I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Let me call the October 10 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 item of business is adoption of the agenda. There is a walk-in item that goes under New Business A. It’s the University Holiday Calendar. You should have it at your – that goes under A. A motion to approve the agenda? Second? All those in favor say aye.

Stephen made the motion; student seconded. The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2007 MEETING

(Pages 3-5)

President Peters: On pages 3-5 are the minutes of the September 26 meeting. Any additions or corrections? Motion to adopt? Second? All in favor say aye. Opposed? All right.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, we’re into – I didn’t call for comments? On the minutes? I said additions or corrections. I assume that comments could cover either a correction --- we will add the attendance. Do we have to revote? Now you want to comment?
J. Stephen: I thought somebody said they couldn’t hear me.

President Peters: I couldn’t. All right. So we have to add the list of attendees. It will be on the on-line version. Thank you Donna.

Well, this is homecoming week and it looks like the weather is going to be autumnal. My annual message is this is a great time when our alums come back and we have celebration and I always urge at this time that everyone be prudent in their reveling and take care of each other. Across the country on college campuses this time of year when everyone has homecoming we always read in the paper of incidents that happen and unfortunately most of those incidents are related to the misuse of alcohol and when you read the police blotter or you hear about incidents on this campus of any sort or any campus, the probabilities are great that alcohol has been a contributing factor and alcohol impairs judgment. That doesn’t mean that people should not have a good time as long as they’re doing it in a legal way and I just always send that message out that have a great time and there are a lot of great activities this weekend and our people are going to be out in force – our law enforcement agents, both our people, DeKalb City police, our Student Affairs staff is going to be out to help insure that we have just the best possible weekend. Brian, you want to add anything to that from the Student Affairs perspective?

B. Hemphill: No beyond the fact that I know that this is an exciting time for us and we put a lot of policies and procedures in place around some of our events which some of our students are happy with; some of our students are not totally excited about but it’s something that Dr. Williams and I and the Provost and the President all know that we needed to put in place to address some of the concerns we’ve had over the years around certain events. So we’re really moving into the weekend with a positive attitude and feel like we’re going to have a great homecoming and our staff will be out and about so if you’re out at events, please say hello to them between 9:00 at night and 3:00 am in the morning because we’ll be out there.

President Peters: And tonight is a special night for me. It’s my 8th year of judging “Yell Like Hell”. I think I hold the record now for the longest and everyone gets a 10 in my book.

I don’t have too much to report. There’s virtually nothing to report from Springfield. The veto session, the second week of the veto session, started today. There is discussion in house of a capital budget, in particular the gaming bill. I just checked before I came over; there’s nothing new to report. I’d like to say there would be – we need a capital bill and the legislatures and our leaders have to determine what the best way to fund that is but we made the case, and the case is undeniable, that the state needs a major capital bill. How it’s funded is up to the policy makers. I’m not sure that we will have one. I think there are hearings in the House scheduled on the gaming bill beginning October 17 which blows by this special session so all the political insiders are saying there’ll be another special session in November. So – but we have an operating budget and they’re working on next year’s budget so it’s a bit frustrating but we’re, in a word, really doing quite well.

I don’t have too much to say. I hope if you haven’t, you take a look at my State of the University address that is on line because I think there’s some very, very important things in there about the future of academic excellence on this campus and we have, what I would consider, Phase II of a
very robust and participatory strategic planning process and both Provost Alden and Dr. Williams are here and both of them are sort of empowered to develop specific ad hoc task forces to come up with certain plans for our strategic plan which I called “great journeys” and it is certainly going to be a great journey; it has been a great journey. We’re looking at curriculum innovation, we’re looking at student access, we’re looking at our clusters of multidisciplinary research programs, we’re looking at environment and sustainability, and I’m try to carry this message to alums, internally to students, to donors, to legislatures, to our higher education community at large that NIU is in this major planning and talking process. There are so many ways to participate either at a department level, at a collegiate level in the planning process to submit concept papers. I personally am meeting with each of the Presidential Commissions and talking to them about encouraging them to get their interests known within the strategic planning process. So I’m very, very encouraged by this. I’ve received an awful lot of positive comments about what we’re planning; that there is a focus. The other thing is, in case you didn’t notice, we have made a huge and substantial commitment to finding and reallocating, finding new resources, redirecting resources, creating new resources to feed the best ideas. Not every idea is going to be accepted but every idea will be heard and the best ideas will win out. We can’t do everything.

