UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, January 26, 2011, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present


I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: Let me call the January 26th meeting of the University Council to order.

President John Peters called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: We need to adopt the agenda, but let me call your attention to some changes before we adopt. There are two changes to be made to the agenda. The first change, under Roman V, Consent Agenda, add a D item, which is to confirm Pat Henry as Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, replacing Kerry Freedman. So, that’s confirm Pat Henry as Chair of Academic Policy Committee, replacing Kerry Freedman. That is now under Consent Agenda under Roman V, add a D, And move item Roman VI, I. University Affairs Committee Report to Roman VI, A. So move Roman VI, I, to University Affairs Committee Report VI, A. Now, with those changes, I will call for the adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion?

Unidentified: Motion.

J. Peters: There is a motion. Is there a second?

S. Willis: Second.

J. Peters: We have a second. All in favor say, “aye.”

All: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? Alright, we have an agenda.
III.  APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2010 UC MEETING
(sent electronically)

J. Peters: Roman III, Approval of the Minutes of December 1, 2010 UC Meeting. I know everyone has received that electronically. Any additions or corrections?

A. Rosenbaum: Motion first.

J. Peters: Is there a motion to approve?

P. Henry: So moved.

J. Peters: Is there a second?

Unidentified: Second.

J. Peters: We have a second. All those in favor of Approval of the Minutes?

All: Aye.

J. Peters: Alright, we have minutes.

IV.  PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: Welcome everyone. The news is, I mean the weather is breaking and so is the news. It has been quite a time in Illinois since we last met. The passage of an income tax and everything that surrounded that, Appellate Court rulings on who can run for Mayor or not and be on the ballot and then something that happened today that is of extreme import to us and seriousness that I want to talk about. And I’ve got some notes, so I’m going to kind of stick to the notes and that’s why I was late, I was working on this. The Illinois Appellate Court today has struck down the State’s Capital Construction Program and all of its funding sources. They claim that the legislation violated the Constitution’s Single Subject Rule and when the Legislature votes on a capital program and a revenue source, it should be single purpose and not multiple. This was passed, you might recall, by the General Assembly in 2009 and many of these projects across the state are under way. And as I walked in, Dr. Williams told me that there is a suspicion that the Capital Development Board, which is the administrator for all these programs, will issue a halt order tomorrow on things. The unanimous court upheld that public law 96-34, which was, I don’t expect you to remember this, but there was video poker, the Capital Spending Accountability Law, the Capital Projects Fund, taxes on beverages, candy, on grooming and hygiene products, on privatizing the lottery, there was money for a U of I study on the effects of the lottery on families, increase in truck fees, liquor taxes. Alright, all of that, that wasn’t single purpose, was it? It sounded as multiple. That violated the Single Subject Rule in the Illinois Constitution. I don’t know if you are devotes of Capital Fax, but I am, and the editor, Rich Miller, wrote, “This has to be, without doubt, the biggest Appellate Court ruling on Illinois policy in decades. Everything, and I mean everything, has to be redone if the capital projects are
to be saved.” Moreover, they were going to privatize the lottery and that deal was just concluded. That, I guess, will be null and void. And they were going to bond several billion dollars bounced against these revenue sources to fund the capital bill. That, of course, now is null and void because the sources are unconstitutional and the program is unconstitutional so how can you bond against something that is unconstitutional. Speaker Madigan, Mike Madigan, indicated just a few minutes ago that he estimates that 40% of the funding sources, 40%, for the State’s major capital construction program passed in 2009 were eliminated by the court ruling today.

