

MINUTES – BOARD MEETINGS

Submitted for: Action.

Summary: Minutes of the February 5, 2002 meeting of the Board of Higher Education held at DePaul University Lincoln Park Campus, Chicago, Illinois.

Minutes of the February 15, 2002 special meeting of the Board of Higher Education held by teleconference at the Board offices in Springfield, Illinois.

Action Requested: That the Board of Higher Education approve the Minutes of the February 5, 2002 and February 15, 2002 meetings.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MINUTES - BOARD MEETING
February 5, 2002

A meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:10 a.m. in Room 120A of the Student Center at DePaul University Lincoln Park Campus, Chicago, Illinois on February 5, 2002.

Philip J. Rock, Chairman, presided.
Patricia Sexton was Secretary for the meeting.

The following Board members were present:

Mark E. Barmak	Thomas R. Lamont
J. Robert Barr	Steven H. Lesnik
Jerry D. Blakemore	Cordelia Meyer
Edward T. Duffy	Lourdes Monteagudo
Robert J. English	Lucy A. Sloan
Samuel K. Gove	John C. Thompson
James L. Kaplan	Jane T. Williamson

Also present by invitation of the Board were:

Keith R. Sanders, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Joseph J. Cipfl, President and CEO, Illinois Community College Board
Larry Matejka, Executive Director, Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Hazel M. Loucks, Deputy Governor for Education

Presidents and Chancellors

Victor Boschini	Salme Steinberg
Stuart Fagan	David Taylor
Daniel LaVista	James Walker
Stephanie Marshall	Walter Wendler
John Neuhaus	David Werner
John Peters	

Advisory Committee Chairpersons

Ken Andersen, Faculty	Gretchen Naff, Community College
Katie Cox, Student	David Tretter, Independent
Jerry Dill, Proprietary	

1. Announcements and Remarks by Chairman Philip J. Rock

Chairman Rock called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and said: “I hope you will take the opportunity to look at this magnificent new building that just opened. The Board will go into Executive Session for a personnel matter at the conclusion of the meeting.

“As discussed two meetings ago, we wanted to find out what a daunting task faces the staff in terms of pending applications. Members have at their places for their information a list of applications and notices that are pending before our staff with respect to requests from the public and private sector. And, there has been a request from a Member that an item on the consent agenda be moved to the policy agenda. Item CA-8, a recommended approval for a public university capital project, will be placed after Item 8 on the regular agenda.”

Dr. English asked if the Board could have a discussion on Item CA-6. Chairman Rock said the item would be discussed following Item CA-8.

Chairman Rock thanked Reverend Minogue for the gracious hospitality.

2. Remarks by Reverend John P. Minogue, C.M., President, DePaul University

Reverend Minogue said: “I am very glad to welcome everyone here. We just opened this building in January. It has been a good time in general for higher education. The demand, especially at the undergraduate level, has been overwhelming. It’s hard to keep building the capacities to educate people, and that is one of our challenges. Certainly in the good times – the last four or five years – that has been a little easier, but now in the tougher times, it is going to be a challenge to figure out how to do that. But we have to get our people educated.

“I sit on the board of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Outer space is about third from the bottom in people’s interest right now. People are much more concerned about what is going on in the world – terrorism, budget issues, and the economy. One of the things NASA is facing is finding the best and the brightest, the rocket scientists, to continue the work of exploration. Certainly, the 21st century is about intellectual capital, and those of us in higher education are some of the key producers in that effort. It seems to me that we have some tough challenges in front of us because the paradigms have changed. In the old days, you needed just a few best and bright people – the king’s son and a few other people. You educated them, and everyone else did heavy lifting. That’s not the way it is today. Knowledge work is all over the place. Even with the tremendous capabilities the United States has in higher education, we’re still behind. We still can’t get enough in place with the right kind of education. So, I think we have some real challenges.

