Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Alden, Coles, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kowalski (on sabbatical), Latham, LeFlore, Middleton, Mogren, Mohabbat, Rosato, Schoenbachler

OTHERS PRESENT: Blakemore, Bryan, Cunningham, Dunn-Kenney, Griffin, Hansen, Hemphill, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Finley, Freedman, Freeman, Kaplan, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: Welcome back to our first meeting of the University Council. Come to order. I’m going to turn it over to Alan who has some housekeeping announcements he’d like to make.

Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

A. Rosenbaum: Welcome back. I want to remind the council members that we are covered by the press, the Northern Star, and sometimes by other news media, so you might want to bear that in mind when you speak. Along those lines, if you wish to speak, please make sure you ask for a microphone. Remember to always state your name for the record before you speak, and that includes before you make a motion or before you second a motion.

I also want to remind you that we have both voting and nonvoting members on the Council. This is an issue when we are voting on things like constitutional amendments and policies. If you’re a nonvoting member, you’re not supposed to vote, hence the title. In general, all faculty representatives, student representatives, operating staff and SPS representatives, the deans of each degree-granting college and the Graduate School, the President and Provost are all voting
members. Others of you who I did not just mention, if you’re not sure, you should check with Pat Erickson. For the new members who are here with us for the first time, I want to introduce Pat. Pat Erickson is the administrative assistant to the University Council. If you have questions about anything, Pat is a great person to ask your questions to. She can tell you if you’re a voting or nonvoting member.

The last item I want to mention is that the University Council Office now features the artwork of our faculty from the School of Art from the College of Visual and Performing Arts. We felt that it was appropriate that the Peoples’ Office should be decorated with artwork from our own faculty. The Art Department has worked with us to get a nice set of paintings and some other types of art. If you get a chance and you’re in Altgeld Hall, drop by Altgeld 103 and take a look.

J. Peters: All right, well thank you very much. Welcome back. I tried to calculate, I think this is my 67th meeting of the University Council.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: Before we have a motion to adopt the agenda, there is one walk-in item. It is the SPS report, and it goes under Roman VI. L. And the other thing I would like to point out, under the Consent Agenda D., there are title changes to our committee book. There are a few changes that are kind of borderline substantive changes that will be presented to you under New Business. There is nothing controversial there, but when Alan and I talked about it, we thought it’s technical enough to be a substantive change. So, we pulled out title changes in the Committee Book from those things that are a slight substantive changes. So, with that, those changes, I call for a motion to adopt today’s agenda.

P. Vohra: made the motion, K. Thu: was second.

The agenda was approved as amended without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 27, 2011

A. Small: So moved the approval of the minutes. D. Haliczer: was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Ombudsman Annual Report (Bylaws, Article 19.1) – Tim Griffin – Pages 4-14

T. Griffin: summarized his report for the Council. He noted that the Office of the Ombudsman at Northern Illinois University is in adherence to the International Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice which incorporate confidentiality, neutrality, independence and informality as the required pillars. We assist individuals who contact us with any university-related concerns, and we serve faculty, staff, students, as well as family members, alumni,
visitors to the campus and any other people who contact us. In the most recently completed data year, we were contacted by 1025 people for assistance. That group was fairly representative demographically of the University population and community.

In addition, an Office of the Ombudsman is not fully effective if it only responds and acts reactively to what people bring. So, on 50 occasions during the year in question, I initiated what we call policy cases where I see trends or issues that are brought by these individuals that indicate that perhaps an alteration in policy or procedure might be appropriate to help reduce problems at the institution. On 50 occasions in the prior year, I met with individual administrators and/or governing bodies, committees, etc., with proposals and recommendations in regard to potentially addressing some of those kinds of issues to reduce the number of individuals contacting our office in the future. I also provided service to 17 different committees, commissions and task forces at the University and presented 58 training presentations during the course of the year on various topics to various clienteles.

**J. Peters:** All right, questions for our Ombudsman? The level of activity, year over year, what’s your read on that?

**T. Griffin:** The level of activity has been constant for a long time. I say constant, no statistical difference from year to year in terms of the number of individuals contacting the office.

