UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, December 1, 2010, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: I call the December 1, 2010 meeting of the University Council to order. Welcome everyone.

President John Peters called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: The first item is to adopt the agenda with this amendment. We will remove Roman VII-A, the Collegiality Policy from the agenda. We’re not feeling too collegial today. We’re going to wait until next semester to be collegial. No, I don’t want to make fun of that. Okay, so remove that from VII-A and I think that was unfinished business. Alright? With that, is there a motion to adopt the agenda as amended?

B. Lusk: Moves to adopt agenda as updated.

J. Peters: Is there a second?

G. Bennardo: Second.

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

All: Aye.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2010 UC MEETING (sent electronically)

J. Peters: You have received electronically, minutes from the November 3rd meeting. I’ll call for additions or corrections. Hearing none, is there a motion to adopt/approve the minutes of November 3rd?

K. Thu: So moved.

J. Peters: Is there a second?

Unidentified: Second.

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

All: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? Alright, we have minutes.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: Welcome everyone. This is our last meeting of the semester. Can you believe that? It’s sort of like crawling to the ends of... Well, I have a, tomorrow, we have a Board of Trustees meeting and at that meeting, I will be presenting the next round of action, let’s call it, in Vision 2020, and I will be presenting to the trustees, not for their approval, but for their information and embracement, the process by which we’re going through. I will announce the Steering Committee. We will have 7 workgroups. I will announce the co-chairs of the workgroups, and we’ll talk about the charge to the committee and the charges to the workgroups. I kind of covered that basically with you last time and then with the various groups for the past month. So, we’re moving at academic speed on that process. Lightening speed. What I want to do today is something that I haven’t done for many years and that’s lecture, and I always used to get good teaching evaluations.

I want to talk a little bit about this branding exercise that we’ve been conducting and if you pay attention to NIU Today and the websites, maybe some of you had participated in this first phase of branding the University, which was a reaction to various taglines. You know, why would we be engaged in branding? Well, it’s something I’ve been thinking about for over a decade. We’re such a wonderful and complex university, but it’s hard to really brand us, what are we? We’re aspects of so many different things, research university, undergraduate, we do outreach, it’s complex. So, we decided to do at least a year-long branding exercise and the other reason to do it is we are in an increasingly competitive market for educational products and we thought, based on what we heard from alumni and you, that we needed a better job of telling our story. I’m not much of a public relations person or a marketing person, I’ve read this stuff but I don’t come to it naturally. But I do understand that if you do have a focus and you do have a brand, that has some validation and acceptance amongst the various constituents. Then from that, you can develop themes and messages that then go out and you can coordinate all these things, at least my
understanding of that’s the way it happens. So, that’s what we’ve been doing. So today, you get to be the first to hear the preliminary report on our tagline research; and tomorrow the branding website will be updated with this information so you can take a more careful look at it. So my presentation is kind of an oral presentation and I’m going to kind of speed through it. The purpose of our project was to determine what was the most preferred tagline of the dozen or so we presented. There could be others out there, but these seemed to be the ones that were most obvious and I think that was borne out by the responses. There were very few people who said, “Oh, none of the above and here’s my idea.” There were a few of those but they aren’t really relevant or printable. But, you know, that’s the way it goes.

So, we wanted to attain the quantitative information and also we wanted some qualitative information about how various groups, they call them stakeholders, I guess we’re all stakeholders, respond to this. Now, here I’m going to tell you, I’m going to go over these in some detail, but I’m going to tell you what the 12 were. Did anybody take the survey by the way? Okay, that’s good, yeah. That’s about the right percentage, 30-40%. That’s good. Here were the 12 taglines. “Thinkers Wanted.” I’ll go over these again, “North of Ordinary,” “Dream, Discover, Do,” “The Power of NIU,” “Within Reach, Beyond Expectations,” “A World of Opportunities Close to Home,” “The Power of Education, Power of NIU,” “Local Address, Global Reach,” “Active Learning, Amazing Futures,” “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow,” “Real People, Real Experiences, Real Results,” and “Your Dream, Our Mission.” Okay, I’ll go over those in turn. Okay, so those were the… and they must have scientifically have come up with those, you know, in a bar somewhere with a napkin and a bunch of undergraduates sitting around, faculty. So, we had a random sample of about 4,000 people, students, parents, parents of students, faculty, staff, alumni, high school counselors, very important group, high school counselors. They are the people who calibrate universities and send people to universities. Very important group. We had a good method, a public opinion lab did this. They did a good job.