The other part of the message is we can’t wait on the state; that we have to move forward. We have to – this is going to be the destiny of American public higher education for the next, well, my foreseeable future – for years to come, for decades to come. We will continue to fight hard for our share of state resources but I don’t think that will be enough so we have to look at other ways to move forward and we’ve been doing that. It also means that we have to look at everything we do and make sure that we’re efficient and make sure that everything we do is relevant to our core academic missions and there may be some things out there that we no longer need to do but I doubt it. We’re a pretty thin institution but we ought to do that as well. So I’m very encouraged on this. I’ve been doing a lot of talking about it. I’m going to continue to do talking about the Strategic Plan and I look forward to listening to the dialogue. I am going to pull together a group of individuals that are going to begin to develop benchmarks for the institution at a macro level because this is something that I think makes sense in our environment and I talked about a couple of those that are so universal in American high education. Things like retention rates and graduation rates, the percentage of growth in external funding, growth in the number of doctorates granted. There are all sorts of benchmarks. Which ones are right for us? I’m going to be spending some time working on that in the next few months.

Ray, do you want to add anything to that or Eddie? I know we’re working to empanel these taskforces and they’re going to be broad-based but – Eddie, you want to say ---? Yeah, yeah. I’ll take questions.

**J. Stephen:** It comes right to one of the phrases you used. I was asked by one of my constituent members to ask about the use of the phrase “reallocation” or “redirection” of funds, whether that means within the Academic Affairs Division or whether that includes the other divisions having some of their funds reallocated into Academic Affairs, the main concern being if we’re going to reallocate or redirect funds only in Academic Affairs, it turns it into a dog fight over already scarce resources for some people.
President Peters: The answer is yes and yes. We’re going to redirect and reallocate from everything – but that’s not the emphasis. The emphasis is we reallocate and redirect every week, every year so that is nothing new. So the emphasis on the strategic planning is not on a major reallocation effort but it is anticipated that that will go forward. Let me give you an example. We identify a need for a program in my area. We want to build the greatest congressional studies department in the country. Part of the reallocation is maybe there’s some new money for a position but to that would be added a vacant position in an area that is perhaps no longer needed or can be redirected. Leverage – that happens all the time and that’s what I’m talking about. We’re going to look at everything we do and that includes both administrative and pure academic and I always in my career, I always look at academic administrative and instructional and then administrative support. So there are all sorts of buckets to look into. But right now, the focus is on the strategic planning process and coming up with proposals and my search right now is for new dollars. That’s what I’m doing, and reallocated dollars and the Provost and the vice presidents will be working on that as well but also evaluating their own programs and looking for savings. Every year we probably redirect – I can’t put – many positions and many dollars.

J. Stephen: I understand that. Thank you. So yes and yes.

President Peters: Does that help? The focus of this is not on reallocation; that’s the message. Yeah, Brigid?

B. Lusk: People that I’ve talked to are pretty excited about the Strategic Plan but a question that keeps arising is what is the connection – and I don’t know if you can answer this; I don’t know if it has been resolved – but what is the connection between the concept papers and the request for proposals that will be made later this academic year? How are the concept papers going to sort of fall in to the RFP’s?

President Peters: I like it when the Provost grabs for the mike.

Provost Alden: I just had a deans’ retreat this morning so it’s fresh in my mind. The idea of the concept papers are going to come up through the deans’ offices as well as from other places. We’re going to ask Student Affairs, Alumni Affairs and the various councils to also submit. The purpose of this is to see which of the concepts really fit in with the ideas to develop a new strategic plan at the college level but also which ones are more at the university level in terms of parallel ideas coming from multiple colleges that could be brought into the concept of a multidisciplinary program. So I think the concept papers are just getting the basic materials for either what the taskforces are going to be looking at or what are the deans are going to be leading in terms of strategic planning. Later on, we were talking about having a kind of proposals for letters of intent or something of that nature coming up from Rathrina’s office to talk about multidisciplinary clusters and he’s working on the structure of that based on some of the input we had from the deans’ retreat this morning. And we will also be having a third round and that’s for the idea that if you need base funding, let’s say some seed funding for a development of an idea, we’ll have a strategic initiative grant process to award small amounts of resources for next year to get some things off the ground that might take off if they were just given a little bit of a
shove so those are three things that we see going on this year in addition to what is going on in the colleges and in the taskforces.

