I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Willis: May I have a motion to approve the Agenda? Second? All those in favor of the Agenda, say aye. Opposed? All right.

The Agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2002 FS MEETING (Pages 3-5)

President Willis: May I have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting which appear on pages 3-5 of your extremely thin packet. Do I have a motion? Okay. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? If not, all those in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Willis: I believe we have set a record for the thinness of the packet here. So the trees are very happy and I do hope that the on-line minutes are working out. As always, if there’s anything that you would like a hard copy of, let us know and we can get it to you. We are saving a lot of money in our budget as well as trees by not printing all that stuff. I actually think it
makes it easier to figure out what we are actually doing when you don’t have to leaf through all of those pages of transcripts. Okay. I have a couple of things that I want to say. President Peters should be here soon. He does not have anything on the agenda in particular; at least not as of last Thursday he didn’t, so he’ll be open to questions. But there is something I want to say, that you will probably want to ask him about. Before we get to that I hope you’ve all seen the Committees of the University Book. This is, of course, not our official version – the official version is on-line - but nevertheless this is very nice and I would like to give a big thanks to Donna for doing all that. It’s a heroic job that she does every fall.

Last time I mentioned that there is a sweatshop committee, which is charged with ensuring that clothing and items wearing the University’s logo are not produced under sweatshop conditions. That committee needs to get back together and so I need a faculty member to replace Dan Griffiths, who is no longer a faculty member. This should only involve a couple of meetings. There is just a very brief set of issues that they need to deal with. George Shur, who chairs that committee, would like somebody to serve on that, as I say just to come to a couple of meetings. If this is an issue that is a concern to you, please let me know because I could use somebody to serve on that.

All right, the last thing that I wanted to say before the President gets here – if he doesn’t, we’ll just go on with the rest of our agenda, such as it is – is that I have spoken to him about us reviewing him and he is very much not in favor of this. When I spoke to him last spring, he thought it was all right but apparently since then he’s looked into the proceedings and the Board is very antsy about it and he feels like he is, if we insist upon it, he is being kind of stuck in the middle, between them and us and etc. and so forth. Well, the Trustees feel that he’s their responsibility since they hired him and it’s their business to evaluate him and of course, they set the salary, all of which is true, of course. What I say was “yes, of course, but we would like to have some input.” He said, “yes, but.” Essentially, the Trustees have to ask for it. I printed out the Board regulations regarding evaluation of the President, and it says that the Chair of the Board of Trustees may seek input from internal and external constituencies such as faculty, staff, students and so on and so forth as he or she deems appropriate; the President did say that he would talk to the Chair of the Board and urge him in the strongest possible way to do exactly that. He asked me in particular for input, but he thought it would be inappropriate for us to offer to without it being requested and would unnecessarily muddy the relationship, that really doesn’t need to be muddied.

A. President Peters will attend meeting

**President Willis:** I see he’s back there getting his cookies and juice so you can ask him to clarify it which he can certainly do better than I can but those are his concerns about that. Yes, Herb?

**H. Rubin:** Making sure there’s no Chronicle around. I’m hesitant because on one hand I’ve always been uncomfortable when bodies that only have passing relationships with somebody, you know, have input into an evaluation but I’m also uncomfortable in what at least I’m hearing procedurally, from the Board. I mean, Pat Henry last time was talking about the IBHE wanting evaluations this way. My Chair spent a very depressing meeting describing how everything we
do gets evaluated. We’re setting up home cycles of core stuff so everything is built in. Now, on one hand I’m begging to think the whole thing is absurd but on the other hand, what’s good for the goose is good for the gander type of logic and I think that should be communicated. I’d much rather have our Board speaking to the Higher Board but this ongoing evaluation stuff that we’re doing on everything under the sun is disruptive to our educational issue and forget everything – but if they’re not, I think we need some consistency.

**President Willis:** Okay, I see the President is hiding in the back, so –

**President Peters:** I was here listening.

**President Willis:** Yes, I know. In any case ---

**H. Rubin:** I didn’t know you were here!

**President Peters:** I was – I walked out – I wasn’t eavesdropping.

**President Willis:** We are now to your entry on the Agenda because I’ve finished with my announcements, so the President is here and I would like to ask him to explain what his view is on this evaluation issue because I’m sure he can represent his views a lot better than I can so I think that would be valuable.

**President Peters:** I’m really very glad to be here. I think I was here last spring. I am pleased to be here; I’ve got a few things I’d like to say that are either amplifications of what I said in my State of the University Address, things that were left on the “cutting room floor” that I didn’t have time to say. I was cutting as I went and there were things that I wanted to emphasize and things that are specific to faculty that I didn’t address. As I said before, I really enjoy preparing that address; it’s an all-year process for me, because I have these folders that I throw all this good news in. Then, beginning in July, I begin to build the address and ask people how we’re doing and touch base with all of our constituencies. I must admit I’m an incurable optimist even in the face of difficulty. That’s the way I’m built; that’s the way I always have been. Just walking over here and talking to students and many, many faculty, and we’ve certainly had our trials and tribulations this last year, but I’m so pleased we’re in such solid, solid shape. That’s on a day-to-day basis I feel that way. When I look back on the accomplishments I feel very, very good. So I wanted to amplify a little bit about that and I’ve got three or four points and then I’ll take questions and address this issue.

I want to focus on the academic side, because I do so much of the other sorts of things - I have to in my role. Part of my role was to move the presidency to an external role and to create an internal governing structure – administrative structure – where the provost would be the person who set the tone and the direction of the academic side with the president. So it’s been two and a half years, and I think I’ve made some strides in doing that. I want to focus on three or four things that have happened in the past two and a half years, that I think are strengthening issues, that I didn’t hit hard enough in my speech. A strengthening in terms of positioning this university to take advantage of its great potential in times of lean and in times of good. That’s what you have to do. We’re all on this earth and we’re all in our situations, when you think
about it, for a short period of time and you have to do what you can do to move these great institutions forward. You know, we have a hundred year history and all of us, you probably more than I because many of you have been here longer and will be here longer than me because I came at the end of my career, but we’ve got short periods of time to make a difference, all of us. We’re the bricks that build great institutions and it’s cyclical – in and out. I’m very pleased with where we are right now, even in view of the fact that we’ve had a tough budget cycle one year and it will be a very tough one coming up. I feel pretty good about that.

