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I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: It looks like most people are settled. We have to apologize for the lack of coffee. That has not gone unnoticed by anybody up in front here. There is a call in to the people who are supposed to be providing the coffee. They say they’ll do what they can. So, no promises. Welcome to the Barsema Alumni and Visitors Center. I’m glad we could all make it; most of us can make it. The folks here wanted to show the building off and let people see what they’ve done so they’ve invited groups over to hold meetings here. We thought we’d take them up on it once.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: On the agenda, we’ve got one item of new business which I e-mailed you about. We’re going to have Susan Shuren from Issacson Miller. That’s a search firm. They’re aiding us in the search for the new provost. She’s the representative for that so she will be here to get insight from the faculty as to what we would like to see in a provost. She’ll be here at 3:45 assuming she is done with her other meetings and she will be here until, at the very latest, 4:45 then she’s got to get on the road to catch a plane. So we’ve got her for an hour to talk to her about the provost position.

Also, with respect to the provost, you have in the package, a packet of information about the criteria that will be used to pick the new provost. These are things that the search committee came up with last night in our discussion and at some point in the meeting – probably we’ll do this under new business – we will get our chance to have some input in to that. I want to point
out that this is not an approval situation; this is just to make sure there’s nothing that absolutely should not be on that list or should absolutely be on that list but isn’t, no oversights. We’re really not looking for information on how many.

For those changes to the agenda, I would accept a motion to adopt the agenda. Second? Any discussion? All in favor? Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2005 FS MEETING

P. Stoddard: Next up is the approval of the minutes. They’re a walk-in item and should be in front of you. A motion to accept the minutes?

W. Baker: Could you change mine from B to W?

P. Stoddard: A B to W, yes, Any other changes. Any discussion – further discussion on the minutes? Okay, all in favor of approval of the minutes?

The minutes were approved.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

P. Stoddard: Under President’s Announcements again the provost search committee had their first meeting last night. We essentially had listen to Susan Shuren from the search firm. We laid out a lot of the concerns that folks had about what a new provost should look like and essentially that is what developed into the list of criteria. It’s basically the same set of criteria that was used for the last provost search that resulted in Dr. Legg. Apparently, we have coffee now so if there is a mass existed to the back of the room that’s o.k..

J. Stephen: On the bottom of search criteria it says ??? and I’d like to change that to an understanding of ???.

P. Stoddard: Okay, we’ll get to that in time. Anyways, that’s what went on at the Provost Search Meeting last night. We have an ambitious timeline. The idea is to submit an ad by the beginning of January and run it for three weeks and also the search will helping keep pushing to scare up candidates that they think might be provost material. Obviously, we will be accepting applications from people. The beginning of April or so we’ll start an interview process. We’ll have a second round of interviews shortly after that. The thought was to make an offer before everybody leaves at the end of the spring semester and to have a new provost on campus ideally by July 1. That’s ambitious. Last year or last time rather however, they started this process back in June; we’re starting it in November, the end of November so it’s about a five month compression of the schedule.

Also of interest I think is the Board of Trustees recently approved our request to purchase the Oracle Student Support Software System. This is thing that used to be PeopleSoft. After everything settled down with the acquisition of PeopleSoft by Oracle we put out a proposal. We
had two interested companies and ultimately, based on a lot of criteria decided on the Oracle package. I saw a lot of those criteria and I think they were right with what they did. Either package would have required using Oracle Software anyway, look at that and the difference in price swayed them to Oracle. That said the implementation of this system is probably not going to be transparent. It will cause some changes probably the loss of some things we like and the elimination of some things we hate. Ideally, we end up with a better system. There will be some growing pains with this. They are putting together a Steering Committee to help move this process forward and I or my designee will be on that Steering Committee. Basically I am asking if anyone out there thinks they would be a good designee to be on that Steering Committee. I’m happy to do it, but I don’t know if I’m the most qualified to do it. So if you feel strongly about the Academic side of this please be aware and be sitting on that committee then report back to the Senate and let us know how things are being planned it would help. I think it’s a pretty important position, so if anybody is interested please let me know. This is going to be a Steering Committee to essentially guide the implementation of the Oracle Student Software Support System.

P. Henry: Is this going part of what ultimately influences the grades of A-, B+ so forth?

P. Stoddard: If that’s going to happen, this is where it’s going to happen yes.

P. Henry: I thought it was going to happen.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, APASC apparently has looked at this and decided not to proceed. I mean, the students are not at all in favor of it; at least all the B-students. So, okay. Any other questions or comments on Oracle?

Okay, one last thing that I was acquainted with a little while ago – the university has been doing a salary equity study. They’ve been working on this for the last couple of years. Basically, they’ve been very interested to know whether or not there are inequities in salary that go beyond the obvious to - well, equally obvious but hopefully not their gender and ethnicity issues. Summary – it’s going out now. The deans have seen it, I’ve seen it, it’s going to the department chairs so it’s going to be out there very soon if it’s not out there already. The bottom line is that, according to their analysis, they did impression analysis and they did some more qualitative analysis, there is no statistically difference for people based on gender and ethnicity. They’re obviously based on discipline and years of service etc., but nothing they could say yes, we’ve got people who are not doing as well as they could because of gender as a group. They did notice – they were able to pick out people who were doing not as well as average and to a standard deviation and people who were doing better and so I think they’re going to go grab the money from people doing better – no they’re not going to do that. Part of this exercise is I think; by identifying these folks it does give them an opportunity to try to right the wrongs at least on the low end of the scale. I seriously doubt they’ll go after the people at the high end of the scale but – so, a couple of deans apparently – and I have no idea which ones – have said oh yeah, there’s something we can do to help bring things better into line. So, I think the good news from this is that, you know, things are in good shape and we’ve identified ways to make them better and we are working towards making things as equal as is feasible in a situation like this. So, like I said, I
Saw that a couple of hours ago and it’s working its way around campus at the moment. So you’re chair should have more information in a few days if you’d like to see more details about that. That was for faculty. Any questions about any of those issues? Okay, if not we’ve got no items to consider or to consent to and I believe we have no report from Academic Affairs or from Economic Status of the Profession. We do have a report from Resource, Space, and Budgets which will be given by Shey. Where’s Shey?