“Here at DePaul, we’ve tried to meet that challenge by staying up with it, and just following that path has led us to about 22,000 students. We see an even mix of adult students and the typical 18-22 year-old students. In fact, I’d say today the typical student is not 18-22 years old. I think our higher education is seen as the best in the world. A lot of people across the world use us to get their education, but I think in a time of competition we need to get even smarter and tougher about the way we do it. There are serious concerns about the broken pipelines in math and science. So many kids won’t get into math and science, not because they’re not smart, but because somewhere along the line they didn’t learn math enough so it’s now a big torture to them. Certainly, the budgets are a way to try to work out those challenges, but I think our challenges are much broader than the budgets. It’s really how to build the capacities necessary to give people a play in this 21st century, which is a knowledge-based effort. And for the United States, it is how

to educate enough people who can handle math and science so that we can maintain technological competitiveness, or even superiority. China has the opposite problem. They have tons of young people and they're educating them well in the basics. They don't have enough universities, and they have some strange systems of educating people, but the world is going to be shaped in the next 20 years by the United States and China in how we decide what we're going to do with higher education. Some of those decisions will be very important.

"Here at DePaul, being right in the city, we have this wonderful opportunity to get a diversity of people – immigrants and folks from diverse populations. About 33 percent of our student body is diverse, which is a great opportunity for us. It allows us to grow and gives us some very smart people who maybe are not getting other opportunities.

"I wish all of us well. We have the future of the nation in our hands, because the name of the game in the 21st century is going to be intellectual capital. God bless you all. Thank you."

Chairman Rock thanked Reverend Minogue for his remarks. He asked the secretary to call the roll and noted that a quorum was present.

3. Remarks by Keith R. Sanders, Executive Director

Dr. Sanders said: "I have one item of very good news. I received a letter last week from President John Peters of Northern Illinois University (NIU) announcing a precedent-setting partnership between Northern Illinois University and Rock Valley College. The new program will allow residents of the Rockford area to complete their bachelor's degrees from NIU with classes taught by NIU faculty at the Rock Valley College campus. This is the kind of baccalaureate completion program that we've been urging people to undertake, and here we have a new and exemplary kind of collaboration. My congratulations go to the leadership of Northern Illinois University and Rock Valley College."

4. All Faculty Matter! A Study of Nontenure-Track Faculty at Illinois Public Colleges and Universities

Chairman Rock said: "Item 4 is a report as a result of a General Assembly request. Mr. Duffy and Mr. Lamont were co-chairs of this study committee, and I will turn it over to them. The plan is to take public comment and come back at the April meeting with recommendations. In the meantime, however, there has been a great deal of interest expressed, and we have requests from several individuals representing different groups to speak to Item 4. We will accommodate those who wish to address this matter with the sole admonition that they not be repetitive and will be as brief as possible."

Mr. Duffy said: "Nearly a year ago, the General Assembly passed a joint resolution which directed the Board to look into the use of nontenure-track faculty at the state's colleges and universities. In particular, we were asked to consider the question of whether there is at the present time an over-reliance on nontenure-track faculty and to develop policies for the use of such faculty to ensure fair employment and consistent emphasis on quality instruction at all levels. As a result of this joint resolution, this committee was formed and Mr. Lamont and I co-chaired it. In the fall of last year, we conducted two public hearings, one in Springfield and one in Chicago. In addition, we engaged the fine staff at Northern Illinois University to look into the topic on our behalf. And, of course, our staff undertook an unprecedented information-gathering effort to provide this Board, the General Assembly, and all interested parties information regarding the topic. Today, we'd like to present to you the findings of that review and at the

conclusion, we would like to present some suggestions for the Board to consider. Doug Day will share with you the findings of this review.”

Dr. Day accompanied his remarks with a power point presentation. He said: “Professor Mike Peddle, Center for Governmental Studies at Northern Illinois University, and I would like to present briefly this morning some of the key results of the committee’s research. I will highlight a few trends from the data that we collected and discuss the committee’s findings in regard to some questions that the General Assembly and others have asked about nontenure-track faculty. Professor Peddle will then summarize the Center’s extensive survey of faculty and administrators at public colleges and universities on this topic.

