L. Jennings attended for S. Clayton.
Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: All right, let me call the February 18 meeting of the University Council to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Is there a motion to adopt the agenda. There is a walk; oh, this is this year’s calendar. Put it under VI, I, 2. All right. It’s the academic calendar for next year – this year, right. All right, is there a second? All in favor say aye. All right.

Wade made the motion; Tollerud was second. The agenda was approved as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 28, 2009 MEETING (will be sent out electronically)

President Peters: We do have minutes to approve and they were sent out electronically because I saw them. Call for additions or corrections. All those in favor say aye. Okay, we have minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
President Peters: Well, I don’t have much to say except to thank everyone for all the hard work you put in on the memorial. Very profound. There were lots of people – now can you hear me? All right. All right, I won’t tell that story I just told about the junior senator from --- I was thinking of all kinds of – are we all right? This thing is – all right? No, is that better? Can you hear me now? Now? Yes. At any rate, I was thinking of all kinds of stories to make up about Illinois politicians but none of them are really very funny because it’s not a very funny situation. Like how many senate candidates does it take to pass the state ethics test? I haven’t figured the answer out though.

All right, there we go. Help! All right. These are actually – these microphones are pretty old fashioned. They should be wireless. Anyway, there are a lot of people to thank. The two people who headed up our two major committees need some special recognition. Brian Hemphill headed up the committee that was responsible for all activities outside of the 10:30 Convocation memorial and Kathy Buettner was the chairperson of the 10:30 Convocation and so when you see them give them thanks and, you know, I’m writing a lot of notes to people. There were a lot of people involved. Very dignified. We got through it; got through the year. Time to move forward. We have a lot on our plate.

I don’t have much to say. There’s nothing I can add to the status of the state budget that I didn’t cover the last time. It’s the same. The Governor’s, the new Governor’s, budget statement has been pushed back by a month to, I think, March 18 period of time. We will have had some budget hearings before that. I’m not sure what all that means but there’s not much I can add to the fact that there is a huge deficit, that it will last more than a year, that there must be talks going on right now to try to qualify that. There are discussions about how that might be mitigated and whether that is budget cuts, whether it’s tax increases, whether it’s different kinds of taxes. There is a federal stimulus package that is tracking its way through that will have some mitigation but in the best of all worlds, there still will be a negative budget for the next couple of years. I mean they’re estimating $4.3 billion this year. Remember, our budget’s about $55 million. Revenue shortfall probably rolls to a minimum $9 billion deficit next year if it’s not taking care of. There’s some huge payments that are due. Pension fund, Medicaid, other entitlement-type programs that sop up all the revenue that would be estimated but now the revenue estimates are off. You are following the economic situation probably as closely as I am and there’s no good news there. Long recovery so we’re all bracing for it and doing what we need to do to prepare. I’d like to say it’s going to be okay. I can’t say that because I don’t know. We haven’t – I’m not signaling an alarm yet, but I think things are going to be different. I track pretty carefully what’s happening in other states and what’s happening in American public higher education and there’s some fundamental changes that may be coming because of the way we have to do business. The other thing to remember and that is in the past decade, there has been quite a reversal in the way we fund ourselves and that reversal has moved away from state funding to local funding based upon external grants and funding gifts, local funds, tuition and therefore, we are a very enrollment driven institution and everyone should recognize that and understand it and understand the consequences if our enrollment dips and enrollment across the country will dip. Not because there aren’t students who want spaces. It’s because of their financial situation and so it’s a very perplexing situation that we are thinking about. We’ve done things to help. The Huskie Advantage and there’s some other – some federal programs. Endowments across the country that help with scholarship funds have been taken a huge hit. We
have a very good investment portfolio that lost in the third quarter not near as much as some other institutions, 30-40% of the portfolio and it takes a long time to recover that. What it means is that the Foundation is working with deans and others who are dependent on scholarship money to see if there’s – what are you going to have to work with and also we’re working with our donors to see what might be done. But it’s not a pretty picture out there and I wouldn’t want to mislead you to think that we won’t have to do some difficult things. It told the Governor on Saturday that we’d like a clear signal. We’d like to be told, you know, we know there’ll be some pain. We want to know how to help and then we will rise to the challenge. I’ve been talking to many leaders in higher education and this is not business as usual. I’ve never – I’ve been involved in higher education many, many years; through many budget cuts and I’ve never seen anything like this at the macro level. It hasn’t come down to us yet completely but – and we’ve done a lot of planning. We’re solvent, but that can disappear fairly quickly because resources of revenue can be threatened and they are ????. I’m not an economist but I do know that enrollment and our revenue is ???. Those small changes have big consequences on our revenue picture and it’s everybody’s responsibility to understand that and so, you know, I’m not trying to paint a dark picture; I’m just trying to be realistic. But I also have great faith in this institution and the people of it that, you know, that whatever we’re dealt, we’re going to handle.