President Peters: Okay. Well, I am just pleased that the community is focused on this. It’s amazing at universities when people start talking about ideas and big ideas is what happens. You know I threw this example – remember in my speech I was talking personally. I wasn’t saying we’re going to do this; I was giving personal examples of things that I thought were intriguing and I mentioned the themed year idea and, you know, it’s not necessarily novel but it’s more apparent at small liberal arts schools that can focus on this and – I think, I’m not sure, one big state university is doing China is their themed year – I don’t know how you do a theme year. I think you probably need a theme biennium but, that kind of a big idea. I was talking to someone in the community who’s a community leader and they had heard this and they came up to me and they started talking about how the community could get involved in a themed year; how local DeKalb could – if it was Latin America for instance or Central America – and then I was talking to a school board official in District 428 who said wouldn’t it be great if we could correlate a themed year in our public schools with a themed year at NIU and the community and then I was talking to alums who said boy, this idea of a themed year is great. Why don’t we do the year of the entrepreneur and we could all come and participate. I began to think well, you know, those are all great ideas but what was really great about it is people were talking about ideas that matter and it’s what a university should do and gets people talking, not only across departments, but they start talking in their communities. So there must be concept papers; there must be some just extraordinary ideas out there that if they fit the rubric, we have our four imperatives, we have the principles by which we operate, we have a role and mission – those concept papers ought to roll up and roll down into that rubric and I think just the process is worth doing. I think the outcomes are going to be very, very valuable.

All right. It is that time of year again. This is a paid political announcement for Deb Haliczer. It is that time of year again for the annual ethics training and this is important. Deb, do you want to grab the microphone and tell us a little bit about this for those of you who have never – has anyone not taken an ethics test yet here?

D. Haliczer: Sure.

President Peters: You’re all veterans.

D. Haliczer: Here we are again. Thank you President Peters. In advance, I want to thank all of you for cooperating with this annual task ethics training. Steve Cunningham, thank you sir, has begun sending out the communications to the campus and by November 14, all 8900 faculty, staff, students, extra-help affiliates, etc., etc. – whoever gets a paycheck – will have completed on-line or paper ethics training and the database is about 8900 people. Come to my office sometime and see the tens of thousands of pieces of paper, those ethics training orientation forms. What’s new this year? Well, most of it’s not new. Well most of it’s not new. You’ve all done this before; it’s the same old contents, same State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. The exciting part is that we give an awfully lot of business to poor Ken Davidson, our Ethics Officer. As people take the training, they begin to call his office and he has to answer questions so Ken, thank you and the army of people around campus. The department heads, secretaries,
business managers, nags, who have to get all of those people who don’t work on campus, doing it. What they say is new this year is there is no quiz. Remember last year our disaster was that too many fast readers whipped right to the quiz figuring if I can pass the quiz, I don’t have to read all these pages on line. So in order to prevent that from happening, they have eliminated the quiz and are going to regulate how quickly you move through the tutorial on-line by making you answer questions in the course of the content. I had a conversation last week with the state administrator and I asked him how long did people spend on ethics training in all those state agencies and he said the average across the state was 45 minutes. And, as your representative, I said oh come on now, this is the university where all of us read faster than the norm.

**President Peters:** We’re all above average here.

**D. Haliczer:** I said 80% of our employees read much faster than anyone else so what’s realistic? I hate the fact that this is being recorded. He said, well realistically, probably half that so the sort of hint, hint is people really should spend 20 to 25 minutes reading and pondering their ethical obligations. I’m sure that they’re going to be timing us; I’m sure the reports Ken and I get everyday will detail ----

**President Peters:** Does anybody want to check – ethically challenge – that statement?

**D. Haliczer:** Oh well, so that’s what’s new with ethics training. October 16 is when we begin; November 14 is when it ends.

**President Peters:** Say that again.

**D. Haliczer:** October 16 it begins; November 14 it ends at midnight.

**President Peters:** What are the consequences of not ---

**D. Haliczer:** The consequences for choosing not to comply with the law and I’m coached to say it that way, is a potential $5,000 fine to the individual and so I’ve had student workers who’ve said I’m too busy; just give me the fine and I say $5,000 to you personally and they say can I come to your office right now and do it – sure. We offer tons of assistance. We have agents through every department and division to help people get through so the good part is – this is the fourth year – and in the three years that we’ve been doing this, no one has gotten fined. So, you know, I have this personal mission to never let an NIU person get that $5,000 fine and we’ve worked really hard to get people through everyone of the annual complications.

**President Peters:** Buck?

???: Ken, how did the SIU case by the professors who refused to sign saying they were non-compliant because they read too fast come out?

**K. Davidson:** I don’t know that there’s anything public on that. There was a settlement.

???: I’m going to keep my normal reading speed then.
D. Haliczer: What I was told was that it was still in arbitration so the settlement is new news to me. Cool.