“The first slide shows the percent of nontenure-track faculty. At Illinois public universities, nontenure-track faculty constitute 49 percent of all faculty. This is similar to the national percentage at public universities and represents an increase from 41 percent in 1991. However, when looking only at teaching faculty, the percent of nontenure-track faculty falls to 36 percent, and again to 28 percent when calculated on a full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.

“At Illinois community colleges, nontenure-track faculty, that is, part-time faculty, constitute about three-fourths of all faculty, which falls to about a half of all faculty when calculated on an FTE basis. Nontenure-track employment is similar to employment at community colleges nationally. Also, the percentage of nontenure-track faculty at Illinois community colleges remained the same during the 1990s.

“The second slide shows the median salaries of faculty in fall 2000. The graph shows the fall semester only and the amounts would have to be doubled to approximate earnings for an academic year. On the graph, the light bars represent median salaries on a headcount basis and the dark bars represent median salaries on an FTE basis. Reading from left to right, the first three sets of bars show public university median salaries of tenure-track faculty, full-time nontenure-track faculty, and part-time nontenure-track faculty. The two bars on the right show community college median salaries of full-time and part-time faculty. I would emphasize that when one looks at an FTE basis, the tenure-track faculty at public universities is about two or two and a half times that of nontenure-track faculty. At community colleges, the tenure-track faculty, or full-time, is about three and a half times the number of part-time faculty.

“The next group of slides presents findings on four questions pertaining to nontenure-track faculty. First is the question of whether nontenure-track faculty are overused. There is no simple answer to this question, since what is appropriate varies by institutional mission, the robustness and quality of the local labor market, and how effectively institutions utilize faculty on the nontenure track. Based on this finding, the committee concluded that it would not be wise to adopt the proposal that some have advocated, that the Board establish a statewide policy limit on the proportion of nontenure-track faculty that an institution should employ. This is an area where one size does not fit all. That being said, the committee does find that the amount of employment of nontenure-track faculty is an educational issue. A college or university can employ too many nontenure-track faculty and this can have detrimental effects for students, as well as for tenured/tenure-track faculty.

“Second is the question of whether nontenure-track faculty are fairly paid. There is a significant difference in the survey data which shows that most nontenure-track faculty believe they have been paid fairly. Some of the testimony that the committee received, as well as press comment, criticizes nontenure-track salaries as being too low. Perhaps the reason for these differences can be explained in three conditions of the market for nontenure-track faculty. One,

there is an oversupply of applicants in many fields. Two, most nontenure-track faculty report that they teach for the love of it, not the money. And, three, teaching income represents less than a quarter of total household income for more than 80 percent of part-time faculty. Acting together, these three conditions serve to depress nontenure-track salaries. While the resulting salaries may not upset most on the nontenure track, they fall particularly hard on the small number of faculty who are part-time in name only and are trying to make a living by accumulating part-time work. Note that such faculty can be found working within a single institution, not only working at multiple institutions.

“Third is the question of whether nontenure-track faculty are treated equitably. Survey data, both from the Center’s report and from a study from the National Education Association, show that nontenure-track faculty are as satisfied overall with their jobs as tenure-track faculty. However, the committee found that the lack of policies and standards about workload, compensation, and working conditions can lead to inequities and a perception of unfair treatment. Often, there are differences in status and responsibilities between tenure-track faculty and nontenure-track faculty that can explain differences in treatment. However, there is at times no good reason for differences in treatment within the nontenure track.

“Fourth, and finally, is the question of whether the abilities and talents of nontenure-track faculty are being effectively developed. This is a question that, unfortunately, not enough campuses are asking and that has been overshadowed by more sensational issues. However, it has tremendous implications for the nontenure track, as well as for their students. The lack of attention given this question is particularly inappropriate considering the size of the nontenure track, which comprises 16,000 of the 26,000 faculty teaching at our public colleges and universities, and the effect that this group has on student learning. I will now turn this over to Professor Mike Peddle, who will summarize the results of the surveys that the Board contracted with the Center to do.”