Now, what does that mean for NIU? Here’s what it means. I guess first the good news is Cole Hall funding remains safe and intact and let’s spend it because I’m not giving it back. In fact, the University has already received the funds for this renovation through the hard work of a lot of people and when the Governor came and visited us last year, he brought the check. I’m not saying we insisted on that, but he brought the check, we have the money. Okay, now, however, NIU’s funding for Steven’s renovation, $22.5 million, and the planning funds for the technology building, the Computer Science Building, $2 million planning money, have been nullified through this Appellate Court ruling as well as most of the millions of dollars in capital renewal funds for general infrastructure upgrade and Eddie knows what those are in case anybody has questions, and our re-appropriations for ongoing projects not yet completed. We’re doing an analysis of that right now to see what is involved. So, we eagerly await further information from the General Assembly leaders and from Attorney General Lisa Madigan and the Governor’s office as to whether the ruling is going to be appealed and, as a matter of fact, somebody just handed me this as I walked in. “From the Governor’s office, the Administration,” that means the Governor, “intends to appeal the Appellate Court’s decision and to seek an immediate stay from the Illinois Supreme Court. The Illinois Jobs Now capital program is an important part of Governor Quinn’s plan to put Illinois back to work. Capital bill projects are putting thousands of people to work in every corner of the State while supporting local businesses, improving our infrastructure and increasing energy efficiency.” I think he’s trying to make the argument there that that’s the single purpose, even though there have been many sources, that’s the single purpose, I can see that, although this is a political statement. “While the Administration’s request to stay is pending in the Illinois Supreme Court, capital projects already in progress will continue as scheduled.” This is what the Governor says, although we have heard something contrary just a minute ago. “We would expect the Supreme Court to rule on this request and stay in the very near future.”

Alright, so that’s the breaking news, but we’ll have to wait and see. But Cole Hall proceeds, alright, Cole Hall is moving forward. We have the money and I’m very happy about that. Yes?

**K. Thu:** Does that also mean then that the planning money that I thought we had for Stevens is gone or we have to give that back?

**J. Peters:** No, it is, yeah….

**E. Williams:** Those funds are also subject to the Appellate Court ruling and therefore, they are frozen.

**J. Peters:** But you said something very interesting, and that is, “give back,” and I don’t know
what that means. Maybe I will act the way the State does about paying its bills.

All: Laughter.

J. Peters: I would say we don’t have enough information yet. It will take us a while to figure this out, but that was pretty sweeping. Good question.

A. Rosenbaum: People need to speak their names into the microphone.

J. Peters: Oh yeah, you’re supposed to be on the record, you’re supposed to indicate your name.

K. Thu: Kendall Thu from the Department of Anthropology.

J. Peters: No wonder anthropology is going into…. Yeah. Alright, now I’ll try to go back to my normal remarks, which aren’t very normal. Let me talk a little bit about the budget. That’s on everybody’s mind. Now, the 96th General Assembly did wrap up its session with final action to substantially, I guess I’ll use that word, substantially raise State revenues. Senate Bill 2505 increased the personal income tax from 3% to 5% along with the corresponding increase of 7% in the corporate income tax, not including the personal property replacement tax. It’s estimated that that increase will generate up to $6 billion annually and has been described as part of the solution but not the resolution of the Illinois fiscal dilemma. I mean, that still looms large. Estimates of $13 to $17 billion at the end of this fiscal year, a backlog of $8 to $9 billion as we sit today and I’ve often thought that, and if you’ve read any of the macroeconomic reports from reliable sources, which means university professors. It’s going to take revenue enhancement, it’s going to take budget restraint and probably some borrowing to set the financial house in order.

I try to explain it to people, and it’s not this simple at all, but think in simple terms: If a household gets itself into trouble and its cash flow can’t meet its obligation, you consolidate its debt, maybe re-borrow and refinance and pay it based on a cash flow. That’s what I think the borrowing bill, which has to be debated in this session, I think it needs to pass, along with several years of fiscal restraint. Then I think with economic growth, I think we can be out of it in a few years, but right now, without the borrowing bill backed up by the revenue stream of the new taxes, with that, you can’t pay the backlog of bills. Because clearly our issue, your issue, is cash flow. I mean, we’re using our local funds to make payroll while we’re waiting on the State to pay us, and it’s getting old. The Legislature also passed Senate Bill 3514 to fund the $3.7 billion pension obligation for the current year, $3.7 billion pension obligation. The larger borrowing proposal, Senate Bill 0336 for $8 billion to pay the current obligations to vendors, including universities, did not achieve the required 3/5 majority of 71 votes and failed on a vote of 68 to 49 in the lame duck session. They came pretty close, and, as I said, the importance of this measure will bring, will come out in the forefront in the new session and probably in the Governor’s agenda. That is high on the Governor’s agenda.