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report

B. Economic status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space and Budget – C. T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 3)

S. Lowman: Okay, I’ll keep this real short. You can read through all the details on this. The reason why we talked to Mallory Simpson who’s the President of the NIU Foundation was to find out what faculty could do to try and help raise funds. If your college needs a new building or you need some sort of facility things, you know, what exactly can faculty do. So, you can see in the next to the last paragraph what was recommended is that faculty can help identify potential donors, especially students. You know which of your students have gone off and done really well. They also recommended inviting alumni back as speakers as this advances their relationship with NIU making them more likely to donate money. Thirdly, when traveling to conferences, offer to contact alumni and host small events. So there really is something faculty can do to work with the Foundation and with alumni to try and generate new funds.

Unless anybody has any questions, that’s it.

P. Stoddard: Any questions for Shey? Okay, thank you Shey. Very good.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Chair – report

P. Stoddard: Moving on, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Anything Buck?

J. Stephen: Yes. I received the minutes from the November 2, APASC meeting and have been asked to address the fact that they did not consider some of our suggestions on the Academic Advising Center to the University – to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council tomorrow because I’m more familiar with it than the chair is. In particular, they passed the catalogue changes but they’re in such an abbreviated form that I don’t believe that they realized what they approved. Secondly, they’ve – well, let me approach three things. One is there’s discussion about what the Academic Advising Center organic constitution should contain. However, they’re approving catalogue changes and empowering a body which has yet to have such an
organic constitution. Two, they talk about what the advising manual for advisors should have in it without having that manual available and three, the APASC has approved a self-contradictory document. In particular, Earl Seaver was asked – excuse me, Vice Provost Seaver was asked “why is the Academic Advising Council or Senate recommending certain courses or exceptions of certain courses” and Vice Provost Seaver indicated that the AAC will not initiate requests for waivers or graduation requirements nor will they do anything to deviate from the university graduation requirements. It was then moved and acted that the organic order of constitution needs to reflect that. A friendly amendment by David Wade said that the policies and procedures need to reflect that the AAC cannot initiate or approve exemptions to curricular requirements or requests for waivers and then they approved the following catalogue change which is read page 41, top paragraph and this is all it says “or with the Academic Advising Center if the student has no college affiliation”. Here’s what the paragraph would read with that new change. “Regulation in this catalogue represents the policies adopted by the faculty and administration of NIU. A student that believes that his or her situation warrants an exception to one of these regulations should consult with the advising dean of his or her college”. It will now read “or with the Academic Advising Center if the student has no college affiliation”. So, in the minutes, we have prohibitions and suggestions that their organic constitutions and their policies and procedures not allow things but in the approved changes to the catalogue, we are seeing the forwarding of a contractual change that specific does allow these things and I thought I’d inform you that this saga is continuing. I’m planning on going to the UCC and I’d like the support of the faculty to suggest that they take a closer look at this and that they not approve self-contradictory documents.

P. Stoddard: Any questions or comments for Buck? Pat?

P. Henry: I have difficulty processing this just sort of hearing it. Is it possible that we could get some, I mean, I quite appreciate your point, that this is self contradictory and I can sort of see how this is but – and I think this is really important.

J. Stephen: Yes.

P. Henry: So I think we need to be sort of kept in the picture and somehow able to follow it along if we could and then have specific – except, I guess what you’re saying is that they aren’t paying any attention to us anyway.

J. Stephen: Well, they’ve developed no organic constitution so they haven’t addressed the faculty oversight. There’s no developed policy for faculty interaction with the advising process. Those are problematic. The most problematic things I think that we should be concerned with is this has already been approved by APASC; it goes to UCC tomorrow afternoon. In the minutes is a statement by the Vice Provost saying “no, we’re not going to do this; we won’t allow exceptions – this Center to allow exceptions – to university graduation requirements”. A friendly amendment says “okay, then the organic constitution should contain these restrictions”. This document doesn’t exist yet. Another amendment says that the Policies and Procedures Manual for the AAC should also say that this is prohibited. That document does not exist yet. The only document that will exist after the approval of these minutes is a document saying that
the AAC can waive or change graduation requirements by changing the catalogue wording on
page 41 of the undergraduate catalogue.

**P. Henry:** What’s your understanding of when the organic constitution will come into
existence? If it does, it will contradict this.

**J. Stephen:** Well, I have no idea. The AAC should not have come into existence until it had
been approved through the appropriate bodies and had a constitution.

**P. Stoddard:** We have Bill, then Colin and W.

**W. Tolhurst:** Am I first?

**P. Stoddard:** Yes.

**W. Tolhurst:** This is unbelievable! I mean, contradictions are like that. They’re unbelievable
and as far as I can see, what is the big hurry. We’re trying this thing up and running before it’s
ready to be up and running. In order for it to be up and running, it has to have a clear, you know,
there has to be a clear account of what it is and what it is not supposed to do. In any event, if Gip
meant what he said, and I believe he did, then he should not want the catalogue to suggest
something different because that makes him look duplicitous and I don’t think he is, but it seems
to me to empower a body to do something that you’ve assured everyone else it will not be
allowed to do is crazy.

**C. Booth:** I completely agree with Bill. I don’t know what they’re thinking. The body’s not
been empowered; it’s acting. The one thing to further the outrage is I figure that computing a
number of undecided, what are called 709 students, we have a directory and assistant director,
four advisors, graduate advisors, peer advisors and only about 635 undeclared/undecided college
students so it’s costing $100 for each of those undecided students just to pay the director of this
center for something that hasn’t been approved, let alone the whole rest of the process.

**W. Baker:** I just have a minor question here, like Pat, I have trouble following the spoken word
as he’s going through there. The section you just read from the catalogue refereed to – on page
41 I think – referred to students who thought they deserved exemptions should consult with the
Academic Center. It didn’t necessarily say that the Center has sort of approval powers does it?

**J. Stephen:** That’s what is standardly interpreted as being - that is the introductory paragraph of
the academic regulations and the advising deans consider that paragraph as the enacting power to
make waivers or deviations from academic regulations either at the dean’s level or by reference
to various departments or programs. It is considered by the deans the enacting paragraph for
making exceptions to academic regulations.

