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I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: I call the University Council Wednesday, February 27, 2013 meeting to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: Our first item is adoption of the agenda. There is one walk-in item at your desk. It goes  
under VI, G, 2, and it’s a statement of priorities from Space Budget that we’ll want to discuss. It  
will require a motion, discussion and vote. That’s under VI. G. 2. That’s the only addition. Is  
there a motion to adopt the agenda?

Z. Bohn: So moved.

J. Peters: Okay.

D. LeFlore: Second, LeFlore.

J. Peters: All those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.
J. Peters: Opposed? Abstain?

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 30, 2013 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

J. Peters: You have been distributed previously, electronically, the minutes of the January 30, 2013 meeting. I’ll call for additions or corrections. Hearing none I’ll entertain a motion to approve those minutes.

A. Small: So move.

J. Peters: We got a motion second?

D. LeFlore: Second, LeFlore.

J. Peters: All those in favor say aye.

Members: Aye.


IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: Well, welcome everyone. This is March, we have snow. I hope everyone has been safe. We had to cancel classes last night. I hope that didn’t create a hardship for anyone but the roads were …. I might dwell on that a minute. We have a very sophisticated system. We monitor, we have one of the best meteorologists in the world, Gilbert, who monitors these things. I have several people involved. I see Steve Cunningham is the point person, but the academic folks are involved and the business people are involved. Don’t forget we have campuses in the region. You have to coordinate. We always have to remember that, even if we close operations, we still have to remain open because we have 6,000 or 7,000 inmates that are here. We have to feed them. We essentially never close, no matter what, because of that. We put a premium on sidewalks, parking lots, and making sure that we’re safe. We monitor the routes because we have a lot of people on the roads. We’ve done a very good job, I think, there is a lot of information that we put out. We try to make quick decisions and yesterday we made a timely decision. But normally we don’t close. We would be the last to close because of the fact that we are 24/7. There were a lot of people working all night to keep us warm and to clear and I want to thank them. Things look pretty good to me today. You want to add anything to that Steve? And then the academic folks they have huge input into this. They make the decision on when we shut classes down. We may advise them on the administrative side about what we’re looking at in terms of weather moving in and roads, but they make that decision.

S. Cunningham: Yeah, we go through quite a process and, Ray, we consulted yesterday afternoon and made the decision, just because the weather system hit us a little more strongly
than we thought it would, so we took account of that. To reiterate, the grounds department and physical plant did a great job of clearing things. They were getting ahead of it even before the storm got very much under way. They do great work.

**J. Peters:** And I don’t know how to put this, but we are cognizant of what those around us are doing, but that is not the driver here. It’s: Do we have parking lots clean? Do we have salt? Are things cleared? Are the busses running? The Huskie bus line, that’s a key. But we listen to what other people are doing, but we’ll be the last to close because I get questions all the time. I remember the time that, it was years ago, we shut down the Monday of finals and that worked because Friday was a swing day for finals so we could just push everything by one except for the law students. I was walking across campus and there were a bunch of them outside smoking cigarettes very angry at me because they were ready for their final. I’m a bad president, what can I say?

I don’t have anything formal today except to say, this is the silly season. There are literally hundreds of bills in the state legislature that many of which are germane to higher education. And we are tracking them, analyzing them, and waiting to see what happens. Our hearings on our budget, appropriation hearings, have not been scheduled. We presume those will be toward the end of March given the fact that the budget message I think soon. I don’t exactly when the budget message is. Do you know that, Steve?

**S. Cunningham:** Its next week.

**J. Peters:** Next week is the budget and that kind of kicks things off. Although, we have received instructions, I think I’ve covered this before, from the governor’s Office of Management and Budget through the Illinois Board of Higher Education, to submit a general revenue budget; that’s the state GRF budget, of a reduction of 4.62 percent from last year’s number, which was a 6.2 percent reduction. The vice presidents are working on developing contingencies. It’s too early to know, but remember last year – and I covered this in some detail in January – our opening condition from the governor was a flat budget and the legislature cut us 6.2 percent. So this year we are starting out with the governor reducing by 4.62 percent. So we’ve got our work cut out for us. We are being very, very careful. A flat budget would be a miracle at this point. We’re preparing for a budget reduction and they are doing that right now. That kind of dominates right now.

It’s also the time, there’s a new legislators, so there is a lot of education, appropriate education that’s going on. For instance, you will see that Dr. Williams is not here or Kelly, our vice president for student affairs, is not here. They’ve been called to Springfield to give testimony before a joint meeting of the House and Senate Higher Education Committees. This is just breaking news so I’m kind of looking to Steve who is giving me this information. There are a couple of issues. Eddie has to talk about truth-in-tuition and tuition and other budgetary matters; and Kelly is talking about the issue of textbook costs have risen again. This happens about every two or three years as we work on that, we have a pretty good story to tell, but it isn’t as if we control textbook costs, but it’s an issue out there. And so there are those kinds of substantive type. They’re really not substantive, they’re informational hearings basically for new members.
We’re going to begin the process of preparing our testimony for the appropriation hearings. And you never know what questions you’re going to get, but we will make the same pitch we usually make about our need for resources, our efficiency, what our priorities are, how we’re handling the cuts. They’ll want to know about tuition.