**B. President Peters’ Remarks**

**J. Peters:** Okay, thank you for that good report. I put so much emphasis on my Vision 2020 statement, that’s pretty much what I’m going to talk about, and I really want to thank everybody who participated over the past year. It was for me, quite profound to witness and read and listen to the rather fundamental discussions that occurred on this campus, dealing with the full range of activities that this institution is engaged in and to evaluate it from both what we do well and what we don’t do so well and what we need to do. It’s really a very shaky time and I was just so proud of everybody that participated. And it’s going to serve us well, so I want to thank everybody. If you haven’t, I urge you to either read or listen to the speech. If you haven’t already, and many hundreds did, read the intensive, comprehensive working reports that back up some of the initial observations about where we’re going.

Let me tell you what happens now. Next week we have the Board of Trustees meeting. I had to ask them to, “embrace,” the concepts, direction and the focus of Vision 2020, and I’m hopeful they will. They will probably work on a resolution of adoption or of embracement, and I know that there will be directives in it, charges to me and the campus community as to how we should proceed and what we should proceed on in what order.

I’m going to be calling together the working group chairs and beginning to put together implementation groups for whatever the priorities will be. I did already make some decisions about what we were going to encourage and we’ll be framing that up in the next weeks. We wanted to invest in many things. We really worked hard on the campus. A lot of people worked real hard. I think that’s good because one of the key ingredients in determining whether you
want to go to a university as a student or as a faculty member or employee is how the campus looks and I always have felt that we have the bones of a beautiful campus. I love the way it’s laid out. I love the yellow buildings. But, we neglected it. We neglected it because the State failed us. They have issues, so we’ve had to put all of our spare cash into our paychecks.

I am intent on making sure that our investments are in line with Vision 2020. I’m intent on it, and we’ve already identified some money, I think $1 million over two years to stimulate research, $3 million for academic enhancements including online learning, $4 million over two years for infrastructure improvements including signage. We’re putting money into wireless technology, and I’m going to watch that. I’m not going to be the banker, but I’m going to watch the distribution and expect results, because this is one report and one set of priorities that will not be on a shelf, and it’s really going to set the stage for the next decade.

The budget is as reported. We’re owed $43 million for last year. They have to pay us by December 31. Who knows, but they owe us $43 million on $101 million base of last year. The good news is, our budget this year was off about -1.15 percent and we considered that to be a vote of confidence from the state that they had cut higher education over the years enough and even though they needed money, they cut us 1.15 percent. We have received some reimbursements for our vouchers on the 2012 budget, so they paid some money on this year’s obligation.

I’ll just say something about pensions, which we follow daily. There hasn’t been a lot of information the past few weeks. Steve Cunningham is our man in Springfield on pensions, really for all of higher education. It’s a serious issue from two perspectives, number one is, the State really has got itself in a bind over the pensions, it’s got to be addressed in some way; and number two is those are our benefits that we earned and we have to do everything we can to secure them for current annuitants and future annuitants. This is one of those issues in public policy, where things happen fast; if you don’t get your spoon in the stew, you’re going to end up starving. I consider it one of the, it’s one of the most serious issues that the State is facing. Therefore, it is probably one of the most serious issues we are facing. I just want to let you know we’re on it and sharing information when we get it.

