I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I'm pleased to call the November 7 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: Before we adopt the agenda, there is a walk-on report that goes in VI, G. It’s the Resource, Space and Budget Committee report. There are no other walk-ons or additions to the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? I hear a motion. Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2007 MEETING

(Pages 3-4)

President Peters: I’m going to call for any additions or corrections to the minutes of October 10 on pages 2-4. Additions or corrections? Motion to approve the minutes is in order. Second? All those in favor say aye. Good.

Stephen made the motion; Baker seconded.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Welcome everyone. I first want to note, right in front of me, I see a full contingent of students. This reminds me of my Political Science 100 class. All right, take out
your papers for a pop quiz. Estimate the combined IQ of the presidential candidates on both the Republican and Democratic sides. Divide by Pi. Welcome students. I’m not recognizing it. I don’t have very much to say that hasn’t already been said. We’re moving along, or right in the heart, of the semester and we still have no capital bill. Surprise, surprise. I did work hard last week shoring up our positioning for the capital bill for Stevens and for the Computation Building and we do have support but before we need a compromise among the leaders and that is moving along. I hope to have something to report before the end of the millennium on that. The Congress is moving on conference committee reports on several bills which contain funding for NIU – defense bills and so forth – but those are – the sausage is being made, the meat is on the barbeque and so we should be hearing about those items soon although there is an amendment and I know Rathinda Bose and our Provost, Ray Alden, knows about this. We’ve been working on this now for several months in an attempt to cap indirect cost recovery on daily grants to – it was 25%; our rate is 47% overhead. That doesn’t mean much to some of you but it does to research professors and it looks like the compromise is going to be 35% which is – it’s better than 20% I guess but that’s historic. I would say that’s history and it might lead to other agencies adopting similar capping. The way that works is each institution that does research and has federal grants negotiates with the federal government as to what an appropriate indirect cost recover is and it ranges – most state universities I would say are in the 40-50% range; privates are 100% cost recovery so for every dollar you get in a grant, there is an indirect cost recovery that comes to the university for clerical, lights, heating, support, processing and so forth and that has been a significant revenue stream for American higher education on the research side. So we ill, you know, stay turned for that.

This is an unpaid, non-political, ethical announcement. The drop-dead date to do your ethics test is November 14. How many people have completed their ethics training? How many people have attempted? All right, so we want – remember we want Deb Haliczer, she’s right here, to have a perfect score. We want 100% of our people to take this test. It is a little different this year too. It’s different.

All right. That’s all I have to say. Let’s move through the agenda and then we’ll have questions from the floor at the end.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: There is no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report

President Peters: Faculty Advisory Committee to IBHE, Earl Hansen, are you here?

P. Stoddard: He’s not.
**President Peters:** Well, I guess we won’t hear that report.

**P. Stoddard:** It wasn’t much.

**President Peters:** It wasn’t much, all right.

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

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Nancy Castle – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

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

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

**President Peters:** Resources, Space and Budgets Committee, Linda. You had a walk-on item. Do you want to say much about it?

L. Derscheid: Not really. It’s pretty self-explanatory. It’s talking about the same issues that we’ve been talking about for quite a while. The same priority list for the last five years and that we’re asking for renovations to Stevens as our top priority. Dr. Williams did remind us that it took ten years to get the Faraday so I guess that means we all need to be patient if that’s what we need to interpret from that. We talked about the flooding of Kishwaukee and what was going to happen with that the renovations at the Monsanto Building.

**President Peters:** All right, any questions? I think we are waiting on Stevens but we’re not patient and we have to remind people continually of the need because in this environment, people can forget so it’s constant reminding, you know, to wash your hands after you go to the restroom – well, we have to remind people all the time of where Stevens is on our priority list. All right. Is this it?

H. Rules and Governance – William Tolhurst, Chair – no report

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

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

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Do we have any unfinished business?
VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Do we have any new business? Will someone please ask me a question?

E. Johnson: I’ve been asked by members of the Law School about who we would talk to about the Law Library. It is not AD accessible; there’s not a button for handicapped individuals to get into the Law Library. I didn’t know whose attention we should bring that to.

President Peters: We will make sure it gets to the head of buttons – no, I think we’ll take that to Buildings and Services. Could you put that in writing so we know? Yes? Professor Stephen.

J. Stephen: The 12% reduction on the overhead, if that were to go into effect this year, how much money would that mean from our budget?

President Peters: I have no idea. A lot depends on how many grants we have.

