I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’d like to call the December 6 University Council meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: We have the agenda before you. I’ll entertain a motion to adopt today’s agenda. Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, we have an agenda.

The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2006 MEETING (pages 3-6)

President Peters: On pages 3-6 look at the minutes of our November 8 meeting and I will pause for any additions or corrections. Hearing none, a motion to adopt the minutes of November 8. Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: It’s hard to believe this is our last meeting of the semester already and we did have to call off classes last Friday which was a very unique event for us but that was pretty obvious at about 5:30 in the morning that this was an uncommon kind of snow and what makes it
difficult is that it froze quickly and it’s really hard to – I don’t know if you’ve tried to do it in
your driveway and remove – once you drive over something, try to remove it after it’s tundra?
It’s not easy and I spent many days in Chicago the past week and you have to dodge falling ice
from the buildings so by and large we got through that pretty well. Our policy is hardly to ever
call off unless we, you know, there’s a safety issue. If we can get parking lots cleared and the
walkways cleared. Huskie Bus Line has to run – right Dr. Williams? The Huskie Bus Line has
to be running. We check with IDOT Transportation. Check with the state patrol because, you
know, we can call off classes and shut down everything but essential services but essential
services is large because we have several thousand students that need to be fed and you still have
to, you know, call your crews in, maintain the physical plant so we really don’t shut down and I
want to thank everyone who was essential service who got in here at some hardship to keep the
place going. I know I came in and it was great not having anybody bother me. It was just – I got
more work done in one day than I have in a whole year! So I just wanted to thank everyone for
their patience and we got through without major incident and that’s what you want. It came out
a good day; Friday is not a day that is crammed with courses so that was good and I’m
appreciative of our grounds crew and our buildings crew and I know our students are
appreciative of the food service people who made sure there was hot food, although I don’t
imagine the students got out of bed until the sun – they missed the storm, by the way, because at
12:30 the sun came out and so thank you very much.

I would just call upon our Provost, Ray Alden, to give us just a brief update on where we are
with our Strategic Planning process.

Provost Alden: Thank you. The Strategic Planning Task Force met with the consultants and
the consultants have been doing basically a forced march of interviews with everybody on that
Task Force as well as other leaders on campus. They are spending basically last week and this
week doing that. By next week, next Friday, we’re having our second Task Force meeting and
they’re going to come in with the results of those interviews and then after the first of the year
we’re going to have a major round table to try and break down into three smaller groups to
review what has been gathered and start to flesh out strategies and so forth. So we’re making
progress and a lot of people are participating. As far as I can tell almost everybody has kept their
appointments or have made arrangements for those which were supposed to be last Friday for
telephone interviews so I think we’ll get a very high return on those interviews.

President Peters: Thank you. I know, I think it’s very important visioning sort of exercise –
the focus is academics and the focus vision. My own experience with other strategic plans, the
ones that were successful, is when they do focus on the larger issues on the academic vision, on
curriculum revision, on areas of strength and focus. They get bogged down if people start
arguing about resources. That always comes at the end. So if there is any advice I could give to
the group it’s let’s chew on the vision and determine what it is we are and what we can be and
then we always find a way of working within our budgets to get some of that funded. But we
have an excellent external consultant who’s nationally known. I’ve talked to him and have been
involved with a couple of projects with Bob ??? and he’s really first rate and he knows the lay of
the land and told me his wife was from Paw Paw. So, even though he’s spent his career on the
east coast, I was a little worried about that but we’re fine.
Tomorrow is the Board of Trustees meeting and we have a lot of action items. The most important action item for all of us, for you, is the ratification of the mid-year salary increment package and, you know, I’m always a little bit nervous when we put these things together and we find the reallocated resources to do it because we’re not getting it from the state so it comes out of — things we can’t do, but salaries are my top priority, your top priority and I always know that I have the support of the Board of Trustees for such a thing but they have to vote on it tomorrow so the cat is a little bit out of the bag but I know, I’ve talked to them individually, and I know how supportive they are of this and I’m very pleased that our people, the academic side and the business side up and down, have been able to bring to me a package, and I can take to the Board a salary package way beyond that which I thought was possible. I thought a half a percent or three-quarters of a percent on the base would be about all we can effect and we’ve come up with pretty much a 1% across the board for everyone and then some more money for critical retention and merit in the three grades and you’ll get more information on that, on the specifics but it’s going to be with great pleasure tomorrow when I move that before the Board and then they approve that. I want to thank everyone for their work on that. That gives us a fairly nice salary package this year, very competitive, but we need to continue to work on that.