Now, that being said, there’s a few bright things and I think for all of its complexity and criticisms the stimulus bill has some things in it – the federal stimulus bill – that have an impact on higher education and states in a positive way. It’s not perfect. It doesn’t get us all the way there but it may help us in the next year or two and there’s a few things that you might be interested in. In this whole big package, there are a few elements that are important to higher education and one I would call aid to students. That’s not aid directly to us, but it is indirectly to us because it permits our students to stay in school and that is there’s about $30 billion in new funds that are going to flow to families in ’09 and ’10 so almost instantaneously and that’s a good thing. Part of it is Pell Grants; an increase in Pell Grants. So if the increase in Pell Grants goes up, that closes the gap between aid and tuition at public institutions. As of this point, private – unless governors take action – there’s not aid for private institutions in that but we’ll have to wait and see. That’s a pretty big number. Also, in terms of – there’s some tax credits that will help families with their tax bill, about the same amount, and for the first time it really goes into the middle class. I think that’s a positive. There is also – let me just talk about research. This is competitive R&D and we have to take advantage of that. It’s competitive. It’s not by formula but there’s a lot of money that has been dumped into the National Science Foundation, $2 billion for research grants, $900 million for equipment and facilities, $100 million for science education. Actually then, in the final bill, that’s even more; it’s $3 billion for the NSF and $400 million for infrastructure and $100 for science education so, you know, I know we’re all – the deans are already thinking about these things and the faculty can find targets of opportunity because it’s competitive R&D. There’s about $600 million in NASA for climate change, again competitive. It’s unclear at this time, that could be up to a billion. It could be up to a billion dollars. National Institutes for Health, $10 billion dollars although some do not like the way this is being distributed because it advantages the more established university research programs and medical schools and kind of hurts a little bit those who don’t do much NIH; we don’t do much NIH work here. But that’s $10 billion. DOE, Department of Energy, that does have an impact on us. $2 billion for research including $1.6 billion for the Office of Science and translate that into Fermilab and Argonne so that, you know, since we have close
associations with both of those federal labs, that’s good news. Whether that turns into jobs or not in the short term, I don’t know but I think that’s good. There are some other monies that I won’t go into that are or could be of benefit.