There’s a tremendous amount of effort that’s going into the NCA reaccredidation process. There’s so many good people on so many committees; I can’t begin to tell you how many committees. Most of you are on one or more; it’s a real bottom-up thing. I recently, in preparation for that, met with our liaison person who’s one of the very, very skilled people in the North Central Region; we’re picking and giving advice on who to bring in to evaluate us. I’m looking forward to that. I want to help pick the right people. One of the reports I’ve received is an evaluation of our mission statement, which is one of the things that you always do in a tenure reaccredidation. I just randomly, from the Midwest and our peer group, had mission statements from about twenty universities printed. Then I had them block off the names of the universities, and I laid them on my desk at home and one Saturday morning I read those. You can’t differentiate those mission statements much and there’s no way you could guess as to which university it is. I read one that I thought was absolutely terrible and it was one of the best Midwestern public research universities. You’d recognize it and say that’s a great university. Whereas I read this great one and yet I didn’t know the university. So it goes to show you that there is a convergence. We all want to try to be the same thing.

One of the things that’s great about NIU almost defies description, because it is so rich in what we do; it’s our job to move forward and focus a little bit more, but there’s certainly a richness and uniqueness here. I want to work real hard – and I said this last year to you – in developing a set of core values or principles that guide us. They’re there – they’re there, they just need to be shaped up and agreed to and somebody has to put them on a 3x5 card but I’m continually amazed at our commitment to social justice on this campus and our commitment to diversity in all its forms. These are core values. Academic excellence is definitely a core value but underneath that, I always see this – we are really a flexible, pragmatic, efficient university. That doesn’t mean we’re not complex; we’re very complex but I think these are hallmarks and I know this from talking to people around the state. The policy makers know that NIU usually responds in a quick manner to a question or a concern. It doesn’t take us years to respond, and that’s true for everybody, top to bottom. There are always exceptions, but I’d like to be able, as part of this NCA process, to communicate that to the outside world. The mission statement is one thing, but what kind of institution are you and what do you stand for? I think that’s more important and I think that’s a real strong suit for us.

All right, so getting into one of the strengthening moves, I think retitling the Dean of Graduate Studies, Associate Vice Provost to Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, although I never thought about it this way, when it was presented to me by the Provost, it made a lot of sense. This is definitely a strengthening move. It isn’t going to cost us any more money but really what it does, if you’re going to be a member of the land grant institutions and you’re going to be involved with Fermilab and you’re going to be involved with the other national
laboratories and if you’re going to raise more money at the federal level and deal with corporations – you need a chief research officer and that also includes the creative side. That’s a strengthening move and we had a good pool of candidates; it just didn’t work out as is often the case but I know I’m excited about helping. I write to presidents to get a very, very rich pool for this position because when you send someone to the land grant meetings the chief research officers meet and you can’t send an associate whatever. You have to have someone who speaks with authority. The other thing is we’d like to attract someone who would be a lightening rod for intellectual activity and discussion who could help faculty departments, colleges, identify research programs that need support, bring people together in interdisciplinary efforts, be our spokesperson while at the same time helping us with the thing we’re very good at. We have very strong traditional graduate programs, and we don’t want that role to be diminished in any way, but that is strong here and we need someone who can help nurture and help the Provost. This position will report to the Provost, although they’ll be on the Senior Cabinet, which is strengthening in and of itself – another academic officer on the Cabinet. Also, I’m familiar with this model and it works very well.

The other thing is external funding. We’re doing better. We’re doing better. We’re not doing as well as we need to, but we’re doing a lot better. That’s competitive R&D which is the standard by which people are usually evaluated. We’re obviously doing a lot better on earmarks and corporate. All right? It’s in balance. We have some research programs which we couldn’t support if they didn’t attract external funding. We wouldn’t be in the business if we didn’t get external funding. That’s just the way it is in some research programs. The other thing about the earmarks – they are to be leveraged money. Forget money from the federal government for a specific program. Then we expect in a period of time that those programs will be able to use that to get a research reputation to get external funding. That’s the way it works and we’ve done remarkably well on that and a chief research officer is very important in that. You know, even though I do it, sometimes I need backup when I work the halls of Congress and I have to explain to a senator, a representative or a staff member how we’re going to use a certain moonbeam extractor to do a certain kind of nano-micro scale analysis of things I can’t even understand. So I do need a little help on that.

**H. Rubin:** Voting behavior didn’t help on that.

**President Peters:** Maybe it’s better if I do this. No, I do understand a bit about science so it works out. But anyway, so, in saying this is a strengthening move it’s not about a title. It’s about a focus for this university and what my hopes are and dreams are for the institution but we do not aspire to be a major, premier, big public university research entity. No. It’s research that makes sense for us in focused areas that fit this region and fits the way we’re going to develop. Okay. That’s a strengthening move.

The recent reorganization of the Division of Outreach and Public Service is a strengthening move. When I came, I was attracted to this campus and that was one reason. We had made a significant investment, taken a risk position, in Naperville, in Hoffman Estates, in Rockford – less so Rockford because there’s some state money in that – and in some of the other activities. We had facilities and we had, thanks to many of you and departments, some programming, but I looked at it and it was obvious that we had to coordinate better; that we had to work together.
We had three entities that were doing different things that had some similarity and so I asked one of the best analytical thinkers that I ran into here early on, Dr. Anne Kaplan, to think very hard and bring some order to that within the context of what we had in outreach. So she has recently announced this reorganization. The benefit of that is we’re going to have coordination. They’ve worked very, very hard. I like what I see. It hasn’t evolved in an investment of resources for which we do not have that investment because this outreach model to work, I’m talking about at the central level, has to be pretty much run on a financial model that is run on fees and on its own bottom line – there’s very little in the way of state dollars in that, nor should there be. I have been so pleased at the coordination that has taken place between Dr. Kaplan and her group and the Provost’s Office, the deans, department heads, faculty, the outreach people in colleges in coming together and so, at the end of the day, I realize that this is just the beginning of something good. We’ve got to let it work, but I feel very good now that at least I have an organizational concept in place that has a chance to work if we figure out a good financial model that doesn’t come back on the rest of the University. That was always my goal from the beginning, and we have a fighting chance to do this. Now, I think that sometimes people make the right decision at the time that turns out to be the wrong decision. I think that a decision was made several years ago to disaggregate outreach and it scattered resources out hither and yon. That probably was a good thing at the time - I wouldn’t have done that but it’s there and we’ve got to work with that structure in a coordinated way. Let’s work with what we have now. I don’t think we’re going to see, for a while, any more fundamental changes until we give this thing a chance to work. So that’s the second thing that’s happened.