With that regard, the budget building process in the state does begin for FY08 now and there yet is very little discussion or information on it. I know that Office of Management and Budget is just beginning to sit down with the Illinois Board of Higher Education and others to try to craft a package and, you know, because of the election and even though the administration did not change, apparently there a lot of senior staff people on the Governor’s inner-circle that are moving on to other things and so they’re sorting themselves out. The revenue estimates in the state are okay but not as high as they had hoped. I don’t know what that means. There is some discussion at least on the capital side of things that in the spring there may be an attempt to find a revenue stream for a major capital bill the large portion of which would be dedicated to K12 but we, of course, all of higher education will try to make the case that, you know, we should be involved in that and I hope we’ll be successful.

I suppose that’s the good news. You know, the bad news is that we continue to struggle with, I guess I’d call them unfunded mandates and pass throughs on top of only marginal increases in our base. You know, for instance, in terms of the new pension bill, the new 6% limitation bill, we will be given at some point a bill for the difference between the 6% and the increases that retiring staff got in the last year of their employment. I don’t know what that will mean; we can’t calculate it yet. I presume it will be in the 100 of thousands of dollars. I hope it’s not a million. The other thing is the CMS pass through on health care contributions will cost us 3.5 million. These are add-ons, plus I just gave an interview before I came over with the Northern Star, a nice reporter, on the minimum wage impact. You know, the minimum wage is scheduled now — it’s on the Governor’s desk — I don’t think the Governor has signed the bill yet but it goes up to $7.50. Is that right? $7.50 in July and then I think there’s some escalators but a couple of years ago, the minimum wage bill was raised and we were okay on that because 99% of the employment individuals, classes, that are minimum wage are student workers and only a segment of the student workers made below the $6.00 and whatever minimum wage. This increase will more substantial and, again, largely is focused on probably 99% or more, maybe 100%, student workers and our rough calculations say this is a cost to us of about a million dollars. Of course, there is no appropriation, you know, that goes with this and so we’ve got to
put this in the mix of things that we’ve got to consider as we build a budget and the implication is that – that’s basically central funds – funds for student workers are where? – they’re in departments and they’re dispersed to the lowest levels in colleges and student workers and kitchen help and so forth and we pride ourselves that usually when there’s a student who needs a job, we have historically been able to find something for them. Well, if you have a million dollar shortfall across units, what happens – the library is a classic user of student help, you know. Guess what happens? You hire fewer students. So we’re going to work on that but, you know, that makes our salary commitment even more important because we’ve made the commitment to salaries but are some other things we may not be able to accommodate.

I was at the IBHE meetings yesterday and I heard a presentation – I’m passing around some graphs and charts from that – and I usually kind of start working on my Blackberry when I hear presentations by economists at IBHE, not here at NIU, and the argument was compelling. It’s the first time I’ve heard a good counter-argument to this foolishness about the skyrocketing costs of higher education and I just wanted to give this to you so you can use it when you see your families over the break because this fellow, Michael McPherson, who’s the President of the Spencer Foundation and, I know the people in education know who Spencer is. He was the guy who created these SRA readers – remember when you were in school? That was him and it’s in Chicago and McPherson, Michael McPherson, is the former president of McAllister College. Very interesting person. Anyway, I want to walk through this data a little bit.

The idea is have college costs skyrocketed? So if you look at that first graph on comparative real growth rates in public higher education costs and GDP (gross domestic product) – admitted this is a little bit rough – but I think it begins at the problem. So here, in chart “A”, you’re looking at annual growth rates in per FTE spending and per GDP per capita and you can see by this basis – and you’ve got two period here – the ’80 to ’91 period and then ’90 to 2000 period, we don’t have any newer data than that, you can see that spending per capita per student was really in line with GDP. You know, the capacity of the country’s growth to absorb those increased costs and “B” is kind of aggregate higher education spending and there again, you can see the numbers are a little larger and I think aggregate spending means both instructional and non-instructional costs, aggregate spending. You know, that gets really messy. Like even our own data that we report on instruction costs versus non-instruction is very misleading. There are so many things that are non-instructional that are really instructional but I don’t want to get into that but, you know that has to be refined and separated. Anyway, that’s not statistically significant in any stretch of the imagination so that doesn’t look like skyrocketing costs to me. Now if you added the year since 2005, I don’t think you’d see much of a difference in terms of that relationship.