I did a little bit; I’ve done a little bit of what does it all mean to us outside of it and that has to do with things that might directly impact us or mitigate our budget problems. Here’s – I’m not there yet but let me give you a little bit of the methodology. In the bill there is money in the range of about $53.6 billion dollars available for what they’re calling “stabilization” to states. It’s called Fiscal Stabilization Funds for the States and it was largely geared out K-12 and higher education to help soften the budget cuts that we have incurred through the states in the past few years and the states who are suffering - ??? it’s a classic stimulus that the federal government can print money; the states can’t. That means the states can borrow the printed money and keep people at work and plug budgets but it’s not a panacea. So, of that $53.6 billion Fiscal Stabilization Funds for States, about $44 billion will be divided among the 50 states according to the general population between the ages of 5 and 24. Don’t ask me how they came up with that. Okay. I know, K-12 right? I should know that – and sent to the governors for distribution over three years. All right so cash is coming on a formula basis based upon those in the school age and collegiate years to the governors for disbursement and of that $44 billion, 81-82% is supposed to be allocated for operating funds for K-12 and public higher ed. All right, so the big chunk of that is for what they call operating; who knows what that means. A lot of it is direct aid to K-12 to keep them going. Then the goal of this by the way is to restore funding levels in the state to the 2008 and 2009 levels so it’s to mitigate the budget cuts that have occurred the last two years. Then the other 18.2% of the stabilization funds are to be allocated in the same manner as above but it could include public safety, modernization, repair, renovation of public schools, and public and private ed facilities. All right, so, you know as I said before, when I see Stevens Hall, I see Cole Hall and other things – the key premise behind all of this is to mitigate a rise in tuition. Whether that happens or not, but that’s what they’re trying to accomplish here. Now what Governor Quinn needs to decide, you know, you’re getting down to how you distribute this now, you know, what the pots are and they’re still trying to figure out what the exact dollars are and what the limitations are – I mean, there’s not a lot of guidance in this bill. You know, being a Political Science professor, there is maybe even a PhD thesis in this because when you look at the actual bill, in the eleventh hour, they sat around the table with a Sharpie and marked it up and the mark ups are there and hand written and it changes the nature of paragraphs, you know, as to who can distribute it, for what purpose – not just the amount – but it changes – it’s really fascinating at the eleventh hour.

Well, here’s what Governor Quinn needs to decide. He has to decide on, you know, that 81-82%. He has to decide the breakdown between K-12 and public higher ed. He has to make that decision; what’s the split. The second thing, he has to decide how to allocate the remaining 18% between operating and infrastructure. He has to decide that and so when it’s all said and done? What are we talking about? Illinois share of the entire federal stimulus bill is estimated at between 6.5 and 8.8 billion. All right, let me give you that again. When it’s all said and done – this is the stimulus bill estimate, the federal stimulus bill – between 6.5 and 8.8 billion and there are a lot of strings attached. More than anticipated. I understand that Governor Quinn wants to appoint or will appoint a senior official to oversee Illinois’s share of the stimulus fund so there’ll be a person in charge of this and the estimate, the impact statement associated with this, the
stimulus is estimated to create or save 148,000 jobs in Illinois over the next two years and that’s according to the Obama administration and that breaks down to 9,400 in the 14th Congressional District of which we are a proud member. So there you have it. That’s what I know. We’ve been making needs felt and I think, I’m hoping for a little bit of – you know, when you break down that 6.5, 8.8 billion and then you break it down for operating for K-12, it begins to go away pretty quick. But there’s something there. Also, it has an indirect impact because that is money for operating that goes to K-12 or us that doesn’t have to be accommodated this year in the state budget so that means less of a cut probably is what it means so that’s a good thing. So, there you go. Eddie, do you want to add anything or Ray? Eddie and Ray are watching the state and I’m just reading the internet and talking to anybody who’ll listen to me at this point. That’s where we are. All right, any questions on that? I know it’s an awful lot but I’m trying to boil it down to what it means to us. Simplified. How much, who controls it, what are the categories, what categories are we eligible for – people know our needs. Let’s simplify. Yeah?

**P. Henry:** You did mention that possibly Cole Hall and/or Stevens Hall could be included in one of these infrastructure things and I would just sort of – I think really in terms of a fitting memorial for the victims of last year and just for the students and faculty in general, that is a really high priority to have Cole Hall or some means of using that space and adding the space because it’s adding real hardship.