House and Senate Republicans withheld any votes supporting either the tax increase or borrowing because I think most of them wanted to see spending cuts and discipline before they would approve borrowing or new taxes. Remember, there was a university borrowing bill last year that ran out and the university borrowing proposal for us to borrow on our funds was not
acted on and probably would be added, gain added importance if new state revenue is not used to bond for sufficient cash to pay our general obligations. So, you know, I’m not a big fan of that bill, never have been, but if that’s our last card we play, to borrow on our local funds, I guess we have to play it, and it would be great to have that authority and remember our trustees very reluctantly voted in favor to support that.

So, we’re going to start, I don’t know when, soon, our budget website again with our counter. We will be starting that and now I guess we’re going to have to add other things as well. General fund appropriations for the fiscal year are total vouchered reimbursements, we put in a voucher for reimbursement to the State. We have received, so far, $9.1 million for this fiscal year. But, that’s the good news. The bad news is we’re owed $77 million. So, right now we’re working under basically a $77 million budget cut right now and every day it accumulates. Now, MAP funds, no MAP funds have been received for fiscal 2011. Zero. We’re owed from the fall semester $12.2 million. So, the MAP funding flow is a little complicated and I don’t want to oversimplify, but a student applies and receives MAP funding from the Illinois Student Assistance Corporation and they determine what they’re eligible for, a dollar amount, and so then they receive an award letter and we have that letter and we make, you know, use that, and then the money for that person comes to us and then we apply it. Would that be about right? I mean, I don’t want to overstate it. Well, so based upon the fact that the students receive the letter, and assurances that we receive that we were going to get the money, the check was in the mail, we have covered the $12.2 million, we have covered it. See that? Nothing. So, add that to your $77 million. Then, of course, MAP funding for the spring semester, another $12 million to be determined.

Okay, now, you know, a lot of, it’s not just public universities that rely on MAP funding. The private universities, the for-profits, they rely on MAP funding as well. That’s very complicated, the MAP funding situation, but there it is, the impact on NIU. I just want to say, due to the great cooperation and the planning efforts of all our divisions of the University and the efforts of faculty and staff to conserve – and I know that on a day-to-day basis, it has an impact on you on many ways that add up to we’re working harder with less and making sacrifices and delaying purchases. The opportunity costs are very, very high. But anyway, due to all that work, a lot of creativity. I don’t believe we’re able to deliver on the quality of our educational experience under tight budget constraints, meet our payroll, invest where necessary in our infrastructure, addressing safety and other related matters, which is always the highest priority as well as positioning the University in our highly competitive market for students, for new and returning students. So, we’re doing all of that, but it’s getting harder and harder in this environment. We’re managing and we’ll continue to manage, utilizing the strategies and the priorities we put in place. We have an employment freeze, but we do let positions go when we determine they’re critical or necessary and we have the funds to support without jeopardizing payroll. So, on occasion, we will let positions go. Winter shutdown does save money, especially when it’s real cold, and it was real cold, so we saved money; limited travel, we haven’t shut down travel, but we’ve limited it; maintenance and repairs on hold and you know, we do have a wonderful physical plant, but a lot of it’s aging and these weather conditions play havoc on the physical plant. And I’ve heard stories about our wonderful building service people in the middle of the night making sure that boilers are fired, that water pipes that freeze and break are repaired and many times, students, staff, faculty, administration, we don’t even realize that something
happened. So, I want to thank the building service people. I rode around one night and saw some of the things they do and God, I’m just very proud of them. You know, so we’re going to keep going and let’s hope the State steps up and solves these issues and now today to have that other thing happen, it makes you want to go to New Jersey. Not. Not.