**W. Baker:** Okay.

**P. Stoddard:** Professor Baker?
**W. Baker:** Yeah, a couple of points. One a general one. Could you please clarify the structures in this university? My perception was, until you answered Professor Henry this afternoon with her quarry concerning grading system, were that votes were taken here which then went to University Council, where things were debated and they were the decision making body. In your reply to Professor Henry, you seemed to be implying, using that word again, that their decisions could simply be over-ridden if some other body and I couldn’t quite pick up the acronym which were being used, decided that wasn’t the flavor of the month. This acronym is again being thrown out here so could we please have some clarification of what this APASC actually is, number one. Secondly, what actual powers it has and thirdly has it any powers to override decisions made by the University Council?

**P. Stoddard:** APASC is the Academic Planning and Standards Committee. They’re a faculty body charged with the things its title suggests; academic planning and standards, and basically they are the ones that are most directly involved with approving things like this Academic Advising Center. APASC, along with a bunch of other committees, reports to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council which is really the main curricular approval body on campus. So the University Council does not approve curriculum changes. Those go college curriculum committees which then go to university curriculum committees and then goes to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and that’s where things like that are applied. So we really have a duo track here where most of the curricular decisions are really handled by faculty committees so they’re still faculty committees such as APASC and the UCC. We deal more with the administrative – that is, the University Council, deals more with the administration of the university. The Faculty Senate is a body in which the faculty express their concerns about things such as APASC or the Academic Advising Center and so forth. The Senate itself cannot dictate anything but can make the faculty’s concerns known.

**W. Baker:** May I ask for follow-up please, clarification. Are you in fact saying, Mr. Stoddard, that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has indeed the authority to override decisions made by the University Council?

**P. Stoddard:** The UCC submits a report to the University Council. I suppose we could chose not to receive that report and ask them to do things differently.

**J. Stephen:** Yes it can. It’s in the bylaws.

**P. Stoddard:** To my knowledge this has never happened but there’s always a first time for everything. I will say this, however, in general I’ve seen some of the – well, I’ve seen the annual reports that a lot of different bodies are required to submit to the University Council and a lot of them are not very informative at all. Recounts are the body met, we talked about stuff, we went home, but I think one of the things I want to do from now on actually is before we start requesting these officially, to point out that they need to be a bit more specific than stuff. They use a better word. Yeah, the University Council is the final word.

**W. Tolhurst:** As far as receiving reports, I don’t know about the University Council, but last time I was on the UCC, we did get a report a report from a committee; I think it was the Gen Ed Committee which had a backlog as I recall and if we had received the report they were
submitting, we would be giving them a blank check for a document they hadn’t submitted. As I recall, we voted to receive the report with the exception of the blank check and that meant that that part of it did not go into effect so I do know that this is something that can and should be done under some circumstances. Furthermore, I take it that there’s nothing to prevent us here and now from expressing our concerns directly to the UCC and asking them to hold off until some of these manners could be resolved.

**P. Stoddard**: Certainly, I think we can always ask. Do we have a volunteer vessel to pass that message along who has asked for essentially our blessing or support in passing that message along. Yeah, that would be perfectly appropriate. Yes, Lynn?

**L. Kamenitsa**: Now, membership of UCC is only faculty or is there also administrative representation on that?

**P. Stoddard**: Vice Provost Seaver is the co-chair. Art Doederlein is the faculty co-chair and I believe everybody else on that committee is faculty. I couldn’t swear to that.

**J. Stephen**: I can give you information about that. Ex-officio members are Bob Burke from Admissions, Eaton from Educational Services, Gillis from the Transfer Center, Kallembach from Registration and Records, and Vice-Provost Seaver is an ex-officio member.

**P. Stoddard**: Right, so they’re there mostly for information and are non-voting. Okay, any other discussion? Would we like to formalize something in the form of a motion? If so, would somebody to propose such a motion?

**J. Stephen**: I would move that we encourage the UCC to return this to APASC until they get an organic constitution and that they reverse their – that they reconsider their approval of the changes on page 41, top paragraph which is the one that empowers them to waive or change university requirements.

**P. Stoddard**: Okay, Bill you’ve got your hand up.

**W. Tolhurst**: I’d like to suggest what I hope will be a friendly amendment. I would like to reword the resolution to request APASC refuse to receive the portion of – the UCC refuse to receive the portion of the report from APASC that authorizes the stuff that Gip said they wouldn’t do.

**J. Stephen**: I’ll take that as a friendly amendment.

**P. Stoddard**: Strictly speaking, we don’t have a second yet so an amendment – we have a second. Okay. Do you accept the amendment as – heck yes? Okay, that’s affirmative. So we have a motion and a friendly amendment seconded. Any further discussion about it? Yes, C.T.

**C.T. Lin**: Is there any possibility that we have our representative to go to the UCC tomorrow to explain the case. Because, you know, all the member on UCC, I heard about it but another UCC member, they never heard about that. Therefore, I think it’s better to have a representative from
here go to UCC with the resolution and to present it to the UCC and make them aware so they can really make an intelligent decision. Thank you.

**P. Stoddard:** It was my understanding of the motion that Professor Stephen would be presenting our concerns in person to UCC tomorrow afternoon to make sure they understand our concerns.

**J. Stephen:** That is correct.

**P. Stoddard:** Any other discussion? Okay, all in favor of the motion please say aye. Any opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes.

The motion passed.

**J. Stephen:** I will report that as a unanimous motion.

**P. Stoddard:** That seems reasonable. Okay.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Stephen Nord, Chair – no report

**VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Executive Vice President and Provost Search – see search packet – walk-in

**P. Stoddard:** We’re going to postpone New Business until our guest can arrive.

At this point, our guest has arrived and I’d like to go ahead and have her come up. This is Dr. Susan Blakely Shuren from Issacson Miller who will be assisting us in our search for the provost position.

