say but there isn’t a call in there that I can see for a major injection. Now, they left alone the issue of what’s happening in states and they did recognize that states have decreased their investment per capita in student support and university support and they recognize that fact but it’s not that kind of report.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, thank you.

**President Peters:** Read the report. It’s interesting and what’s interesting to read again with my President’s hat is the dialogue that’s going on among our associations and how they’re trying to position themselves on this. There are many problems that the country faces right now. There is the war. There’s the problem with health care, sustainability in energy, homeland security, pensions, all of those issues and my guess is this issue that this report raised while I think is
significant and you do too, is kind of an under the radar screen. Now what’s dangerous is and this is true of No Child Left Behind, what you have to watch out for is rule making committees and things like linking federal aid or for research or for student loans to learning outcomes. Okay? I’m very much interested in this at two levels; as a president and as someone who studied this stuff and I’ve spend a lot of time thinking and talking about. I’m going to spend a lot of time in Washington on it too. Yeah?

L. Kamenitsa: Lynn Kamenitsa and this is a continuation of that. Is this on? I heard some media reports which mentioned the dreaded phrase of standardized testing which just sent shivers down my spine. Is that going anywhere? Isn’t that in this report, the recommendation of standard testing for certain courses across universities, not within universities?

President Peters: The implication is that the higher education community has to come up with learning outcomes-based assessment in the fields, you know Political Science would be one. You and I could do that, right, no problem and then probably general education so that’s it’s comparable with what’s know as the unit record so that if you go on a website you could type in Political Science, NIU and see the gain scores that all your majors have accomplished relative to Miami of Ohio, Chicago State, Urbana. That’s neither desirable nor I think possible but that’s why we’re watching this very carefully. I think I’ve participated in at least four attempts to try to define what a general education is and then try to measure it. All four, just because of the nature of the beast, have never gone very far. All right? Anything else?

W. Tolhurst: I just wanted to ask that members of the Rules and Governance Committee meet with me shortly afterwards and I wasn’t sure if this was the right time but it’s out there.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: All right, motion to adjourn? We’re adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 3:53 P.M.