The second page just compares – if you want to look at skyrocketing costs – this has got – health care, that’s skyrocketing and you can see the differences there. So, you know, when you hear that, I know – I have, I’m getting myself in the mode of saying hey wait a minute, that is not true. These costs have not skyrocketing. But you know there is a problem isn’t there? If you look at the next page and that is the real annual growth rates of education costs, net tuition revenues and non-tuition revenues per FTE enrollment at public institutions – by the way, this data is only public institutions, not private – what do you see? Well, you know, it’s not a pure market. Public institutions are not a pure market; it’s not just price and demand – it’s not that at all is it – there’s a middle thing. It’s called a subsidy and what is that subsidy? That is the
historic commitment of the states to help subsidize the cost of a public higher education and that has been substantial over the decades but that, as I said I think three or four university addresses ago, that the social contract was broken. That I don’t see the commitment any longer the way it was to supporting a subsidized public education for every qualified student in the states. So what you’ve had is, you know, you haven’t had costs skyrocketing but you have had a transposition on who pays for the cost and that the burden is now on students and parents and I think our alumni groups, our students, and our parents should scream about this. I think this is – I know for one being dedicated my whole career to public education, I think this is really an argument we have to get in front of people. The next page just sort of takes a look at the ability – if you look at disposable income – the ability of our families to pay for that transitional cost, that increased cost, and you can see that even there it’s not great but, you know, our tuition costs are outstripping personal disposable income and therein lies the rub and therein lies something that should concern us all because in the Spellings Report and in this – I don’t know if you read this Tribune magazine article on Southern Illinois University – what did they leave out of the Spellings Report and what did they leave out of the Tribune article? The fact that for five years the state of Illinois put no money into basic GR and therefore the costs had to be passed on to students if you want to maintain reasonable quality. Then you can see this state appropriations share of state expenditures. You can see how it has just plummeted beginning in the ’80’s. That’s a problem and then the last page shows you the difficulty we’ve had that even taken into a fact that the state’s share of appropriations has gone down, it’s also higher in elastic and it fluctuates and it creates havoc for us for planning. So with planning this year, well, how do we accommodate a minimum wage increase, how do we accommodate salary increases, not knowing what we’re going to get if anything from the state? So we’re in a new environment and we have to think differently and we have to get realistic and question some of the assumptions on which we run our business and look for efficiencies wherever we can and we are efficient and I’m hoping that will be enough but I don’t think so. I think we’re going to have to be entrepreneurial and have to make some critical choices about where we spend our dollars. So I’ve spent a lot of time thinking about these issues. That’s going to be occupying my mind this spring. With a new set of representatives in Springfield, I’m going to do all I can to educate them about the needs of higher education and to activate our alums. I think that’s really important. But I think our faculty and staff have to understand the options that are before us. You know, we built our education system around a different set of principles than efficiencies, you know, we value other things. We value education free discourse, academic freedom, you know, the search for knowledge – that’s the way we set up these institutions. That’s what drives us. It’s not how can we most efficiently service every student FTE that comes through here and so we’re going to have to be thinking a little bit about that.

All right, okay? I’ll get off the soap box now, except to say we’re going to the Poinsettia Bowl which is a great bowl, probably a little more money in that bowl than any other bowl we could go to. The TV networks are just excited about that being the kick-off game because it features one of the nation’s top running backs against one of the nation’s toughest defenses. That pro football team out there, the San Diego Chargers, has its premier running back, arguably the best running back in the NFL, is LaDainian Tomlinson who is an alum of TCU and, of course, his backup, not too shabby, is a guy named Michael Turner, the Burner from NIU so that creates some interesting ---- and the president of TCU is the former president of Illinois State, Vic
Boschini and so we’re – a bushel of corn is wagered against a barrel of oil. I don’t know how I’m going to get that barrel back! I’m very proud of the team; they really deserve it.

???: Shouldn’t that have been a barrel of ethanol?