I found out this summer that there is real serious concern among the faculty about the legislation that passed in the spring to establish performance-based funding for higher education. There was a law passed that directed that a process be set up whereby in part, higher education, including community colleges, would be funded on the basis of performance for certain indicators. That committee is now working and let me give you a status update. Virginia Cassidy is one of the people we have monitoring this, and she went to the committee meetings. There is a committee that was set up by the statute, and they have held two meetings. The public universities are represented by three presidents, Elaine Maimon from Governor’s State who succeeded me this year as the convener of the presidents, Rita Chang, the Chancellor of Southern Illinois Carbondale who is knowledgeable about performance-based funding, and Wayne Watson who is the President of Chicago State. The focus is going to be on access and getting more Illinoisans a degree or a credential, whether it is community college or a university; to close the gap, achievement gap, between the haves and have nots, between those students who grew up in
Now, here’s the good news: We had a conference call this morning of all the presidents where we heard a report from those three presidents, and I walked away with two impressions. One is I was relieved to hear that their focus is not on the individual level performance, but it’s on institutional performance so that as a faculty member, one could take solace that they’re not looking at, “Gee, how productive am I as an individual? How many students do I have? How many kids do I graduate?” No, they’re not going there. At least that’s what we got out of the first two meetings. So, it’s institutional outcomes, how is NIU doing in accessing and graduating students. The other thing that I think is good about this is that they want to determine what are the appropriate metrics. Is it IPEDS graduation rate, six-year persistence rates? There is a growing rejection of that across the country with more interest in the number of baccalaureate degrees per 100 students that are achieved irrespective of a timeframe. Some institutions have individuals who have to work, who take longer, who transfer from community colleges to university, who move from a community college to one university back to a community college into another four-year, and what we’re really after is the success rate of that individual; does that individual achieve their educational objectives and get a degree? I think I’m going to push that because that makes a lot of sense to me, and also it makes sense to NIU because 40 percent of our students are transfers. They never get counted in the data. That’s crazy.

Another thing that is good about this process is the legislators that are behind it are really supportive of higher education: Senator Maloney and Bob Pritchard. So, my message to you is, I’m calmer about it today and you should be too. However, here’s what I’m doing: We’re putting up a website that has all this information on it, that’s number one. And number two, I’m putting together a team to monitor this that will include people from this group, people who kind of understand this stuff and are experts to advise us as we move forward and I will be getting to that pretty quickly. The reason I am going on about this is that when we had a meeting of the UAC – twice, I heard it, that this is of concern. I get it, so I’m involved.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve 2011-12 University Council Standing Committees – Pages 15-17
B. Approve University Advisory Committee to BOT, confirmation of Rosita Lopez to a three-year term (2011-2014) – Page 18
C. Approve Supportive Professional and Operating Staff members of Student Conduct Board – Page 19
D. Approve maintenance updates of various position titles referred to in the Committees of the University Book – Pages 20-38

E. Williams: moved approval of the consent agenda. R. Lopez: was second.

The consent agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.
VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report – Pages 39-45

E. Hansen: The significant thing that happened at the meeting at the Kankakee Community College was that we finally got a person from the, Faculty Advisory Council onto the, IBHE Board. The position has been there; in fact, there are two positions there for faculty members across the state and I have been doing this for like five years and this is the first time we’ve ever had anybody on that board. So, that was a step forward.

We’re meeting in Macomb and I know Bob Pritchard is going to be down there. In fact, both he and Mr. Maloney have attended our Faculty Advisory Council meetings in the past and they are certainly two people that care a lot about what is going on in higher education. I would like to have that in the record.

J. Peters: It’s in the record. I think that the involvement of our faculty and the Faculty Advisory Council to IBHE is extremely important. Thanks for doing that. I know it is a burden and hopefully you get some help every now and then. The other thing I’d like to say is that our students have become very involved with the student version and I think one of our students is the president.

N. Lindvall: Yes, I’m the Executive Secretary.

J. Peters: We think it’s valuable because when we go to the IBHE for approval of our campus projects, whether they be curricular or residence halls, the IBHE listens to the voice of the student member, so thanks for doing that.


F. Bryan gave the report of the May 12th meeting.

F. Bryan: Thank you. The May 12th report from the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee includes primarily the recommendations or faculty promotions, tenure, and promotions with tenure for the academic year. Much of this information has been disseminated, but I want to highlight that as well as information provided from Dean Neal from the reorganization of the College of Education, and the item which generated the most discussion at this committee meeting was the request for a change in degree designation from an Ed.D in Educational Psychology to a Ph.D in Educational Psychology. The Board was very concerned about that and asked good questions. And, as you can see, they approved it with the understanding that questions would be responded to by the June 9th meeting of the full board. So, please take note of that in the subsequent reports. That concludes my report from the May 12th meeting and I would be happy to answer questions if there are some.