The third thing is coming up; it’s a whole set of activities and it started with the appointment of a provost. That was very important to all of us and we got a good one. We’ve got a provost who – he and I never have to exchange more than three words and we know what the problem is. We’ve seen it before and we’re in sync on this institution and, unfortunately, I thought I was an incurable optimist, but our Provost is – he’s cut from the same bolt of cloth and he’s very experienced and we share the same aspirations for the academic side of the institution. So there’s a bunch of things he has to do. One is on the research side and he’s working on that. Number two, we have to replace someone who’s almost irreplaceable and that’s Bob Wheeler; we’re moving ahead with that, but behind that is a set of functions that we need to enhance and look at. We’ve done very well with the Honors Program so far. Believe me, if we would have had a normal year, I would have tried to find a way to invest more money in an Honors College. That’s a goal, but we’re going to have to put that back a little bit. Learning communities – we have been in a couple year evaluation of our academic standards. It’s a concern to me and a concern to faculty. We have to look at whether or not students are coming to us as prepared as they need to be. This is not an NIU problem alone; this is a problem for American higher education, particularly American public higher education. The issue goes back to what’s happening in the schools which we bear some responsibility for, don’t we, because we train many of those teachers. So we have to look at that. Obviously curriculum is a never-ending process of evaluation and fitting what we do to the needs of a modern, educated person.

So the other part is that we are trying to get a handle on rationalizing our enrollment mix and you can’t do that overnight. That’s a several year process. Last year we did a lot of studying, and we even had some market research on where our students come from, what they think of us, and they speak well academically of us. It wasn’t the best marketing study, but what we saw we
liked. It speaks very highly on the academic side. But we need to rationalize that. By the way, I’m sure that the new Vice President for Research – I’ve asked Ivan when that person is hired within the year – we really do need to get on with looking at our graduate programs and evaluating them and calibrating them. You know, we are facing an enrollment situation that is a pleasure but it’s perplexing and you might be interested in this. I recently looked at some data, preliminary data, that showed most of the – 95% of the increases in student population this year can be traced to eight academic departments. There are decreases in many departments. That adds a level of complexity to enrollment management, doesn’t it? So, anyway, we’re looking at those things.

All right, so these are three strengthening moves and they begin to fulfill the requirements and the expectations that I was given when the Board of Trustees selected me. I was asked by the Board to try and raise the profile and stature of NIU in the region and state and nationally. That was easy to do because we were on the rise. It was just a matter of telling the story. I was asked to hire a provost and create the external presidency and create a powerful internal focus on the academic side and then focus on our research, which varies in strength, and look to enrollment and rationalize our enrollment mix and we’re on our way to doing that. That’s never-ending. The third thing is, I was told, claim the region whose name we bear, that meant doing something with this wonderful set of educational sites that we have, and I think I’ve moved in that direction.

Which brings up the issue of this evaluation. The Trustees take their role very seriously and they do a few things. One thing they feel very, very strongly about – they hire a president, they evaluate a president and they have high expectations and they are guarded about that. They also are very faculty oriented and student oriented. We’ve got a great group. So, I am perfectly pleased to take your plea for evaluation to them. It’s something I cannot decide on my own because I am hired by the Trustees and evaluated by the Trustees, and that’s clear to me, but I will take your message forward and we’ll get back to you on that.

Now, I want to end by saying whatever I can, which is not much, about the budget and other situations. The revenue side still does not look good. It’s anemic. We have something coming up next Tuesday – it’s an election and we know that there will be major changes. There’ll be a new governor. Brilliant statement. There will be major changes. The current governor is talking about what you do with what looks like a looming 2 billion dollar hole. I don’t believe you can cut your way out of a 2 billion dollar hole but there is the issue so, right now, there is no talk about it except the concern among all of us who survive and need public funds to do our function. We’re very, very nervous and we’re planning and thinking and the IHBE, of course, is moving ahead to frame a budget for next year. Sometime in November they usually do this. Well, I think it will be a very skeletal budget because they have to wait to see who the new governor is and, more than that, what the budget staff in the governor’s office is going to look like and what the appropriations committees are going to look like; preceding all of that will have to be an assessment of the revenue and the current state of the budget. So I think the first thing will be the state of the current budget and whether or not a rescission is in order; we have planned for that. We’re planning for that eventuality. We have contingency plans in place. That’s for this year and we’ll be okay unless it’s a catastrophic number. But ’04 remains a question and everyone is expecting that, if nothing is done, the real potential is there for a downturn in budget. I’ve been meeting with Trustees and others about the bigger issue and what
we can do to make our case that higher education is important, NIU is important and that we’d like to get higher up on the priority lists of whoever is elected and we’re spending a lot of time doing that. Promises have been made to other groups, particularly K-12 which require huge investments and if there are no new taxes and you have a budget hole plus you have promises that even creates more pressure on state agencies like higher education.

The other pressure that’s out there, as I’ve said, is the talk about cost and about administrative costs, about accountability, about what faculty do but my guess is when it all shakes out, it’s about the budget. It’s about how does the State balance the budget and how does the new governor begin to set priorities and begin to do some of the things he will want to do. So, we’re planning and meanwhile, what we’re doing is working hard on those things we control. This is my ninth budget cut and I’ve learned that you work on what you can control. So we know there probably will be capital expenditure, there always is, even in a bad budget. We’re working hard on that list. We’re working very hard in Washington although that has proven to be difficult because the federal government will be run on continuing resolutions, budget resolutions. They won’t shut down government and, therefore, a lot of requests that we have in will have to wait. I mean, this thing could go on until February. So, we’re working very, very hard on that because that’s a bright spot for us depending on the outcome of the election. So, as you can see, the campus is taking shape. We’re working very hard on our projects. I think fall is the most beautiful time of year here, and I hope you can see, as I can see, what this place is going to feel and look like in ten years. We’re working very hard on that. Obviously, faculty are working very hard at teaching and research. I spend a lot of time with students, and I hear nothing but good things about the faculty. Really. And that wasn’t true in my other institutions. So, at least about that part of your job, you should feel very, very good.