So, each tagline was presented and they had a series of attributes that you could respond to and I’ll quickly do the attributes. “Attracts my attention,” the tagline, does it attract my attention? “Does it represent what NIU is about?” “Does it make me want to find out more about NIU?” “Is it original?” “Is it easy to understand?” “Does it match the image that I have of NIU?” “Is it believable?” “It’s not a lie. Is it memorable?” Do you remember it? “Does it represent what I would like NIU to be?” So, an aspirational aspect. Those were the attributes.

Okay, we got our surveys back. We got about a 20% response rate, which apparently for that sort of thing is about what you expect the norm with a couple of reminders. Then, backing this up and supplementing it were in-person interviews. There were focus group interviews, particularly with students because remember, the big purpose of branding is students and student recruitment. That’s the major purpose of this. So, they went through this with a group of about 40 students. Alright, so now, I’m going to go through each tagline and sort of the responses and then a summation, and I can do this pretty quickly. But tomorrow, all the dirty details will be up on the website with the response rates by a stakeholder group. It’s kind of interesting to see what various groups thought about these.

I’ll do the first one. “The Power of NIU,” that’s a tagline. Parents are more likely than any other stakeholder to agree with that tagline. That attracts their attention. It represents what NIU is about. It’s believable, memorable, it makes them want to find out more about NIU and
represents what I would like NIU to be. That’s parents, so there was a chord there. High school counselors, they’re more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that the tagline attracts attention, is memorable, makes them want to find out more about NIU. Remember, that’s the, “Power of NIU,” and 2% of the respondents selected that tagline as their most preferred. That ranged from 1% of faculty to 5% of parents. So, parents liked it the most, but that was only 5%. What they liked about it, it’s short, simple, direct, strong, the “Power of NIU.” Most students had a negative reaction to the tagline is what they said. They disliked the word, “power.” “What does it really mean? It’s pompous and empty.” They used to say that about my lectures in teaching evaluation. Pompous and empty? “Not appropriate for a university. Too aggressive.” That’s what the students said.

Alright, #2, the second one, “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.” You know, this could be a Letterman thing, couldn’t it? “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.” Parents are more likely than other stakeholders to agree with this tagline. I think parents agree to anything that gets their kids to a university. I’ve come to that conclusion. They agree that it’s more likely to attract attention, original, believable, memorable, makes them want to find out more about NIU, “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.” Alumni and faculty are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that this message matches their image of NIU. Faculty and alumni, so you and our product, “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.” I don’t know which part of that they disagree with, the active learning part or the amazing future part. Students are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that the message is memorable. More on that, 4% of the respondents selected that tag as their most preferred and that ranged from 1% of staff to 12% of high school counselors. They like, “It’s goal oriented, inspiring, positive and original,” “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.” Remember, counselors see all this stuff. I mean, they get every brochure, they get every, I mean, they see it all. Most students had a negative reaction to this tagline. I’m having more respect from our students every day. They questioned the, “Truth of the statement,” “Amazing Futures.” I mean, their own? I’m sorry. They, “Really don’t know what is meant by, ‘Active Learning.’” “Use of the word, “Amazing” is unprofessional and cliché.” “It’s not an attention grabber.” Okay, that was, “Active Learning, Amazing Futures.”