Okay, wait a minute, I’ve got more good news here, pension reform. This is shaping up to be the biggest issue facing the State and all of you as tax payers and State employees and our retirees and our annuitants. As employees, you have faithfully and regularly contributed your 8% of your gross earnings into your pension plan during you tenure here at NIU. You are not eligible for Social Security credit tenure if you are in the SERS system. Unfortunately, our political leaders have for years underfunded public pensions and now a real crisis is here. You’ve paid your share, I’ve paid my share, they haven’t paid their share, they’ve taken a holiday. The obligation has built up and now the viability of the pension funds is threatened and then the public gets mad at us and blames us. There’s just something wrong with that equation, but that’s the way it is. NIU has been working really hard and our hero there, Steve Cunningham, is, I think you spend, well, when you’re not getting me out of trouble, you’re spending your time working on this. We’ve been working hard to bring the message about employee pension plans to legislatures in Springfield, and that’s really going to be important this spring. I urge you to review House Bill 146, and we’ll probably get that up on our budget website whenever we have the time to get to it, but we’ll do it as quickly as we can. It was introduced by a suburban legislator last week that would basically enact most of the changes to the pension plans for current employees that took effect January 1st of this year for new employees, which is capping and limiting. NIU’s pension and budget tracking monitoring website will be live again, we’re trying for February 1st, you know, we’ll get it up there by February 1st, so I encourage you to go there for most current information.

So, we really have our work cut out for us and there’s a lot of strange legislation out there like the piece of federal legislation that would give authority to the states to declare bankruptcy, which I think is an ideological thing and I hope they’re not serious about that because it would send shockwaves through the bond markets. If a state goes bankrupt, like Illinois, and we’re about to issue bonds in Illinois for capital construction and Illinois may go bankrupt, who would buy bonds or at what rate? So the rates are going up. Now, with that, let me just end this portion of it by saying how fortunate we were that our Board of Trustees gave us the authority and our administrative group, came up with the idea of bonding to get American bill bonds, how many millions?

E. Williams: 135.

J. Peters: $135 million we got in at those low rates before December 31st. They were sold in two issues, like immediately, and we have that money to do our new residence hall and our renovations. So, it’s about, segue, it’s what Vision 2020 is all about. At least one aspect of Vision 2020 is how do we, within 10 years, be more self sustaining and less dependent on the State? We need the State, we want their money, don’t we? We are a State institution. We’re chartered by them to deliver and yet, they’ve not been reliable. So, we have to do more on our own and I’m pleased to say that, I’ll give you a little update on Vision 2020, we now have across the Steering Committee and the seven working groups, we have about 113 people involved and
it’s a broad representation from students and faculty, alums, administrators; it’s really a good group. We’ve had a Steering Committee meeting, face to face – it’s pretty big, 30-40 people – and I’ve met with the co-chairs of the working groups, and they are in the process of meeting and most have met multiple times already, working on coming up with benchmarks in their areas. I’ve scheduled monthly meetings with the working group co-chairs to discuss their progress and early in February we have our next meeting, and we’re going to have a Steering Committee meeting in March. I know that many of the groups are putting in place processes to get input from the larger community, whether they’re focus groups or websites, they’re all kind of doing it in their own way, depending on the issue. Our timeline is ambitious. I’ve asked the working groups to have their reports finished by April 15\(^{th}\) so that they can be presented to the Steering Committee by May 15\(^{th}\) and presented to the Board of Trustees in June. And in between there, there will be public comment on the various drafts. Ambitious, but you know, they accuse us always in higher education of being slow as molasses and we can be. We can be, we like to get it right. But since we’ve done so much strategic planning through the Great Journeys and the other reports, what this is about is benchmarking, and I think we can – and we must – act quickly and to get our trustees to embrace what our future will be. I think it’s the best thing we can do right now in this very, very difficult time of uncertainty in the State. So, I’m not going to predict anything right now because I never would have predicted that Rahm Emanuel would have been ruled off the ballot or the Supreme Court, well, there’s lot of things I wouldn’t have predicted. Nonetheless, I’m still very proud of NIU and we’re doing some great things, we really are, and our spirit is high. Alright, any questions on that? I kind of threw that together. Yeah, Pat?

**P. Henry:** I just, in terms of the websites for the various subgroups, is there some sort of central website?

**J. Peters:** Yeah, there is, yeah, as a matter of fact, [www.niu.edu/Vision 2020](http://www.niu.edu/Vision 2020). Now, there’s not a great deal of update on there right now, but there will be in the next several days. I didn’t want to tell the workgroups how to do their own, you know.