R. Bose: This is only Department of Defense. As you know, there are three types of projects by the Department of Defense. In their language they’re called 6.1, 6.2, 6.3. One is domestic research, one is somewhat applied not quite confidential, the 6.3 is completely secured research so we normally bring 6.1 and 6.2 type. There are three of them currently on campus right now. So the existing grants are not going to have an effect; these are multi-years grants. FY 2000 – starting 2008 – any new grant comes in, that will be subject to only 35% indirect costs. But there may be some ways of working through it if I looked at the exact language in the legislation that says no more than 35% the total cost. We way we charge our indirect costs is only based on salary wise and other things, not for the equipment and so forth so I’m not going to make any kind of noise at this point. We’re going to work with the Department of Defense Program Officer and see still we can recover 45%, you understand, but it’s not more than 35% of the total project. So I’m not quite sure how this is going to play out so that is an option we might be able to exercise depending on what are the itemized items in the specific grant. Now in terms of currently if we are going to make adjustment for the indirect cost on an existing grant, that would be somewhere about $150,000 for this year alone.

J. Stephen: ???

R. Bose: No, if we’re going to the NSF then we are.

President Peters: Yeah, if it ripples; if this approach is adopted by other agencies. You know, there could also be, in the grant application process and I think you were hinting at this, a shifting of what you would put in the grant as a direct cost which before was an indirect recovery. You know, you can’t do that totally because of the rules but there may be a possibility for some of that.

J. Stephen: That one talking about landscaping, nice job on Castle Drive here and the bridge and all, but there aren’t any garbage cans from the bridge to the Law College on that whole road there and it’s a high traffic road so ---
President Peters: What does that bridge need?

J. Stephen: Garbage cans. There used to be three between the bridge and Lowden Hall on whatever drive this is.

President Peters: Well, I think Lowell’s is having a sale, a Thanksgiving sale on those. That’s doable. Would you e-mail me that so I can give that to --- Dr. Williams is handling something right now for me.

J. Stephen: Okay, I didn’t know if I should send it to Bob Albanese.

President Peters: That’s a reasonable request.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Questions, comments.

P. Stoddard: If we have time?

President Peters: We have time.

P. Stoddard: The university is getting together a new ID card for faculty, staff and students. They’ve narrowed it down I believe to four possible themes and appearances and I think they’re going to put this up for a campus-wide vote at some point in the future so if you see anything about that and you’re at all concerned about what your ID card of the future will look like, that’s your opportunity to give some input into it. So just keep an eye out if you see something that says ID card, it might not be spam.

President Peters: I’m going to ask Provost Alden to give us an update on where we are with these various strategic planning process and taskforce. There’s a – I think a day doesn’t go by when someone doesn’t come up to me and talk to me about some aspect of it and there is coming up a working session with the Board of Trustees where they’re going to be informally presented with what we’ve done so far and then there’s going to be a dialogue and we’re going to have the taskforce chairs there and the Trustees are extremely interested in this and very actively involved in asking questions so we thought it would be a good idea to do something a little more, not totally formal, but formal where there could be a nice give and take at this early stage because they’re very, very supportive and want to hear more and what we want to attempt to do is let them hear some of the campus and departmental and collegiate plan. They know what the macro level planning is but they’d like to hear some of the ideas that are being discussed. I think it will be very fruitful.

R. Alden: Well, right now we’re in the middle of going through literally hundreds of concept papers we asked the various components of the university community to give their ideas in a very brief, concept paper format and I’m going to have a deans’ retreat, or a Deans’ Council, at the end of the semester to go through those that are not unique to the colleges. Of course, the
ones that are unique to the colleges will be the basis for the college level plans but the ones that are by their nature at the university level or multidisciplinary in nature will be discussed extensively by the deans to decide how to integrate them together and then asked for a more detailed strategic plan. Then in the spring we will develop these strategic plans. We have I think four task forces right now, three of which are working on strategic planning issues; the other one is working on security and safety which was kind of an independent thing but clearly a component of our campus climate and environment issues. So those four task forces are one on student success, which primarily will focus on issues that are dealing with students’ ability to get through and graduate in a timely manner. What they think about the university climate; what they like about it and what they don’t as well as a number of the issues that are brought up by the first imperative which has to do with quality of undergraduate, primarily undergraduate, education and engaged learning and so forth. The second is on innovation in curriculum, looking at ways to improve various ways we deal with curriculum rather it’s general education or how courses are delivered and so forth. The third forth is really the Deans’ Council group working on multidisciplinary programs to try and make sure they’re integrated across the university and then the fourth is on sustainable development primarily of facilities, the green facilities and they way we do business. As I mentioned another one which wasn’t among the four strategic planning groups is safety and security which your Executive Secretary is your representative on that one. So in the spring we expect these various task forces and the colleges to work on strategic plans. We will also have a RFP process for looking at research clusters and Dr. Bose is working with me and the deans on that effort to try and identify those multidisciplinary research clusters that meet the various criteria that were identified in the strategic plan so as we find ways to support them and encourage and enhance their activities. I hope to also have a process by which strategic initiative grants are solicited and awarded during the spring for implementation next year. These are for relatively small amounts of money from a few thousand maybe up to tens of thousands maybe up to twenty or thirty thousand dollars for ideas that require some money to develop and show their potential. Much of this money could be used for release from courses or for graduate assistants or for other things that would help someone have the time and the human capital to put towards developing an idea. In other cases it may be actually acquiring something or attending a meeting, going somewhere else for best practices or whatever. So that will be something that will be in the spring as well.