**President Peters:** Well, this is crude; we’re going to blend when we get here. We wouldn’t blend any Texas crude with substandard corn from Texas would we?

???: ???

**President Peters:** Well, that’s a different kind of distilling process.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

**President Peters:** All right. We really don’t have much of an agenda today. There’s no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report (pages 7-12)

**President Peter:** So Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees. Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** I went to the FAC meeting last November 17. We met at Illinois State. We got a little presentation from their legislative liaison who works mostly in Springfield talking about the results of the election and how that might impact the upcoming legislative year. His main thrust was it looked more likely now that we would get a capital budget, we haven’t gotten one in the last four years or so, so there’s a little bit of good news that might come. He then talked in general terms about the strategy he and his counterparts here and elsewhere across the state have that in dealing with legislators in Springfield, that it’s mostly defensive; we don’t propose new legislation. We react to the legislation they give us, fight to modify decent legislation to make it better, and work against legislation that we feel is really detrimental to the mission of higher education in Illinois.

We got a presentation from Rick Pearce who is an IBHE staff member and liaison to the FAC and he told us about – he’s actually a very good guy and I’m encouraged that he is a member of the IBHE. I wish we would get more of the ear of the Board itself but he does seem like he understand the role of education in the state of Illinois and what it should be. He was talking about a little bit of re-arranging, not re-arranging, but an attempt to get more cross-fertilization among the staff and so currently the staff is divided up into areas like academic affairs and financial affairs and so forth and they wanted to get these folks working together, out of the silos, and working on issues of importance like articulation and transfer, P20, teacher prep, and so forth. So this is a new idea, something new they’re implementing and the thought was that this would be a good time for the FAC to try to stick its foot in the door because these working groups are trying to figure out what their mission is, what their function is, and how they go about carrying that out, where they’re going to get input from. We said well, if they start getting
input now from the FAC and that becomes the status quo then we’ve (the faculty) have got a voice in IBHE, at least among the staff and the staff helps shape the agenda to a fair degree. So that was something we thought might be good.

Speaking of teacher prep, this generated a little bit of discussion here last time. That discussion continued at the FAC meeting and it was decided that the best course of action would be for the drafters of that teacher preparation position paper to meet with representatives from the council of deans of the colleges of education so we could actually get a dialogue going. That was generally the idea of the position paper. It could have been handled more tactfully but the dialogue is going and I think that’s for the best for education P-20 in the state of Illinois.

Those were the main things we covered. Attached is also another position paper draft, this one dealing with student debt. This was not discussed in any great length at the November 17 meeting so I don’t have much to report on it but I include it there so you can see what they’re thinking about.

I’d be happy to take any questions anybody might have.

**President Peters:** All right. I think that report on teacher preparation was presented and accepted by the Board yesterday. Is that right Virginia Cassidy? This is the teacher preparation – the paper from the Faculty Advisory Committee and they accepted it and they wanted to talk about it some more and they encouraged discussion with the deans of education. Yeah, so it was the outcome that you would desire. There was not much comment or debate about it so if there were sensitivities, it didn’t bubble over in that meeting. Yes?

**J. Pierce:** What does it mean to accept? Does that mean it’s the law of the land?

**President Peters:** They received it and then, you know, it could be a ship that leaves port that never docks. It’s just out there, safe, there if someone needs it – but I don’t know to tell you the truth. I think I remarked to someone on the staff that they had a wolf by the ears at best so we’ll see.


**President Peters:** The Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee report. I think Buck --- all right.

**F. Bryan:** Yes, I’ll highlight the report which is before you. This is the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee meeting that met on November 16. Three major action items. The first, most significant with a lot of excitement, the beginning of the Proton era here at Northern. The university has received 3.3 million dollar federal funds to begin the formal planning process for a Proton Therapy Treatment Center adjacent to Fermi Lab. There is a very informative PowerPoint presentation by Presidential Research Professor Gerald Blazey about the particulars of this wonderful new center. He was joined by Provost Alden to talk about the numerous academic departments and research opportunities that would be related
to this center. They also talked about the timeline which I’ll just summarize briefly for you. Yesterday should have been the day for the release of the request for proposal. In 2007 they will begin architectural planning and equipment contract. 2008 would be the groundbreaking. 2009 would be the installation of the equipment and treatment would begin in 2011 and Trustee and Chair of the Committee Murer was very excited and emphasized that this Proton Center would offer the university national leadership potential and the integration of various academic departments and programs on campus and it was particularly impressive to hear that both she and other members of the Board seemed actively involved in the planning and even visiting similar facilities in Texas. That was very encouraging to see that. So that was very exciting.