Then there’s a whole range of things that we have to deal with. For instance, there are bills out there about elimination of the dependency waivers, which are a very important thing to us. I think they’re employment contracts, to tell you the truth. We are going to have to defend those. There’s talk about how many waivers we give for tuition. That’s an issue that is out there. MAP funding. So it’s really too early to tell, specifically, but we have to prepare for it all. We’ve done so over the years and we’ve got a pretty good story to tell, but then again you never know. Those are some of the budgetary things that are out there, that concern us.

We are still focused very, very much on pensions. I haven’t had a chance to analyze it, but yesterday a new bill was dropped in which was a bipartisan bill that is supposed to save $30 billion, and Representative Cross and Representative Nekritz filled it and that’s on the House side and we’ll have to analyze that but … Do you have any comments on that, Steve, because I know there’s a new tier three and there’s some new wrinkles.

**S. Cunningham:** Just that it’s significant because it was jointly sponsored by Elaine Nekritz who is the chair of the House Pensions and Personnel Committee and Leader Cross, Tom Cross, Republican leader of the House. The fact that both parties are co-sponsoring the bill, there are a number of sponsors that have signed on to the bill, so it will become a dominant bill along with Senate Bill 1 which was introduced by the senate earlier in the year. Basically, it is very similar to Senate Bill 60 and 73 that was introduced in the January session and was not moved. And we will get information out about it, but it essentially would reduce COLA coverage and limit pensionable income for tier one participants and make some other changes in terms of age to retirement and so on. It’s structured very similar to proposals we’ve seen before. With the president’s leadership, we are working with the sponsors of the bill and have been for some time and will continue to work on it with the process as it goes forward.

**J. Peters:** Our approach is to stay in contact with them and stay involved and to participate whenever we have an opportunity and to seek information in a rapidly changing field. From my perspective as a political scientist, it does all come down to mathematics. It does come down to putting a vote together. What package will garner enough votes, irrespective of the constitutionality and all of that? They want to try and pass something. We’re monitoring it. That sounded cynical, it’s not really cynical, it’s just the way things are, and we’re monitoring it. Do you want to add anything about pensions?

**S. Cunningham:** Just that we will, we see this legislative session, there’s a great deal of pressure for the need for some form of pension reform enacted. We’ve been working on this now pretty steadily for the last 18 months as the president has reported to the council many times. There are currently a wide number of proposals out there. At this stage, we are monitoring those, working closely with the other coalitions, labor coalition and community colleges, of course, the presidents and chancellors and the legislature. We’ll keep the campus very informed. We are
reaching a period of time, though, where this is going to become very relevant to the state budget process. There will be a lot of pressure to enact something.

**J. Peters:** I’ve been spending a lot of time, and then Alan has a question, I’ve been spending a lot of time with annuitants and others asking them: Sooner or later there has to be some sort of resolution of this and what sorts of issues, what sorts of elements, might they want to see in a bill understanding that almost anything that goes through is going to be tested constitutionally in the courts? But what is it that seems reasonable? And I’ve been listening and there’s no consensus on that. I think that represents to the policymakers how difficult this situation is. The presidents and myself, I continue to support things such as the cost shift, but I do not publically support anything that would take away a constitutionally guaranteed benefit. We’ll have to work within that and see what happens. But I’m listening and I’m out there listening and I’m getting a good feel for what our folks think, particularly the annuitants who are on fixed incomes. They’re scared. They really are, particularly those who have increasing medical bills. I only have this for 121 days, the bully pulpit here, and I want to tell you, as a public employee who has health care like many of you do, and who had to use it this summer for some medical care, to put up with the indignity of the state not paying bills and to be treated as if you were on relief or something, is quite an indignity. I’m really quite upset about it personally. I’m trying to display that anger about that to any politician I see no matter what their strife, friend or foe, this really can’t go on. It’s giving the state a bad name. It really is. Go ahead.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I just have one question, Steve. For these suggestions such as increasing the retirement age or putting a cap on retirement income, are they talking about that now in terms of people who are already in the system, or is this just for new hires that will be coming on after they pass the bill?

**S. Cunningham:** The proposals all are – this particular one is House Bill 3411, by the way the most recent one – would enact these changes for current employees as well as future employees. It would implement a tier three which would be a new hybrid plan combination defined benefit, defined contribution for all new employees or current employees who elected to transfer into tier three, but in terms of the so called planned designed features, this being the pensionable income, the cost of living limitations, etc., those would apply to all employees, tier one participants who have not yet retired. And the COLA limitations would apply to personnel who have already retired as well. It’s a very substantial reduction in benefits as the president indicated. There are serious constitutional issues with that. It is associated with a stronger funding plan, a more guaranteed funding plan, but again that’s already the state’s responsibility.