Alright, next one. “Local Address, Global Reach.” “Local Address, Global Reach.” Students and parents are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that this tagline makes them want to find out more. Faculty are more likely than other stakeholders to agree that this tagline represents what they would like NIU to be, “Local Address, Global Reach.” I understand that and 4% of respondents select this tagline as their most preferred. It ranged from 1% of students to 8% for high school counselors. They like that, “It seems unique for a university and is ambitious and realistic.” Students had a negative reaction to this tagline. They, “Don’t understand it, they’re not convinced by it, and it’s too complex. “Local Address, Global Reach.”

Moving on. The #10, no, number, I don’t know what number this is, “Thinkers Wanted,” and 6% of respondents selected this tagline as their most preferred. Ranges from 0% for parents to 11% for faculty. They like that, “It’s original, memorable, easy to understand, emphasizes that NIU is a place of serious academics.” I understand that completely. Most students had a negative reaction to this tagline. “It’s insulting to current students.” I guess we have non-thinkers. “Too vague, generic, and something else should be included.” Something else should be included, like “Thinkers Wanted for Good Things.” Faculty are more likely than other
stakeholders to agree that this tagline represents what they’d like NIU to be. High school counselors are more likely than other stakeholders that the tagline is believable. Students are more likely than other stakeholders to agree that it matches the image they have of NIU. That’s pretty good I thought, that this is a place where thinkers are.

Alright, moving on to, “The Power of Education and the Power of NIU.” Faculty are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that this tagline attracts attention, is original, memorable, makes them want to find out more and 7% of respondents selected that this tagline is most preferred, 7%. It ranged from 3% for students to 14% for staff, NIU staff, “The Power of Education and the Power of NIU.” Students had a negative reaction to this tagline. They don’t like the use of the word, “Power.” “It focuses on strength rather than education.” “It’s boring.” Interesting.

Moving on, here we go. “Dream, Discover, Do.” Alumni and high school counselors are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that this tagline is original. High school counselors are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that the tag attracts their attention and is memorable and 7% of respondents selected it as their most preferred and that ranged from 4% for high school counselors to 9% for alumni. They like, “It’s simple, concise and inspirational.” Students had a mixed reaction to the tagline. Finally, something positive to report. “It’s an attention grabber, however, it’s being used by a local community college and it’s too commercial sounding.” “Dream, Discover, Do.”

Moving on, “Real People, Real Experiences and Real Results.” Students, parents and high school counselors are more likely than any other group to agree that it represents what NIU is all about. Students, parents and high school counselors agree to that. Students and faculty are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that the message attracts their attention and 8% selected that one as their top. It ranged from 5% for alumni to 16% for high school counselors. The counselors liked it. They liked that it, “Captures the cultures of NIU.” “Real People, Real Experiences and Real Results.” Kind of pragmatic. Most students had a negative reaction to this tagline. “Too long for a tagline, unoriginal and boring.” Real people.

Alright, moving on. “North of Ordinary.” “North of Ordinary.” I sound like Johnny Carson, like the Great Carloni would read, like, high school counselors are more likely than other stakeholders to disagree that the tagline attracts their attention, makes them want to find out more or is memorable. Parents are more likely than other stakeholders to agree that it’s original, it makes them want to find out more and matches their image that they have of NIU, “North of Ordinary.” Well, 10% of respondents selected that tagline as their most preferred and that ranged from 8% for faculty and high school counselors to 13% for students. They liked it; they, “Liked the play on words.” They thought it was, “Clever, unique, catchy, memorable and brief.” Maybe if our campaign was “True North,” Northern Illinois, so. Most students though had a negative reaction to this tagline. “Difficult to understand, too complicated, too vague, puts other universities down.” “North of Ordinary.”