I want to thank you for what you’ve done and, you know, at the end of the day we’ve got some tough decisions to make and some things to do but, at the end of the day, I’m very optimistic for the long-term viability of this institution. All right?

President Willis: Are there questions for President Peters? Yes, Pat.

P. Henry: This is Pat Henry. You mentioned the results of a marketing survey and it seems to me as I recall, in the spring there was this survey that was also going to involve consultants who were going to figure out how to get the word out about NIU. Am I remembering that correctly?

President Peters: That was the plan. But that was phase two of the plan; we’ve got phase one done, which was our analysis. Phase two, now, there’s some more research that has to be done; we’re evaluating that right now, and here’s where I am. We’ll be presenting the results of phase one. I don’t want to get ahead of that. We presented it to several groups and shaped it up; it’s going to be presented to the deans and I didn’t want to brief you on it before I brief the deans. I didn’t think that was safe. But, I’m not moving ahead with an expensive phase two if I feel after phase one there are things we can do without spending a lot of money. You know, I’m not a big person for strategic planning or for elaborate studies. I usually see what needs to be done and reason together and go for it. I don’t like to waste time. You know, I think I’ve seen enough in this study where I know what to do. Now, you need validation. Here, in a nutshell, is what was found in the marketing study. We looked at several groups. We looked at prospective students,
guidance counselors – we looked at influencers, politicians. We looked at some alums. Faculty who are representative of these groups and then randomly selected junior faculty, so we got a good feel for it. Here’s what we found in general about NIU. From the point of view of prospective students – very good academic reputation, very good. Known for the way in which students are treated in terms of the resources, the counseling and the academic support. Many programs were mentioned as centers of excellence. If I start naming them you’re going to want your program named but, I’ll bet if I passed a piece of paper around and it said you can’t name your own program, that we’d bushwhack which ones there were. There were about ten of them. Good faculty. The students, the counselors like our admissions process. High marks, and our orientation – high marks. The students gave high marks to our physical plant with the exception of some of our residence halls. So that’s something we’ve got to work on. We knew that. I don’t need another study to tell me that. Do you need that? I don’t need another – I need money. That’s what I need to do that. We’ve got the resolve; we know what the problem is.

So, on the negative side, or the things to work on – the image is not well defined. People don’t think ill of us but when pushed, they can’t come up with a set of defining characteristics, which is good. It’s not as if you had a reputation as a party school and you really wanted to be known as an ivy league academic institution – that’s a hard distance to move. It’s better to be able to define what you are, because I think it’s easy enough to do – to define what we are. It’s hard to communicate that to people and it takes years. So that’s part of what we have. Some students indicate that the area is not as vibrant as they would like. It doesn’t have all the amenities that they would like in either a town that’s in a college or a college that’s in a town. All right. That’s cool – that’s correctable but that’s out there. So, at the end of the day, I’m very pleased with that and we’ve got some indications on where we need to go. Our alumni are fiercely loyal to NIU. They need to be activated though. All right, so it basically revalidated what we all know. Now we need to move into the next phase and, again, we’re going to do that and I want to do that with minimal expenditure resources. That was more than you wanted, Pat.

President Willis: All right, David then Herb.

D. Wagner: David Wagner. I said this last year and I was shot down but I think I’ll repeat it again. From your remarks it’s clear that the problem in this state is revenue and it seems to me what’s needed in this state is a rational discussion of revenue. Both the candidates for governor are ostriches. They completely ignore that this is the problem and it seems to me the university ought to have some role in promoting rational discussion of how revenue can be increased.

President Peters: No disagreement there. As a matter of fact, I think there is going to be an economic summit, I think at ISU right after the election, but it’s a lot of university people. That and an economic summit and then the other thing is what do we do about K-12. I mean, there
are important policy issues here where we have to find our voice. We have to be careful, however, that any one institution – public higher education institution – doesn’t promote one particular policy over another but brings people together to rationally discuss what the issues are.

D. Wagner: You always emphasize promoting higher education and this is a zero-sum game. If we get more money, K-12 gets less, and the answer is that this state needs more money. I did say this last year and did not get quite a positive response as this year.

President Peters: Well, I can’t disagree – well, I agree whole-heartedly. It’s the question of who is most effective at carrying that message forward. The people that are effective in carrying that forward are students and parents and taxpayers and the alumni; universities can provide the expertise and the platform to analyze this.

President Willis: Herb?

H. Rubin: I’ll try not to be too controversial I guess.

President Peters: I didn’t know you had that reputation.

H. Rubin: I’m glad that you made those comments about the marketing study because many of us, when we first heard about it, were saying so much of this can be done in-house. I’d really like to reiterate that we’re a strong faculty in lots of areas and we can do a lot of these outside services. You needed validation because they’re not going to trust us – that’s one thing, but when it really is for internal consumption I think it can be done internally and I’m glad that you are moving in that direction.

President Peters: External validation is real important because somebody else did it and found it out.

H. Rubin: I think so. I have some questions because I guess I’m glad that you see the empty glass as having something in it, I mean that’s useful – but we’re facing some very immediate concrete problems. Okay? For old-timers such as myself, a year or two with less salary is annoying and basically I have very little choice other than to accept it. But we have some very good junior faculty and if any of them ever were to look at me and ask my advice, I’d say fill out your resume because the whole nation is not in this state, it’s not.

President Peters: You’re talking about the career now. You’re talking about a career in higher education.

H. Rubin: A career in higher education and what do you say to a junior person when you’re seeing several potential years of zero raises. How do you respond to a person like that?