**J. Peters:** That is the guarantee that the state will pay what they say they are going to pay for the unfunded liability or whatever, is looming as a key ingredient on the part of those of us in the system, unions, that the state live up to its obligation and is there, can the state ever give a guarantee on anything? Is that full faith in credit? I suppose, but that’s becoming, I don’t know, Steve, if you agree with that, that’s the one thing I hear, that’s a key element to this.

**S. Cunningham:** It is, and any proposal to be taken seriously by the General Assembly or the different coalitions, including us, must have a very solid funding guarantee that provides almost
for a interceptive funding if the state has not appropriated the funding and needs to. That’s now becoming a common feature.

**J. Peters:** Any other pension type question? Moving along from the state level to the federal level, there’s, of course, an issue coming this Friday I believe it is, which is the sequestration issue where there has to be an automatic $85 billion cut because they haven’t agreed upon a budget. There is a continuing resolution that avoided the fiscal cliff in January that pushed it out to, I believe, March 27. So they hit a date based on an agreement that was previously made that sequesters $85 billion for this year if agreement has not been made to cut the budget in other ways. Depending on where you are on this, it takes a rather, it’s been referred to journalistically as a meat-axe approach to cuts, huge cuts to defense and we’ve been monitoring this as our associations, federal APLU all ACE, American Council on Education, have been monitoring this and we’ve all been lobbying because there is impact in two areas, at least two. And then there are the indirect impacts. One is student aid and a lot of student aid programs. And then the other is our federal research dollars. And as we have it, just back from the wars in Washington D.C. where she was briefed on this, is our vice president for research, Lisa Freeman. And I’ve asked her to give you an update on this. I don’t know if you’re going to talk about the student aid side or not.

**L. Freeman:** I’ll talk about the student programs but not student aid if that’s okay. I am just back this morning from Washington, DC and I can tell you that the weather there is better than in Illinois, but the political climate and craziness not so much. If you remember, the Budget Control Act of 2011, which proposed these cuts, very deep cuts as President Peters has told us in both defense and non-defense discretionary spending, so domestic programs other than entitlements, like federal support for research through the agencies like the National Institutes for Health and the National Science Foundation and the Department of Ed. When they passed this act, the thought was these cuts are so un-strategic and poorly conceived that nobody would ever let them go through and it’s pretty obvious now that they are going to go through on March 1, which is fairly deep into the federal fiscal year which normally runs from October 1 to September 30.

There are a couple of questions that we’re all asking ourselves. The first one is: What does this mean for NIU and our faculty and students this year? The agencies have not all issued guidance on how they will make up this difference this far into the fiscal year. The National Institutes for Health has indicated that they will stop awarding new grants and they will decrease the amount of incremental funding. So non-competitive grants that are coming in for the second or third year of the three-year award will be decreased. We actually do not have that many grants in this category. We’re fairly well protected there.

The National Science Foundation, where we have a much larger portfolio, have indicated they will not issue new grants this year, but incremental funding is safe for at least FY 13 so that’s helpful to us. We have not heard yet what the Department of Education will do. We have $4.5 million in incremental funding in Department of Education grants and that funds things like Upward Bound training grants and student support services. So it pays students, it pay graduate students and we’re watching this very carefully so that we can mitigate the impact. We have 67 proposals pending with the federal agencies totaling $36 million and that’s largely NSF, NIH and
the Department of Education. And that doesn’t count subcontracts and flow-through that we have when we partner with other institutions. That has the potential to be a very large impact in FY 13 and into 14.

Even as I tell you this, I think that we all need to really remember that the biggest issues is not FY 13 or FY 14, but the Budget Control Act and Sequestration is a nine-year process of across-the-board cuts and the thing that we want to be saying to the media is that this is a very poor decision to make because fundamental research drives our economy. It’s the backbone of innovation. It creates jobs. It generates economic growth and, while we’re pulling back, our competitors in India and China are investing very heavily and we will be mortgaging the future of our students and our country if we continue down this path.

While I know everybody wants to know what’s going to happen to my grant and what’s going to happen to the student services that my students rely on, I think it’s very important to remember that we need to be ambassadors for universities as places where knowledge is created and the future is created. Because every time you pick up your cell phone and you use the GPS or you use the transmitter, that was fundamental research, funded by the Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation and NASA that lets you do that and that’s a good example I think to give other people. I’d be happy to take questions if anyone has them.

**J. Peters:** The APLU in particular the universities have banded together to try and demonstrate the difficulties for our basic R&D in this country if our agencies, our grant agencies NSF and IH, are cut this way over the next ten years. This is every year for ten years. We’re going in a ten-year cycle. It will be devastating. Remember, we are a student-centered university, but we’re an engaged university. Our value-added is we get our students, undergraduate students, involved in research and other activities of our faculty and we are a vibrant graduate and professional institution. We are a research institution. We are not an undergraduate institution. We’re a research institution who takes advantage of that at the undergraduate level. That is what makes us distinct.