**S. Shuren:** Thank you very much for making a little time for me on your agenda. I’ve spent the last twenty-four hours meeting with several members of the university. I am a partner with Issacson Miller which is a national search firm. It’s based in Boston. We have offices in Washington which is where based and in San Francisco. We do exclusively searches for – a retained executive search which is to say we’re hired by the institutions to find executive leadership at the top and about one level down so we do university presidents, deans, provosts, center directors, people of that sort and we deal entirely in non-profit admission driven organizations. About 60 percent of our practice is higher education and what I’m doing here now is to meet with the search committee and with a whole bunch of different constituencies from the university to try to get a pretty good sense of where you are now; where it is you’d like to be; and, how the new provost is going to fit into the whole process of getting you to where you need to be. The major question that I’m trying to identify in order to be able to pull together
some information which we’ll be able to use to hook in people who are absolutely not looking for jobs and have no intention of moving to Illinois, what are the opportunities that are here. What is exciting about this job? We’re putting together what basically will be a marketing document but we have to sell the truth. Nobody expects to come into higher education and not find problems. Most people are far too realistic for that. What I’d like to be able to identify is what you as faculty see as the main challenges for the next provost and how you will now one, three, and five years from now that you hired the right person. So what sort of key measures or indicators are --- What I’ve heard from virtually every single constituency with which I’ve met is a passion for and demonstrating commitment to diversity, to the fact that this is a public university with basically a land grant mission and people need to be comfortable with that and a high degree of comfort with and commitment to shared governance. So, just to tell you that that has come through loud and clear. What I’d really like to do is to open this up to you to tell me; I’m here mostly to listen, what it is that you’re looking for in your next provost so that we can sort of target how we’re going out to try to find somebody. What the challenges are and what the key characteristics are of the next provost. I’d like to open it up. Yeah?

**B. Lusk:** I come from one of our professional programs here and I think it’s key that the new provost have an understanding of health care and health care professionals and the specific needs of their education. Our college is I think going through a time of major change and we need someone experienced in these various professional school issues.

**J. Stephen:** I think to expand upon that, Northern Illinois University has a well-recognized reputation for turning out educators but whoever comes here should recognize that this is an across-the-board research model institution which produces a number of research-level PhDs as recognized programs outside of education; has recognized programs in the professional fields and their background should reflect that kind of breadth of experience. Another thing that I think is important is that the new vice president and provost be committed to expanding and continuing our recognition as a national institutional as opposed to a regional university.

**A Senator:** One of the things I’d like to see is someone who is committed to breaking down barriers between departments and making for more multi-disciplinary studies in research and in education. We have department research tracks that run in parallel and don’t communicate as well as they should and I think that would be a very fruitful direction to go.

**P. Henry:** I’m sort of following up on what Buck was saying, understanding the research mission of the university, it’s also important that it’s recognized that there’s such a range of diversity in terms of what is offered here and what is taught. We’ve got very exotic things and not so exotic things but the university sort of ranges through the offerings as well as the student body and some higher research oriented areas and more teaching oriented areas and indeed, the communication among all those is something that the provost needs to be very good at doing.

**W. Tolhurst:** Following up on that, it seems to me that many, including someone named Kaplan was it, seems not to understand that what really makes this university as important as it is, is the quality of the students who get their degrees here and the quality of their education is determined by the quality of the faculty who are teaching them and that the research that the faculty does it not something that gets in the way or providing high quality education; it’s an
essential ingredient in providing that kind of education. All too many people outside the university don’t understand that if we don’t keep up with our fields, our students don’t get properly educated and that means that we have to do research; it’s not an add-on. We need a provost who as the chief academic officer can communicate that very clearly, preferably without using the word synergy.

M. Morris: In our President’s State of the College address or State of the University address earlier this year, he spoke to the importance of internationalization and we do have an excellent study abroad office here that has quite a number of excellent programs but I would like to see the new provost have a commitment to internationalization because as, you know, with the direction our world is moving, I think that our students have to have a broader-based perspective in order to be successful because they have to be able to focus – or they cannot focus simply in a small area; they have to have a broader perspective.

L. Kamenitsa: You mentioned that you heard elsewhere about diversity. I hate to have you walk away from here not hearing about diversity as an important issue and I’m thinking about that quite broadly not only in terms of diversity in terms of who the faculty are but also curricular offerings. It touches on the internationalization point and it touches on the inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary points. I think that’s something we’ve made a great deal of progress on recently and I think it’s somewhere that we as a university need to continue to go. I hope we can find a provost who will be supportive of that even if that sometimes means kind of pushing and nudging faculty to get out of our comfort zones as we’ve seen done here in the past.

J. Stephen: Can we express opinions on what we don’t want? I don’t want to see somebody who thinks that the University of Phoenix is an excellent education. I want someone who is committed to the idea that a decent education requires interaction with faculty.

M. Morris: After that, interaction that is not computer based or facilitated by a computer but is based on person-to-person.

C. Rollman: That includes the community too.

P. Henry: I think one sort of really asset of Northern Illinois University is that it does offer this sort of best of both words in terms of research and teaching and having a wide range of students and faculty and disciplines so that it’s not perhaps as tidy as some universities but it has a lot of exciting things going on.

C. Hubbard: I would like to expand on the community aspect of this. I think sometimes the university has or is perceived to have somewhat of an arrogant, elitist attitude by the rest of the community, not just here in DeKalb, but surrounding communities as well and as I see one of the responsibilities of the provost is to out his outreach to the community and I’d like to see the university interact more with the rest of the community not just in terms of teaching, but community affairs in general and be a part of the community rather than a director of what happens in the community.
**J. Stephen:** Are we open for procedural questions? Is your firm committed to extending this search next year if we have a failed search this year?

**S. Shuren:** We’re engaged to complete the search. I’m not sure what the question is.

**J. Stephen:** Our time on this is very short. The intention is that we would have someone in place by the first of July, the beginning of the next academic or fiscal year. If our search fails and we don’t find a candidate acceptable or a candidate we find acceptable doesn’t find us acceptable, is your firm going to continue to represent us in the next year until the search is complete?

**S. Shuren:** It’s a highly complex question and there are a lot of things that fit into this including the judgments of the search committee and whatnot. I’m not quite sure what you’re asking.

**J. Stephen:** If we have a failed search, what happens?

**S. Shuren:** We start over.

**J. Stephen:** With you?

**S. Shuren:** Maybe and maybe not.

**J. Stephen:** I was just wondering if the contract included that. Evidently it doesn’t?

**S. Shuren:** I think that there are so many hypotheticals that you’re way beyond anything within the context of that. I mean it’s quite possible that the search will take longer but that doesn’t necessarily make it a failed search. It’s not uncommon for it to take longer.

