UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT  
Wednesday, September 7, 2011, 3 p.m.  
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


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: I just turned my mic on, can you hear me? Something new. Welcome back to our first meeting of the University Council. Call 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: Okay, can you hear me? Yeah, I think you can. First, welcome back. Secondly, 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. We have to be able to know who said what when we do the transcripts for the minutes. 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. So, that would be most helpful to us. I know we said this in Senate, and the senators remembered it for about three seconds and then they went back to not saying their names. So, we’ll see if the Council can do any better than that.

I also want to remind you that we have both voting and nonvoting members in the Council. This gets to be 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. So, just to give you an idea, 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, you want to stand up so people can see who you are? Pat is the administrative assistant to the University Council. If you have questions about anything, Pat is a great person to ask your questions to. So, 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 and so we have done that. The Art Department has really worked with us to get us a nice set of paintings and some other types of art. We would welcome you to drop in and see the artwork in the University Council Office. If you get a chance and you’re in Altgeld Hall, Altgeld 103, drop in 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. I think I have survived 67, so we will see how I do this year.

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, say New Business B., let’s say. 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 change. So, with that, those changes, I call for a motion to adopt today’s agenda.

P. Vohra: So moved.

J. Peters: Okay, so moved.

A. Rosenbaum: Who said that?

J. Peters: Yeah, you’ve got to identify yourself. I think we have, “So Moved” is not a legitimate member of the voting members.

K. Thu: Second.


J. Peters: Kendall, all right, have we got that?

A. Rosenbaum: You didn’t last as long as the Faculty Senate did.
J. Peters: All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? Alright, we have an agenda.

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

J. Peters: I am going to call for additions or corrections for the approval of the minutes of April 27th. Are those online? Yeah, those are online or were online. Hearing none, is there a motion to adopt the Minutes of April 27th? Anybody?

A. Small: So moved.

J. Peters: Andy Small moved. Second?

D. Haliczer: Second.

J. Peters: Okay, second from Deborah. All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye

J. Peters: Opposed?

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

J. Peters: Now, I think the first item on President’s Announcements is that Tim Griffin is with us, sitting over here to my right, and he has an extensive written annual report that he gives to us according to the Bylaws and, Tim, I’m going to turn over to you. You can say anything you want to say.

T. Griffin: How brave of you. I will attempt to be brief. I have been asked to give an oral report summary of the written report included in your packet beginning on page 4. It is my honor to do so. I would point out 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. I refer you to table 1 of the report if you would like to see a more detailed breakdown of the clientele that we serve. We were contacted last year. Our data year runs from the end of spring semester to the end of spring semester. 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. Then, 308 of those individuals
were classified as referrals as stipulated by the Constitution and Bylaws of Northern Illinois University. These were people who called with issues that we were able to simply refer to an appropriate individual or office for resolution and required no further action or assistance on our part. Then, 717 of those 1025 were classified as cases, which did require further assistance and analysis on our part to assist those individuals in achieving a resolution to their concerns.

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 will call cases, also represented as such on that sheet, which 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.

On table 4, you will see a display of the various types of concerns most commonly brought by different individuals, different types of individuals to the Office of the Ombudsman. You will see, for example, that among students, treatment by and performance of faculty and staff and academic status issues tended to predominate but were by no means exclusive to the types of concerns brought by students. In terms of faculty and staff issues brought to the office, those relating to employment, no surprise, and those related to treatment by other faculty and staff members tended to predominate in terms of quantity, the kinds of concerns brought to the office. Rather than bore you further with what you have in writing, I would be glad to answer any questions that you might have, but that concludes my formal report.

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.

J. Peters: Constant?

T. Griffin: Yes.

J. Peters: So, no spikes, no hot spots?

T. Griffin: There are occasionally hot spots among certain clienteles over certain types of issues as things happen. Obviously, when we have a major campus event like 2/14 and things, we get spikes, but in the absence of those types of events. We had a spike, if you will, over the last half of this past year of people with issues related to their potential retirement and benefits due to actions happening in Springfield, but nothing of particular interest internal to the institution over
the past year.