**President Peters:** Of all the statements and quotes about that situation that I found actually pretty compelling was what Senator – ah, Senator – Representative Prichard said and it was something to the effect and – only somebody outside our family could say this – that NIU cannot be completely healed until the state helps find the funds necessary to renovate Cole Hall; they cannot truly move forward. It thought that was an incredibly sage and important statement and I congratulate him for that. There’s no one I’ve talked to in the state government who doesn’t feel that way. It’s just a matter of money. But, you know, we need a lot of other things as well but that is a – there’s a little portion of the stimulus package that can fix that. You know, when it comes down to it that’s not a lot of money to go around. You’re not going to get everything you want. Then hopefully you’re going to have a state capital bill and I’m not sure where that is. The talk I hear, or just reading the newspaper like you do, is that there’s some talk about a gasoline tax of certain cents that would be enough to create enough money for the federal match for transportation portions; roads, bridges, not vertical, not buildings. In other words, enough of the federal highway tax to raise money to fix roads and bridges; 9 billion or 11 billion, whatever is due us and matched from the state’s 24 billion from the last highway bill but it doesn’t help with vertical and that’s another problem. Good comment and good question. Anybody else want to chime in?

All right, we don’t have much of an agenda so let’s get to it.

**V. CONSENZ AGENDA**

**President Peters:** We have no consent agenda.

**VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES**
President Peters: We have no reports except David Wade, Rules and Governance is that correct?

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report

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 Clerisida Garcia – 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 Dersheid, Chair – no report

H. Rules and Governance Committee – David Wade, Chair

1. Article 8.32 – ACTION ITEM (Page 2)

D. Wade: As you recall at last month’s meeting we came with a first reading. It appears now on page 2 of your agenda and ???.

President Peters: All right, this is the second reading on this action item and there’s a motion to approve or adopt. Is there a second? All right, discussion? You want to tell us what it is?

D. Wade: Sure. It was reported to us a few months ago through the UCPC there seemed to have been a concern that sabbatical requests had moved their way through the system. Ultimately, the number of sabbaticals is determined at the end and some sabbaticals were awarded and then later were found to be unsupportable because of the absence of those faculty members. A recommendation was made that we put a step in the process that would require departmental – at the first stage – departmental and representatives to make a determination whether the absence of that faculty member in the case of multiple requests within a department, can be accommodated in terms of without hiring people or cutting student sections or other adverse effects. This is language that adds that step in which that must be considered before it moves to the next step forward which is the College Personnel Committee.

President Peters: Okay. Now questions.
P. Henry: Just a quick editorial comment. Shouldn’t number 2 say “if there are more than one application”?

President Peters: Rather than.

D. Wade: Yeah, I don’t know if I copied that wrong or whether it appears wrong but you’re certainly right.

President Peters: Do you accept that as an editorial ---

D. Wade: Absolutely. Friendly amendment.

President Peters: All right, you got it.

D. Wade: In number 2 in 8.32, number 2, if there are more than one – gosh, I usually do this by ear and neither of them sounds right to me.

D. Wade: That’s the existing bylaw; I believe so. I thought I copied it correctly. I didn’t make an editorial comment as I copied it so.

P. Henry: I don’t care.

President Peters: That’s not the right answer.

D. Wade: Okay, we’ll just regard Pat Henry’s comment.

President Peters: All right, so we’re going to vote as is. It was not accept let’s say as per the record.

D. Wade: It all depends on what you mean by is.

President Peters: All right, more comments? All right, ready for the question? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained?

The motion was made by Wade; Promod made the second. The motion was approved.

I. University Affairs Committee – Linda Sons, Chair

President Peters: Let’s move on to university affairs. Linda Sons has two items.

1. Article 9.4. (Page 3)

L. Sons: The University Affairs Committee had referred to it the potential of a change in Article 9.4 in the Bylaws that would have made it possible for a Faculty and SPS Personnel Advisor to just continue term after term after term, let’s put it that way. The discussion that the Committee had on it was – we proceeded in two ways. One we
looked at a lot of different institutions as to what they did with advisors of this sort. It’s rather an interesting exercise but anyway, be that as it may, it lead ultimately to our feelings in discussion that there was really no compelling reason to make this change and three were some good reasons not to make the change and those are the things that you see written in front of you here and so our recommendation is that there be no change. So all the Council, I think, does is receive our report.