Another somewhat related issue is for reward and regard. The President is going has already presented to the Board the idea of having distinguished Board of Trustee Professorships and we will be running that process to try to identify the first group then it will be three a year for the next five years so that’s a component of the strategic planning as well. I’ve kind of run on too long.

President Peters: No, that’s great. Are there any questions? Would you also talk a little bit about our anticipated plan to do the student Phase I, the student climate survey – generically talk about that.

R. Alden: Okay, one of the issues that was inherent over and over again both in the strategic plan and what we’ve heard from the campus community, particularly the fourth imperative dealing with the campus community is the need to make sure that we knew what the climate was on campus and so we will quite likely fairly quickly be acquiring a survey from a national firm
that looks at how students feel about their priorities of what’s important to them on campus and how satisfied they are with those various types of activities as well as if they represent a specific ethnic group or gender, we can sort out and find out if there’s anything specific to various components of the campus community that we may have to focus on. So this will be something that will either be probably early in the spring that we would hope to get a good statistically base, maybe 2,500 to 3,000 students, randomly selected to ask them what they feel about their campus environment. We would at the same time be asking for a statistical sampling from our faculty and staff on what they consider the campus priorities being and we’ll use that combination to see how – to make sure there’s alignment. If there’s not alignment, we need to realign some things and so that’s what our focus is going to be on this spring. We will also continue to be asking for student engagement issues. We do a survey of people coming in the first year, after their first year experience, and as they leave the university as a senior to find out how engaged they were in various types of activities. So those surveys will continue as well. Some of you may be asked; we can’t sample all 25,000 students so we try to sample enough so we can get a representative sample and I’m hoping that any of you students who get a request, that you take it seriously because you represent – like a Nielsen family, you represent a fairly sizeable population of your peers so take it seriously and take some take some time to think seriously about how your answers reflect on your peers in terms of their concerns.

President Peters: We’ve got a question back here.

W. Baker: May I ask whether you are in a position to clarify the relationship between the proposed Trustee Professorships and the existing Presidential Research Professorships and Distinguished Professorships?

President Peters: The Board of Trustee Professorships as envisioned is an add-on. The others continue. In other words, it’s a new category.

R. Alden: The actual criteria we’ve been working on is to focus on individuals who have scholarly reputations of national or international level and engage students in either their research, their service activities. Engage students outside of the classroom in addition to being kind of at the top of their discipline so I think that was the concept and the criteria are still being worked on.

President Peters: So the criteria is distinguished scholarship validated or artistry and a commitment to the NIU concept of engaging students.

W. Baker: In other words, you’re envisioning combination of the Research Professorships and the Distinguished Teaching Professorships.

President Peters: You could think of it that way, you could think of it that way. You know we’re going to do three a year rolling to fifteen and the standards should be high and we’re still working on the criteria and the process to be inclusive and fair and, you know, all the questions you would have about distribution and appropriation across colleges – is it straight merit – they’re working on that. My concern was we needed more reward and regard items in our portfolio compared to our comparative group and I think this is movement in that direction.
**R. Alden:** Many universities have university professors, regent professors – this would be equivalent to that and is looking for the faculty who best integrate their scholarship and their engagement of students in the various activities, not just being an excellent teacher in the classroom but engaging them in other ways as well. You said – you asked the question would we stop at fifteen – these are five year appointments. They’re renewable but they’re also competitive at the end of five years so every five years individuals who have it would have to compete with the new nominees coming up so it’s rotating in many years.

**President Peters:** Professor Stephen:

**J. Stephen:** I might be agreeing with Professor Baker here when I think that the standards as you’ve outlined them are a little too close to the two awards you’ve already got, but I see where there are some differences in particular the integration.

**President Peters:** Okay, you had one shot. Yes?

**D. Montel-Anderson:** My name is Deseree Montel-Anderson and I just wanted to know how we can get involved with the strategic planning committee.