J. Peters: Okay, well thank you, Tim. Alan, anything for Tim?

A. Rosenbaum: Nope.

B. President Peters’ Remarks

J. Peters: Okay, thank you for that good report. Okay, I just have a few things to talk about. 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 and also a sense of realism in this sea of insanity that we happen to live in right now. It’s really enough to get up every morning and hear another bad thing that happens, if you’re lucky enough to have a stock portfolio, if you were smart enough to get rid of the stock portfolio that you had. It’s really a very shaky time and I was just really so proud of everybody that participated. And it’s going to serve us well, it really is, so I want to thank everybody. If you haven’t, I urge you to either read or listen to the speech. It’s a real quick read, and 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. They’re really worth reading. There are things that are gaps that are identified that need to be addressed and analyzed, but it’s pretty comprehensive. The newest report that came out, because it’s the most difficult, and it had to wait on some things, is the Sustainability Report. The more I read that report, the more I am impressed by the thoughtfulness of it. In there is imbedded, like not a road map, but a primer on the economics on how we’re going to have to run an institution of higher education going forward. So, spend some time doing that. Where are we right now? I tried to highlight in my speech, and it wasn’t my stuff, it was what I thought was the predominate imperatives that you, everybody who worked on it and commented on it, indicated we needed to work on. So, I agree with all of it, most of it, but it’s really a campus report.

What happens now? Let me tell you what happens now. I think I just said, next week we have the Board of Trustees meeting. Next week, the Board of Trustees, which has two new members, I had to ask them to, I used the word, “embrace,” I didn’t want to say “improve,” I didn’t know what to say. I thought “embrace” was a pretty good word, the concepts and the direction and the focus of Vision 2020, the process, and I’m hoping, 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 think that’s all, you know, some of that’s obvious but I’m not sure. I will let you know that all along for the past year at key points in this process, trustees have been appraised of it individually. They participated, or they observed. We had two really big workshops this summer on the Vision 2020 for the Board and one for all working groups, except sustainability, and then one focused primarily on sustainability, given that resources is such a crucial point of it, something they can innately grasp.
So, that’s going to happen next week. I’m trying to, obviously, we’ve already done things, but I’m trying to hold back a little bit until we get that embracement and maybe some direction so that then we can begin even further implementation and I’m going to be calling together the working group chairs and beginning to put together implementation groups for whatever the priorities will be. What 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. Again, we didn’t wait. You came back, you can see that we shot the lock off the cashbox and found a few pennies and planted flowers. 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 of 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. Why did neglect it? We neglected it because the State molested us. They have issues, so we’ve had to put all of our spare cash into our paychecks. We’ve had to meet payroll, but we realized that we couldn’t anymore, so we’re moving on that already.

So, I’m very excited about that. We will be, 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. I really like what is in there, particularly on the academic side, and we borrowed so heavily from the Great Journeys academic strategic plan, which we did invest I think last year, we reached $6 million, a $6 million investment in Great Journeys. I never really reported on that, but it’s done a lot of good and so now we’re going to continue with Vision 2020. Okay, so that is Vision 2020.

The budget, it is as reported. We’re owed $43 million for last year. Eddie, I don’t think we’ve received any more money? By statute or continuing resolution, that payment to us, that obligation, it’s a state obligation. It’s isn’t something that they can, they have to do it. They have to pay us by December 31st unless say, by continuing resolution they have until June to pay us. 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 -1.5 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 1.5 percent. We have received some reimbursements for our vouchers on that budget, so they paid some money on this year, but they owe us $43 for last year. A lot of that has to do with funds that refresh over a year. They couldn’t expend it last year because they already expended it, but it refreshes this year, and were education funds that could be dedicated toward higher ed. So, there is rationality there. One would assume that what the state does is always irrational, but that was rational. But we haven’t heard about that. This is a very quiet time publically and politically. We’re going into an election cycle. There is a veto session. The Governor has indicated, sent a signal that code agencies (we’re not a code agency)
will be cut, some closures based upon the fact that he believes the budget was never balanced as delivered to him, #1, and #2, state revenues are down. There was an income tax, income and corporate and it’s started to kick in nicely, it was what, 5.5 percent, and at this last reporting period it was off a little bit. That adds to the anxiety of how are you going to pay for these programs.