There are four public research universities in the state, Urbana which is the AAU; UIC; Southern Illinois Carbondale; and us, we are in that category. Therefore, we don’t talk about it very much. We probably should talk about it more. We attract the kind of faculty who can deliver on the engagement situation, promise for our students and the whole infrastructure of American public research higher education, the land grant system and others, are built on federal dollars that support our programs because the state can’t afford them. We can’t afford on our own to invest in these research activities where research dollars are necessary. I don’t know what the dollar impact is. Did you say what the dollars impact might be on us this year?

**L. Freeman:** This year, if you consider pending grants, we’re upwards of $30 million. If you just look at incremental funding, we’re probably below $10 million.

**J. Peters:** So, this will ripple through and have an effect. Maybe next year as new grants, they are just going to contract the portfolio. I remember last year I think in my discipline they tried to eliminate NSF funding for political science.
L. Freeman: That’s still on the table.

J. Peters: That’s still on the table. I’m not happy about that. I had NSF grants. But you see the seriousness of it. So we are watching that one very, very carefully. On the aid side, we take a hit on work study almost immediately. Steve, do you have any impact on work study? Then down the road, although the president, Obama, has tried to protect student aid, it will be a target down the road.

S. Cunningham: All those things are targeted. We’ve already received our work study allocation for the year fiscal 13 so chances are that will remain intact. But fiscal 14 is certainly going to be at risk and we did receive a reduction in work study at the beginning of fiscal 13 as well.

J. Peters: So, you know, if you think about this, there is time to repair all this between Friday and the 27th of March when they have to do something about the concurrent resolution. We don’t have a federal budget right now. We’re working under a concurrent resolution to spend. So if they don’t do that then, as you know, this has gotten horribly political, almost totally political. Any questions on any of that wonderful news?

I’d like Alan to give an update on the presidential search process if you have anything and Steve is staff to that, but Jerry Blakemore who is fundamentally involved is not here. He is doing a legal matter for me.

A. Rosenbaum: Before I talk about the search, I just want to point out that, as you can see, we’re now projecting the agenda on the screen with our newly acquired projector and also that this will be the last month that you will get a printed agenda in the mail unless you send an e-mail to Pat and tell her that you want a printed agenda. But if you don’t do that, then the way that you will get the agenda will be electronically, including all its attachments. We are encouraging people to download it to iPads and laptops because we can’t project all of the different items from the agenda onto the screen. This is the last time so, if you want printed agenda, make sure you send Pat an e-mail and we will put you on a large list that will be publically displayed that you have no interest in protecting the environment.

J. Peters: Tell us what you really think about this?

A. Rosenbaum: Well we’ve been getting a lot of pressure to reduce the amount of paper that we use so this is kind of a response to becoming more eco-friendly.

The search committee. We are at the final stages of the search right now. This Friday we will have our meeting where we select those people that are going be invited for airport interviews. We currently have 48 completed applications and it will be the job of the search committee to winnow those down to somewhere around eight plus or minus people who will be invited to come to the airport interviews next Thursday and Friday. That will be the 7th and 8th of March. And at the conclusion of the airport interviews, which will hopefully we are hoping the weather doesn’t throw us a curveball, but assuming that it doesn’t, the search committee will complete its
work on the evening of March 8. At that point, we will turn over to the Board of Trustees a short list that will have four, plus or minus, candidates that we feel the Board of Trustees should begin processing for their selection process. Once we give them that short list, the matter is out of the hands of the search committee and it becomes the domain of the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees has not, at this point, finalized the process that they will engage in from that point on. The expectation is that they will be meeting shortly, possibly tomorrow, after the sub-committee meetings to finalize the plan for interviewing the finalists for the position. Although I don’t know what the Board of Trustees is planning to do, I can tell you that the recommendation of this search committee and apparently what is typically done in universities, who are looking for presidents these days, is to handle the final interviews in a very confidential manner. That probably means, although it doesn’t definitely mean, but it probably means that we will not have open forum at the university for people to attend. But rather there will be a confidential vetting process by which different interest groups in the university will be invited. Again, that is not definite; it’s up to the Board of Trustees how to proceed. If they choose to interview the candidates and make a selection by themselves, they have the right to do that. The search process is really coming to a head now and we should be having some word on the remainder of the process within the next couple of weeks and the expectation is that the board will try to make an appointment probably by early April so that the negotiation can begin and we have an opportunity to get the new president in place for July 1. That’s about all I can say about it but if you have a questions I might be able to answer it.

**J. Peters:** Okay, thank you. I’m not a formal part of the process. I’ll probably meet with the finalists and answer any questions they have and provide transition.