J. Peters: Thank you, Ferald. Andy Small is going to give the 25th of August report.
A. Small: directed the Council to the list of award recipients on page 48, and asked them to stand (if present). The Council applauded those recipients present. He also asked them to identify the awards they had won.

G. Long: Greg Long, I won Presidential Teaching Professorship.

K. Thu: Kendall Thu, the Presidential Engagement Professorship.

C. Mirman: Cliff Mirman, Presidential Engagement Professor.


A. Small: Thank you.


A. Rosenbaum: If you’re paying attention to these reports, you will notice that we do the same things in the Board of Trustee’s report as we do in the subcommittee reports and so it’s repetitive. What happens is that the subcommittees meet before the Board of Trustees and the items that each of the subcommittees approves are then brought forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Because the items that were approved in the May Finance, Facilities, and Operations committee, will be reflected in the Board of Trustee’s report, I’m only going to give the August 25th report. At the August meeting, the Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee looked at the FY2012 internal budget and the recommended approval of the budget, which reflected a 1.15 percent reduction, which was enacted by the Governor and the General Assembly. It was also noted that our request for the 2012 internal budget included a 3 percent salary increase for employees, and this increase was not supported by the IBHE or the Governor. I think this exemplifies something that President Peters mentioned a moment ago and that is how much influence the IBHE has over our lives here at the University and hence the importance of having a strong FAC that represents the faculty position and the student positions to the IBHE. The FY2013 budget guidelines were presented and approved. The budget guidelines again include a 3 percent salary increase for employees as well as a 3 percent increase in facilities and library technology. We have to be concerned that these may be met with opposition when it goes to the IBHE and then on to the Governor and the Legislature. The FY13 appropriated capital budget request was approved. This is money that we use to make improvements in academic buildings and to a certain extent, the campus as well. We put our requests on this list and eventually, hopefully, they get funded. Sometimes it takes a decade or so for them to get to the funding level. At the top of our list at this point are our plans to build the Computer Science and Technology Centere followed by the Davis Hall and the Wirtz Hall renovations.

The non-appropriated budget includes things that are funded through bond issue such as the
recreation facilities, dormitories and student-related items. We had a bond issue last year and we have that money. And those items that were approved include a scoreboard updating for the stadium, several parking lot reconstructions, residence hall painting, installation of wireless access in the residence halls, remodeling of kitchens and bathrooms in the Stevenson Hall live-in apartments.

The last informational item is of interest and that involves taking the current computer lab in the Holmes Student Center and converting it into what is going to be called the College Grind, which will have wireless access, computer access and also a coffee shop, and this is supposedly state-of-the-art in the types of facilities that students look for in their student union.

K. Thu: Speaking of waiting ten years, since the State Supreme Court decision sort of paved the way for the capital bill to proceed, is there any new news on capital funding for Stevenson, since I guess it was early summer last?

E. Williams: I would just say that with the Supreme Court decision, that sort of opened the gates and, yes, those fundings will occur, it’s just a question now of the Governor releasing funds. We are moving forward with Stevenson as if the money is coming. So, we already have had planning meetings, so we are working with the architects on design. In fact, the CDB (Capital Development Board) had representatives on campus just last week where we reviewed projects including Stevenson.

K. Thu: So, does that mean that the money is in the coffers and the Governor just needs to be in a position to release it or somewhere in between?

E. Williams: It’s in that mystical point of view of “we don’t know.”

J. Peters: But we are moving forward. You have to have the patience of Job to be in higher education. The thing about that, it takes so long, you have to be very careful how you set your priorities because things change and we can’t slip that above any other priorities or you’ll be accused of bait and switch. So, when you put something on that list in that order, you have to stick to your knitting even if it takes two decades.