Okay, so that’s that and also in the balance is whether or not there is borrowing to pay off past bills should there be a big borrowing bill so that you can have capital with a big gaming bill pass. All those are, that’s a calculus I can’t understand, but they will resolve them one-by-one I hope. The veto session, in case those of you, the veto session is two separated weeks in November every year where the Legislature comes in and cleans up either vetoes that have been made by the Governor or attend to other things that they need to clean up. We’re not sure what that agenda is going to be.

I’ll just say something about pensions, which we have followed daily, we do follow daily. There hasn’t been a lot of information the past few weeks. I don’t know where he is, but I know Steve Cunningham is here, there he is, our man in Springfield on pensions, really for all of higher education. I did speak to our annuitants, for those of you, that’s retirees, and I was invited to speak to the State Annuitants Association on this issue of pensions, probably because people heard I was worked up about it. So, I went and worked them up even more. It’s a very serious issue. 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. So, we’re monitoring that. Whether or not they run a pension bill, there’s a lot of pressure to do so in the veto session, I don’t know. There are those who say yeah, one’s coming and no one knows what’s in it. There are those that say we’re going into a political cycle, there’s no way they’re going to vote on a pension bill in a political cycle. I don’t know, but we know the issues, we have analyzed the issues, we want to be part of the solution, and we’re going to continue in that vein. Steve is, I constantly want to know as soon as something changes, Steve Cunningham lets me know so I can get involved and get to the bottom of it. Because this is one of those issues in public policy, I just sound like my old political science professor self, don’t I, where they happen so fast, if you don’t get your spoon in the stew, you’re going to end up starving. You’ve got to know what’s going on and you’ve got to be there and it’s the subtleties, you have to be ready with proposals and counterproposals or you’re out of luck. 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. Okay, that’s pensions.

Other things that I found out this summer, I knew it, but I didn’t realize the depth of it, 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, and I want to talk just a little bit about that and tell you what I know, which is some, but not all because it’s becoming. There was a law passed that said, 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 made sense to a set of state values or a plan. Maybe I’m dignifying what the law
said, but that’s the way I would write it if I was going to write it. So, that committee is now working and let me give you a status and I don’t know, is Virginia Cassidy here? No, Virginia Cassidy is one of our, one of the two or three people we have monitoring this, and she went to the committee meetings. There is a committee that was set up constitutionally 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, I have laid my burden down after many years, thank God, so she is representing, Rita Chang, the Chancellor of Southern Illinois Carbondale who is knowledgeable about performance-based funding, and the third is Wayne Watson who is the President of Chicago State. Those are the three presidents who represent us on this committee, if we can be represented. Basically, there have been two meetings and I think the parameters of this would be 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 economically deprived and inferior schools and those that don’t. So, I think that’s the major goal, which I agree with that, and that’s national goals, Race to the Top, it’s what the public agenda in Illinois says, I think, that for the future of this state and this country. I think that’s a noble goal. Okay, there may be other things as well in there. So, they are discussing that now.

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. And there may be other things as well, but let’s just focus on those because the second thing is they’re not going to do everything, they’re only going to focus on a few things, and there’s some talk about the role and mission of the institution. So, we will wait and see how that happens. The other thing that I think is good about this is that they want to, before they get into specific metrics, and there was a lot of debate about well, what are the appropriate metrics, is it IPEDS graduation rate, six-year persistent rates? There is a growing rejection of that across the country toward more, and I wish Ray Alden was here because he really knows this stuff, toward the number of baccalaureate degrees per 100 students that are achieved irrespective of a timeframe. And, if you think about it, that’s much more sensible and much less, has much more social class bias in it than the IPEDS because what that means is that for some individuals and some institutions, they 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. They don’t get counted in the data. That’s crazy.