Professor Peddle said: “I’m going to do a very quick summary of the survey process and results that were used for surveying both faculty members and institutional representatives. All of the surveys were completed in the fall of 2001. Institutional surveys were sent to all chief academic officers at the public colleges and universities, the deans of a select number of colleges, and department chairs. Faculty surveys were sent to both tenure-track and nontenure-track faculty at community colleges and universities. There were three groups at the university level, both part-time and full-time nontenure-track faculty. At the community colleges, only tenure-track and part-time nontenure-track faculty were surveyed because the category of full-time nontenure-track is not a meaningful category for most community colleges.

“The key results are that, regardless of the faculty group, faculty at Illinois public colleges and universities seem to be highly satisfied. Over 90 percent were satisfied at some level in all of the faculty groups. Notable differences exist in the roles and responsibilities of the different faculty groups, with tenure-track faculty having the greatest range of responsibilities and part-time nontenure-track faculty having the narrowest range of responsibilities. To visually see the satisfaction issue, we produced a chart for the university faculty, with the tenured or tenure-track faculty on the left, full-time nontenure-track faculty in the middle, and part-time nontenure-track faculty on the far right. The results for the community colleges mimic these university results. As you can see, the satisfaction levels are relatively comparable among the three groups. If anything, the part-time nontenure-track faculty actually visually look to have a little higher level of satisfaction, but that’s not a statistically meaningful result.

“The additional key results were that nontenure-track faculty tend to have fewer years of experience teaching and nontenure-track faculty have fewer duties. Freeway flyers are the exception. Less than five percent of part-time nontenure-track faculty are employed by as many as three institutions and very few actually are even employed by two institutions. Part-time nontenure-track income is most often supplemental income. Over 80 percent have indicated that they get less than 25 percent of their household income from their part-time teaching job, and a very high proportion of part-time nontenure-track faculty receive key benefits from other employers. About 66 percent of part-time nontenure-track faculty at public universities receive health insurance benefits from a spouse’s or significant other’s employer or from another employer, and it is upwards of 80 percent for the part-time nontenure-track community college faculty. That completes my summary of the key results of the survey.”

Dr. English asked Dr. Peddle, “On Page 5 of your survey, in the ‘Students, courses, and sections taught’ section, is there an error on that? Are you saying that tenured professors only teach an average two classes per semester?” Professor Peddle responded that would be correct for the median amount. Dr. English continued, “When I take the comment from above, we’re saying that the part-time faculty contacts 35 students per section, the tenured teacher contacts 30 students per section, and the full-time nontenure-track faculty contacts 25 students per section. So, the highest section load is the part-time teacher who has 35 in each section based on your data.” Professor Peddle said, “It would appear that that would be the case, but I think it is dangerous to take the two results and make that particular conclusion. That may or may not be the case. The median that is taught by a part-time nontenure-track faculty is 35 students and the median number of sections is one section, but it doesn’t necessarily follow when you do the weighting that it actually will come out that way. I would expect that it would come out pretty close to that, though.” Dr. English said, “Having worked with this kind of data, I would expect that it would also. The differentiation would be the weekly student contact hours. That would tell us what the differential in loads is, but from these data, it doesn’t seem like there is much differential in load between the tenure track and the nontenure-track full-time faculty.” Professor Peddle said, “That would appear to be the indication in the data, but there also are a lot of other teaching activities, as we point out later on, that involve student contact hours that are not traditional classroom section hours. Those wouldn’t have been included, so there is a little bit of murkiness in the data.” Dr. English said he didn’t want to be misunderstood; he thought it was an excellent report.

Mr. Lamont said, “One issue that Chairman Duffy and I were particularly concerned with was whether or not the quality of instruction was somehow impacted by nontenure or part-time instruction. Our surveys are rather tough to get a handle on that situation, and I believe there may be a perception out there that somehow there may be a lesser quality with these individuals, and I’m not sure from the testimony we received that this is borne out. Those faculty may oftentimes be less experienced. I think just the opposite is true, as well. We have a fair number of individuals who are very senior and retired faculty members who are very experienced, who simply do not choose to work full time. We also have a number of professionals, particularly in the community colleges, who teach on a part-time basis. I’m not sure we really determined any generalization that there is a lesser quality of education with these individuals.”