**P. Henry:** But this would connect?

**J. Peters:** Yeah, you’ll be able pick your favorite topic and get to it. We have a lot of people here who are involved, raise your hands? Okay, see? Blame them, Pat. Don’t blame me. I’m very excited about it. I really do think, it’s where I’m spending my time, and I guess I’m going to be spending time in Springfield, begging. Alright, any other comments or questions?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. [2020-2021](#) academic calendar – refer to University Affairs Committee – page 3

B. Review and update [Guidelines](#) and Principles for Establishment of Academic Calendar – refer to University Affairs Committee – page 4

C. Annual Evaluation of the University Ombudsman, [Bylaws 19.4](#) – refer to University Affairs Committee
D. Confirm Pat Henry as chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (replacing Kerry Freedman)

J. Peters: Alright, let’s move to Roman V, Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda?

J. Kowalski: So moved.

J. Peters: Alright, is there a second?

S. Willis: Second.

J. Peters: We’ve got a second. All those in favor say, “aye.”

All: Aye.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. University Affairs Committee – M Cecil Smith, Chair – report

1. Collegiality Policy – page 10


A. Rosenbaum: No, we’re not doing Earl first. First do the new University Affairs.

J. Peters: Oh, I’m sorry, got to go to University Affairs. Where are you Cecil?

M C. Smith: I would like to call your attention to the University Collegiality Policy on pages 10 and 11 of your agenda. There is some accompanying documentation on the following pages, the rationale for the University Collegiality Policy, which University Affairs has been working on for about the past year and a half. There are two issues, one is first for the University Council to accept the policy, and I’ll make a motion to that effect in just a moment. The second issue pertains to the appropriate placement of the policy, I’ll let you think about that for a moment, and I’ll make a motion in regards to placement of the policy, but before making any motions, I would be happy to entertain any questions that you might have about the Collegiality Policy and I’ll try to answer your questions.

J. Peters: Alright, questions for Cecil?

A. Rosenbaum: We need to second the motion (inaudible).

J. Peters: Alright, so I take that as a motion from the committee to adopt the University Collegiality Policy, is there a second?

P. Vohra: Second.
J. Peters: Alright, now discussion. Yes?

K. Thu: I would just offer a friendly wording suggestion, change for section 1.13, the very first sentence where it reads, “Allegations or complaints of a documented pattern or frequent and pervasive un-collegial activity,” I would suggest putting the last or the second part of that sentence there, which is, “or a severe un-collegial act that clearly interferes with the professional working environment.” So, you delete, “resulting in the same circumstances,” which is somewhat ambiguous. You want me to do that again Cecil?

M C. Smith: I got it.

J. Peters: Alright, do we, for the record, did we get that?

A. Rosenbaum: He has to see if we accept it.

J. Peters: It’s a friendly amendment. I think he did. I think he shook his head.

M C. Smith: Yes

J. Peters: The record shows that Cecil Smith agreed to that change. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: As I was reading this, I noticed, I presume that the strikethroughs mean that’s being omitted?

M C. Smith: Yes.

J. Kowalski: That the reference to, “student” or “students” was uniformly excluded.

M C. Smith: Yes.

J. Kowalski: On Faculty Senate, we had a recent discussion about the need for student grievance and I read Buck Stephen’s memorandum that’s posted on that site, so I’m asking, I guess, for a clarification. I mean, what was the reason for striking, “student” from this at this point. It raised a little bit of a possible concern.

M C. Smith: That’s a very good question.

T. Latham: I believe the committee discussed that this particular policy really dealt with the employees as a whole and that the student grievance process would be separate by itself. So, when we’re looking at this policy, we look at faculty and we look at the civil servants as an encompassing document and students, we believe, should have been left to another policy to address their process. So, this is more of an employment type of policy and conduct.

M C. Smith: As you can see, the language for the policy is largely drawn from the bylaws and from the AADR.
J. Peters: Does that answer your question, Jeff?