President Peters: Well again, you’re asking someone whose life has been the university and all of its manifestations who got great rewards out of classrooms and students and conversing with faculty and having the freedom to think. The galling part about it is that, in this room and in this university and all the universities in this state, you’re talking about individuals with incredible
potential and incredible training and education and wisdom and, as David said, we have a lot to say that’s controversial sometimes but the living wage for faculty is not where it should be. We’re losing ground. It’s not as if others are not losing ground but it is difficult. What would I say? Well, over a thirty or forty year career there’s going to be highs and lows in that. If somebody wanted to make a lot of money, if that was their goal in life, that would get a lower rating on my evaluation sheet. I remember when I got my first job. I told my father, who was not an educated man; he asked me what I was going to do and I said “well, I’m an assistant professor teaching political science at the University of Nebraska and I’m paid $11,000”. That was a lot of money back then, $11,000. We were working on the farm, and that night we were on the porch. He didn’t talk much; he said two things. He said “Well, to me political science sounds like the science of fools”. That’s the first thing he said Then the second thing he said was “You mean that you’re going to work nine months a year, you get to do research in the summer, you have some travel and you’re going to teach five courses a year and you’re going to teach what you like and you’re going to write those papers you like to write and they’re going to pay you $11,000 for that?” Over the period of a career, I wouldn’t do it any differently and I wouldn’t dissuade anyone from it who has what it takes, but we need to fight for better salary and benefits and reward and regard.

H. Rubin: You’re providing the answer that, given similar circumstances; I gave to myself several years ago.

President Peters: Yes.

H. Rubin: But that’s not the question I’m being asked. These are people who want to be academics, who will be academics; the question is will they want to be academics here if during the early parts of their career they’re starved. How do I answer them?

President Peters: Yes, but tell them what the realities are. There will be years of lean and there will be years of good but, see this glass?

H. Rubin: Yes.

President Peters: Look. You just hit on something, Herb. We need to replenish the professorate because, you see this, and I see a little gray out there, we need our best people to take our place, and we need them in a hurry. That means we’ve got to pay them their market value. It’s what I said. It’s the travel money, it’s the research support, it’s the aides in class –it’s the whole picture. When the budget starts to go down guess what goes – it’s all the stuff that makes your life easier, or at least more effective. It makes you a better teacher, better researcher.

J. Pierce: Southern Illinois University had an 18% tuition hike. What are the chances that we might find some money that way?

President Peters: Well they were pretty low tuitions – 18% is a lot. Across this nation right now, the big public policy issue is cost and access to higher education. Our Trustees are low tuition trustees and I’m a low tuition president, but we will make the argument for as much tuition as we need to keep the quality of what we do up. There have been attempts across the
country to cap tuition either at the gubernatorial or the legislative level. This would be very
difficult for us, because in order to manage this huge enterprise efficiently and to keep the
quality up we need the flexibility not only to raise tuition if we need to within reason, but also to
control tuition. It’s just recently that in Illinois we have had the ability to control our income
fund. More than anything else in my years in higher education as an administrator, budget
flexibility is as important as the dollars that come in because the dollars are never enough to do
the job. You know the Trustees set the tuition here and they usually set it in February. The
students have a role in that; our tuition is still in the affordable range but it’s pretty high.

President Willis: Are there other questions? Yes, Jim?

J. Lockard: It’s been an interesting year already in that normally we would really be prepared
to celebrate the hefty increase in enrollment that we had this year but I’m not so sure we can
properly do that given the financial situation. As another old-timer like Herb here, I can
remember only too clearly what happened - how long ago, Herb? – ten, fifteen years, whatever it
was – when we sat around doing the exact same things. Seeing lovely increases in enrollment
every year without any concomitant increases in any other support for the university until we
finally reached the point where we were catching hell from every corner because students
couldn’t graduate in four years. How long can we let this go on?

President Peters: That issue has been something that has taken up several discussions at least
three or four times a week. Because I’m not going to let that happen; we have put so many extra
dollars into giving every student a course or a full load and I’ve been assured reasonably that that
has happened and I said it my speech. There’s a limit to how many more students we can take –
we’re at our limit and we’re carefully watching that right now. There is something about NIU
that’s very important and that is we traditionally have been a place that gave students access; it’s
part of our heritage. It’s something that the public officials find very refreshing and important
about NIU. An argument that I have been effective with, and will be effective with, is that NIU
needs more resources to handle this increase in students. Now, there are those in the legislatures
and in the committees that have data that shows that we have fewer students than we did but I’ve
been making the case. Just last night I made the case to an important member of the legislature,
and I met with Ivan Legg. We have contingency plans in place to manage our enrollment with
the existing tools that we have, deadlines and so forth and setting some limits. I would say as we
sit today it’s been tough, but we’ve managed and there hasn’t been deterioration. But I’m very
concerned about what you’re saying and the last time, let’s face it, we shot ourselves in the foot
by not fixing the problem, we complained about the problem and told people about it and they
believed it. That was really foolish. You got a problem, you fix it.

I’m very proud of our football team and very exited for those young men. We’re getting some
publicity and the town is excited, believe me, I’m getting calls. We’re going to play Bowling
Green, who is was ranked nationally, but we’re playing them and the community is excited.
Hopefully on the 9th we can have 25,000 people at Huskie Stadium. I hope we can do pep rallies
and things. We’re going to make it easy for the community to embrace Huskie pride and there’s
great benefit in that, isn’t there? It extends beyond football. The community has to take pride in
NIU – our larger community. That’s the key for us. So, with that, I hope I didn’t overstay my
welcome and answered your questions. I’m glad to be with you again. If you have any suggestions, let me know. All right?

**President Willis:** Thank you.

**President Willis:** Okay, now with your permission, Paul Stoddard has been waiting very patiently in the back of the room. If you look under New Business he would like to bring up some issues about general education and I’d like to allow him to do that at this time. Yes, Herb.

**H. Rubin:** I move the agenda be changed.

**President Willis:** Okay, it’s been moved that we go ahead and do that. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay, Paul, you’re on.