Chairman Rock said there were a number of individuals who want to address this item. He recognized Dr. Donna Manering, Director of Higher Education, Illinois Education Association. Dr. Manering said: “The IBHE has had an opportunity to study the report on the status of adjunct faculty members at Illinois colleges and universities. There are serious questions which focus on the design, implementation and, consequently, the findings of the study. Unfortunately, adjunct faculty members were not consulted in the design of this instrument to

determine appropriate topics. Therefore, important issues were not included in the study. Professional as well as economic subjects which impact on adjuncts are not easily understood by those who have not experienced a situation where they are highly qualified yet underutilized and, most critically, unrecognized. The survey avoids asking questions to determine the true picture facing the culture and future of higher education. Survey questions were asked and the results reported in a manner which de-emphasizes the exploitative nature of the use of part-time employees. Many of the survey questions allowed only yes or no responses. More open-ended questions over a large number of specific topics would have produced more valuable information for the IBHE.

“There is concern about the manner in which the IBHE hearings in Chicago and Springfield were cited in the report. In the findings, we have administrators reporting the conditions and wishes of adjunct faculty. Testimony from individual adjuncts from throughout the state clearly highlights how adjuncts return year after year because they enjoy teaching in spite of the marginal job security, the poor pay, and little administrative support or recognition. Yet, little testimony offered by adjuncts is reported or alluded to in the study. Sadly, in this study of adjuncts, adjuncts are conspicuously absent.

“Many issues in the report fail to explicate the study’s findings. For example, the report states that nontenure-track faculty interact less with students than do tenure-track faculty. What is not included are underlying reasons for this situation such as lack of office space – sometimes there isn’t even an empty classroom – and the basic support services taken for granted by full-time staff. Adjuncts report that they often feel great frustration when they must short-change students in these situations, yet possible remedies are ignored. The key findings section of the report notes that nontenure-track faculty are as overall satisfied with their positions as the tenure-track faculty, yet survey questions related to this issue were not worded in a manner that would elicit more complete responses. Indeed, adjunct faculty members are satisfied with their jobs, but only in the context that their primary desire, as the report states, is to teach, and they cite their love of teaching as the reason they teach.

“Questions which elicit responses as to how conditions might improve or what conditions impair the quality of teaching were not included in the survey. It is difficult to conclude that adjunct faculty members, many with advanced degrees, being paid \$2,000 or less per class with virtually no benefits or other traditional professional recognitions truly feel satisfied with their situations. The questions which would bring about these kinds of responses just were not asked. Indeed, testimony at the IBHE hearings verified the sense of exploitation, yet those testimonies were not cited in the report. The key findings section also states that institutions need to establish processes and standards governing work load, working conditions, and compensation to minimize inequitable treatment. Adjunct staff also felt that seniority, meaningful recognition of service, and a good faith opportunity to fill full-time positions should be added to the list.

“It is gratifying to read in the conclusions section of the IBHE report that having a diverse faculty does best serve an institution’s students. Nontenure-track faculty will strengthen this level of service even more when they are fully integrated into the institutional family. We urge the IBHE to make specific guidelines for administrative staff to follow in bringing the groups together in order to ensure that part-time faculty receive equitable recognition of all types with full-time staff. The report’s conclusion minimizes the importance of pay equity, health insurance, and other important compensations in favor of providing nontenure-track and nontenured faculty with more opportunities for development. Even though the report indicates that adjunct faculty must derive the largest portion of their income from positions other than teaching, the survey’s conclusions would suggest that controlling the number of hours worked by

part-time faculty would seem to move in the opposite direction. Rather, a voice in the decision-making process, compensation which recognizes adjuncts' value to the institution, contractual assurances, and resources for the nontenure-track and adjunct faculty are advances to strive for.