President Peters: All right. Let’s move on.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Academic Calendars for 2015-2016-2017 – refer to University Affairs Committee

President Peters: We have a consent agenda today. It’s the Academic Calendars that have to referred to University Affairs. Is there a motion to accept the consent agenda? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right; that will be sent.

The motion passed.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report (Pages 6-11)

President Peters: Reports. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Paul Stoddard, I know you have a report.

P. Stoddard: I do. This report was actually written by Jody Newman-Ryan but she and I both attended the meeting. This report is on one of these pages, 6 I’m told – 6 and 7. Basically, as we met, President Peters came by and addressed the group and outlined what we do at Northern and how we are reacting to and interfacing with the decisions made in Springfield. Then we had a couple of representatives from Springfield come. That was our State Rep Bob Pritchard and later on State Senator Brad Burzynski came. He spent a fair amount of time with the group, an hour or so. Some of the things we touched on are listed in the report. Not mentioned in the report is something each of them said, which I personally found surprising, and both of them were talking about the need to probably – the probable need – to actually raise the income tax in order to fund higher education and education as a whole in the state of Illinois. Now keeping in mind that the Governor has already pledged that that will not happen, I’m not sure how sincere those comments made but they were made by Republicans. I find that extremely interesting and somewhat promising.

Also of interest, Representative Pritchard, while not the founder of this group, apparently was instrumental in helping to get it going, that was a caucus – a higher ed caucus that is both bipartisan and bicameral. There are a lot of different caucuses in Springfield but to date there has not been one dealing with higher ed issues so now they’ve got, I think he said sixty or seventy people involved, who get to go and talk about higher ed. Also it came out in this meeting - obviously the faculty at these meetings are always concerned about how they might be able to influence the legislature – a couple of points came out of that. One was that going with hat in hand and saying we do wonderful work and we deserve more money isn’t going to work very well. A better technique would be to say here’s what we can do for you; what can you do
for us? One of them made the statement I could get you all a 20% raise if you all agree to teach 20% more classes. So, I mean, there is the expectation that if we get more money, we need to provide more. The status quo apparently means we get what we get; we do what we do.

The other thing that came out that I found useful I think is that, you know, generally the representatives and senators from districts that have universities have been very supportive of higher education. It’s in their interests since we’re their constituency but it’s useful to remember, especially for those of us who don’t live in this district, that even if there’s not a university in a particular representative’s district, there are no doubt students and parents of students who depend on the university system for their education who live in every district across the state and when we make points to legislators about the need for quality educational opportunities in Illinois, we need to be pointing out that it’s their constituents who are going to be able to take advantage of that.

So those were the main things we got from the legislators. Otherwise, the other thing of particular interest I think was a position paper which is included on pages 8 and following on college students’ mental health issues. This was pretty well received by all members of the FAC. This is something they actually started working on before the Virginia Tech tragedy although the Virginia Tech tragedy did give additional urgency to this particular document. So I encourage everybody to take a look at that and think about how the findings of that document or the conclusions of that document might come to play here at Northern. In an un – well, not unrelated but in a different vein – I’m currently sitting in on the task force that is charged with looking at the Virginia Tech report and seeing how it applies to Northern; what we at Northern need to be aware of from that report and one of the four groups that that task force is broken into specifically is dealing with student mental health issues. So this is something that’s very important these days and the university is taking that very seriously.

I’ll take any questions anybody might have on the FAC report. All right.

**President Peters:** Did we get someone to be that representative?

**P. Stoddard:** On mental health?

**President Peters:** No, on the Faculty Advisory – are we covered?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes, we have. Earl Hansen will be our representative to the FAC.

**President Peters:** Good. All right, good report.

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

President Peters:  It looks like the next report is Paul on the BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee.

P. Stoddard:  Okay, I don’t see Nancy here.

President Peters:  I don’t see Nancy.

P. Stoddard:  She has a copy of the report on page 12.  I can probably read this as well as you and visa versa but basically the Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee in September is concerned with the budget for the upcoming year.  They made recommendations for the internal budget and the capital budget which looks the same as it does every year because we never get any capital budget money from Springfield.  Maybe this year will be different; maybe not.  Anyway, so that budget was approved; the internal budget was approved and they approved the renewal of the academic program enhancement and instructional technology surcharge and that’s what Nancy had to say.

President Peters:  Okay.

D.  BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – report (Pages 13-15)

President Peters:  Jay and Bobbie, BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee.  Do you have a report?