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Paul Stoddard to talk about General Education**

**P. Stoddard:** Thanks.

**President Willis:** Do you want to come up front here so people can actually look at you? You don’t have to, but otherwise people will twist their necks. Whatever. All right, that’s fine.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, I’m here as Chair of the Gen Ed Committee. It’s been the impression of the Committee, at least during my tenure there, that the General Education Program has a less than stellar reputation among students and faculty. We’re of the opinion that that’s an unfortunate circumstance, and that we think the General Education Program actually has a very vital role to fill here. The General Education Program is the primary place the University can leave its mark on the undergraduate body and can give to our graduating undergraduates the tools we think are necessary for them to have in order to become good citizens and enjoy the things that life has to offer. We specifically are thinking about giving students various ways of approaching problems and appreciating the world around them and so on and so forth. Unfortunately, it’s our impression that most students see the General Education courses as some hurdle they have to get over and as they’re done with that they can go on and study the things they really want to study. A lot of faculty, we’re afraid, also see the General Education Program as merely a way to increase credit hours and don’t really take to heart what the program can offer. Certainly that’s not true of everybody. I know there’s an awful lot of committed teachers of these courses out there. I know that from personal experience and from what I read from students and so forth. So I certainly don’t mean to put anybody in particular down, but what we would like to do is examine whether our perceptions are accurate. To that end, tomorrow we’re having the first of what I hope will be a long series of informal lunches with groups of students to get their input into the General Education Program - what they think of it and how they would like to see it improved. We would like to have a sister program where we have informal meetings with groups of faculty. This seemed like the appropriate body to come to at least get that ball rolling. I don’t know that we want to come here necessarily and take your time on this issue but if we could get groups of faculty, five or ten people together who could meet over lunch or at the Twin Tap - so
we would like to get feedback from the faculty as to ways we could make the program more palatable to the people teaching it. I know there’s been some friction between faculty and the Gen Ed Committee over resubmission of Gen Ed courses and so on and so forth. We would like to make that go more smoothly. We would like to invigorate the people teaching it if they need invigorating. We would like to stress what we think the goals of the program are and compare that to what the faculty think the goals of the program are and see if we can reach some meeting of the minds. So, I’m just asking this body if they would have any input on ways to proceed from here.

**President Willis:** Yes, Herb?

**H. Rubin:** I think it’s a wonderful idea and I would strongly suggest that you have conveners and heads of these focus groups being actually non-Gen Ed Committee members. I mean, I’m just speaking for my department—we are a Gen Ed department. The criteria the Gen Ed Committee has set are what we set internally long before we ever heard of the Gen Ed Committee. When we were dealing with the Gen Ed Committee we felt professionally insulted, demeaned and basically came back and said okay, it’s something we have to do formalistically and found it very discouraging. I’m not sure how many people are like myself who will say what they think in such an audience. But I think the Committee’s a wonderful idea and my only suggestion is that you need as a convener people who really are not the people who might get criticized.

**President Willis:** Yes, David?

**D. Wagner:** Yes, I’m in the process of resubmitting for credit, and it really seems to me the biggest problem that maybe the whole faculty faces—maybe it’s only me—is understanding the move towards assessment which is really unclear and time consuming and I’m not convinced useful. But that may be personal.

**P. Stoddard:** Well, I’ve shared your concerns about assessment from the first time I started hearing the word—I think the first meeting I ever attended at Northern, assessment was an issue and I’m getting up there in the old-timer range too. But assessment has—well, first off it’s something that’s coming to us from above. We have to assess the Gen Ed, or at least develop a plan this year for developing the entire Gen Ed Program. This is dictated to us by North Central and the IBHE, so what comes down to us comes down to everybody eventually. But there are people are the Committee who speak well of assessment, and they actually are beginning to convince me that there is merit in this particular exercise. We claim that we want to be doing certain things, and how do we know whether or not we’re doing them is an issue that we have to address. It’s nice to say well, we think if you take my course you’re going to come out and you’re going to be able to do wonderful things, but how do we know that that’s true? So, I certainly am not the best person to defend this. All I can tell you is that even if the Gen Ed Committee didn’t have people on it who thought it was a good idea, we would still have to do it.

**D. Wagner:** I was not denying that. I was just saying that it seems to me that is the most critical problem that’s facing your Committee.
P. Stoddard: It is and also there have been problems with this and when it came down to it, I don’t think anybody really had a good feel for how to do assessment. There was a reluctance to tell departments how to do assessment and so we tried to leave things as open as possible but in so doing I think we denied departments any type of guidance they might have found useful. So we’ve been debating with ourselves what we need, and I think we have finally ended up getting somewhere where we’re comfortable with at least knowing what to ask for. That’s been a bit of a painful process for us and unfortunately, for the departments involved in the process along the way. We’re hoping to fix this, of course. There was another point I wanted to make about assessment but it slipped my mind and maybe that’s just as well for now.

President Willis: Jeff?

J. Kowalski: Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art. I sat on the General Education Committee for three years. I’m also Division Head of Art History so I’ve seen this from both sides. I’ve had to prepare materials to submit for resubmission at the same time as I sat on the Committee and read similar materials from other departments. I think with regard to assessment, I have a sense that, if handled properly, assessment can be a helpful exercise to give members of departments a sense of whether or not the objectives or goals or certain knowledge they think is being absorbed by students in courses is being absorbed as well as they think it is, and if it’s not, it should give them an opportunity to determine whether or not there are other ways of conveying that information to the students or other ways of giving them instructions on how to accomplish particular tasks or things of that sort that may strengthen their learning. But from the point of view of people who have to work with colleagues in departments to try to organize these activities, the critical factor that really rubs people the wrong way is when it begins to take too much time and if it takes too much time then all of us, myself included, begin to feel that we’re on that little mouse treadmill and that we don’t have enough time to actually prepare our classroom materials or do the new readings we need to keep abreast of our fields because we’re spending our time assessing how we teach rather than teaching. Finding the balance is the key to this, but I don’t think assessment is completely a wasted effort as long as we work to find what works. We need the best assessment experts in the university to help us determine that and then make sure that when the plan is put in place, that it can be managed in terms of the time commitment involved by the people involved in gathering and then analyzing the materials for assessment.

President Willis: Okay, Herb?

H. Rubin: This is really more what we should be doing at the focus groups, but I just want to say that the last statement I agree with entirely. The alienation of my department was based on the fact we had one person who had been involved for years in national assessments and design of assessment instruments, and another person without the same exposure but with probably more technical competence in the area. We wanted to do it right and we ended up with circumstances that would be as analogues for me to go over to tell Sue how to use a cosmotron to beat up whatever she beats up in the little atoms. We had somebody with absolutely no knowledge dictate instrumentation for a department that professionally designs instrumentation. What we did is we totally capitulated because we were threatened and we end up now with years
and years and not getting back data that could useful from a department that wanted to do it. That’s the procedures that we have to fight.