**V. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 3

**J. Peters:** Okay, we have no consent agenda. Let’s move to reports. We have Sonya, Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE. Sonya, are you here? You have a report on page 3, go ahead.

**S. Armstrong:** I wasn’t able to attend the meeting so I really don’t have any additional insights but I can certainly answer questions on this report and also if you have questions that you would like me to take back for our next meeting at Joliet I can do that as well.

**J. Peters:** Okay, Sonya’s doing a good job. I see her at those meetings. She stays to the end and I don’t.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas –


no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Sean Farrell, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair

1. Report – Pages 4-6

[Based on Steve Cunningham’s clarification during the discussion on item 3.c in the report, the original report was revised and re-submitted by RSB Chair Paul Carpenter.]

J. Peters: All right moving on then to Paul Carpenter for Resource, Space and Budget Committee, we have a report and a proposal.

P. Carpenter: Thank you. We first turn to the report which is Item G. 1. This is a report of a meeting the committee had with the president and provost. I think the report is fairly self-explanatory. There is one item on the report, 3. c., and as Steve Cunningham is here, maybe I can ask him to clarify that point. There were some questions about the percentage number there.

S. Cunningham: Okay, the 8.5 percent, that is. We, in the committee, we discussed the increment allocations to faculty over the three fiscal years because the university has been allocating resources to supplement faculty increment programs since 2011. We’ve done that before. We’ve done it for Civil Service in the past, we’ve done it for SPS in past, and we have been, as part of our planning, allocating resources toward faculty during the last three fiscal years. Those increments have totaled 8.5 percent which, as we commented to the committee, is extremely competitive. In fact, I don’t know of any public university in the state that can match that. Again that’s always a tenuous competitive analysis in terms of how well we do in terms of faculty and all salaries but that number is specific to faculty and Ray is correct, it’s total not average.

A. Rosenbaum: And you mention three years but this says 2011, 2012, so what’s the third year? S. Cunningham: its fiscal 11 through fiscal 12 and going into fiscal 13. I’m just counting backwards since its fiscal 13, fiscal 11, fiscal 12 and now we’re in fiscal 13. That’s really a two year total, you’re correct Alan.

2. Proposed Statement of Budget Priorities – walk-in

P. Carpenter: Okay, if there are any questions on the remainder of the report I’d be happy to entertain them otherwise I’ll move on to the budget recommendations. Do we need the motion first?
A. Rosenbaum: You could make the motion first, yes.

P. Carpenter: Motion to approve the recommendations as brought forward by the Committee for Resource, Space and Budget.

T. Latham: Second.

J. Peters: Okay it’s been seconded. Now, Paul, do you want to make some comments?

P. Carpenter: I’ll make some brief comments first if I may. The committee met several times over the course of the year. Those meetings included a number of representatives from the university administration. We’ve also met with the president and provost a few times as well. Based upon those meetings and input from the members of the committee, we formulated these recommendations. They’ve been presented to the Faculty Senate Steering [Executive] Committee and some suggestions were made from that body and also from the University Council Steering Committee and then last week it was presented to Faculty Senate. They, too, made some suggestions and the document you have in front of you now has incorporated all that feedback.

J. Peters: So, this is a clean copy with all that input?

P. Carpenter: I hope so.

A. Rosenbaum: And we should add that the Faculty Senate endorsed this as well. To just give a little perspective on this, this is the way that we engage in shared governance around the budgetary issues. The various employee constituent groups don’t create the budget, but we try to give a sense of how we feel the budget priorities are to be arranged. This is, I think, the third year that we have done this and so this is a very positive step that the Resources, Space and Budget provides our voice to the Finance, Facilities and Operations people and also to the president regarding how we feel the university should allocate its resources. It’s a very positive thing and we’re asking the University Council to give its approval to this as well.

J. Peters: All right, there are questions directed to Paul?

S. Farrell: Given the eloquent statements about research and scholarship which were made recently, the fact that there’s no mention of research in this page and a half struck me as interesting. I wonder if you could respond to that.

P. Carpenter: It was never an item that was brought up by the committee or anyone else so that’s why it’s not here. But my understanding is that part of the purpose today is to add those items, if this body felt that was appropriate. So I would, on the committee’s behalf, entertain any statement to be added to this to that effect.

A. Rosenbaum: Maybe you could clarify how you would like research incorporated into this document.
**S. Farrell:** If we’re talking budget priorities I would at least want some kind of a mention of a commitment to maintaining this institution as a research institution. Both Lisa and John talked about different ways of allocating that given the things that are listed here. That just struck me. I’ve only read this for the first time here and it struck me that, given this institution as a Ph.D.-granting institution in many plays, I’d like at least some kind of statement of a maintained commitment to this as center of research and creation of knowledge.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Maybe we should get more microphones.

**M. Theodore:** I’m wondering, looking at the top, would simply adding a need to prioritize to safeguard the teaching and research commission. Do you think that would be a broad enough statement that would cover the priority of research? Or do you want an actual specific thing in there for research?