The second action item was an amendment to the Board of Trustees Regulations regarding student residency status. President Peters commented that these amendments were needed to eliminate current ambiguity and also he further emphasized that Illinois is very “user-friendly” in accepting domiciled students compared to other nearby states.

The third and final action item dealt with the Board of Trustees Regulations regarding military and disaster relief leaves of absence for university employees and Steve Cunningham pointed out that these were unfortunately needed in light of recent changes in state laws or executive orders enacted or issued related to events such as, of course, the conflict in Iraq and hurricane Katrina.

Those three action items will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow on December 7.

The three information items I think we’ve already briefly covered but the Fiscal Year 2008 Programmatic Budget requests were briefly highlighted. There was also a discussion of the new Guarantee Agency possibility now with the new Student Information System and the Board of Trustees Committee Dates for 2007 were set.

That’s my report.

**President Peters:** Okay. Questions? Very good report; very comprehensive.

C. **BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report** (page 15)

**President Peters:** Paul and Xueshu Song do you have a report from Finance, Facilities, and Operations?

**P. Stoddard:** I do as it turns out. That committee met right after the previous committee. They had several action items that they approved, keeping in mind, of course, that the full Board meets to approve all of these tomorrow. They approved the request for proposals necessary to evaluate the equipment for the Proton Therapy Treatment Center that Ferald just referred to and they were equally impressed and eager and enthusiastic about that project.

Dr. Williams has completed several performance contracts to replace windows, doors, motion sensors, water conservation and air handling needs in various buildings on campus. These are
contracts again where Northern pays nothing up front. We get all the improvements all front and we end up paying for those improvements out of the energy savings generated by the improvements. So, literally, these things cost us nothing. They’re good for conservation. At the end of twenty or thirty years when the contract is done, we still have the windows and doors and so forth and in the meantime students and workers have less drafty buildings. So it’s really a win/win situation for everybody involved and I think Dr. Williams should be commended for getting these types of contracts whenever he can.

President Peters: Very good.

P. Stoddard: We officially have named the new student – housing for students with dependents “Northern View Community” which is easily to say than housing for students with dependents so I like that change. This will be out by the Convocation Center. We had groundbreaking on that a month or two ago on a very chilly day as it turns out.

President Peters: We could have done it today if or last Friday if you preferred.

P. Stoddard: Last Friday would have been interesting. We had – but there was a lot of good food. We had an approval of money to remodel the office of Financial Aid in Swen Parson. Currently the situation is not very conducive to privacy. Students meeting with counselors are apparently in the open for other people coming in so when you were discussing finances it was felt that was not appropriate so they will reconfigure that office to allow for privacy for those types of conversations.

Finally, and the most important news to the students, 1.4 million dollars was approved to improve Parking Lot W (that’s the one along Glidden out by Grant Towers) which is currently a gravel lot. It will be paved and drainage and sidewalks and so forth will be put in – lights, of course, and a new road leading to the lot. So that should make parking there – roughly the same number of spaces – better defined but certainly a much better situation for anybody who has to park there.

President Peters: Okay, questions? Presumably these items will all be approved formally tomorrow but usually when our sub-committees approve it, because we’re so small and involve so many of the Trustees, you usually can count on support when we get to the full Board.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Bobbie Cesarek – report (pages 16-17)

President Peters: Let’s see. Our next report is John Wolfskill.

P. Stoddard: You left out Legislation ---

President Peters: I left out Bobbie and Rachel. I didn’t mean to leave you out. Who’s giving that report? Bobbie? All right, go right ahead.

B. Cesarek: Thank you. I appreciate that. We had the opportunity to attend the Board of Trustees Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee meeting in Hoffman Estates on
November 14. There was one action item and that was the Internal Audit Department had a charter that was undergoing revision and the charter, the main portion that needed revision, was the fact that nothing in that original charter had anything about consulting services which that office does on a regular basis so that was added to the charter. It was part of a self-assessment that was being done by the department. They re-arranged some language. They added some new language and that was passed by the sub-committee at that time. That presentation was done by Sharon Down, Director of Internal Audit.