So anyway, let me see what else I have here. Okay, so it’s moving forward and they’re going to
focus on principles, they’re first going to focus on principles. Now, the other thing that is good about this process is the legislatures that are behind it are really supportive of higher education. Senator Maloney from higher ed and Bob Pritchard, our own Bob Pritchard, you know him. Mary, do you know him? No? I want to send a message to Representative Pritchard. No, these are two people who get it, and they will listen to us. So, my message to you today is, I’m calmer about it today and you should be too. However, here’s what I’m doing: We’re putting up a W website, and we haven’t been able to get to it because of the Vision 2020 speech and getting the year started, but I’m going to have 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 – what’s that group? UAC – twice, I heard it, that this is of concern. In fact I kind of knew it but I heard, you know, when you hear it with verve, I get it, so I’m involved.

All right, that is the end of my report. Questions? I know that’s an awful, it’s a short report. I said it was going to be short, but that’s an awful lot, isn’t it?

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

J. Peters: Okay, let’s move on to the Agenda. We need to adopt the Consent Agenda and remember that the D. has title changes only. So, is there a motion to accept today’s Consent Agenda? Remember your name.

E. Williams: So moved.

J. Peters: Eddie Williams moved.

R. Lopez: Second.

J. Peters: Rosita Lopez seconded. All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.


VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES
J. Peters: Okay, let’s move to reports. I saw Earl Hansen here. He has a report, and you better give us the time frame because the summer has intervened.

E. Hansen: Earl Hansen, Department of Technology, Faculty Advisory Council representing the Illinois Board of Higher Education. We had some meetings. The notes are in here. The significant thing that happened at the meeting at the Kankakee Community College was that we finally got a person on the, Faculty Advisory Council member on 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 particular committee. So, that was a step forward.

You’ve already mentioned the comments regarding the based education, performance-based education, and there are three reports in here. If anybody wants me to expound on any of them, I would be glad to do it, but time being the way it is, I’m going to say that I have a copy and if anybody wants the site of the University of Texas having adopted the plan to publish space data on professors and campuses, that is out of the Chronicle of Higher Education. If anybody wants that site, you can electronically get it. But just ask me for it or I’ll send it to Pat. There didn’t seem to be any interest last week in hearing this, but I think maybe there’s more interest today because you’ve got an article in the paper today.

In addition, or in closing, looking at the State of Illinois from the Chronicle of Higher Education in its almanac once a year, public financing in Illinois was down four percent during the year 2010-2011. The projected high school graduates in Illinois will be down by five percent in the next ten years compared to states like Arizona, Nevada, Florida, Texas, and Georgia that will grow up to 20 percent. Illinois is one of 16 states with a percentage of adults with bachelor’s degrees or higher is over 30 percent, which is commendable when you stop and think about where we are struggling with higher education and we still have 30 percent out there with baccalaureate degrees. IIT has the highest percentage of international students at 50 percent or at around 3800 students on their campus. Then, 43 percent of the minority students in Illinois are enrolled in for-profit institutions and that affects the MAP funding to the state institutions. Northwestern, well Illinois has two of the total of 25 institutions in the nation that generated licensing revenue in 2009. Northwestern is number one in the nation with over $161 million and such income, University of Illinois at Chicago and Urbana Champaign are listed 24th with $13 million in such income. That’s in a nutshell. 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. Any comments? 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, whatever the top president or whatever, and you’re involved, aren’t you?
N. Lindvall: Yes, I’m the Executive Secretary.

J. Peters: What are you?

N. Lindvall: Executive Secretary.

J. Peters: Executive Secretary, and I don’t know if you find that valuable, but 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 that is associated with the IBHE and so we need – our students need – your voice, so thanks for doing that.


J. Peters: Well, let’s move on to the Board of Trustees subcommittee or committee reports, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel. And we have, I think, two reports from May, a report from May and a report from August and I think Ferald is going to give May and Andy, you’re going to give August.

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: All right, any questions on the May 12th report? Thank you, Ferald. Andy, you’re going to do the 25th of August report.

A. Small: Good afternoon everyone, Andy Small, President of Operating Staff Council. I would like for you, if you could, turn to page 48 of the University Council report. The reason I ask you to do that, the list on page 48 is a list of our best and brightest that have received awards this year and what I’d like to do, rather than going through this list, is take a page out of Provost Alden’s book. He asked the award recipients to stand if they were present at the Board of Trustees meeting. I think that’s appropriate at this meeting also for us to acknowledge them. So, if you happen to be in the room and your name is on page 48, if you could stand and tell us what award you won so we can acknowledge you, Cliff and our winners. Yes.