**President Peters:** Did everyone hear that?

**D. Montel-Anderson:** Hi my name is Deseree Montel-Anderson and I’m just curious to know how we can get involved with the Strategic Planning Committee.

**R. Alden:** Basically, we had gone out to the Student Association as well as to your representative on the Board of Trustees and asked them specifically to solicit these concept papers. Since the deadline was last month, I’m not sure we can keep getting them but if you have the better idea, you may want to contact your leadership of your Student Association or your Trustee representative and see if they could submit something through the process. As I say, we will not be discussing these until the end of the semester but we had to have basically six weeks because there’s already I think well above 200 of these papers that have been submitted so that’s a possibility. These meetings that we will be having theoretically you can go to those. Those are not, I mean, we’ve never had a Task Force meeting yet that’s been a closed meeting so if you want to listen and hear what’s going on or if you want to participate, we have student representatives I think on almost everyone of the committees so if you think of something that you hear and you want to communicate it to one of the task forces you should have a representative on that. The only exception being the Dean’s Council; it doesn’t have any students on it but on the other hand what they’re talking about has been through a lot of discussion all the way from the department up through the college already so hopefully there’s opportunities for input there as well.

**President Peters:** All right. Deseree you have a follow-up?

**D. Montel-Anderson:** Just one follow-up. When are these meetings? I’m curious because there’s two of the topics I’m interested in attending.
**R. Alden:** Well, the first meeting of the Task Force on student success and on innovative curriculum is actually this Friday and I believe it’s at 10:00 – 10:30 – oh, one of the chairs is back here. Do you happen to know where it is?

**President Peters:** Is it on the website?

???: I believe it’s on the website. I believe it’s in Room 203 of Altgeld.

**President Peters:** Of Altgeld? There’s supposed to be a timely posting on our website. There is a Strategic Planning place that all this is to be posted.

**R. Alden:** This is just an initial meeting for these two groups to receive their charge. I’m not sure how much additional work they’re going to be doing beyond that but I assume they’re going to get started so it would be something that as soon as that meeting is over I’m sure that any work product would be posted.

**D. Montel-Anderson:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** Eric you had a question?

**E. Johnson:** In terms of a student survey, is it going to be delivered via the campus e-mail system or are they going to be selected and sent a paper packet and the timeline for that, is there going to be some sort of advertising campaign so the students are aware they may be selected and this is an important survey?

**R. Alden:** Since we have not yet talked to the group that puts these together, we decided to go with a national group that can help us not only integrate the questions and summarize them, they can put it against our peers in a national sense so we can see how we compare on various benchmarks against how other university students feel about their university of a similar sort. We have not talked to them about specifics. I believe there may be an option for taking it on line but I don’t know. I would have to find that out. We will be obviously be contacting those people who are selected to do this and it will be a random selection based on just a statistical selection and the group is going to help us determine how that’s done. So we’ll definitely be contacting those people who be selected. Hopefully, we can get a little press on the whole process so those people who are contacted know how important it is as well.

**President Peters:** We will put out a request for proposals. There are several national firms that do this and we will say what we want and then of course they come in and we’ll want to make sure we can add questions from various groups and also because, you know, they have a methodology these groups, they’re going to want to pick randomly so that there’s no bias and to minimize the bias in their samples. We want a national firm that has a data base over a period of years so we can bounce our data against our peer groups and there’s also that small faculty component that kind of reconciles – now the second phase of this we’re going to do a faculty and staff climate survey. We want to do the student one first and then we’re going to do a separate faculty and staff survey that we’re just starting to talk about. All right? Yes, Linda?
**L. Derscheid:** I also, as part of Resource, Space and Budgets have to serve – not have to but I’m supposed to be serving on Campus Security and Environmental Quality and we’re dealing with the Smoke Free Illinois Act that will be going into effect January 1 so this is more of an FYI because we don’t have a formal letter yet proposed with all our suggestions on how to implement this Illinois Smoke Free Act. The Act specifies that no person shall smoke within 15 feet of any entrance, window and/or ventilation intake. In addition, the Act also stipulates that smoking will not be allowed in any university owned, leased or operated vehicles which NIU already does but we’re in the process of trying to think through how to implement all the different aspects of how do we mark the 15 feet away from all entrances, windows and ventilation intakes and so we’re looking at every building on campus and this also has to be implemented on all the off campus sites too. It starts January 1.

**President Peters:** Interestingly I had a lunch with student leaders today and this was of concern to them. Some universities have just banned it on their property. I don’t know that that’s reasonable for us but we have to comply with the law. I’m glad your committee is looking into that. Motion to adjourn?

**X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m.