J. Peters: Let me talk a little bit about internal audit or really it’s not internal audit, it’s really the external state-mandated audit for which we pay $170,000 to be audited. Then we also have internal audits that we do. But to have just five findings that are non-material is relatively unheard of and we were commended by the trustees for that. There are some universities out there, I think I read one in the paper, had 49 material findings. Then the other thing is, the Legislative Audit Commission, which has legislators and others on it, just accepted this, and we didn’t have to go appear before them. That’s a credit to everybody here, which means we watch what we do with our money. We account for what we do with our money.
A. Rosenbaum: So, this is the June board meeting. Chair Strauss started by expressing confidence that despite the state’s problems, NIU will continue to flourish. He acknowledged the expertise of our administration, especially commending President Peters, Dr. Williams, and also Dr. Alden. President Peters then, as he said before, noted that the IBHE was discussing how to develop and implement performance and outcome measures as mandated by the new state legislation. He also noted that Dave and Linda Nelson, longtime benefactors, had given $100,000 endowment to support a scholarship program to help students in danger of dropping out. So, this is significant in light of the Vision 2020 emphasis, and the emphasis that we have had even prior to Vision 2020, on retention of students. Again, the president noted that cash flow is our most pressing problem.

The board considered 24 action items, and I’m not going to go through all of those. The ones that were of most interest were the approval of 21 recommendations for tenure and promotion to associate professor, three recommendations for tenure only, one promotion from assistant to associate, and 15 promotions from associate to full professor. They also approved the reorganization for the College of Education including departmental name changes and faculty reassignments and the change in degree designation that we heard about just a moment ago.

The Board of Trustees also approved the FY12 tuition recommendation, and this was a 6.8 percent increase, which translated to a $270.30 increase per student per semester. It should be noted that again, there is a truth-in-tuition policy in Illinois and so once a student enters, their tuition is frozen at their entry level for nine semesters. So the University is really stuck; if our expenses go up, we can’t raise tuition on students that are already in place. We can only implement an increase for new students. There is also a great deal of attention to keeping NIU affordable and so I don’t think the board takes tuition increases lightly, and they also vet these very carefully with the student organizations to make sure that the students are on board with the increases that are implemented.

Then the board confirmed Bradley Bond as Dean of the graduate school and Mary Pritchard as Interim Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences. Lastly, the election of the Board of Trustees officers for FY2012 was deferred until the September board meeting. I believe the Board of Trustees is reconsidering its bylaws and is going to be making changes in bylaws and I believe that’s why they’ve deferred the election of officers until the September 15th meeting.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper, Chair – no report

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

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Greene, Chair – no report
J. Peters: Hearing no questions, let’s move on to J. Now, this is something different. We have a Student Association report from Austin Quick.

A. Quick: Thank you Dr. Peters. First off, just let me say thank you to Dr. Rosenbaum for allowing us to be a part of the Faculty Senate. We attended the last Faculty Senate meeting and it was very educational for us. These last few weeks of school, the Student Association, Elliott Echols and his entire staff, have worked very hard at growing support for our university within the programs that we hold. We’ve really put a lot of effort in getting students out and getting students involved and getting them excited to be a Huskie and to be here at NIU, and we’re going to keep moving in that direction all year long. Over the last two weeks, we held the Huskie Shuffle. We had over 2000 students involved and many day activities, so it was a great event all around. At the Faculty Senate meeting, it was discussed a possibility with the Huskie Bus to have a ridership card for faculty and staff. Josh Venaas, the Director of Mass Transit is here. We have been meeting over the last few days. We will have something for Faculty Senate, so there will be some sort of card that the faculty and staff can purchase so they won’t have to have money every time they go on the bus and it will get them a discounted rate. So hopefully that will improve ridership and get more faculty and staff excited to take the bus as an alternative than driving their cars and trying to find a parking place on campus.

Also, this last summer we’ve worked together a lot to grow the involvement in the scope of what the SA does away from just giving out promotional items and those types of things. So, we’ve been involved with a lot of different meetings across the board with civic and community leaders and I just wanted to name a few just so you’re aware. Over the summer, both President Echols and I have met with the city leaders from both DeKalb and Sycamore. Representative Pritchard, Renew DeKalb, DeKalb Chamber of Commerce. Congressmen Walsh, Manzullo, Schilling, Hultgren have all visited the Student Association in the last few weeks, and representatives from Faculty Senate. So, we’ve really tried to open that scope up of what we’re doing in the Student Association and grow our influence and our general communication with the different areas of the University to move in the right direction.