“We implore higher education institutions in Illinois to go beyond the recommendations of the study and to conduct meaningful dialog with adjunct faculty and nontenure-track faculty on their campuses – dialog with a southern Illinois female faculty member who teaches part-time, has an eight year-old daughter, teaches on three different campuses, and has no health insurance; dialog with a central Illinois female nontenure-track faculty member who spoke out and has no teaching assignment this semester; dialog with a northern Illinois male adjunct faculty member who teaches technology courses yet does not have a computer in his home; dialog when determining which specific actions are needed to provide the highest quality of service to our students as well as enhanced quality of professional life for those who staff our state's higher education classrooms. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Mitchell Vogel, University Professionals of Illinois. Mr. Vogel said: “As one of the major initiators of House Joint Resolution 19, I must express disappointment in your staff's initial response, *All Faculty Matter!*. There is no hard data and there are no specific recommendations on issues. While I'm happy your staff intends to continue its study and seek public input, I can only hope that they complete their task and provide the legislative requested data and a specific recommendation needed to solve the important problem facing our state's great treasure, its public higher education system.

“At present, I must give your staff's report a grade of incomplete. I want to state why by identifying four points. One, responses to some of the questions that HJR 19 asked are not in the report. There are no campus-by-campus data. There are no discussions about differences in the use of nontenure-track faculty amongst our universities and colleges. We don't know whether doctoral-granting institutions rely more upon part-timers than other campuses. We don't know if there is a difference in the use of contingent faculty between urban and non-urban campuses. We don't know what impact the graduate employees have upon this data. What percentage of classes are they teaching consistently throughout the state? Are these numbers growing or not growing? We don't know these answers. We don't know whether all the universities and colleges complied with the staff's request for data and, if so, did they do it all completely? So we have some questions about things not being done, that I think sometime in the next month or so, other people will find other ways of making the report a little more complete.

“Two, HJR 19 asks for recommendations as to the methods and estimates of the cost to index part-time nontenure-track salaries to those of tenure-track. At present, there is no response to that in this report. What are the financial costs? I was embarrassingly asked by a member of your panel, what is the cost if we would convert all of this? I said I would look around for it, but I was led to believe that that data would be part of this report, and it isn't. Other states have done it. California has done it, and we could clearly see what the cost would be to index and create some sort of standard method of pay for these exploited faculty members.

“My third point is the most crucial and affects all of us far more than the exploitation or over-use or non-overuse of half of our faculty. What is the impact of the use of contingent faculty on the state's 'consistent emphasis on quality instruction?' That is what HRJ 19 called for. I am stating that by dramatically changing the ratio of full-time tenure-track faculty to part-time nontenure-track faculty we have effectively changed the social machinery of our universities. Just a few decades ago, our universities functioned with real shared governance. Faculty knew that they were required to perform at an exceptional level, they knew that senior

tenured professors would evaluate them at regular intervals, and they knew that the development of courses and academic policies would involve all those with a long-term stake in the university's future. Faculty knew that tenure and the pursuit of tenure was the driving force for excellence in academic integrity.

"I do want to make it clear that when one considers the impediments under which they work, it is remarkable that the vast majority of contingent faculty teach with great distinction and make enormous contributions to the institutions in which they serve. The weakening of quality is a direct result of the conditions that they work under and their 'exploited status.' It has nothing to do with their intellectual capacities and commitment. The report must explore the impact on academic excellence by the over-use or abuse of contingent faculty, and there is no real mention of that. Instructors who are underpaid are continually insecure as to their future employment. They find it difficult to bring to the classroom the confidence and creativity necessary for the best teaching. Instructors called up at the last minute, which they are consistently, find it difficult to provide their best work. They quite often lack decent offices and paid office hours. In addition, uninformed of departmental and university policies and procedures, it is hard for contingent faculty to serve as a liaison between the university and the student.