**J. Stephen:** Correct and I was just asking if it takes longer ---

**S. Shuren:** That doesn’t make it a failed search. It’s a failed search if you really don’t find anybody acceptable.

**J. Stephen:** If it takes longer, you’ll be continuing. That’s what I’m asking.

**S. Shuren:** Ours is not limited by time.

**J. Stephen:** Okay.

**A. Senator:** I have some concern about the sort of the lack of publicity about what has been going on and so personally I didn’t know we were looking for a provost until the memo or the e-mail came across and people in my department hadn’t been aware that the provost position was open and there was a search going on so what I’m wondering is since we can only – well, I don’t know if other people have been aware of this for a longer time, but given that our department wasn’t – if there an opportunity for us to get back to our departments, talk about this question with them and then be able to give some input into the process so that we’re not just speaking for
ourselves or what we might individually want but represent what people in our departments are looking for so what is the mechanism by which we can continue to give input after having department-wide discussions around this where we can actually think about this for some time.

**S. Shuren:** Let me just describe where we are in the process. It’s just getting started. Provost Legg has been ill and expecting to be retiring by the end of this academic year and so we’re just getting started. The Search Committee has just been constituted where you are, where you hope to go and what some of the major challenges are to be met at this institution. We will then run that through the search committee. The search committee will then have an opportunity to refine it, sort of smooth it out, sort of make sure that you feel that it represents you and we will at the same time, be starting the process of contacting people who may know people, people who are potential candidates for the position. As soon as we have this available, there will be a web site that will be set up. This will be posted on the web site and all the instructions for your input will be going – that’s an internal issue for the university here. What will happen is that all of your suggestions and one of the major things that I’d like to ask you to do is to look hard at your own roledexes. Who do you know at other universities that you would like to see here as provost because usually in an institution like this, the kind of people who are going to be coming here and will be comfortable with this position are going to be two to three degrees of separation. People you know know, or knows someone who does know, the next provost, so we need your help to be going out and identifying the kind of people that you want. I’d especially like to emphasis that from the standpoint of the diversity. You need to help us identify a diverse pool; identify people who aren’t necessarily obvious candidates. We have our own contacts for that but we need your help doing that as well. Then we will go out, we will meet with people, come back, meet with the committee and the committee will give us direction in terms of the people that you’re most interested in and then we will bring people in to meet with the committee and we expect to whittle it down to a point where we get there or four candidates who will be of highest interest to the committee who then be brought to campus. So, there’ll be plenty of opportunity to have input and I would recommend channeling – because of the way the committee is set up – it’s designed to have people who represent various sorts of constituencies with exactly this idea is to channel input and suggestions through the search committee.

**W. Baker:** May I ask how many, how competitive is this kind of field? In other words, in comparative institutions over the past ten years, what has been the field state of play to find provosts?

**S. Shuren:** I guess I’m not again – could you define the question for me?

**W. Baker:** Is this going to be ultimately a very competitive search? I mean, in some fields, clearly in some areas of academia, some positions are more sought after than others, in your experience and in the experience of your firm, how competitive – are there lots of provost positions out there?

**S. Shuren:** There are lots of provost positions out there and the provost position is a very hard job. I think I understand your question. The provost position is a hard job; it’s also a very desirable job for people who are seeking leadership positions in academia and so for certain kinds of people, it’s a very, very attractive job. It is a challenging job. There is as there are in
many areas of academic leadership, a lot of turnover and a lot of burnout in these positions so there are a significant number of positions that are open. I see no reason that it shouldn’t be a very attractive position for people who have this kind of interest.

**W. Baker:** Has your firm done a statistical breakdown of the kind of people who may well be attracted to “university x” rather than “university y”.

**S. Shuren:** Usually, there’s some degree of consistency in the sense of people who have a strong background in private universities will go for private universities. It’s very difficult to bring someone into a university like this who has no experience with a public institution at all because the cultures are so different. They don’t necessarily now to be at a public university but it’s going to be somebody who’s had some experience in a public university as opposed to somebody who’s spent his or her entire career in a private institution. There’s some consistency there.

**C.T. Lin:** I see quite a lot of people asking about the transformation of the university toward research, research type of institution because, you know, related research type of institution because, you know, in terms of education, all the knowledge what the teachers research and also in terms of research and development and I think it is very important to us we can see the first goal of the six commitments of higher education in Illinois is that higher education should have the standard economy grow so my thing is that I’d like to see, the future provost – the current provost is very supportive in term of research and development and from the development generate a pride type of technology can be commercialized so therefore, our current provost has established a spinoff company for the university and they turned out to be very successful that the spinoff company can be used for a way to generate some additional income for the university. So therefore I’d like to see that the future provost continue to support the idea of research and development current technology to possible commercialization, the industrial spinoff company and actually, you know, put it on the market.

**S. Shuren:** Some of what you’re saying is relevant to these issues of what kind of institution. The provost is unlikely to come from a small liberal arts private college and is much more likely to come from an environment which is like this and one of the missions of most land grants is to have an economic impact and this is a Carnegie classification research extensive university. It has the potential to have that kind of impact and it is certainly part of its mission. Yeah?

**K. Gallagher:** My question is somewhat procedural also. In your experience, can a search of this type be successfully carried out in seven months?

**S. Shuren:** Yes.

**K. Gallagher:** Good.

**W. Tolhurst:** I just had a general question about your experience and the kinds of candidates that might pop up. It strikes me that one sort of candidate would be someone who’s already a provost at some lesser institution for whom this would be a move up or you might have someone who’s a dean from a comparable institution looking to move up to being a provost somewhere.
Are there other sorts of people who might be viable candidates and what sort of person in your estimation tends to work out better, seems to be happier and more effective in the job?

**S. Shuren:** There are lots of different models so any of these – it doesn’t have to be somebody – as we go through the interviewing process, somebody who’s been a provost says well, they have the view of the whole university whereas somebody who has been a dean – the standard, every single time complaint is, well, they only know that single school and they don’t know the whole university. You know, everybody has a significant learning curve. Everybody’s going to have to learn something and so what we really try to do is try to identify some of the kinds of challenges that this person needs to have met in the past and some of the kind of building that this person needs to have done. There’s a huge component of managing people, there’s a huge component of managing money. So somebody who hasn’t had significant administrative and fiscal responsibility is going to have too steep a learning curve and too little demonstrated success to be in this position.

**W. Tolhurst:** So you have a pretty good idea of what you would see as necessary for a successful candidate in those kinds of areas?

**S. Shuren:** Right, and also we have some instructions both from the search committee and the president. It has to be somebody who is tenurable at this institution. Somebody who has got academic credibility because this is the person – this is the chief academic officer – it’s the person who’s going to oversee all the tenure and promotion and faculty appointments. I think everybody sees that as a very, very serious issue.