Members: Applause.
A. Small: And I know I have embarrassed you at this point but maybe you could tell us what award you 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.


Members: Applause.

A. Small: At this point, I turn your attention to page 49, the list of Emeritus Status award winners. I’m assuming that none of those people are in this room at this point unless they have nothing else better to do on this afternoon, but those folks were awarded Emeritus Status.

At that point Lisa Freeman, Dr. Lisa Freeman, gave a report about external funding and sponsored projects. She highlighted three of those, one of which, of course, was the project of $68 million, the largest award that NIU has ever received for the informational highway that has gone around northern Illinois hooking some 500 cities and countless, innumerable entities into the information highway. I believe she said at this point, it is our job to put the cars on that informational highway here at NIU. She also noted that sponsored projects were kind of a flat graph for the last five years but, due to all of the things that are going on in Springfield and around the country, that that is very commendable for NIU and she noted the catch phrase that “flat is the new up for sponsored projects,” so she was very proud of that. She also highlighted a $9.4 million defense grant and also had a little fun with Trustee Boey about sponsored projects for biodegradable golf tees that Boey seemed to be interested in.

At that point, I believe our esteemed President Peters just kind of summarized it up, and I don’t want to put words in your mouth, but with funding down and regulations up and more constraints on everything that we try to do here, it was very important that we go out and try and recruit the best and brightest and retain those people in order to continue with our sponsored projects. With that, I conclude my report and will take questions if there are any.


A. Small: Thank you.


J. Peters: All right, the Board of Trustees Legislative Audit and External Affairs committee, I don’t know if Todd, I’m sorry, I skipped one, it’s BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations. I
think Alan is going to give both May and August.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Actually, I am only going to give the August one because, just a procedural thing, many times if you’re paying attention to these, 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 really very repetitive. What happens is that the subcommittees meet before the Board of Trustees and the items for each of the subcommittees that each of the subcommittees approves are then brought forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval. So, there is some duplication there.

So, the items that were approved in the May Finance, Facilities, and Operations committee, will be reflected in the Board of Trustee’s report. So, I’m only going to give the August 25th report because we haven’t had the subsequent Board of Trustees meeting. So this one will be a little less repetitive. 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 sort of represents or 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 really 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 again been concerned that these may reach, or be met with, tough sledding when it goes to the IBHE and then onto 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. Is that correct Eddie, the campus as well? But not things like the dormitories and the student union and things like that. 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. The top of our list at this point has our plans to build the Computer Science and Technology Centere followed by Davis Hall renovation and the Wirtz Hall renovation. So, Dr. Williams explained that it’s important to get these things on the list so that they, hopefully, will eventually get funded, even though many of the current students may be faculty members by the time that happens.

The non-appropriated budget includes things that are funded through bond issue and those include things like the recreation facilities, dormitories and student-related items. Those we do have the money for because we floated a bond issue last year and we have that money. And those items that were approved include a scoreboard updating I guess for the stadium, so we’ll have a brand-new scoreboard and we can see how the team’s doing, 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 and also 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. Those are essentially the items that were approved at this August 25th meeting. You will hear them all again when we get to the Board of Trustees report after the Board of Trustees meeting that is happening this next Thursday I believe. Any questions? Kendall?

K. Thu: Kendall Thu, Anthropology. 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?

J. Peters: Eddie, you probably have more specific information.

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.

A. Rosenbaum: Either way, you can have a cup of coffee at the College Grind.

J. Peters: 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, right? We might need a flying trapeze tomorrow to make sure Anthropology is on the cutting edge 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. That is very frustrating. Good report by the way. That was a good report.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – report – May 12, 2011 – Pages 55-56

J. Peters: Okay, the Board of Trustees Committee on Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs. I don’t know if Todd or Rosita is going to give that, but there is a written report. Rosita Lopez will.