"Four, what are the recommendations to curb the increase? You state in the report that a disconnect exists between the perception of the group as an exploited class and the comments of the contingent labor force that they surveyed. There is a time for survey research, and there is a time for other types of investigation. I don't know if conducting a survey on these problems is where we're at. I think we have to get hard data and the data will tell us a story. Historically, eminent scholars studied exploited classes throughout the last couple of centuries. They conducted good research, and they quite often describe large numbers of contented exploited workers. I think we can probably draw a parallel with that today. While it is true that there are many part-time employees who really love their work, some because it is supplemental, your survey says it is 56 percent. There are also large numbers that don't want to continue to work on a part-time basis. They are interested in full-time work, and they are not that happy. We will hear some of that today. They're happy with their work; they're very passionate about teaching and enthusiastic about it; but they're not happy about the economic situation they're in and the lack of security that they have. This is the group that is being exploited, whether it's your survey's number of 44 percent – which I think is considerably low – or it's the 56 percent that other national studies have indicated. The group wants full-time work. In many cases, they are working full-time, but at more than one institution. We should not confuse their happiness in the classroom with their unhappiness when bill-paying time comes along.

"The other troubling recommendation is a flat-out statement that these recommendations should be solved at the campus level. I think this is faulty. While it is clear that some decisions have to be made at the campus level and certain implementations of policies will be done at the campus level, the worst thing we can do is let the people who made the problem solve the problem. There has to be some intervention or else this problem will become more serious than it is today. If you don't fix it, others will. There are a number of remedies that can be recommended by this body. There are some legislative remedies; there are bills in the state legislature to mandate a cap of 25 percent of part-time faculty. You folks have the ability to recommend remedies. I don't think that solving exploitation should be left to the people who have done the exploitation. So I give this report a grade of incomplete. There is a lot of merit and a lot of value in it, and I hope in the months to come we can reshape it so I can give it a much higher grade. So, please finish the study. House Joint Resolution 19 requested data and recommendations that are here. They also requested information that is not here. All of the universities should be in compliance and provide the necessary data. Keep in mind that a survey

of feelings is no substitute for hard data. Most importantly, do not ignore the problem. Our universities are suffering; many of our teachers are suffering; and most importantly, the quality of public education in Illinois will suffer if this continues. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Leo Welch, Professor at Southwestern Illinois College and member of the Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council. Professor Welch said: “I will confine my remarks mainly to the public community colleges that serve approximately half of the students in higher education in Illinois. In the report regarding the community colleges, the indication was that 75 percent of the headcount of faculty were part-time and 25 percent were full-time. If, however, we look at some reports that were issued earlier, specifically an IBHE report on staffing trends, during that same time period between 1991 and 1999, even though the percentage is essentially flat, according to that report there were 370 full-time faculty positions lost within the system. This is even though the percentage is apparently remaining the same. There is also a loss in some of the part-time faculty, as well, so that may explain that. One of the items in the report was the cost associated with additional full-time faculty. But during that 1991-1999 period, executive, administrative, and managerial full-time positions increased by 43 positions. So there apparently is money available for certain types of positions.

“If we look at additional reports going back a little earlier, specifically data and characteristics of the Illinois public community college system dating back to 1985, we find as far as staffing trends from 1985 to 1999, 546 full-time faculty positions within the public community colleges were lost. During that same time period, the number of full-time administrators increased 14 percent. The loss of faculty within the Illinois community college system occurred during a time of increased student enrollment. In 1985, there were 166,000 full-time-equivalent students; in 1997, the full-time-equivalent student numbers had increased to 185,000, an 11 percent increase. So, in regard to those aspects of staffing trends we see that full-time faculty have decreased, full-time administrative staff have increased, and the number of students has increased. So it’s only in the full-time faculty positions that we see a loss.