Alright, we just have a few more. “Within Reach, Beyond Expectation.” Alumni are more likely than others to be unsure that that tagline matches the image they have of NIU. That surprised me. High school counselors are more likely than others to disagree that the tagline
attracts their attention and 10% selected it as their most, ranging from 5% of alumni to 12% of faculty. They like it. “Attracts attention, thought provoking, clever and original.” “Within Reach, Beyond Expectations.” Students were mixed on it. “It makes them want to find out more about NIU, is not catchy and is overplayed; they’ve seen it before.”

Next one, “A World of Opportunities Close to Home.” Parents are more likely to agree that it makes them want to find out more about NIU. High school counselors and alums are more likely to disagree that it’s original and high school counselors are more likely than others to disagree that it attracts their attention or is memorable and 9% was their top choice, and that ranged from 7% of staff to 12% of high school counselors. What they liked about it is, “It’s accurate.” “A World of Opportunities Close to Home.” “Believable and targets regional students.” Students had a mixed reaction. They liked the fact that it is, “True but it’s not a relevant message to all students.” Okay?

The last one is, “Your Dream, Our Mission.” No difference found between stakeholders and 12% of the respondents selected this as their tagline, ranging from 4% for high school counselors to 19% for students. They liked that it’s, “Student focused, realistic, catchy, inspirational.” Most students had a positive reaction to the tagline. They liked the reference to, “Dreams.” “It’s clear and coherent and shows that NIU is there for students. “Your Dream, Our Mission.”

Then, the last one, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow.” Parents are more likely than any other stakeholder group to strongly agree with the tagline. “Attracts attention, represents what NIU is about, makes them want to find out more, is memorable.” Then, 20% of respondents selected this tagline as their most preferred, ranging from 14% of high school counselors to 23% of staff, faculty was 21%. They, “Like the alliteration, it’s a powerful message, it’s believable and it sums up what education at its best is all about, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow.” Most students had a positive reaction to the tagline, “Inspirational, says everything that needs to be said, it’s a bold statement and future oriented.” So, the scientific members of our academy crunched all the numbers and presented me with the conclusion that the tagline, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow,” performs well on all attributes, and respondents have a strong preference for the tagline, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow,” and no stakeholder groups dislike the tagline, therefore, our tagline is, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow.” Aren’t we happy? I would have voted for, “North of Ordinary.”

So, what happens next? That’s just the beginning. Now with that message, you know, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow,” what our groups will begin to do, everyone, is develop messages around that theme, and you can think of almost everything you do fitting into that as we move forward with the comprehensive public relations campaign in the next year.

Now, we turn, and now we’ll start a new project, we’re turning our attention to our logo. It’s hard to say what our logo is right now, is it Holmes Student Center, is it the Castle on the Hill, is it NIU, what is it? We are going to go through a process of developing a logo, and we won’t be using a consulting firm. We have enough talent to do this. We’re not spending money on that. So, I thought I would present that to you. It would have been better had you seen the data, but then you wouldn’t have looked at the website tomorrow. People spent hundreds of hours on this, maybe they spent thousands. It was very thoughtful and we had a lot of input and it’s hard.
Obviously, it takes a lot of creativity to think about it, but I’m comfortable with that. I think it cuts across a lot of different stakeholders and remember, we are trying to attract the attention of students and their parents to our University. I’m going to end there, my lecture and take questions and there will be a test in a few minutes. Anybody want to add anything to that? You know, when I started at the University years ago, we didn’t have taglines. I guess we didn’t need them, but we do now. Good, alright. Are we ready to move on?

P. Henry: Can I ask one question?

J. Peters: Yeah.

P. Henry: What you just said there, it prompted me to wonder, what do other state universities around here have as their taglines?

J. Peters: Oh, I think they change every time there’s a new president by the way. I think U of I had one, “Always Thinking.” Knowledge for the use of, yeah.