R. Lopez: I will do that. This is my, I attended the August 25th meeting, but we do have the May 12th report here and basically, the General Assembly report, that particular area is covering the pension that Dr. Cunningham presented and then the congressional report, there is no further report on that. The internal audit update, item 7.D. received five fiscal year 10 audit findings,
and they are required time reporting. The remedy is to implement the SOEEA system. The second item, inadequate disaster contingency planning and the remedy is to implement new computer resources. The third item, inappropriate emergency purchases. This was only a one-time occurrence. Then fourth, weakness regarding security control of confidential information and basically this is an opinion so really there was no factual basis behind it. Issue five, computer security weaknesses. Again, an opinion not based on fact. The seventh item, which was NIU’s Blackboard mobile application, which by the way, I’ve just added to my little Android and it works really well. Basically this is all that Todd wrote. I had no idea I was going to be presenting this today. I’ll be more prepared next time. Thank you.

**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 well over $100,000, $135,000? Around $170,000 we pay 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 was several years in a row, knock on wood, because you never know in a big place. That’s a credit to everybody here, which means we watch how, what we do with our money. We account for what we do with our money. We account for it in the right buckets, and I’m really proud. The other thing is, we haven’t had a lot of – we’ve really done a very good job of – getting rid of cash operations that just, in their very nature, can create problems. But I’m just real, real pleased about that, and the trustees, who three of them are on big audit committees, are just elated with that. Okay, thank you. Rosita, questions?

**E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Pages 57-58**

**J. Peters:** Let’s move on to the Board of Trustees, Alan Rosenbaum, and that’s the June board meeting.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Right. So, this is the June board meeting. So, this meeting preceded that FFO report that I just gave so the stuff in that came after this meeting. So this meeting will refer to a number of the items that were approved at the May FFO committee meeting.

Okay, first of all, 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 I guess, or maybe they were just of most interest to me, 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. Again, you don’t have it until the Board of Trustees puts this final stamp on it at the June meeting. So, they did that. 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. So, they did approve that 6.8 percent increase.

Then the board appointed 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. I have nothing else.

J. Peters: Okay, questions on that? It seems like yesterday, but it was so long ago.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, you know it’s so much fun that it just keeps on happening.

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. Student Association – Elliott Echols, President and Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 59-60

J. Peters: Hearing no questions, let’s move on to J. Now, this is something different. We have a Student Association report from Elliott and Austin and I don’t know who is giving that one. Austin is giving that one. Okay, Austin Quick.

A. Quick: Yes, Austin 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. We ask for your support and your help in this effort. Over the last two weeks, we held the Huskie Shuffle. There were a couple of activities involved and I’m sure you saw the advertising. 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 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. Hopefully that will help in that regard.

Also, we’ve tried, 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, just general communication with the different fractions here at the, I always say fractions, but 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 – I just wanted to discuss that we’re looking at this – is the entire issue of the plus/minus system. It was asked at that meeting…

**J. Peters:** Grading system.

**A. Quick:** Grading system, that we look at the student voice and what the students’ opinion is. And last fall, excuse me, last spring, we held a, I guess 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 about there were some 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, and thanks for protecting me on the sideline in the fourth quarter. Not that I need any protection, but I appreciated it anyway.

**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:** So, those are the lines they’re using.

**A. Quick:** Correct.

**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…

**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, and that, 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. And this seems like a good idea so we improve our communications with the student organizations. We’ve also added a report from the Operating Staff Council and the Supportive Professional Staff Council, and so these are three new items that will be appearing regularly on our agenda.

**J. Peters:** Good additions. Professor Thu has a question.

**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:** And we will pay you later for that comment. 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 I don’t know if you’re aware, I’m sure you’re aware, but everywhere across the stadium was 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. I hope you like it. I’m aesthetically not too good, but the 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, just thank you. Well, good. Very good. Questions for our students?

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Pages 61-62

J. Peters: Okay, now I think Andy you’re up again on Operating Staff Council.

A. Small: Andy Small, President Operating Staff Council. 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, charting the course, whatever the case may be, for us, both the Operating Staff Council and the SPS.