The last thing I want to discuss, and it came up at Faculty Senate is the entire issue of the plus/minus grading system, that we look at the student voice and what the students’ opinion is. And last spring, we had a referendum regarding that and that students did vote pretty much across the board that they did not want a plus/minus grading system and since the Faculty Senate meeting, I’ve had many emails from faculty members with concerns that students didn’t understand how this would affect them. So, we’re going to look at this again per the request of the Faculty Senate and really kind of get an idea of where our students are on this.

J. Peters: All right. Elliott, you want to say something?

E. Echols: Thanks Dr. Peters. On behalf of SA, we would like to thank you all for even having us here. But we do want to let you guys know that we are working very hard to work with the
University to make sure that we change the climate of the institution, whether that be the way students perform academically or behave. We want to make sure that we, as student leaders, take pride in what we do that it will cause a ripple effect with our students and know that it’s time for a change and we want to market our university much better than what we have done in past years. So, thank you.

J. Peters: I think it’s great that you guys are working together.

A. Rosenbaum: I just want to clarify one thing, the ridership of faculty and staff on the busses. There isn’t a charge for most of the lines. There are only two lines where there is a charge is what we’ve been told. That’s correct, yes?

A. Quick: It is correct, but we have found that with most faculty and staff, the lines that they use to drive from their homes are further away from campus, so it would be those routes.

A. Rosenbaum: But the faculty and staff can still use the lines that go around campus; it’s only the ones that go off campus that would be affected by the fare cards.

A. Quick: Correct, the 7 Route and the 2 Route.

A. Rosenbaum: The other thing I wanted to point out is that we’ve actually added three things to the agenda this year with President Peter’s approval, You’ve just heard the first of them, which is the Student Association report, which will be a regular presentation at our Senate and also our University Council meetings. We’ve also added a report from the Operating Staff Council and the Supportive Professional Staff Council, and these will be appearing regularly on our agenda.

J. Peters: Good additions.

K. Thu: Just one very quick comment. For the first time last spring at President Peter’s reception for University Council, I got to sit down with Austin and Elliott just by coincidence, and I learned a tremendous amount from them and then we set up and had lunch a couple times over the summer. I think this body would do well to listen to them very carefully and appreciate the opportunity to have you guys here to become more formally involved.

A. Quick: The last thing I wanted to say, President Peters, to that is Elliott and I were talking about this before. I was lucky to go to a Bears game last Thursday and everywhere across the stadium were NIU banners. Everywhere. It was very exciting to be a Huskie that day, walking with pride. They had another collegiate team sport over the weekend but to have NIU everywhere up there in the city was very exciting.

J. Peters: Yes, it’s great, it’s our new logo. It’s up with our tag, “Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow,” and it will be up for three Bears games including our Wisconsin game. And when you see someone from the Foundation, thank them because the Foundation paid for that. Then we’re going to be bringing those banners back to campus, so you’ll get a chance, they’re beautiful banners.
K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Pages 61-62

A. Small: Like the Student Association, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Rosenbaum for allowing us to have a place on the agenda in a permanent fashion. I believe the Student Association were the ones that brought it to the attention of the University Council and so I would like to take this opportunity to thank you folks too for paving the way for both the Operating Staff Council and the SPS.

What I did for the first report was to try and give you a little history of the operating staff, including how the Operating Staff Council was formed. What’s pertinent to the operating staff? Better employee benefits, merit raises, salary increases, communication, public relations, representation on University committees, recognition awards, staff education, and family activities. It’s interesting that those things are pertinent to us today because that was written 42 years ago when the Operating Staff Council was formed. So, 42 years ago those things were important and they’re important today to us also. The more things change, the more things stay the same I guess. I remember distinctly President Peters writing a letter to our operating staff newsletter. It said, “We must prepare to do more with less,” and that was seven years ago that that letter was written. So, we continue on with our progress so to speak.