J. Kowalski: I think it answers my question. It provides a rationale for making this primarily about people who are employed at the institution in some way, whatever their particular status is of employment. But, it might make it more imperative that we then consider whether or not we have need for a student grievance policy of some sort.

J. Peters: So, what I’m hearing is the issue of students in this process, the issue of students and grievance is unresolved by this document and that that’s an issue that should be considered in some other fashion. Is that what you’re saying?

J. Kowalski: I’m saying I could accept excluding the word, “student” or “students” from this, but there should be an understanding that there are other reasons why we need, perhaps to consider it elsewhere or in other ways.

A. Rosenbaum: Historically, I think though, Cecil, your committee did not strike, “students.” That’s the way it came to you, am I correct on that?

M C. Smith: That is correct.

A. Rosenbaum: So this, as Cecil mentioned at the beginning, this has gone through a number of different bodies including legal counsel. And that was stripped out early on in the process because it seemed inappropriate to sort of bog this process down by trying to also craft a student grievance policy at the same time. So, this committee didn’t strike that, that’s the way it came to them.

J. Peters: OK, other questions? Alright, then, now for the vote. All those in favor of adopting the University Collegiality Policy as brought forward by the committee say, “aye.”

All: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? Okay, we have a policy.

M C. Smith: The second issue pertains to the placement of the policy, so I would like to make a motion that the policy be placed into the APPM, section 2, item 21. That section is titled, The Statement on Professional Behavior of Faculty. As part of the motion, we recommend changing that to The Statement on Professional Behavior of Employees. That’s a long motion, I’m not sure that that’s accurate, but that’s our intent.

P. Vohra: I second that motion.

J. Peters: We have a second, so the recommendation is to place this policy in the Academic Policy Manual, the right subsection. Okay. Deborah Haliczer I think has her hand up.

D. Haliczer: Hello, I apologize Cecil because I’m going to reverse what I was talking to you
about last time. We’ve discussed a great deal about the placement of this policy and, while it makes a great deal of sense and procedurally it’s pretty efficient to put it in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, I would be concerned that that would mean that operating staff might not feel it applies to them, as non-academic staff, so can we discuss that a little bit?

**P. Vohra:** I sit on the committee. This was discussed in the committee and one of the suggestions that was made by the members was that we should list this policy on the HR website and link it to the APPM place where it is listed. So, everybody who is looking for some policy is going to go to the HR website and the academic world will go to APPM, so we will cover both the worlds.

**J. Peters:** Alright, so the Academic Policy, usually is involved with faculty matters.

**S. Willis:** Faculty and SPS.

**A. Rosenbaum:** SPS teaching, many of the SPS are teaching.

**S. Willis:** Right, but I don’t think it distinguishes in the APPM, it just refers to SPS.

**J. Peters:** Did the committee consider other appropriate places?

**M C. Smith:** Yes we considered placement into the Constitution Bylaws.

**J. Peters:** Okay.

**A. Rosenbaum:** There was also something that was raised the other day about the possibility that we have some policies that are neither in the APPM nor in the Constitution, and we were going to try and get some clarification of where those policies reside. Do we have anyone that has a comment on that, maybe Steve?

**S. Cunningham:** Hello, yeah, there are a wide number of policies that exist that are adopted in various ways. They are adopted by this body, they can be adopted by the administration, they’re administrative policies, in accordance with statutes and regulations; and, of course, there is the Board of Trustees regulations. On the HR website, we do have an Employee Conduct and Accountability Guide that attempts to incorporate as many of these policies as possible, sort of as a single reference point. So, it’s easy, it’s not a problem, to put this policy in that. As a dually-adopted University policy, it carries weight independent of where we put it, and I think, you know, we probably have some work to do longer term in terms of indexing and compiling all the various policies that exist out there. But probably the APPM is sufficient for this policy and we can also place it in other areas where we put policies that pertain to all staff, both academic and non-academic.

**J. Peters:** Alright, yeah Sue Willis?

**S. Willis:** I just have a point of clarification Cecil. When you said you wanted to change the title to Professional Behavior of Employees, is that the title of all of section 2 that you are referring
M C. Smith: Yes.