**W. Tolhurst:** And I take it that in terms of having the ability to manage people that one of the significant components of that is the recognition of the importance of process in managing people. That if you screw up the process then you’re not going to have a good outcome.

**S. Shuren:** And that actually is one of the issues in terms of the kinds of institutions and environments that people come from is that academic environments are not totally – I mean, there’s a lot of consistency. Many of the things that you face here are at many different institutions but it’s not corporate. It’s not command and control and that kind of approach doesn’t tend to work in an academic environment.

**W. Tolhurst:** So we don’t want to be talking about customers?

**S. Shuren:** If you’re talking about customers ---

**W. Tolhurst:** They’re students not customers.

**S. Shuren:** That’s right.

**L. Gregory:** It seems from the discussion that we have an idea of the job of the provost is not only to work on campus but to represent us well off of campus and I fully agree with that. To see us where we want to go to and how we’ve been described in research. I’d like to point out that he needs an overview, he or she, I’m sorry – what research is, that it doesn’t always turn into
something that we can market or that we can take directly into the classroom. There are experiential things. We have creative writers; we have artists; we have performers; we have other people who maybe the general public doesn’t see as easily as researchers in some of the higher end, more publicizable achievements in research and I think this is an important fight that we’ve had through the years to keep that recognition and I would like to see that whatever person you bring in here or whatever candidates you bring in here for that would be committed to that as well. It’s a big job who has someone who has all of these plus all the things that we haven’t mentioned and to meet all of those too.

S. Shuren: Right.

A Senator: I would like to know that since this position is sort of accountable to a body or maybe several bodies, what is the share of the faculty of that – being accountable to the faculty and if that is the case, what is the final share of the decision having made by faculty. In other words, how you really – final decision comes in terms of sharing the final candidate.

S. Shuren: This is the executive vice president position and it reports and it’s an administrative position and reports to the president. It’s the president’s decision. It has to be somebody who will work in close partnership with the president and with whom the president is comfortable. The reason for the extensive search process which involves people from all aspects of the university and people who represent all of you is that the president needs to make his final decision from the pool of people who have been identified as acceptable and attractive to the people on the search committee. The search committee should not be presenting people to the president with whom they’re not comfortable. That is really the vetting process from the standpoint of the faculty. Yeah?

J. Stephen: We had a previous, what a comedian calls a call-back, to a person named Kaplan. That’s actually James Kaplan who’s Chairman of the IBHE, not Anne Kaplan, whom you might have met. I think it’s necessary that we have an extremely aggressive advocate for the university at the state level in terms of what they do about funding and their financial management skills because we’re in an environment where our funding from the state has dropped by 15 percent in the last ten years and in a rather hostile environment from the state of Illinois’s viewpoint from both the IBHE and, I can’t remember the name of the office – it’s Elliott Regenstein – in the Lieutenant Governor’s Office there’s a very – not only do we not want to commit money to the universities, we want to make you pay more, you know, we want to give you less support – and we need an aggressive advocate ---

S. Shuren: I will warn you though that that’s the experience across the entire nation. There are places where state universities are getting single digit levels of percentage of support in some of this. You need advocacy that some of that’s not going to change.

J. Stephen: Right.

W. Tolhurst: Just to follow up on what might be going on in one of the other questions or comments, I take it this procedure will like past procedures allow for widespread interaction between all members of the community and the viable candidate in appropriate venues?
S. Shuren: At the appropriate time.

W. Tolhurst: Yes, at the appropriate time.

S. Shuren: You appreciate I’m sure the sensitivity of people who come into this process and will respect their privacy until everybody’s had a chance to decide that they’re interested in you, you’re interested in them and at that point it becomes opened up but the search committee has a strong commitment to try to keep the strongest candidates in the pool and for that we can’t compromise them at their home institutions.

P. Henry: In terms of getting the feedback from us to you as to our possible friends of friends or acquaintances of acquaintances and other names that we might have in mind, how should we do that? Through our representatives?

S. Shuren: You can do that through your representative on the search committee. Absolutely. When the web site goes up, there’ll be clearly identified ways of doing that. You guys will be setting up the web site here for the provost search and there will be a link to our firm. We’ll set up a specific search mailbox and if you send it in, we have people who check it several times a day and we’ll pay close attention. All of that will be clear at the point when we’re ready to handle the information which we’re not quite yet. Nonetheless, I’m going to ask all of you to go home and check your rolodexes or contact files or whatever it is you keep it on.

J. Newman-Ryan: I’d like to just follow up what Buck said a minute ago about advocating for us with the legislature. Our current president, as a political scientist, has a great interest in working with the state government. It seems to be a passion of his. Our next president, whoever that may be, may not be so interested and so is that something our next provost would do or if not, who would our next provost see as doing that? I think that would be important to discuss on some level.

S. Shuren: Great.

W. Tolhurst: I think it might be unwise to assume our president will not be here and to make contingency plans for his absence.

S. Shuren: This will be an ongoing dialogue. All of this will be stuff that is further discussed through your chair and I very much appreciate your thoughtful attention and think about people, think about characteristics that matter and we look forward to working with you. Thank you so much.

P. Stoddard: Thank you very much for coming. And as was mentioned, there are several different avenues for giving input. Obviously, you can talk to me. Each college has a representative on the search committee. Each constituency – students and staff and so forth – have at least one, usually two or three members on the search committee so there are a lot of people to try to get information and concerns into the search process.
Now might be a good time since it’s all fresh in our minds and we’re rapidly losing people, to take a quick look at the last page of the last handout you have. It’s the candidate screening criteria. As I said, this is something we came up with last night. It’s similar, there have been a few changes, but it’s fairly similar to what was used last time around. Basically, this is a guideline document. Some of these guidelines are more firm than others. The first one is extremely firm. The candidate will have an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree. They won’t consider anybody who’s not in that. Some of the others you can see get a little involved and get into some philosophy issues a bit more than others perhaps and just because somebody doesn’t have one segment of one of these asterisked comments, doesn’t mean that we’re going to rule them out but this is a fairly, I would guess, fairly comprehensive document describing what we would expect from a candidate we’re considering. She was a little vague on people asked about – the number of applicants or the size of the pool we might get. We’re get a lot of people who have no business applying. Their job is to weed a lot of those out although you do get to see every single application; they make no final decision about anything. An estimate, obviously a very rough estimate, is we might get twenty or thirty people who are qualified for the job and then it’s a matter of who’s got the attitudes and philosophies and the actual experience that we value. That’s what this is supposed to help us remember as we go through the process. Our job here is again, according to Bylaw 18.311, that’s on the very first page of this little handout, “the Faculty Senate or Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall have the opportunity to review the selection criteria prior to the advertisement of the position” and so that’s what we’re doing right now. The advertisement starts in January as I mentioned. We don’t meet before then. The Executive Committee does not have a scheduled meeting before then so this really is our opportunity to comment on these criteria and we’re looking more for general ideas and not editing niceties.