B. Cesarek:  Yes I do.  The report is included on pages 13 through 15.  It was – this committee in the past had met at Hoffman Estates so everyone from the institution trucked over to Hoffman Estates for a one to one and a half hour meeting.  Our meeting location was changed.  It now follows the other two committee meetings of the Board of Trustees so it was held in Altgeld which was delightful for everyone relative to travel but at the same time, because it was the third of three meetings and the first two did run over in time, this particular meeting and the content was squashed into a very small amount of time and everyone spoke very rapidly so I did my best to put together as much as I could from the notes that I took.  Ken Zehnder had a report relative to all the bills that were being tracked by NIU.  The one comment that I did want to make particularly for the faculty was that this time there were no textbook bills that made it to the Governor’s desk because I know that had been a concern of yours in the past.  Some minor language adjustments here and there.  Again, NIU is continuing vigilantly to follow the capital funding bills but again, a very concise report because of the time.  Relative to the higher education budget, as you certainly know from the President’s comments previously, while there was a bill approved, there was also a line item veto by the Governor to the extent of 28 million which for NIU came out to just about $124,000 so I’m sure we’re working to fill that in as we can.

Kathy Buettner gave a great report relative to what’s going on in Congress.  Some things that she did mention which were delightful for NIU is that the Department of Defense budget – the Department of Energy budget – currently have two items in there that involve NIU’s budgeting; 3.3 million for the Proton Therapy Project as well as Rockford Airport Authority and Rockford
Commerce trying to find alternative air fuel. We have some things from the College of Engineering as well as the Burpee Museum in Rockford and Anthropology and Biology Departments at Northern that are continued funding that look like they will continue to pass. Higher Education Reauthorization – the Senate passed their version; the House has not yet. You can see some of the things that the Senate did. A call out in particular that Kathy made note of that I will not certainly read for you but is there for you to review that is not at this point in time finalized because, again, it hasn’t been passed by both the House and the Senate.

There was a university report by Steve Cunningham relative to any employee conduct and accountability policies with a new reference guide that I know is right now, I believe, in Ken Davison’s office for final review but it looks to be a great resource for NIU faculty and staff relative to again, a guide for the things that we need to know about being an employee at the institution. They’re all pulled into one location which I think will be helpful to all of us. It is not up on the website yet but I’m sure that those parties, once it does get posted, that it will be shared with everyone.

Ken Davison also talked about our trademark seeking for a trademark of both Northern Illinois University and NIU. Ken is that, as far as I know, still ongoing?

**K. Davidson:** The federal process will take a little while longer. The state process is completed.

**B. Cesarek:** Okay, great. Thank you. Sure?

**J. Stephen:** Is Victor E. Huskie and the Huskie logo, do we have those registered as service marks or whatever the category they fall into?

**K. Davidson:** Which ones again?

**J. Stephen:** Victor E. Huskie and the Huskie wolf. Are those registered service marks for NIU?

**K. Davidson:** For athletics I know that there is at least one version of the dog. I’m not sure about the Victor E. Which one are you referring to?

**J. Stephen:** The mascot.

**K. Davidson:** Yes, that one – the current version of the Huskie is indeed service marked.

**J. Stephen:** But we as an institution don’t have a trademark on our name?

**K. Davidson:** We have a common law; we have an ongoing common law. We’ve always had a common law claim because we put it into use in interstate commerce in 1957 or 1958 ongoing but ---

**J. Stephen:** Okay, so we’ve got Northern Iowa beat on the usage?
K. Davidson: Northern Illinois University is reserved in use; NIU is reserved in use. It’s not necessarily pre-emptive to others who would have a similar common law claim.

J. Stephen: Okay. 

K. Davidson: It’s not registered federally.

B. Cesarek: Northern Iowa is the University of Northern Iowa. Sorry.

J. Stephen: Thank you. I was just wondering about our service marks because I think we have one for this building too as a logo.

K. Davidson: Yes.

President Peters: Just make sure we get those paws trademarked.

K. Davidson: Which ones?

President Peters: Well, let’s not discriminate. Yeah, this is – we’re attending to these matters.

B. Cesarek: The final few comments – the trademark registration with Ken Davidson leading that discussion prompted further discussion about the copy write infringements and the illegality of file sharing and the processes that NIU is currently undertaking in order to inform new students and all the current students relative to the problems that certainly that carries with it.