P. Henry: Some of them used to be in Latin I think.

J. Peters: That would be a problem. Did you take Latin in high school?

P. Henry: I can’t remember.

J. Peters: I had four years of Latin and all I remember is, *Latin as a language is dead as it can be. It killed off all the Romans and now it’s killing me.*

P. Henry: *Ars longa, vita brevis.*

V. CONSENT AGENDA

J. Peters: We have no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – pages 3-4

J. Peters: Are we ready for reports? Okay, Earl Hansen, Faculty Advisory Committee to IBHE. You have a written report.

E. Hansen: Everything that occurred down in picturesque Bloomington is basically on two sheets of paper here. If you go on the first paragraph, when you go down to the bottom of the first paragraph, go up six lines, Dr. Bowman, the President of ISU, was addressing the financial welfare of academic institutions, and he basically talked about four-year institutions being in pretty good shape, community colleges in rural areas hurting somewhat, and he talked about the privates in the Northeast and North Central area of the country are most likely to have more problems than the others. Then, on the last paragraph, the last part of the paragraph, the private
schools have gone after MAPs, which brought up a question that I tried to get on the agenda, which I will go back to, it’s on the last paragraph on the last page, prior to that though, we discussed the letters that were sent to Northern Illinois University by different institutions, Chicago State, Knox College, the Faculty Advisory Committee and so forth, I don’t know whether any other ones came in or not, John.

**J. Peters:** A couple, yeah, community colleges.

**E. Hansen:** Okay, we had a group of individuals there, a panel discussion on remediation and articulation, and I’ve listed the people that were there and their background for your information if you have any interest and you want to contact them. Bob Blankenberger, the IBHE Deputy Director of Academic Affairs, passed out three documents. Now, these documents that get passed out to us in these presentations are available on our website, the FAC website of the IBHE. If you need some information on that, get a hold of me and I will get that to you. I found it interesting that Lisa Monda-Amaya, Associate Professor of Special Education Director of the Center of Education of Small Urban Communities at the U of I, suggested that the common core standards are improving but discussions about them need to be ramped up. There was concern about what’s done with the K-12 and the management aspect at U of I with enrollment of students and the fact that the math and science scores are not very reflective of positive actions across the state. They also discussed the recent Chicago Tribune article that came out. In fact, I brought it to the meeting because I came in from DeKalb that morning, regarding the teacher preparation programs in the state. Last, but not least, I had a brief discussion with Andrew Davis regarding a MAPs question that was asked at the last Senate meeting I was at that I had left, and I proposed that question to him and I did mention this to John at our 25th anniversary for the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, that he had offered to come up here and talk to us about MAPs and I don’t know whether that’s something we want to do or not. I would tend to think that our administration has a pretty good idea what’s going on with MAPs. John, do you want to make any comments on that?

**J. Peters:** Ah yeah, the Monetary Award Program is a very important program to students in the State of Illinois and to almost all institutions of postsecondary education, not just the publics. The independent colleges and universities, Loyola, DePaul, depend heavily on MAP money for a percentage of their budgets with regard to students, and there are about 144,000 students who are on MAP money in the state. We have about 6,000+ students, over $12 million, $10-$12 million per semester, so it’s a pretty big chunk of, not our budget, but because the students get the money directly, but it’s a pass through. There’s controversy right now, there are two. One is the community colleges would like a bigger share of that because they are shouldering a larger and larger share of individuals going on to postsecondary education. So, Andy Davis, the Executive Director of the Illinois State Assistance Corporation or Commission, has a plan to try and bond using this concept using human capital and near as I can tell, what it means is that there are predictable increases in one’s lifelong earnings if you get more than a high school education and for certain levels of increases, there are predictable increases in income, therefore, in revenue to the state through taxes. So, there are a few states that are bonding against that potential. It’s called a Human Value Escalade or something like that. What that means is that the State would have to earmark that portion that they think is coming from this increase in education and using that to expand MAP funding because it is not clear in the near term that there will be any
increases in the base funding for MAP, which is at about less than $0.5 billion a year. It’s been there for a while. So, what Mr. Davis has been doing has been going around trying to solicit support for that concept and probably if he came, that’s what you’d hear from him. He does believe that our tuition has had, increases in tuition has had an impact on the distribution and use of the Monetary Award Program. So, my guess is you’re right. I think I know all I need to know about ISAC and MAP funding, but it might be a benefit for faculty and others to hear him out. He is a very passionate individual who has got good values. We need to educate more, get postsecondary education for more Illinois citizens. That’s really a very powerful idea. Alright, is that it?