**President Peters:** All right. Does anyone want to drill down, question that wisdom? No? Thank you. Next item?

2. **Academic Calendars** 2009-2019 (Pages 4-13); 2008-2009 – walk-in

**L. Sons:** The next item is relationship to academic calendars. Let me take these in the order of first looking at the one that was represented by the walk-in. This was a request that we received independent of the other requests and so was brought to us as a change in the calendar to accommodate the number of Saturdays that need to be there for those classes which meet on Saturdays and so to define those as well as defining what represents the end of the term, particularly the end of summer term so that the Saturdays are appropriately included. The second issue is one of making all of commencements now conform to the idea of having a graduate commencement on the Saturday of the appropriate timeframe and an undergraduate one on the Sunday whereas in the past calendars were approved in a form where they were all on a Sunday. So I would first move approval of the 2008-2009 change which includes then the items for the end of this year and the summer session.

**President Peters:** And that was the walk-in.

**L. Sons:** That was the walk-in.

**President Peters:** Okay, is there a motion to approve that?

**L. Sons:** I move it.

**President Peters:** You move it? Is there a second? All right, discussion? Pretty straight forward. Bringing it into comportment with the changes in graduation.

**L. Sons:** And the Saturdays.

**President Peters:** And the Saturdays.

???: Commencements are all on Friday and Saturdays rather than Saturdays and Sundays. I’m not trying to say it’s wrong; I just don’t understand how that fits in to the Saturday/Sunday rationale.

**L. Sons:** The usual thing has been they were always on Saturdays, the spring ones; not on Sundays.
L. Sons: Sunday happens to be Mothers Day, if you want to look at it and we’re not going to have them on Mothers Day I don’t think. That would be – some schools do but it’s a bad move so ours has been approved always to be on Saturday so to accommodate this graduate/undergraduate, we moved the graduate one to the Friday, late in the day.

???: Thank you.

President Peters: Reasonable. All right. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstain? All right.

Sons made the motion; Promod made the second. The motion was approved.

L. Sons: Okay, then we’ll go on with the other calendars looking year by year to be sure that no one has any problems as we go. So if we look at the year 2009-2010 this would then be in the materials that you received along with the agenda and what you’re seeing is accommodating exactly the same thing that we were talking about a moment ago, namely that to get the right Saturdays, number of Saturdays in, we changed the calendar to include the Saturdays relative to, as you see, with the spring recess, for example, starting on Sunday so that the Saturday is still a class day and the commencements are appropriately set in the same way we’ve just talked about with the fall being as we did it last fall. The spring being as we’ve just approved for the spring semester this year and the Sunday included in the summer session end so that the Saturday there exists as a class day for the summer session. Again, I move approval.

President Peters: And this is for 2009-2010. All right, is there a second? Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right, we have a calendar.

The motion passed.

L. Sons: 2010-2011; same kind of thing. I move approval.

President Peters: Second? We have a second, now discussion. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right.

The motion passed.

L. Sons: 2011-2012; the same schedule.

President Peters: That’s a motion. Is there a second? Now discussion.

P. Stoddard: I’d like to point out that in that particular year the way it falls, originally I think we had it so the semester began, the fall semester began on August 15. Faculty are not on contract on August 15 so it was suggested that the semester be pushed back.
However, and those are the corrections you see in – however, that means ending on December 18, which really squeezes us at the end of the semester, especially for the advising deans who have to do some work post-graduation and that brings us right up against the winter break, so I would like to recommend as a friendly amendment that we instead start the semester on August 16, a Tuesday. The first week is for faculty meetings anyway; it’s not for classes and it seems like faculty should be able to meet in four days instead of five and then go back and August 22 would be the first day of classes. December 2 classes – actually December 3 classes would end that Saturday the 3rd, then December 5-10 would be the finals, December 17 – that’s all right – December 10 would be commencement, December 11 would be undergraduate commencement if everybody followed that so basically, going back to the pre---

President Peters: Does that have an impact then on the spring semester?