A. Small: This October, the Operating Staff Council will have its 12th annual Council of Councils meeting. Now, that particular organization started right here in this room 12 years ago when we invited the representation of all 12 state universities at the Operating Staff Council level to come for a one-day seminar where we invited state legislators. Dr. Peters has spoken at our seventh Council of Councils, and gave us an update of state activities. The reason I mentioned that is I believe that that potentially has some merit for this organization. We get together with our Council of Councils representatives as I mentioned one from, more than one, several from each of the state universities on an annual basis and talk about issues. I believe I could only imagine how strong a voice might be of 12 university councils giving a voice to our state representatives on an annual basis. I offered that up. My next report will contain some information that will come from our Council of Councils meeting in October. So with that, I hope you take the opportunity to read about the history of the Operating Staff Council and again, I am very grateful on behalf of the operating staff to have this position on our agenda on a permanent basis. Thank you.

J. Peters: There is a theme here, and that is that the public higher education community has been thrust together over the past few years because of the common issues that are facing us. I think historically, we’ve been characterized as being hypercompetitive and I can say that right now, there is more collegiality and consensus among the public universities and chancellors, 13 of them, than at any time. It’s really unusual, and to hear that the students and the student advisory group and the faculty advisory group and then the councils are together, the annuitants are together. This is very important that we communicate and hang together on these things.

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – walk-in
M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Committees of the University Book – maintenance updates – Pages 63-67

J. Peters: Hearing no comments, let’s move on to new business. We have item VIII.A. Committees of the University, maintenance updates, pages 63-67. Can I turn that over to you Alan to direct that one?

A. Rosenbaum: As President Peters mentioned earlier, this is part of a larger project that Pat has been taking on, and that is to bring our Committees of the University Book up to date. Some of you may be aware of the Committees of the University Book. We have a lot of committees. The formation or the rules for forming those committees as well as the membership of those committees is published in our book, which you can access from a link on the University Council website. As we go along, there have been many changes in the way those committees are comprised as well as in the titles of people that are to be included on each committee. We thought it was time to start going through that book and bringing it up to date to reflect the composition of those various committees. We approved the name and title changes as part of the consent agenda because they seemed minor and did not reflect a substantive change in the committee structure, however, if it was something more substantive [e.g., such as the idea that someone can name an alternate to fill in for them if they are unable to attend a meeting], we thought that we should at least give an opportunity for anyone who did have a problem with it to raise those concerns. If there are concerns, we can talk about them. If there are no concerns, I think we can entertain a motion to approve those maintenance update on page 63-67 as a block.

D. Smith: moved the approval of the changes listed under VIII.A. S. Willis: was second.

K. Thu: What is the rationale behind striking the section on page 66 about SA minority relations advisors? What does it mean? Are they going to be represented in some other way?

A. Rosenbaum: In most of these cases, Pat has put down a little box there that explains what the logic is or what the reasoning was that these committees used.

K. Thu: Okay.

The motion was approved without dissent or abstention.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: We have one item only carrying over from last year’s business and that is the guests in class policy which is in our Academic Policy subcommittee. So, at the moment, that is the only thing that we still have working through the Council.
X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: You’ll see Roman X. Information Items, the meeting schedule for this academic year on page 68 and then many annual reports and minutes for our various university committees, councils and groups.

A. Meeting schedule, 2011-2012 – Page 68
B. Annual Report, Affirmative Action & Diversity Resources Advisory Committee
C. Annual Report, Academic Planning Council
D. Annual Report, Campus Security & Environmental Quality Committee
E. Annual Report, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Annual Report, Faculty & SPS Personnel Advisor
G. Annual Report, Graduate Council
H. Annual Report, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
I. Annual Report, University Assessment Panel
J. Annual Report, University Council Personnel Committee
K. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
L. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
M. Minutes, Athletic Board
N. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
O. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
P. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
Q. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
R. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
S. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
T. Minutes, General Education Committee
U. Minutes, Honors Committee
V. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
W. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
X. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
Y. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Z. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: Called for a motion to adjourn.

K. Thu: So moved. The motion was seconded.

The motion carried without dissent or abstention

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.