**P. Stoddard:** I would say that this is exactly the type of feedback we would like to have. I’ve seen too many cases where people who are really dedicated to what we’re trying to achieve just get beaten down to where they’ve lost all heart for it and that’s exactly what we want to avoid. We want to change the system that creates that circumstance.

**President Willis:** Okay, are there other comments for Paul? Yes, Jeff?

**J. Kowalski:** One brief comment is that I teach every semester, large auditorium, General Education courses and I think the concept of General Education is vital to preparing an educated citizenry in our state and in our nation. Try to get people who are exited about teaching their field to students who may come into your course thinking they don’t want to take it; persuading them that there’s a reason why they need to know something about your area is a challenge but a great opportunity.

**President Willis:** I agree completely. Yes, thank you. All right, any other comments for Paul? Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you for your time and attention.

**President Willis:** Okay, thank you Paul. All right. I believe the rest of the Agenda we can get through pretty quickly because hardly anybody has reports.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report

**President Willis:** We’re down to Item VII. Reports From Advisory Committees. Pat, I believe – Pat does not have a report. I just put report on there because it seems like she always have one but, in fact, she doesn’t, nor has the Board of Trustees or any of its Committees met; so much for Item VII.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Beverly Espe – no report
E. BOT – Sue Willis – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Jody Newman-Ryan, Chair

President Willis: Jody has told me that she has no report.

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Jim Lockard, Chair

President Willis: Jim Lockard, Economic Status, I believe you have.

J. Lockard: Yes, let me give you a quick update. The written report will be in the minutes but was not prepared in time for today’s meeting. You may recall that the Economic Status of the Profession Committee was asked to look into some issues related to insurance coverage and the apparent handling of insurance claims in part, perhaps, due to changes from Unicare to Cigna as an administrator over the summer. We have been exploring that and have a long ways to go. It’s going to take some time to try to do this job right, but you can also well imagine, in this economic climate anything that has to do with enhanced benefits is very unlikely to move anywhere in particular. In fact, I wrote down something the President said a moment ago because he summed up what we decided at our last meeting in a way that I hadn’t quite come up on myself, and that was work with what you can control. That’s what we propose to do over the course of the year.

Here’s the situation as we have it right now. We started out with a charge to look into some cases that were called specifically to our attention; we believe that by and large the situations are the result of either a misunderstanding of program benefits or, in some cases, errors on the parts of the administrators. We think there’s an educational job that’s going to have to be done among all of us on this campus to make the most out of what we actually do have at a time when we cannot realistically foresee any way of getting great improvements.

So, bottom-line here, a couple of things for you to think about. First of all, Human Resources has assured the Committee that the change in administrators did not in any way involve direct changes in benefits or coverage. However, the change did, in fact, alter the list of preferred provider organizations and so people who may have been used to getting one amount covered in the past have continued to go to the same provider, only that provider may not currently be on the PPO list and, therefore, yes, you are paying more. That’s a problem. The problem was compounded by the fact that our good friends at CMS could not provide enough booklets about the preferred provider list so that we could have them as we have in years past. So people have made this error, if you want to call it that, or at least have gone into a judgement case without even knowing they were making a change. Unfortunately, the best we can tell you is you can go out to HR and see the PPO list, but CMS is too strapped or whatever to be able to provide those for us as they have in the past. Similarly, there was a change in the provider for prescription coverage and, as you should have received in the mail over the summer, there were substantial changes in the lists of which drugs are on the low end of the co-payment, which are in the middle
and which are on the high end. In many cases, if you have continued to take the same prescription that you have all along, you may be paying more or you could be paying less, it all depends on which one you had off of the list. It’s very unfortunate when we know for a fact that drugs are not all alike, and the fact that one is preferred for this ailment versus another by one organization and that flips the next time around isn’t appropriate, isn’t right but it’s a fact of life and so we simply have to be aware of those kinds of things that are going on around us.

Secondly, we’re still very interested in hearing from any other people who think they have experienced an actual change in coverage. We need to know particular cases to be able to figure out if indeed there is a problem that we’re not aware of at this point or if it’s something that was an educational issue that you may not have realized.

The third point is that we do know for a fact that mistakes have been made already in this changeover. In one case in particular, the billing notice or notice of benefits, whatever you want to call the thing, was provided by a sub-contractor to Cigna, a company called Concentra. If you’ve received anything from them you might want to look at it closely in case you found or thought you were getting cheated in the first place because they made mistakes and apparently, as best we can tell at this point, they not only made them, they knew they made them and they knew who they had made them with but they were not about to take any proactive stance in addressing it. They sat back and waited for those who received these erroneous bills to call them and when called they said “oh, we’ve been waiting to hear from you”. Great way to do business. So, the point is, mistakes have been made. If you think one was made on your behalf, then raise hell over it. If you’re right, that’s what you’re going to have to do and don’t expect them to fix it for you, in all likelihood. If it doesn’t look right, question it.

We’re going to work with Human Resources to try to schedule a series of meetings probably in the spring semester – we won’t be able to do it any faster than that – on a college level is what we think at the moment, for sessions in which you can go and have the benefits package explained, hopefully in a clearer manner than what we may know now, because if we don’t understand what our rights are, we certainly aren’t going to take the fullest advantage of them and that’s really about all we can hope for at this point. Right after the New Year we’re going to schedule a meeting of the Committee with representatives from some of the area health care providers because we’re hearing some interesting stories from them as well about their working relationship with Cigna. Since ultimately it all comes back on us one way or another, whether they get paid, how much they get paid, when they get paid, etc., we want to try to understand their side of the perspective as well at this point and we figured they were going to need about six months before they really knew what it was like to work with Cigna. So we will be doing that. The one thing that might have some potential for improvement in a tangible way is that we believe, based on our preliminary investigations, that a good part of the problem stems from the way in which usual and customary charges are calculated. We think it’s probably erroneous the way it’s being done for this area right now, and if by any chance we could succeed in finding a way to influence a better approach to calculating those things, we could wind up perhaps getting a tangible benefit form it without actually changing the benefits package itself. That seems to be the only hope we’ve got.