Rather than taking an approach of telling you about all the issues of the operating staff and such and so forth, what I did for the first report was to try and give you a little history of the operating staff in your brochure here, your backup material, including how the Operating Staff Council was formed and so on and so forth. What’s pertinent to the operating staff? Just take a little paraphrase here, 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. As 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.

J. Peters: My annual letter.

A. Small: Yes, the more-with-less letter. The thing I will want to potentially call your attention to, 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 and what we did is 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 conference, number7 Council of Councils, and to give 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:** Okay, thanks Andy. You mentioned something, in some of these other reports, 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 issues that are facing us. And we’ve found in that there is tremendous commonality. 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. So, I’ll look forward to your reports.

**L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – walk-in**

**J. Peters:** Okay, I don’t know if Todd is here, but there is a walk-in SPS Staff Council report. Is anyone filling in for Todd?

**Unidentified Speakers: Inaudible.**

**J. Peters:** We have, I see we have, I was going to say old SPS people, but SPS people with tenure.

**D. Haliczer:** Some of us are older than others, right? This is Donna Smith, our Vice President, and Deborah Haliczer, and we are here subbing for Todd. You can read Todd’s report which at the end summarizes some of the issues that the Council will be addressing in the next year. Todd says to say, “Hi.” He is out representing NIU at the schools.

**J. Peters:** Good, okay.

**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: Okay, again, 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 off of the University Council website if you ever want to see the committees and who is on them. As we go along, there have been a number of changes in the way those committees are comprised and the titles of people that we have just approved in the Consent Agenda have changed. So, we thought it was time to start going through that book and bringing it up to date to reflect the situation that we currently find in those various committees. The reason we split these off is because name changes, for example, if the person who used to do it was a director and now it’s a vice provost, we saw those as name changes. But, if it was something more substantive such as this particular position doesn’t, says it has to be done by a specific person but doesn’t allow that person to name an alternate and they want to change it to include an alternate, we saw that as a little more substantive. We really didn’t think the Council would have trouble with this, but we thought that we would at least give an opportunity for anyone who did have a problem with it to raise those concerns. So, the idea was for you to take a look at those and to see if you have any concerns with them. If there are concerns, we have to 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 and I think that would be the most efficient way to do it. So, hopefully people have had a look at those. Again, I don’t think there is anything urgent here. We couldn’t find anything terrible about them but then, often I don’t see something as being a problem and somebody else says, “What, are you nuts? There is something terribly wrong with that.” So, just to make sure that the Council had an opportunity to raise objections, we put them in this New Business instead of the Consent Agenda. So, if people have problems, raise them. If not, we’ll take a motion to adopt these changes as well. Yes, Donna.

D. Smith: So moved.

A. Rosenbaum: So, you are moving the adoption of all of these changes in block? We need a second.

S. Willis: Second.

A. Rosenbaum: Sue Willis second. Discussion?

J. Peters: Comments?

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: Yes. Well, the explanation, do you see the explanation down in the note?
K. Thu: Okay.

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. In many of these cases, they’ve actually already made these changes and they’ve been operating under these changes without our approval anyway. So, not all of them are awaiting our action. We will now have a Committee Book that at least reflects a little bit better. You also, by the way, these are not the only changes, so we’ll probably, as we go through the year, be bringing other changes like these to the Council for ultimate approval. Any other discussion of any of these items?

J. Peters: Okay, raise the vote. All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed? Alright, we accept those. Is there any other new business to come before the House?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: How about comments or questions from the floor? Yes, Sue Willis?

S. Willis: I would just like to ask members of the Rules and Governance Committee to come see me very briefly at the end so we can schedule a meeting.

J. Peters: All right, Sue Willis has asked Rules and Governance Committee members to caucus after to set dates for meetings.

K. Brandt: I would also like to ask please the members for Academic Policy.


K. Brandt: If you could also meet with me please.

J. Peters: Okay, so noted and do that. Anybody else? Comments, questions?

A. Rosenbaum: Also, at the present, 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.

J. Peters: Great, alright.

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: All right, hear motion to adjourn.

K. Thu: So moved.

?? : Second

J. Peters: All those in favor say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: We’re adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.