Informational items – there were a number. The first was from Steve Cunningham relative to employment conduct and accountability policies document to go actually go through all of the various again, policies that “are out there” to pull them, reign them all in and provide them a solid home in one location. Specifically, it is going to be very important for new employees when they come in, not to mention some of us that have been here for awhile but probably can’t find many of those documents as they currently exist so it was a great project, still underway by Steve Cunningham and his staff and it will be something that’s going to be very beneficial for the university community as a whole.

Lots of information relative to legislation coming up in both the State Legislature and in Washington. Ken Zehnder was kind enough to review a number of public acts. There are a few of them that are itemized for you in your packet that were relative specifically I thought to higher education although all of them presented really were. I’m sure they’re available for review in format if you’d like to take a look at them further.

In addition, there were a number of General Assembly approved resolutions that were mentioned and two that I thought were quite important again was the Midwest Student Exchange Program as far as shared files which I believe the President has talked about previously and also a textbook rental program report that is going to be forthcoming.

We had the opportunity to be introduced to Lori Clark, who’s the new Coordinator for Agency Relations and Research Park Initiatives – quite a title – a wonderful young woman who comes to us from the State Legislature if I’m not mistaken. She was Department of Commerce from the State of Illinois and is going to help the institution as it moves forward in providing an opportunity for our innovations to hit the actual economy of Illinois. Her office is going to be located primarily in Chicago although she will be on campus maybe one or two days a week but will be located there, making some inroads for NIU and all of the work that is done by faculty at NIU.

Kathy Buettner was kind enough to review a number of the congressional – well, the congressional budget and legislation updates. In doing so, she made note that with the change in the congress as it’s upcoming that the Higher Education Reauthorization Act was waiting for the new congress. It has not passed as yet. Also unsure of exactly were the Spellings Commission Report is going to be heading and is waiting to find out a little more about that. But again, as you’ve already heard, we had an opportunity through the defense budget to actually get some appropriations to NIU and that is the 3.3 million dollars for the neutron and proton particle therapy research and 3 million was also made available for the ROCK (Rapid Optimization of
Commercial Knowledge) through the College of Engineering. So it’s nice to see some appropriations headed NIUs way albeit through the defense budget.

That’s the end of the report. I’ll take questions if you have them.

**President Peters:** Very comprehensive

**B. Cesarek:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** Lot in there.

**B. Cesarek:** There was a lot that went on; it was a great meeting. Very, very informative.

**President Peters:** There’s one thing I should comment on here. You’ll notice under Ken Zehnder’s report there was a piece of legislature that passed and the Governor signed that would augment the monetary award program. It’s called MAP Plus for students whose family incomes were – who were ineligible because their family incomes were higher. I think it was about $34 million proposed for this program, nearly $34.4 million proposed for this program – but it was to be funded by the sale of the ISAC student assistance portfolio which apparently has come a cropper and hit a snag so there’s no revenue stream. So, therefore, no public university in the state or no university are making MAP Plus awards because there’s no revenue stream and so who knows where that is going but you know, hopefully the state can find a revenue stream for that but you can’t make awards when there’s no money for the awards so we’re kind of watching that one pretty carefully but, you know, it gets a little confusing but I know we spent a lot of time at IBHE kind of clarifying where we were on that. Nobody is making MAP Plus awards because there’s no revenue stream. Okay. All right. Very good.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – report

**President Peters:** Now John Wolfskill.

**J. Wolfskill:** The Academic Policy Committee has not met yet this year. We have had no business referred to us. However, several important issues connected with the new student information system were identified in the Fit Gap Analysis some months ago and these issues are being discussed and negotiated in the appropriate committees for them. I’m aware of two particularly important matters which have been resolved relatively recently and I’d like to tell you about those.

First, the new system is not designed to handle our current scheme of 400 star courses which are available for both undergraduate and graduate credit. After extensive discussion, the Graduate Council approved the change which has the affect of splitting current 400 star courses into one course at the 400 level for undergraduates and one at the 500 level for graduates. Courses now number in the 500’s will be moved to 600’s and similarly 600’s up to 700’s.
Second, the new system is not designed to treat repeated courses on a student’s transcript in as highly nuanced a manner as our current policy allows. This matter was recently debated and resolved in APASC, the result being a choice of policy which, in my opinion, is as close as possible to our existing one, consistent with the limitations of the new software.