**J. Stephen:** I withdraw my earlier comment when you brought that up. It’s obvious that they have an understanding of what we want in the way of a new provost.

**P. Stoddard:** Right, I was actually the third person to mention shared governance in the meeting last night, much to my shame but much to the credit of everybody else. I really do think everybody at the table last night ---

**J. Stephen:** She seems to have gotten the message.

**P. Stoddard:** She did get the message, yeah. Any other comments or questions about this? I know this is a little short notice on this thing so feel free to e-mail me with anything that come up. Yeah, Bill?

**W. Tolhurst:** Just glancing at this, it seems to me obvious that what’s there makes sense so as far as I can see, the real question is, is there anything that isn’t there that should be there.

**P. Stoddard:** Right and I think that’s the main thing that the search committee would be looking for at this point. Are there any glaring admissions that, you know ---
J. Stephen: It looks complete to me but in my experience in hiring people in the department, we still have to send the wording of the advertisement through Affirmative Action and a number of other offices. Is anyone presently working on the actual wording of the advertisement?

P. Stoddard: We do have a job description there which I suspect would be more or less, I mean, there’ll be some modification of that. We haven’t started that process yet. I think the criteria, the existing job description – those are going to be some of the factors that go into it. You mentioned Affirmative Action; they have a representative sitting in on all these meetings so Affirmative Action, you did mention them, right?

J. Stephen: Yes, I did. I’m worried about their turn-around time on this.

P. Stoddard: They’re working with us. We’re telling them the schedule. They’re letting us know of any concerns they have about it. She did mention a couple of things last night and we made sure that everybody was okay. So yes, they’re aware of it and we think that this schedule is possible.

J. Stephen: Good. From a department, it would be very hard to get it approved by January.

P. Stoddard: Yeah, well when the chair of the search committee is the president of the university, things kind of move faster. The co-chair. My role notwithstanding, I still think it will move quickly. Okay, any other questions? On the agenda, we still officially have one more report from the FAC. Jody, you feel like giving that? We’ve lost a lot of people or do you feel you’d be better heard next time around.

X. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sharon Holmes

  1. October 18, 2005 report (Pages 4-6)

P. Stoddard: Next up would be a report from Sharon Holmes, representative to the IBHE.

S. Holmes: I attended the first IBHE and FAC meeting at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign on October 18. I won’t bore you with everything; I’ll just highlight what I think you might want to comment on.

The Board Meeting started with a discussion by Stanley Ikenberry. The question that he posed to the group was “Is higher education in trouble in this country; does it matter if it we believe that it is and that it matters, what can we do?”. I think we could all say that higher education matters in this country and it is in trouble at some level. He said that what we really needed to do was to understand the importance of the IBHE in giving voice to these types of concerns. He also said that we need to open up a dialogue with the American public which I think he has developed a committee to do just that and we will be meeting on Friday of this week and so I’m sure we’ll hear a little bit more about what they’re doing in terms of that committee that’s going to be going around I guess the state talking with people about what higher education means to
them and what it should mean for us. Comments from the Board based on Ikenberry’s discussion was that faculty and administrators need to make significant changes in how we think about higher education and our methods of delivering our services and Ikenberry had initially said that he believed that higher education was in trouble and that we stood to lose the American dream as he talks about benefits of having a college education. The Chairman of the IBHE was very adamant that he did not believe that we were losing that aspect of the American dream and said that we all probably needed to just look at how we view higher education differently. No longer do we have a model that students leave high school and go to college; we have life-long learning now and so he stressed that. There were a number of questions from the Board members in terms of how many years of education does a person actually need beyond high school or need of education period. It was determined by all that a high school education was very important and that probably a four-year education was the thing that everybody should have access to.

The next thing that we discussed at the meeting was Dr. Gary Alexander gave a discussion of faculty salaries and fringe benefits in Illinois colleges and universities. As you might imagine, that was a pretty heated discussion. What he talked about – he said it was determined based on the information that they had pulled together was that the average faculty salary at public universities in FY 2005, and this was weighted for all ranks of faculty, was approximately $69,000 and he said that represented a 7.1 percent gain over 2003 and a 13.4 per cent gain over 2001 and he indicated that when compared with peer institutions in other states, salaries were only marginally more competitive in 2005 than four years ago. There was a lot of discussion about faculty salaries and fringe benefits and a number of Board members indicated that they didn’t think that the IBHE should even publicize this type of information but there were other Board members who said that this was public information and this committee had just taken the time to pull it together. If you really want to get into all of the charts and graphs because they had numerous charts and graphs, it is on their web page and all you have to do is just go to the IBHE web page and you can pull in the link.

The next thing that we talked about was the new IBHE Executive Director, that’s Judy Erwin, and she’s on board already and we will be meeting with her as the FAC on Friday. She’ll spend an hour with us to tell us what she intends to do and how sensitive she may be to the needs of faculty in the state and universities in general.

Then I think – you know, this was my first meeting attending the Board meeting or the FAC and it was very interesting. We had lunch with the Board and the Chair of the Board, Kaplan, raised this question. He said “tell me what the faculty intends to do to change the current state of the university, what allowances or concessions are faculty willing to take and are you willing to work more hours”. As you can imagine, that raised a lot of discussion and you notice on my little minutes here I only put “while much conversation followed, Kaplan suggested that we think about this and get back with him” because I didn’t want to say on paper that it was very heated. There were a lot of raised voices and I came away from that experience saying that I think there is a definite disconnect maybe with the Chairman and with the universities and particularly faculty, that the Chairman doesn’t seem to be sensitive to what faculty do and even – I don’t want to over-generalize it or, you know, to say maybe what universities do at some level and so after he left and the other board members left, the FAC met and so we continued that discussion.
and my thoughts were validated. They said that there is a definite disconnect with the current Chairman of the Board with what universities do and with faculty and so we are going to be trying to come up with some suggestions to take back to him because these – you an look at the highlights I gave you here from the FAC meeting – but they don’t really encompass what we talked about. There was really anger in the room about what the Chairman had said and for him to just make a blanket statement – what are faculty going to do to resolve the issues that we’re having in the state at our universities campuses, no one appreciated those comments and so that will be one of the agenda items for us on this coming Friday.