**S. Farrell:** Well, I’d rather have a separate bullet for some commitment to it, but I’d rather have teaching and research than nothing.

**L. Freeman:** And artistry.

**S. Farrell:** And artistry.

**M. Theodore:** Yeah, so unless there’s any other suggestions going on, I just suggest adding a priority to safeguard the teaching, research and possibly artistry but I’ll see what everyone else’s opinion is.

**J. Peters:** Is that a friendly amendment to Paul?

**P. Carpenter:** Certainly.

**J. Peters:** So it now reads, teaching, research and artistry mission.

**S. Farrell:** This type of wordsmithing of the groups always ends badly. Would it be possible to send that back for a revision with that recommendation to wordsmith this in a subcommittee or what’s the timing on that?

**J. Peters:** Well, I don’t know about timing but we do – the operating procedure we’ve got a motion on this, we have a second and discussion. We’re supposed to have a vote so we’d have to lay it on the table and send it back.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think the timing of this was arranged such that it would be given to the president and to Dr. Williams in time for the budget considerations for this year and I think we were told that we needed to have it to them. This is the last meeting. I think, that we can do it and still get it to them on time. But what we can do is something we did in senate, which was – and, of course, Ferald can tell us if this is okay – we can take these suggestions back to the committee, trust the committee to make some of those changes, approve it sort of in principle and then we
can make sure that there is inclusion of the items that people are agreed upon.

**S. Farrell:** I guess I’d be much more comfortable with procedure rather than try to wordsmith on the fly as a group if our parliamentarian is cool with that.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, we did it in senate, so he better be cool with it.

**F. Bryan:** All of our discussions, since they are on the record, officially form a basis; and then the committee can look to improve the language. So, if it’s the will of this body to have that record inform the writing of this revision of this, then it’s certainly acceptable.

**J. Peters:** If I could offer something, my interpretation of this, because if I’m going to be guided by this, this bullet on resources, which is the top bullet, says to me: protect the teaching mission of the university. That’s what it says. It doesn’t say protect the research mission. You would as it might involve engagement, but it doesn’t talk about pure investment in research activities or artistry and I think that’s your point. That argues then for a separate item and the friendly amendment really doesn’t quite speak to that. That’s just someone with 121 days left.

**R. Alden:** Just getting some wordsmithing and I know we said we weren’t going to try and do this, but at least to go on the record from Lisa. Perhaps we need to replace teaching with academic mission of the university and after welfare put research and artistry and improving the academic quality of these programs. And that covers the full richness of this integration that we want to have between research and teaching and the whole creative process.

**D. LeFlore:** Would you repeat that one more time?

**R. Alden:** The revised suggestion, and again it’s just a suggestion, is overall budget allocation needs to be prioritized to safeguard the academic mission of the university including those programs and services directly related to student learning and welfare comma, research and artistry and improving the academic quality of these programs. I mean it’s a little bit redundant but if it’s going to go back to the committee, if we decide to do that, at least you can get a sense of trying to incorporate it all in one bullet, but maybe it should be in two bullets.

**J. Peters:** So, my interpretation, the sense of that, is you’re protecting the academic mission of the university as defined by teaching, research and service. We can’t protect everything. Remember that, that’s the difficulty here. Do you accept that?

**R. Alden:** I didn’t make it out as a motion. I’ll leave that up to someone else.

**P. Carpenter:** It works for me. Sean was the person who raised this.

**S. Farrell:** That’s acceptable.

**J. Peters:** Promod wants to say something. He wants engineering in there.
P. Vohra: Since this is gonna go back to the committee, I think we

J. Peters: We don’t know that. We don’t know if it’s going to go back to the committee.

P. Vohra: When I look at this document, two of the documents that we have worked to prepare in the last three to four years have been Strategic Journey and Vision 2020. Isn’t that what our priorities are on this campus? There is not a single mention of those two documents in this priority. I think the committee should look at this very seriously and try to incorporate what the whole campus, including faculty, staff and administrators, did in terms of how we move forward. This appears to be a separate document than what we did in Strategic Journey, strategic planning, create journeys and also Vision 2020. We cannot create a separate sheet of priorities when we already have a priority. It’s just mentioned one time in one bullet.

A. Rosenbaum: Also, I don’t think we’re creating a separate sense of priorities. This is not supposed to summarize everything that’s going on on campus. This is supposed to represent the input of the faculty, SPS and operating staff regarding what we feel should be considered. It’s not a binding document in any sense. It’s trying to get a sense of what we feel the administration ought to consider in the budgeting process.

P. Vohra: One of the struggles we are having is that, to have funding allocated to the priorities that we identified in those two processes – and we would hope, certainly, as an NIU community between faculty, staff and everybody that those will become the priorities because they were decided by a lot of people working together for a long period of time. So if those priorities are not a part of the priorities that we give to the senior level administration about funding, and about supporting those, why did we get engaged in those activities for a long time?