S. Willis: OK, thanks.

J. Peters: Alright, further discussion or are we ready to vote on where we place this in the Academic Policies Manual. Alright, all those in favor of that placement say, “aye.”

All: Aye.


B. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – page 5

J. Peters: We are now moving onto VI. B, the Faculty Advisory Committee to IBHE. Earl has a report on page 5. There you are. I didn’t see you come in, Earl.

E. Hansen: The meeting on December 10th was held in Springfield and I’ll briefly cover this for you, get through it and get out of here, whatever you want to do. The December IBHE meeting had a blue ribbon study group look at the MAP bond funding proposal was formed. You can find information on that if you look at the www.illinois.org. It’s both in paragraph 1 and in paragraph 3 where you can find information as to what is going on with the IBHE and the Faculty Advisory Committee and what have you. The meeting on January 21st, which was last Friday, we met with some business leaders and I’ll present that at the next meeting. Skipping on down here, get to the bottom of the page there, the question was asked as to what is meant by efficiency and budgetary ties with more unprepared students and response by _____ of the IBHE was, first look at changes of procurements of mandates; and second, look at money. And that doesn’t seem soundly different than what we’ve been hearing for the last couple three years. The MAP issue was discussed by President Peters and we’ve got that number. Also, we’ve hired – the IBHE has hired – a new Executive Director, George Reed, who was the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Academic Affairs of the Maryland Higher Education Commission came on board on the 27th of December in Springfield. The question that comes up with the community college is the monitoring of dual credit, and it is done by the community colleges. So a student taking a course in high school and getting both a high school and college credit for it, it does become an issue in some instances and that gets discussed on occasion. The Governor’s office has finally asked for a list of four names from the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee to put on the IBHE Advisory Committee, and those names have been sent forward. A question was raised in regards to MAP funding in relation to public institutions and not private institutions. Then there was the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee has a position paper related to online degrees, and a number of us on the Faculty Advisory Committee think that paints too broad a brush. It’s way, way too negative where it’s going with it. We’re more interested in quality online programs than we are just being an online program. I don’t know what’s been going on with the IBHE with that and that’s what I’ve got.
**J. Peters:** OK, Sue Willis, questions?

**S. Willis:** Yeah, Earl, on the second page of your report, which is page 6 of the handout. In that first full section, it says something about, “In response to a question about eliminating advanced degrees and about teaching loads at public institutions, Don said he expects no movement on the latter, however, legislatures might want to take a look at the former for public institutions since everything is on the table.” Does that mean that they are looking at eliminating advanced degrees at public institutions? Am I looking at that, am I reading that correctly?

**E. Hansen:** My question to start with is that my hearing aid cut out, so I don’t even know what paragraph you were reading from so I could join you in this thing.

**S. Willis:** Sorry, it’s the first full paragraph on page 6.

**E. Hansen:** The first paragraph on page 6 where, on page 35?

**S. Willis:** Yeah.

**E. Hansen:** Eliminating MAP to public institutions.

**S. Willis:** The third sentence in that where it says, “In response to a question about eliminating advanced degrees.” That’s the one I’m asking about.

**E. Hansen:** Are you talking about the performance-based funding?

**S. Willis:** No, I’m in that first paragraph, the third sentence says, “In response to a question about eliminating advanced degrees and about teaching loads, he expects no movement on the latter, however, legislatures might want to take a look at the former for public institutions,” and so I’m asking, does that mean that they’re looking at eliminating advanced degrees?

**E. Hansen:** I think they are just looking at everything across the board from an IBHE perspective. I seriously doubt, from what I hear and see at our meetings, that we’re going to see any big movement on teaching loads at public institutions and/or doing away with degree programs. I don’t know. There are funding issues at each state institution and those institutions are going to have to address those funding issues as best they can, which SIU did just last month.