P. Henry: I guess I need some clarification. I thought, aren’t MAP funds awarded to the student?

J. Peters: Yeah.

P. Henry: And the student decides where to take them. So, I’m not sure what it means.

J. Peters: Yeah, the students are awarded and they can pick where they go.

P. Henry: Right, so how does that work with community colleges?

J. Peters: And that includes almost everything including, and here’s the second controversial issue, proprietary schools. And you know, there’s a national controversy over the value and some of the practices of the proprietaries with the Student Loan Program at the federal level and that would, of course, come down, but I know of no efforts at this point to deny MAP funding to proprietary students, probably because there’s a constituency. These are students and parents who want this funding.

P. Henry: My original concern, I think, was not so much with that as with possible ways to improve our recruitment of students with MAP funds in competition with proprietary institutions or community colleges and I’m not sure if that falls under this topic or not.

J. Peters: I would say that we do very well, because you know, you stack Pell Grants with MAP Grants and then there may be local grants and then we close the gap to tuition, the Huskie Advantage Program. So, I don’t know, Brian, I think we’re about as progressive on this as you can get.

B. Hemphill: We get a large number of MAP students every single year, but I think the issue that this gentleman is probably bringing up is that at a certain point, they will cut off the deadline, I think this year it was sometime in April or early May, the number of MAPs, people who will actually receive MAP, and I think this gentleman is probably trying to grow the pool because regardless, you still can have more students going to community colleges and going into higher education, but that pool is still going to cut off at this $0.5 billion that the President has talked about.

J. Peters: All right, so I guess I am lecturing today. So, when you think about it as distributing a
scarce resource across a population, right now, the decision rule is first come, first serve. The standard is, academic achievement standard is, can you get in somewhere. So, one suggestion would be, if you’re going to have a $0.5 billion, which is, in terms of State input, across the states, that’s a lot. I mean, I think we rank third in the country, maybe behind California and New York. I don’t know, it’s substantial, and since it’s not going to grow and since this is an important public policy and since the State gives the money, should they be investing that money, that $0.5 billion, in a set of individuals who have a better than average chance of success in academic institutions, writ large, in Illinois, which means that ISAC would probably get in the business of setting a floor on academic standards that right now, they don’t do that because we do that by if they are accepted in U of I or Western or Loyola, they’re in. Yeah?

**B. Hemphill:** I just had one other thing, this one thing the Provost and I were just talking about a second ago and that also with community college students, they make their decisions traditionally a lot later than a four-year, or a student coming to NIU or any other four-year public. So, therefore, by the time they’re making those decisions, the cutoff date has typically already passed. So, you will have a number of students that will miss those deadlines based on that, and I know that they are considering that as a part of their approach with the community colleges.

**J. Peters:** And another undeniable fact is that those students who come from the least vibrant high schools and from economically deprived schools, neighborhoods, families, are least likely to apply on time. So, it’s an important public policy issue. I don’t know if human capital is the answer to it, but at least Mr. Davis is thinking creatively, like we all should be. Is that helpful?

**P. Henry:** (Nods)

**J. Peters:** You done?

**E. Hansen:** I was done.

**B.** BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – report – pages 5-7

**J. Peters:** Alright, now we have Kerry and Ferald on the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs Personnel Committee. I have Kerry, anybody, it’s there. Alright, anybody want to ask any questions?