P. Carpenter: I don’t know if I am in a position to answer any of Promod’s questions there. I would suggest, though, that many of the items that are on this list are already embedded in the Vision 2020 plan and many of the items here are things that are already in process. So I don’t think the two documents are completely different or unique. I think there’s a lot of overlap, but this came out of the committee. These were the items that were discussed and talked about at the committee.

P. Vohra: Well, to me, they are paired different enough to warrant a second look at the document and then re-evaluating what you are prioritizing.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, if there are other comments, if people don’t want to vote for it then they will not do so.

J. Peters: So, we have some accepted edited language. More discussion? Are we ready to vote? Okay, we have a question.

Z. Bohn: The item that we’re voting on, does that include the suggested amendments? Okay that was the only clarification I wish to make.
J. Peters: It’s a friendly amendment that was an editorial amendment that clarified, we’re talking about the academic mission, which is inclusive of research, teaching and artistry. Yes?

D. Cho: One of the Vision 2020 items was focusing on enhancing the honors program, and I was wondering if we could include the University Honors Program in this priority items.

J. Peters: Well it’s the space committee’s advisory set of principles and priorities and I think my guess is that would be embedded in protecting the teaching mission. And, if a document like this is going to be useful, it can’t be constituency-based where everyone is protecting their own and that would be my view on that. But it’s not our document, it’s the committee’s document and they’re getting some buy-in from the University Council.

P. Carpenter: I think the intent of the committee was to try and give bullet points that were fairly inclusive. If we were to try and come up and cover every single item, I think we’d still be writing the document.

J. Peters: Well, if you read it, it’s a pretty good blueprint. What you’re saying is: Look, you’ve got to trim budgets and you’ve got to allocate money but we’re basically in the cutting budgets. It would be different if we were into allocating new money. It’s saying: Do what you can to protect our basic mission. We got space issues in deferred maintenance you ought to take care of like leaking roofs and our salaries are really important. That fits 2020, it fits everything.

T. Latham: I call the question.

N. Bender: Second.

J. Peters: The question has been called. It’s not debatable.

A. Rosenbaum: Are we ready, Pat?

J. Peters: 1 is yes. You’re voting to endorse this statement as amended. 2 is no. 3 is abstain. Ready, vote. All right, what is the tally?

1 – YES – 33
2 – NO – 10
3 – ABSTAIN – 2

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so it passes.

J. Peters: Thank you, committee. By the way, just let me say that this year the Space and Resource Budget committee, we’ve met several times and we have had just really fundamentally good meetings. They are serving you well. They are asking tough questions and contributing. I appreciate that. We appreciate this set of priorities as well.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Melissa Lenczewski, Chair – no report
I. University Affairs Committee – Kathleen Coles, Chair – no report

J. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and James Zanayed, Speaker – report

J. Peters: Okay, we now move to J. I think Delonte is going to give the Student Association report.

D. LeFlore: Good afternoon everyone. First and foremost I want to thank you all for closing down the campus yesterday.

J. Peters: For closing it down or not closing it down?

D. LeFlore: For, for classes. It was a great gift.

J. Peters: Thank you. I take full credit.

D. LeFlore: Secondly, elections are coming up.

J. Peters: You must have had a big test or something that got canceled?

D. LeFlore: No it was law class. Elections are coming up. We had one candidate meeting that was on Monday and we had another one yesterday that got canceled. So far, we have ten candidates who attended the meeting. The next meeting will be next Thursday. Right now we’re reviewing, I’m sorry this Thursday. Sorry about that.

Right now we’re reviewing student organizations and departments’ budgets before we go forth to the senate. The finance committee has pretty much viewed, I want to say, maybe 70 percent of the budget allocations process right now. We’re in a tough situation because we’re trying to predict enrollment for next year to make sure that we’re still aligned within the budget but also give us wriggle room if we do come up short from that particular goal that we are basing our budget off.

Next we purchased, we are in the process of purchasing, a new database called OrgSync and OrgSync will allow us to interact with our organizations and departments better. It provides them opportunity to interact with their organization and also allows us to do online voting instead of going to the voting polls and vote. This is something that a lot of student government bodies are doing across the country and I think this will definitely be able to solve some of our communication issues that we are facing with students.

In addition to that, we are continuing to working to address our bus concerns. This year some of our students have experienced bus route cuts due to the budget and the cost of fuel inflations. Right now we are looking at trying to determine this year, we’re going to turn it over to the next administration for next year, is determining the mission of the bus. The sole mission – is it to serve the students? Is it to serve the community? Is it to take us to Wal-Mart? Is it to take us to
Schnucks? What is the mission because right now we are stretched so thin and we forgot what was the mission of the Huskie bus. So we are going to reevaluate that and that’s going to take a three- to four-year process to determine how we are going to continue to move forward with our bus service.