The last and final was the Federal Direct Lending Program. We are switching as an institution from the Federal Family Educational Loan Program in the fall of 2008 to the Direct Lending Program and both Enrollment Services and Media Services will do its very best to ensure that all of our students are well informed of that and what they need to do in order to make the transition from one program to another. That’s the end of my report unless you have questions. Yes sir?

E. Johnson: Just a quick question. The trademark and licensing money, is that a general revenue – where does that money go; who’s making like off the t-shirts and stuff that’s being sold? Where’s ---

B. Cesarek: Well, I think the licensing as far as the Huskie logo and I really need to have our marketing person from Athletics here but I believe that’s an Athletic Department entity and as such at least a portion of that goes back to intercollegiate athletics. I don’t know. Eddie do you know? I don’t know what the actual agreements are.

E. Williams: Unfortunately, we get the return that you would see maybe at the University of Michigan or whatever but the funds that come back are, as indicated, a portion goes right directly to intercollegiate athletics because those come out of their area and the rest in the general fund for the university.
**President Peters:** We’d like it to be more and we want to make sure we protect our property; our copy write and on the athletic side you have other relationships with collegiate sports and Mid-American Conference also has a contractual relationship so that all – on the athletic side, that’s pretty much taken care of. We’re not generating much of anything on any of their marks at this point. Maybe the Department of Mathematics can have a logo or something.

**J. Stephen:** Actually, we do have one. I know that state law prohibits us from going into contracts with Pepsi Cola and stuff like that but does that same law prohibit our Athletic Department from making connections – well, they’re not going to get $70 million from Addidis – does that same law apply to athletic programs in the state?

**President Peters:** There’s no state law that I know of that would prohibit us at this time from entering into a *** rights contract with a vendor based upon proper request for proposals. We’re in one right now with Pepsi – for years.

**J. Stephen:** I thought we had been prohibited from renewing that.

**President Peters:** There was talk of that but no.

**J. Stephen:** Oh, good.

**President Peters:** No, and that has been a wonderful injection funds for student scholarships and that’s what it’s pretty much exclusively used for and USOAR and other things. That’s where the Pepsi money goes; every penny of it. Linda?

**L. Sons:** The million dollars that’s supposed to be for NIU’s involved with Rockford Airport Authority and so forth. What departments are involved in doing this?

**President Peters:** I think that’s Engineering. Dean Vohra – you want to take credit for that?

**P. Vohra:** Sure, why not.

**President Peters:** And tell us what it is.

**P. Vohra:** It is basically ---

**President Peters:** And if there’s a mathematical twist, you might have to share some of it.

**P. Vohra:** The mathematical figure is 1 million which you all know. It’s an endeavor between the College of Engineering and Outreach. It is being sponsored by ??? and the focus of the project will be to look at alternate fuels for the aviation industry. So we will be doing different kinds of research to find out but depending upon the type of the flight, the type of the plane and the height of the flight, what kinds of fuels could be more efficient either to ??? the plane or to give them supplemental energy. It’s purely a research project.
President Peters: Okay, it’s good research. I might say just my own comment. You mentioned the recording industry and those issues. I think every student and everyone in the community should read the editorial, I believe it was in the *Northern Star* sometime this week that talked about this issue and gave some guidance to students and I thought it was spot on. Basically, it’s against the law to steal intellectual property and even though the technology is easy and even though students come here with that from high school and it’s very easy to do – this file sharing – it is intellectual property and universities value that and there are certainly ways to download music, I know less about the movie downloads, in an economical way. So I would read that editorial if I were a student. All right?

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report (Page 16)

President Peters: The next report is Paul Stoddard. The BOT meeting.

P. Stoddard: The full Board of Trustees for Northern met on September 20. Essentially, they acted on the recommendations made by the various committees. They approved all the recommendations. The one thing they did that was not on those agendas was the approval of the salary increment of an average of 4% for faculty and staff. Due to the late breaking budget discussions, that increment was not ready in time for the FFO meeting which would have normally handled it. Anyway, the full Board took it up; they approved the recommendation. It looks like the university has decided to divide that increment up. I think everybody has already seen a message from the President and whomever else their supervisors are as to how that works. It does seem like it was done according to the guidelines and recommendations of the various councils. Those suggestions were made to the people deciding how the increment would be divided and from what I’ve seen, it looks like those suggestions were taken to heart. They also approved a Bylaw change which I believe was actually mandated by state law that Board members not able to physically attend the meeting – they used to be able to just phone it in – but now they actually have to have a video link as well so you have to be able to see the person and hear them with some sort of audio/video equipment for them to take part of voting members of the Board meetings.