As other Fit Gap problems are discussed and negotiated, it may be the case that the Academic Policy Committee will meet to consider one or more of these issues. For now, to the best of my knowledge, these matters are in process as they should be.

**President Peters:** Very good. That’s a good report and having been through this at a couple of other places, that’s what has to be done and I commend the Committee for – these are very difficult issues and you have to change the policy because to do the coding creates – that’s not the way to do it. I appreciate all the work you’re doing on that. Any questions?

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – Linda Derscheid, Chair – no report

H. Rules and Governance Committee – William Tolhurst, Chair – report

**President Peters:** We have a report from Rules and Governance.

1. The Committee on Multicultural Curricular Transformation – **ACTION ITEM** (pages 18-19)

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, it’s not exactly a report. We’re revisiting an item that we brought to the Council last meeting. We had the first reading for a motion to add on a regular basis, the Advisory Committee on the Multicultural Curricular – I can’t even say it – you’ve got it in your report here. It’s an action now. The language is on page 18. If passed, this committee will become 14.9 and the membership is specified. It’s a committee whose sole function is to advise the Provost with regard to the Multicultural Curricular Transformation Institute that’s offered every year for faculty.

**President Peters:** All right, so does that require a motion?

**W. Tolhurst:** I’ll make one if you’d like. I move that we adopt this item.

**President Peters:** Is there a second? All right. Discussion? All right. Yes?

???: Is there some reason why the Director of the Asian Studies wasn’t included on this?

**W. Tolhurst:** This item came to us at the request of the Provost’s Office, the previous Provost and since the committee has the sole function of advising the Provost, the Rules and Governance Committee thought it would be presumptuous to change the composition of the committee because it seems to us that if this committee advises the Provost, the Provost should get to say who he wants advice from and so we decided to forward it as requested by the Provost’s Office.

**President Peters:** Yes, Virginia, you have some additional clarification on that?
V. Cassidy: A representative from the Asian Studies Center was not included in this proposal nor were the directors of the Resource Centers, or LGBT Resource Center, etc. The individuals serving as the current directors for the Center for Black Studies, Center for Latino and Latin American Studies and Women’s Studies are faculty members and those units are also responsible for the oversight of curricular components. They have minors or concentrations that they supervise and so that was the rationale for including those individuals and not including the directors of other centers that address multicultural issues. As a point of information, all of those individuals have been very active in the presentation of information at the Institute and so we have representatives from C.A.R.R., LGBT, University Resources for Latinos, Asian American Resource Center, etc., but it wasn’t deemed appropriate to include them on the committee.

President Peters: All right. More questions? Yes, ????

R. ???: Was there any consideration to include the Director Southeast Asian Studies? That is represented by faculty as well.

V. Cassidy: No there was not. That point was not discussed.

President Peters: All right, ready for the question? All those in favor of this proposal say aye. Opposed? Abstained. All right. We have a change.

The motion passed.

President Peters: Anything else Bill?

W. Tolhurst: Not from me.

I. University Affairs Committee – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Brigid Lusk, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Any comments or questions for the good of the order?

???: Go Huskies!
**President Peters:** The end zone facility is now named after Jeff and Kimberly Yordon who made a 2.5 million dollar commitment. Private funding for that is now 9.5 million and we have had a lot of success with private fund raising and the focus is shifting pretty dramatically now toward academic issues. We have some wonderful things we’re going to be announcing soon so I’m just so pleased that our alums and friends and ourselves have supported with their own dollars, private dollars, initiatives at this institution that we couldn’t do on our own and it’s hard work but when people see our students and they see what we do here and the kind of research we do – but basically it’s the production of students – they really want to invest in us so that’s good news.

X. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Academic Planning Council minutes
B. Athletic Board minutes
C. Campus Security and Environmental Quality minutes
D. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification minutes
E. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum minutes
F. Graduate Council minutes
G. University Assessment Panel minutes
H. University Benefits Committee minutes
I. Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
J. Alternate List (Page 8)

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

**President Peters:** Motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.