**K. Freedman:** Um, should I say something about it first before questions?

**J. Peters:** If you’re inclined.

**K. Freedman:** Because I’m in the School of Art, I thought it would be appropriate to read this short statement to the Committee, basically saying that we were doing fine. So, I quoted that statement in the report. There were three issues dealt with during the meeting. The first was the Higher Learning Commission visit, which went very well, and it went so well actually they didn’t, I believe, the person who visited the sites didn’t feel the need to look at the third site it
went so well. The next agenda item was Vice Provost Cassidy did a quite extensive report having to do with the academic review process, so I summarized that. Finally, Vice Provost Seaver gave a presentation on the outcomes of the retention work that was being done, that was done by a couple of task forces, one of which I actually was on, and he summarized. He discussed particularly the issue of student success, the definition of student success being completion of a degree in four years, which was very important from a Faculty Senate standpoint, because we had been asking what the definition would be and also the definition of at-risk students. So, an at-risk student from this perspective is a person who may not finish a degree in four years. I asked the question with regards to student success, “will faculty members be asked to reconsider academic standards in order to improve retention.” I heard an answer, I reported the answer in my report. Someone made a decision to take that out.

**J. Peters:** Now questions. That report was well received by the Board, what we’re doing was really quite amazing, the work that’s being done. The results of retention efforts are always measured several years down the road. Those things are never immediate so we will just have to wait and see. Alright?

**K. Freedman:** I mean I can ask a question. Who made the decision to take the answer to that question out of my report? Can someone tell me that?

**J. Peters:** I don’t know what you mean by that.

**K. Freedman:** There was another sentence in that paragraph with the answer to the question that has been taken out. It was in the Faculty Senate Report.

**J. Peters:** I don’t know. Who prepares the report?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, we just take it verbatim.

**K. Freedman:** The answer I heard was, “No, we will not be asked to reconsider academic standards in order to improve retention.” Maybe someone disagreed with what I heard and took it out of my report. I don’t know.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, if the report was sent to us, which it usually is, we just take them off line and print them up, so we don’t edit it at all. So, I don’t know how that would happen.

**P. Henry:** Filling in the blank, it should be, “no,” right?

**R. Alden:** Since I answered the question, I said, “The simple answer is, ‘no.’” So, that was a simple answer and then I went and got on my soapbox and said that the student success was trying to prevent students from getting into academic trouble and not to try and reduce the rigor of coursework or anything else. But, I don’t know what happened to the sentence either because I don’t touch these reports.

**K. Freedman:** That’s what was originally in the report. I don’t know why that’s missing.
J. Peters: I think we should get that in the record, don’t you?

K. Freedman: Well, I can resend my original file.

J. Peters: Do that. Al and Pat, you get that in the record. That’s that.

A. Rosenbaum: We will look into the original transmission and find out why that wasn’t in there, but it doesn’t sound like something that anyone would want to take out.

P. Henry: It sounds like good news.

K. Freedman: Sounds like it to me.

J. Peters: Good news from a Provost.

A. Rosenbaum: We’ll look into it.

J. Peters: We better get that in the record. Any other questions for Kerry on that? Okay, thank you.

[For the record, the file sent by K. Freedman did not contain the disputed sentences. She subsequently graciously offered an apology and sent a corrected report which will be included in the minutes of this meeting at the suggestion of President Peters.]

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – report – pages 8-10

J. Peters: The Finance & Facilities did not meet, so we’ll move to Jay and Todd on Legislative Audit and External Affairs Committee report to BOT.