**President Willis:**  Yes, Mary? Get a mike; I know you guys don’t have one there.
M. Larson: How often do the carriers change, Jim, like from Unicare to Cigna? How long will we be with Cigna?

J. Lockard: We’ve been with them since July.

M. Larson: Yes but how long down the road. Is it just one year?

J. Lockard: I can find out.

President Willis: Yes, Herb?

H. Rubin: Yes, similar type of question. Is there anyway we can have HR or us just put out the preferred provider list electronically and the list of approved drugs?

President Willis: I was wondering about that too. Why can’t they just put it up on their website?

J. Lockard: We can ask; we can explore.

S. Mini: I’ve checked the CMS website and if they have it there, I haven’t seen it. All it did was crash and I let HR know and I’ve not heard back from HR, so.

H. Rubin: Someone can look into that?

J. Lockard: Yes, we’ll check it out.

President Willis: Okay, other questions or comments for Jim?

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 6)

President Willis: Resource, Space and Budget, C. T. Lin.

C. T. Lin: Well, a report is attached on page 6. This report was prepared by Herb Rubin, the Chair of the Joint Committee of the University Council and Faculty Senate. Only two points to report. The meeting was held on October 16 and we have lot of discussion but only two points to report. One is that we have subdivided the whole Committee into sub-committees to deal with all different types of agenda such as physical innovation, campus connectivity and technology resources. The second point is related again to the 240 acres of the west campus plan; we had a great deal of discussion again, ranging from an industrial research park to the Center of Excellence and also some sort of hotel or all the different ideas. But one thing that is important is that the Executive Vice President at the meeting agreed to present to the Committee by the end of the current semester a document with some preliminary ideas. As soon as we have that document, we have that presentation, we’ll report to you. Thank you.

President Willis: Any questions? Yes, Pat?
P. Henry: Just one comment. I hope that somewhere along the line some input could be given about transportation between the two sides of campus including bicycles.

H. Rubin: It’s my fault we haven’t progressed further. I’ve been involved in another issue that is very time consuming – my life.

President Willis: Okay, other questions or comments?

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Mark Cordes, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance, I believe has no report.

M. Cordes: You skipped over me.

President Willis: Oh, Mark, I’m sorry. You do have a report.

M. Cordes: Just a very, very short report. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities continues to meet with the Academic Policy Committee of the University Council to talk about the Institutional Review Board issues. At the end of our last meeting in October, we began to formulate some areas for possible recommendations. John Wolfskill and myself, the schedule we hope to follow is to bring written recommendations back to our Joint Committee at the November meeting for consideration and then pass those on if they’re approved to the Graduate Council in December and make a report to this Committee and the University Council in December. I can’t promise we’ll be able to meet that schedule but that’s what our hope is right now.

President Willis: Okay, any questions or comments for Mark?

E. Rules and Governance – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair

President Willis: Rules and Governance, Gretchen has no report.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – John Novak, Chair

President Willis: Elections and Legislative Oversight has nothing.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Willis: Okay, we have no Unfinished Business and we already did the New Business. So are there any Comments or Questions from the Floor, yes?

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Willis: Kevin, yes.
K. Miller: Good afternoon, Kevin Miller, Student Association President. Again, you’ll hear me harping on this probably all year. Please, please, please do not ask your students for Social Security numbers. Please go back to your department and tell everyone else that you know, other faculty, it is still a continuing problem and it’s getting uglier and uglier. I’m hearing stuff from students every day. It seems like the more the word gets out, the more it increases, the use of Social Security numbers so, please, please, please go back and tell everyone. I do know, at least I’m told, that the Provost’s Office is going to be sending out some sort of communication to all the faculty some time this month regarding the issue and some other options, some other alternatives so, again, I just want to make you aware of that. And an 18% tuition increase – no, no, no, no.

H. Rubin: That’s just for one semester.

K. Miller: You will never hear the end of it if that happens to me. I will go kicking and screaming. You will have to drag me out. Anyway, have a great day.

President Willis: By the way, I did talk about Social Security numbers. I’m in a continuing dialogue with Steve Cunningham who is interested in learning of all the occasions when we have to give our Social Security numbers to people so every time I hear of a new instance I tell him and he has a growing list of things that he’s looking into. So we’re working on that for faculty and staff as well. Yes, Jim?

J. Lockard: I just have one quick, I guess it’s a comment here; I want to express my concern about the changes that have been made in the graduation plans for December. I don’t know if I’m misinformed, I hope I am, but from what I have heard a long history of tradition as to how graduation is conducted around here has been wiped out in one fell swoop and I, for one, find it amazing that after twenty-some years on the campus here, suddenly my graduate students are going to find that they’re graduating from the Graduate School which to them is nothing but a bureaucratic cesspool rather than something to be proudly associated with and to have them denied the opportunity for the participation of people they are familiar with at the graduation ceremony so we can make this a more whatever, cohesive thing as the Graduate School’s opportunity, is nonsense and to have that done without the input, as far as I can tell, the faculty weren’t involved in all this, makes no sense. This seems to have been an administrative decision that we’re told we’re not to question until after its been tried the first time. It’s nonsense.

President Willis: There was a faculty committee. I was actually on it.

J. Lockard: Was there? Well, whatever. If anybody has graduate students who are familiar with and consider themselves to be associated with the Graduate School, I’d be interested in knowing about it.

President Willis: Yes, David?

D. Wagner: I don’t know whether to say this or not but they always have had a student responder in the College of Liberal Arts and that was just done away with. I know people that go
to the graduation think that’s the highlight of the whole ceremony for at least undergraduates. So, I agree completely.

**J. Lockard:** Thank you.

**President Willis:** Okay, I’m making notes. Okay, other comments or issues? Okay, motion to adjourn?

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. [University Council](#) Membership List  
B. [Faculty Senate](#) Membership List  
C. [University Council Personnel Committee](#) Membership List  
D. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council  
E. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board minutes  
F. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification  
G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum  
H. [Minutes](#), Graduate Council  
I. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes  
J. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel  
K. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee minutes

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.