P. Stoddard: No, no that would have no impact on any of the other semesters.

President Peters: So what you’re saying is that rather than rolling the semester back because of the 15th issue, a whole week – just one day – and it’s faculty meeting. It’s not class time is what you’re saying and that keeps the buffer in at the end of the semester so you’re not up against the 18th.

P. Stoddard: Yes.

President Peters: He’s saying that’s a friendly amendment.

L. Sons: If everyone is friendly enough, I am.

President Peters: So you accept it as a friendly amendment.

L. Sons: I will.

President Peters: Do we have a second? All right, now let’s discuss the amendment.

G. Seaver: Just to point out what happens as Paul said, what happens if finals were to end on the 17th, typically grades would not be due until the Tuesday which would then put that at the 20th and the college advising offices like to notify students of – particularly those that will be academically dismissed or will be on probation – they’d like to do that before break so the students have the entire break to try to either re-plan their schedules or to make appointments to come back out and see the faculty and for those who are dismissed, either to appeal or to make plans for other institutions. That would keep us from notifying students prior to the break and I think that’s something that the academic advising community very strongly believes in, being able to notify students immediately after the semester. This is why the need – if we could move things back a week it helps us process. We can process things much more quickly now for the processing of grades but it still takes a lot of human resource time for the colleges to go through those potential dismissal lists.
President Peters: All right, so we have the motion as amended on the floor. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained.

The motion passed as amended.

L. Sons: 2012-2013. Similar changes. Now here it’s going to be a little tighter because although there’s a leap year in there, it moves it a couple of days forward but then it would really be asking too much to change that start date I think.

President Peters: All right, is there a second? Discussion. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained?

The motion passed.

President Peters: Okay, now 2013-2014?

L. Sons: So moved.

President Peters: All right, discussion? This one’s straight forward? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right.

The motion passed.


L. Sons: I move.

President Peters: Second? Discussion. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained?

The motion passed.

L. Sons: 2015-2016. I move that approval. It’s the same set of changes.

President Peters: We’ll let Toni this time; Malcom is wearing out the second. All right, any discussion of 2015-2016? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay.

The motion passed.


President Peters: There’s a second, all right.

P. Stoddard: All right, okay. I would move the same amendment to this one that we just made to 2011-2012 for the same reasons.
President Peters: So we’d start on the 16th?

P. Stoddard: We’d start on the Tuesday, that would be Tuesday the 16th.

President Peters: All right, does everyone understand that’s the amendment? Is there a second for the amendment? Discussion? All those in favor of the amendment say aye. Opposed?

President Peters: All right, now the ---

L. Sons: The calendar.

President Peters: The motion for the calendar year as amended. Was there a second for that? All right. Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay.

The motion passed as amended.

L. Sons: 2017-2018

President Peters: All right, second? Discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right.

The motion passed.


President Peters: All right, there’s a second. Malcolm. All right. Okay. Any discussion? All those in favor say aye. All right. Why do we do all ten years? People can’t have everything.

The motion passed.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair – no report.

President Peters: There’s no report from Elections and Legislative Oversight.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any unfinished business? Yes.

L. Sons: I would like to make a motion – it may be appropriate; it may not be appropriate at this moment. If you want to put it under new business or someplace else it’s okay with me but I would like to move a resolution of thanks to all of those who planned and executed the day of reflection for the wonderful job that they did and also to express our sincere thanks to you for the way you represented NIU for us President Peters.
P. Stoddard: Second.

President Peters: Well, I agree with half of that part. All right, by acclamation all those in favor? Thank you Linda. What can I say – how proud all of the alums are and what you’ve done. It was a hard year but I’m very proud of all of you. Now we move forward with vigor. Any of these other budget things, we can handle that after what we’ve been through. What a great place to come and study and to research and teach.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: New business? Comments and questions?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

P. Stoddard: Once again I’m going to call on people to consider nominations for a person to replace me. It’s a fun job so I encourage you to think about it if you can.

President Peters: All right, anyone seeking a fun job, line up. Talk to Paul. Are we ready? Adjourned.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 P.M.