The next meeting of the full Board – that’s a typo – on the report. It should read, I believe, December 6 not December 2 here in DeKalb.

President Peters: Questions? All right.

F. Academic Policy Committee – William Baker, Chair – no report

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

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

President Peters: William Tolhurst, Rules and Governance Committee? Do you have a report?

W. Tolhurst: I’ll be calling a meeting ??? the recommendations.
President Peters: You have to be on a microphone to be legal.

W. Tolhurst: Okay. The committee hasn’t met yet. I’ll be very soon calling a meeting of the committee to discuss how to best implement the suggested changes by the University Personnel Officer.

President Peters: Okay. Good.

I. University Affairs Committee – David Wade, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Toni Tollerud, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Approval of the UAC to BOT (Page 17)

President Peters: All right. It looks like unfinished business. Approval of the UAC to BOT, page 17. Paul?

P. Stoddard: Yeah. We need to reappoint Professor Stephen to the UAC. His term is up so he’s interested in a second term and Nancy Castle I think will be filling in the end of the term for Xueshu Song. So we need to just approve that. Do we need to actually vote on it?

President Peters: All right. Is there a motion for this approval? So moved. Second? We’ve got a second. Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right we have members.

B. Cesarek: Paul I just have a comment if you’d like to fill in the slots. I serve a three year term so my name could be on there through 2010.

President Peters: And beyond.

B. Cesarek: Well, we don’t know that yet. One term at a time.

President Peters: What about Jay? Can we fill you in too or are you year-to-year?

J. Monteiro: Mine is year-to-year.

President Peters: Okay. All right.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. University Holiday Calendar 2008 – walk-in
President Peters: New business – the University Holiday Calendar 2008 is a walk-in. This is an item for approval. I know that Steve Cunningham is here who has worked with the various groups to come up with this. Steve, do you want to make any comment on this?

S. Cunningham: Just that it’s that time of year again. We designed the calendar for next year’s holidays at this time and bring them to the Council for concurrence following President Peters’ approval. We’ve taken every measure to slide in the floating holidays and administrative closure days to maximize the ??? and the calendar has been reviewed by the Operating Staff Council and Supportive Professional Staff Council representatives.

President Peters: All right, so the Councils have seen this and have had input.

S. Cunningham: Through their presidents, yes.

President Peters: All right. Questions? Yeah?

???: Thank you. Just a quick question. I was wondering what the difference is between administrative closure days and floating holidays were? Just a general –

President Peters: What the difference between what, administrative closures?

???: Administrative closures. Just what are they in particular? I understand what a floating holiday is. It’s time that can be moved around for individual holidays and different things but administrative closure, I wasn’t sure about.

President Peters: I believe administrative – Steve, I think that has to do with winter break.

S. Cunningham: That’s a good question. Actually the Board regulations basically grant President Peters with a certain number of floating holidays and administrative closure days and he then utilizes those to complete the calendar.

President Peters: It gives us a little flexibility in trying to maximize break time with our need to do the work. All right? All those in favor the university holiday schedule for 2008 say aye. Opposed? All right. We have holidays.

The motion passed.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Comments from the floor, questions? Yes, Professor Stephen.

J. Stephen: We’ve talked about the increment. One question I’ve received a lot is when can people expect to receive their letter telling them what their increment will be.
President Peters: Steve Cunningham, how are we doing on the notification process for increments? When might our faculty and staff expect that envelop in the mail? The information rather.

S. Cunningham: Right, the processing schedule is running smoothly although it’s a compressed schedule because our goal and we see the increments in the November 15 payroll so that’s just right in advance of the Thanksgiving break fortunately and the increment notices will go out to employees I think toward the end of the month and that follow reviews of both the college, divisional and university levels.

President Peters: Okay, is that specific enough? This is not a simply process. It’s pretty complex the way this is.

J. Stephen: Thank you. That’s why people are saying if they don’t have the letters out, how can they get the pay forms filled in by November 1, you know, la, la, la.

President Peters: We are a university.

J. Stephen: I have one other comment. You complimented the Star on their covering of the ?? system and file sharing. I’ve noticed a marked improvement in the quality and the focus in the Northern Star, in particular the two editorials on the crisis in Burma right now and would just like to compliment the Northern Star on an obviously high quality editorial policy that seems to be emerging this year.

President Peters: Okay. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: This is a question regarding the action that was taken by the Senate, I forget precisely how long ago, but it had to do with identifying a formal recommendation on relative percentages or a formula for determining the percentage of across the board versus merit pay and I was just wondering if that has formally forwarded to Provost Alden yet and if not if it could be done so that working with the UCPC, the UCPC could consider that matter this year.