**S. Willis:** Thanks.

**J. Peters:** I’ve heard nothing but anything’s possible. I do know that – remember there was a financial study that I was on that wanted to move to outcomes-based funding – and I believe there will be some bills introduced to that effect, that didn’t have anything to do with the review of programs. It had to do with how many students do you graduate in a reasonable period of time, how many students who start American Politics in the fall complete it at the end of the semester. So, that’s one thing, but you have a new Director of the IBHE, you have a new legislature, you have a difficulty, who knows, but I haven’t heard anything about that. It’s possible, but I haven’t heard anything.
E. Hansen: John, one thing that came out of the meeting on Friday that I haven’t got the minutes together for this group yet are was that we met with an executive from one of the associations in the State and we’re trying to find a way that we, as academicians are in different departments, it’s relatively easy for some of us in certain departments and programs to place kids in internships than it is for others. I would like to see what they would like to do across the board. I’m trying to get a dialogue with that particular gentleman and when I do, whatever comes out of that dialogue, I will gladly share with the group here.

J. Peters: Great, good. Alright, any other questions for Earl? Okay, it will be interesting with the first meeting, the next meeting of the IBHE, Earl and others, what the agenda will be of the new director. I have not met the gentleman, I don’t know him and I have not a clue as to what that will be.

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – no report

D. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – no report


J. Peters: Alright, shall we move onto Jay Monteiro and the Board of Trustees report?

J. Monteiro: I’d like to point out first that cut and paste is wonderful but you have to remember to cut when you’re done, so if you could go to section 2C and cross that off. It’s already listed in the first section. We’ll move down to the President’s Report section and we’ll talk about the items that were approved at the Board of Trustees. Letter A, the ITS multi-year Blackboard incorporated software licensing agreement was passed and what this does is this adds mobile access to the Blackboard system here on campus. Letter B, the Northern Illinois Proton Treatment and Research Center grant agreements. This is a U.S. Army Medical Research grant from the U.S. Department of Defense, which includes $9.4 million in funds over two years, and that does have the potential of going into a third year of funding. Letter C, Finance and Facilities, NIU enterprise resource planning infrastructure replacement and what this is, is an upgrade to the current PeopleSoft system, which is actually, if you can believe it or not, ten years old at this point. Letter D, selection of architectural and engineering consultants for projects related to campus non-instructional modernization and capacity improvements and this is contingent upon the IBHE approval and I don’t know, was that discussed? Earl left, but I don’t know if, was it discussed? And was it approved? Excellent. So, this allows NIU to select designers and engineers and consultants that are needed for the improvements to Grant Towers, Gilbert Hall, Holmes Student Center, other roadways and infrastructure and the new intramural fields that will be located on the west campus by the residence halls. Letter E, collective bargaining agreement for Metropolitan Alliance of Police. This is a union agreement. It will be
for a 5-year agreement, and this is for security guards here on campus, which affected four employees. Then, President Peters presented his Vision 2020 plan. During the Chair’s report, the following action items were approved: A number of Board of Trustees Executive Session Minutes were released for publication and then Board of Trustees, the 2011 meeting dates were approved and those are listed there. Then the last item there, a presentation was given to Ken Davidson, a resolution was read in honor of his retirement and his distinguished service to NIU and I might add that Todd and I were a little late today because we were meeting with the first candidate for Ken’s replacement. So, we are in the process of hiring a new General Counsel.


G. Academic Policy Committee – no report

H. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper and David Goldblum, Co-chairs – no report

I. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

J. Peters: Is there any unfinished business to come before the House?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

J. Peters: Any new business or comments from the floor? Go ahead Susan?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

S. Willis: Just a brief thing for the Rules and Governance Committee, I’ve asked Pat to arrange a meeting for next week, so she has sent you all an email. Please respond to it as expeditiously as possible, and I also do need to speak to the committee very, very briefly right after we’re done, so please come and speak to me. This will take about 2-1/2 minutes.

J. Peters: Alright, other comments?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification – October 15, 2010 minutes
B. University Assessment Panel – November 5, 2010 minutes
C. University Coordinating Council – November 4, 2010 minutes
D. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum – September 16, 2010 minutes
E. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum – October 14, 2010 minutes
F. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum – November 11, 2010 minutes
G. Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum – November 18, 2010 minutes
H. Annual Report – Athletic Board
I. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education – October 4, 2010 minutes
J. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education – November 1, 2010

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J Peters: Motion to adjourn? We’re adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.