The next project we are going to continue to work with is the amnesty policy. We’ve been working with both NIU and the DeKalb chiefs, student affairs, conduct, everyone, to be able to figure out a good policy that we could put in place here and benchmarking other institutions and how they are implementing this amnesty policy and looking at current laws that support certain things that we are trying to do under this.

In addition to that, this month I met with, there were a few students who met with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the committee, to be able to talk to them about some of the issues we are facing in higher education. Figuring out ways that we can increase involvement in the SAC committee, the Student Advisory Committee to the IBHE and coming up with ways they can better support that committee and really trying to get universities to really invest in it because they lost the importance of that particular committee and so they are trying to come up with ways to build that back up. And also we were able to highlight some of the things that we are doing here at NIU and they were really impressed by that. I think that’s it. Are there any questions for me?

**J. Peters:** Questions for Delonte?

**D. LeFlore:** I yield.

**J. Peters:** That’s right, you mentioned the trustee committee meetings tomorrow and this is the time of year where the finance committee, facilities and finance, will hear the recommendations on student fees. That’s tomorrow and that’s at the end of a long process. Based on action of that committee, it will go to the full board on March 22. I think that’s when the meeting is. The students work real hard at that.

**K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – Page 7**

**J. Peters:** Okay, now, if there are no questions, Andy Small Operating Staff Council report.

**A. Small:** Good afternoon everyone. Thank you President Peters. I have a written report there. I’d be happy to entertain any questions that you may have on the report otherwise just a couple of quick notes.

I’d like to publically thank President Peters for attending our council meeting last month. The fireside chat that we were able to have with you was very much appreciated and thank you so much. And we certainly wish you well in your endeavors as you continue your planning for retirement.

I also want to, Dr. Cunningham if you’ll correct me if I’m wrong, but I understand that there’s a
potential issue on the Board of Trustees agenda tomorrow. It deals with vacation accrual for exempt versus non-exempt operating staff employees. Briefly, exempt employees were able to accumulate 56 days vacation towards retirement; non-exempt are able to accumulate 50 days towards retirement. This has been a proposal that we have been working on for a number of years and it is finally coming to fruition with the Board of Trustee meeting tomorrow. We want to publically thank Dr. Cunningham and his group for helping us push that forward.

S. Cunningham: And President Peters.

A. Small: And President Peters, yes, of course, and the rest of the administration, obviously. One more quick note, there are a couple more days left if you have an outstanding Civil Service employee in your department. The outstanding service awards submissions, I believe the deadline is March 1. If you have anybody that you think deserves a nomination in your department, please get those nominations in to help acknowledge the outstanding work of the staff in your department. With that, I yield. Or, if there is any questions, I’ll be glad to try and answer them.

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 8

J. Peters: Okay thanks Andy. Okay good work. We got Todd Latham on SPS Council report. We have a question.

D. Haliczer: I’m reporting for Todd. Todd had to leave. SPS Council’s report is attached in your packet. What we wanted to highlight was our intense concern at efforts to eliminate the dependent tuition waiver. This is a benefit that Faculty Senate and the university worked on back in the ‘90s, I think ‘95, ’96, when I was chair of University Benefits Committee then and we worked very hard to extend that so that you could go to other universities. This is a benefit that benefits many of our employees, but I may say it is our less highly compensated employees who are most likely to use that benefit. And, Steve, correct me if I am wrong, but this is a benefit that is of great interest to all employees and anything that we can do to preserve that benefit is really important to many of our colleagues.

J. Peters: Okay, questions for council?

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revisions to NIU Bylaws, Article 14.6.4 Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Pages 9-10

J. Peters: All right, moving on to unfinished business. We have a second reading of the proposed bylaw change, the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and on page 9. We discussed this last time, during first reading, and this is to, we wanted to fix up some grammatical things and also to align the APPM guidelines with the bylaws. So what we are going to need today is a
motion, and a second, discussion and a vote. It’s second reading.

A. Rosenbaum: I’ll make a motion.

J. Peters: Motion is made by Alan Rosenbaum. Is there a second?

S. Farrell: Second.

J. Peters: All right, now discussion. All right, hearing none, should we go to the clickers? The bylaw – two-thirds of those present voting?

A. Rosenbaum: Two-thirds of the University Council members.

J. Peters: Which the number is?

A. Rosenbaum: Sixty or 81. So we need 40.

J. Peters: All right. Let’s hope. 1 is yes in favor of this change. 2 is no. 3 is abstain. Ready, vote.

Pat: See up in the right hand corner, only 39 people have voted.

A. Rosenbaum: Anybody not voting? Can someone pick up a few extra clickers?

J. Peters: So parliamentarian, it fails, do we bring it back next time?

Parliamentarian: Yes.

J. Peters: All right, then that creates a different parliamentary procedure because we would have to reconsider.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

J. Peters: Any new business to come before the house? Anyone have anything for the good of the order? We have a whole series of information items. When is our next meeting? Pat do we know that? April 4 is our next meeting.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Graduate Council
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: We stand adjourned until April 4.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.