P. Stoddard: Last year the Senate took up the idea of trying to proactively recommend to the UCPC how an increment might be divided up. The Senate, in a strong majority but not unanimous vote, asked that half of the increment – I believe we did use the phrase across the board; the other have be based purely on merit. The date, the across the board issue, focused on the fact that faculty doing their jobs would be losing ground to inflation if we kept making the entire thing a merit based increment and so we recommended that people doing their jobs be taken care of with at least some increment and also recognized the need for merit in order to retain the best people. Last semester I verbally indicated that to the Provost. This came up at the first Faculty Senate meeting. This year, after which I made sure I e-mailed the Provost that along with the minutes I believe from the Senate so the Provost should have all that and if he needs it again I’ll be happy to send it along again.

Provost Alden: I have it now I just didn’t have it before the end of the year when the UCPC stopped meeting so that was the issue. The issue was that it didn’t coincide with their meetings
last year but we do have what you recommended and I thought that was just for this year because I got the impression it was year-by-year. Now if that’s for now and forever, I need to know that as well.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, and we didn’t address whether that was a sort of standing thing or we would revisit that on any given timetable. I will ask the Senate if that still stands or we can revisit it.

**Provost Alden:** Yes and if we could do that before the spring because that’s when we’ll have to meet on it. One of the subtle issues is we decided that the component of merit for satisfactory performance would be taking the place of that across the board cost of living portion but we were not going to be giving people who were denied tenure or were stopped because of probationary issues a merit increase so that’s the subtlety that was the difference.

**P. Stoddard:** Right and I felt that that actually did keep the spirit of the debate was honored by the way that worked.

**Provost Alden:** And there is one other exception. If a college council somehow designates there are other types of unsatisfactory behavior, we’re honoring that as local shared governance issues.

**President Peters:** All right. Linda?

**L. Sons:** I just want to make one comment because Buck brought up the idea of editorials in the Star. There was an editorial in the Star the last two weeks or sometime there, I’m not sure exactly when, talking about large classes and how it was so difficult to ask questions in large classes and get yourself such that you could, in fact, you know get the most benefit from large classes. However, most large classes have connected with them and in this particular instance I know there was connection with it to something that’s called “recitation section”. Small sessions that meet during the week and individuals who do not go to such things might find out that it is impossible for them to ask their questions or get the same measures of understanding. Let’s encourage students to go to class—all their classes.

**President Peters:** Well, as a founding member, maybe the founder, of the Century Club at the University of Nebraska for instructors who taught over a hundred—actually, I taught five hundred—I firmly believe you can have extremely effective instruction in large. And today with the technology and text messaging and then having been at two large universities that had mega large classes, it was such a pleasure to be president of a public—a fairly large public university—that really has by and large not a lot of mega classes. We’d like to reduce our class sizes; we all would wouldn’t we. But effective instruction can take place but that again is a time honored thing that students are concerned in and in our careers, students are always concerned about that as they should be. Part of the learning process I guess. Are we adjourned? I got them with large classes there.

**Provost Alden:** Just an information item. The UCPC met this week and we discussed a policy—or actually a practice matter. The Bylaws suggest that every year a special hearing board be
created in the event that any personnel actions come forward that involve a discrimination charge. Because of the nature of the timeline, by the time the UCPC membership is determined and by the time the pool of candidates for that board are selected, we’ve already burned one semester. So we suggested, based on a fairly thorough discussion, that we make the pool for every two years, selected in the spring, select fifteen people by lot from that pool at the beginning of every academic year and then, of course, there’s always options in the Bylaws for allowing people to either excuse themselves or allowing either side of a grievance to ask for someone to step down because of conflict of interest and then we could go back to the pool. But this would ensure that we would comply with the spirit of the Bylaws that at the beginning of every academic year, we do have that group formed in the event that we need them and I would hope that we don’t need that group very often. But because the Bylaws were silent on exactly how we were able to expedite that we took it upon ourselves to create that as a working policy or a practice so I just wanted to let people know that that’s what we had decided.

**J. Stephen:** If it’s unclear in the Bylaws I would suggest that the UCPC make a formal statement of this and refer it to Rules and Regulations.

**Provost Alden:** We will bring it forward at a future UC for incorporation in the Bylaws since it tells how the pool is selected. It is silent on when it’s selected, how often it’s selected and so forth and so we’re trying to expedite the process.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

**President Peters:** We’re adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 P.M.