That concludes my report.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you Sharon. Any questions? Colin? No? Is it appropriate for mixed company?

**C. Booth:** Yes.

**P. Stoddard:** Then please share it.

**C. Booth:** Obviously, in relation to this last issue, having just filled a thing out yesterday, I can certainly attest that every faculty member in this university has to fill out for every semester, the average number of hours worked per week for the benefit of splitting that down into different categories which means that that data is available and presumably is available to the IBHE for probably the last twenty or thirty years or something like that. So if the Chairman of the IBHE needs to figure out more hours than what, then all of that data is available for the IBHE to look at.

**P. Stoddard:** Buck?

**J. Stephen:** Is Alan Karnes still on the Board? No? The figures on the average faculty salary at public universities and the rate of change and also the comparison of peer institutions aren’t consistent with previously reported figures. So they’ve changed either how they’re doing this or what group we’re in or they’ve changed what we consider as peer institutions or I’m thinking of an NIU study as opposed to a state-wide study where somehow or another all of the universities in the state suddenly have peer institutions they’re equivalent. These figures are not consistent with figures for NIU or NIU’s peer group.

**P. Stoddard:** That’s something to consider. Anybody else? Pat?

**P. Henry:** I’d just like to say there’s a sense of déjà vu here in terms of Kaplan especially as Chairman of the IBHE. Thank you for that report and continue to keep us posted.

**P. Stoddard:** Thank you again Sharon.
J. Newman-Ryan: I don’t need to say much but there’s one thing I need to point out. Those of you who have had a lot of experience with articulation initiative, serving on panels and the like, I think many of you or people in your department are involved in that process so I do need to point out that there’s a new report. I took excerpts from that on pages 5 and 6 so there’s a preliminary report. It’s posted on IBHE website up in the upper right corner. They’re asking for comments before December 15 so I have not been involved in this process enough to know – I did try to pick out what I thought seemed to be some of the major changes and so you might want to look at those that I have here outlined and then look at that web site because there might be people in your department who need to comment on that and that comes up by December 15.

The other information – I have a lot of supplemental information in here from the Illinois Summit so I didn’t intend to read much of that anyway but in my experience, these things have come in the past, they have come up in different ways such as new initiatives like our priorities, productivity and accountability. So if you want to see some of the present buzz words, some of them are in there and that’s available on the web too if you’re interested in any of that. I think that’s probably it that’s really important.

P. Stoddard: Buck?

J. Stephen: A comment on that – the IAI, the page 17 recommendation “shift responsibility to faculty at individual colleges and universities for certifying that their courses meet the guidelines for IAI”. That’s sort of like recommending that we reverse the articulation initiative so if you have someone in your department who’s active in this, I think that you should definitely get them to take a look at that recommendations because that’s what the articulation initiative was meant to take care of.

P. Henry: Could you repeat that please?

J. Stephen: It says “it says refine – shift the responsibilities of faculty at individual colleges and universities for certifying that courses meet guidelines for IAI”.

P. Stoddard: That’s on page 5 of the walk-in from Jody and it’s the paragraph that’s titled “see page 17”.

P. Henry: Okay, thanks.

P. Stoddard: That’s actually a huge, huge thing. Right now these courses are – a panel gets together from universities and colleges across the state to decide which courses are acceptable. What this means is that any community college or four-year institution can say this course that we have “chemistry of the grocery store” is a legitimate first year chemistry course and will suffice as an articulation equivalent to any first year chemistry course in the state and I have seen “chemistry of the grocery store” proposed.
J. Stephen: That’s an important part that I didn’t stress. This is an attempt to shift the responsibility for certification to the institution providing delivery of the course, not to the university which is supposed to articulate the course.

P. Henry: How can they do that?

J. Stephen: That’s the problem.

W. Tolhurst: They can’t if we don’t let them.

P. Stoddard: Jody?

J. Newman-Ryan: Page 17 refers to – there’s a 34 page report that you can get on the web so that’s what the page 17 refers to. Again, I haven’t been involved with this enough to know all the details and unfortunately, there was no discussion of this really last week at the meeting. They said the report had just come out but nobody had it. I went back and found it on the web so I don’t know why it wasn’t discussed. I assume it will be discussed Friday but again we won’t have a chance to hear about that until after December 15 so I just thought it was important that you look at that. It’s a 34 page report; there’s a lot there.

P. Henry: Where is it available on the web?

P. Stoddard: Jody, cold you remind us again where we can get this and what we can do to express displeasure.

J. Newman-Ryan: Okay, it’s on ibhe.state.il.gov – it’s the IBHE web site and if you look at the upper right corner, I think it’s the first item in the little box up in the upper right corner and it says “draft report”, well the name of the report “comments requested on a preliminary report and recommendations from the evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative”. So I think on the web site it said something like draft, comments requested on preliminary report or something like that. So it’s 34 pages long. There’s a lot there and, again, without following this process clearly over the last three years, I’m not sure what all the major changes are but I tried to pick out some there that I thought we would want to know about. So those of you who have been more involved with this really need to look at that closely and the deadline is December 15 to comment on it so there’s not much time.

P. Stoddard: That’s two weeks from tomorrow in case you’re interested.

J. Newman-Ryan: I would also point out that obviously as you need these reports that you’ve written yourselves, you find typo’s that are quite embarrassing so, I don’t see a whole lot here that you couldn’t figure out on your own but on page 15, on the last paragraph, it says “tips on how to identify diploma ills” and it’s not “ills”, it’s “mills”. Sorry about that. There might be diploma ills as well but it is diploma mills.
P. Stoddard: Okay, thank you Jody. Any other questions for Jody? Okay, at this point, I think we’ve done everything we’re supposed to do and since a good number of people have already left, I’m going to consider that a motion and acceptance to adjourn.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Rachel Turner and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.