T. Latham: Under item 7A, it was basically a report by Steve Cunningham to the members of that committee. It addressed potential amendments to the regulations of the Board of Trustees, and it dealt with the matters that related to employee benefits for employees and their families. There were three components of this, the first one was a comparative review in which presentation to the members included areas such as peer groups, domestic partner benefits, NIU commissions, state benefits and review of the Board of Regulations. The second part of the presentation dealt with the physical impact that benefits would have on the University. It was identified that tuition waivers could possibly have the largest impact because of the number that were being utilized. The third area that I moved onto, a discussion by the committee members themselves, the Board of Trustee members on this committee had several questions too regarding the legal definition of a domestic partnership, what the draft would look like and the amendments, how to document this type of procedure, language, the certification process, the legalities, what the expense might be and even all the way to the bottom where it says residency
requirements. The discussion was lengthy. It was obvious there wasn’t a whole lot of consensus by the trustees. The Chair basically concluded it to come back at another time to discuss the student area of the draft, which we didn’t have a chance to get to that particular day.

Under 7B, the general assembly report was made by Ken Zehnder. It essentially was a review of the election results and how the NIU community faired, whether it was current people or alumni. The major points that you should pay attention to are the areas in bold, which are taking place under the veto session that deal with sensitive issues to the University such as pension borrowing, University borrowing and debt collection, procurement, administrative burden, Illinois Higher Education funding and redistricting.

On 7C, the congressional report, Lori Clark, the main part of this is to remember that there is lots of funding that’s been committed to NIU, but it hasn’t been appropriated and that NIU was anticipating these funds through the 112th Congress. They come from areas and departments such as Health and Human Services, Transportation and the Department of Defense. Under the internal audit update, Danielle Schultz, the Internal Audit Director, indicated that for the fiscal year 2010 and 2011, there were 17 anticipated audits, which was reduced to 14. That was due to two projects that were being postponed and a reduction of her staff from 5 to 3.

**J. Peters:** OK, questions?

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kerry Freedman, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper and Jozef Bujarski, Co-chairs – report – page 11

**J. Peters:** Hearing none, Todd, you’re up again under Resources, Space and Budgets Committee.

**T. Latham:** The committee met on November 11th with President Peters and Provost Alden. It was to continue a dialogue about our current financial situation at the University. The last line is probably the one that the Chairs of our committee wanted me to point out, that basically even during this difficult budget situation, the strategic plan initiatives and the salary increases are still being funded and fulfilled.

Under item #2, we had further discussion about Vision 2020, and I would like to report back that representatives from the Resource, Space and Budget Committee will be part of two working groups. They will be on Facilities and Environment and also on Sustainability.

Under item #3, the committee also expressed an interest to continue the dialogue on a regular basis with ongoing input to the administration on Resource, Space and Budget issues, and the administration was very welcoming to that idea and we will continue to have a partner role in that process.

**J. Peters:** OK, good report. Complete report. Questions?
H. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report
I. University Affairs Committee – M Cecil Smith, Chair – no report
J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

J. Peters: Moving on. Is there any unfinished business? We had scratched collegiality today.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

J. Peters: Is there any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: I will say under comments, and you have information items there, that we are playing a football game on Friday night, and it’s only the most important football game in the history of our University. And our coach and team have got us in a wonderful spot, and I’m getting calls. I’m continually amazed at the power of Intercollegiate Athletics, calls from politicians that I never get, calls from and comments from people I haven’t heard from in years just walking down the street. But I’ll tell you what, our football team are, our team and the band and they all, everybody works at that, they deserve it, they’re fine people, they work hard and bring attention to a university where we’re “Learning Today and Leading Tomorrow.”

Motion to adjourn. Yeah, Sue?

S. Willis: I hope this is not inappropriate, but I did learn earlier today that Francis Stroup has passed away.

J. Peters: Yes, and for those of you who don’t know, he’s famous for many things, but has most notoriety for what, Sue?

S. Willis: Forward, Together Forward.

J. Peters: Yeah, the Huskie, the Forward Together Forward fight song.

S. Willis: And also one of our emeritus faculty, of course.

J. Peters: Distinguished faculty.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Athletic Board – September 15, 2010 minutes
B. Academic Planning Council – October 4, 2010 minutes
XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: Alright, motion to adjourn.

Unidentified: (motion and second were not audible nor identified)

J. Peters: We’re adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.)