“In regard to the specifics of the report, four questions were answered. I have my own interpretation of those answers. One, are nontenure-track faculty overused? I would answer that yes. If we look at the report’s national averages, part-time positions within higher education throughout the country were 64 percent, and they were 75 percent in Illinois. It certainly appears that we exceed the national average in regard to part-time faculty. Two, are nontenure-track faculty paid fairly? My answer to that would be no. If we consider a full-time-equivalent at my institution who is paid essentially a set amount for credit hours generated, a full-time-equivalent part-time faculty member would earn approximately \$12,000 during an academic year, with no health benefits and no insurance. Three, are nontenure-track faculty treated equitably? The report recommends that institutions need to establish processes and standards governing workloads, working conditions, and compensation.

“One of the colleges that is cited in the report is Parkland College in Champaign. The part-time faculty at Parkland are in a collective bargaining unit. I’ve looked at their contract, and most of these particular topics that need to be addressed are addressed in that contract. So I certainly agree that the institution where the adjunct faculty are organized is meeting those requirements. The 1984 Education Labor Relations Act makes it quite difficult to some degree to organize part-time faculty in the state of Illinois. Those restrictions should be eased. Four, are the talents and abilities of nontenure-track faculty effectively developed? No. It is all too common that institutions employ a *laissez-faire* attitude about part-time faculty. I wholeheartedly agree that that certainly does need to be addressed. Finally, I’m interested in the recommendations that Illinois public colleges and universities should develop both short-term and

long-term goals and objectives for best practices, and I would hope that all faculty employment categories would be involved in the development of these reports from their inception. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Jocelyn Gras, Illinois Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Ms. Gras said, “I am also a member of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor and an alumna of the University of Illinois and supporter of the graduate employee organization. I want to present some data from a survey of our membership that our organization did, talking about whether people were satisfied with their working situations. I was thinking about a few of the questions that were asked in that survey, the wording of the questions, and how I would answer them if I were asked. If you would ask me whether I teach for the love of it or for the money, there is only one answer that makes sense because, obviously, I’m not teaching for the money. I teach because I enjoy working with my students, but that doesn’t mean I can afford to teach for what I’m currently paid.

“Here are some quotes from some other teachers, instructors in higher education in both universities and community colleges in Illinois, when asked if they were satisfied with their work situations. ‘No, I can’t make a living.’ ‘I feel exploited – putting in a full-time effort for more than a decade while being paid on a part-time scale is not satisfactory.’ ‘It would be nice to teach in a place where materials and equipment could be secured.’ ‘Only our immediate supervisors and deans treat us with respect.’ ‘We have student desks that are falling apart, dirty buildings, and little heat or air conditioning in the classrooms.’ ‘There is not nearly enough recognition for what the teachers do, and the teachers have no say in policies the administration enforces, but they have to live with the consequences.’ ‘I’m satisfied, although I wish I saw more of the other teachers. I teach and go home.’ ‘There is not enough cooperation between faculty.’ ‘Because my husband has a full-time job with benefits, I can afford to work here under these conditions.’ ‘I’m satisfied and fulfilled. I am driven by the participants, the students.’ ‘Benefits are definitely lacking.’ ‘Yes, I’m satisfied because I consider myself a volunteer working for the community. I don’t have to depend upon my salary for survival.’ ‘It suits my time constraints, but I know I could serve the students and curriculum better if I were full-time.’ ‘I work full-time in a bank. I would rather teach ESL for adults but the demand is not here. ESL adjunct faculty are generally not given the respect or benefits for the work they do, and may have had to leave a job they love because of poor working conditions and lack of benefits.’ ‘I love teaching, but I’m not taken seriously within the administration.’ ‘In general, this is a nice program. If I didn’t believe that, I wouldn’t stay here. However, if I were offered full-time employment with benefits and appropriate pay package, I believe that I could be an even better, more effective teacher. Under these circumstances, I would be perfectly willing to accept such things as certification and performance reviews.’ ‘I had to leave this job because full-time is not an option. The pay is hourly and there are no benefits. Now I work one day a week because I love this work. I had to take a different full-time job.’

“I don’t think the survey points out those situations. It talks about people who have a full-time job with benefits and work part-time, but it doesn’t necessarily show that some of those people have gotten advanced degrees like I have and now can’t find a full-time job anywhere. Last year, I worked at MacCormac College; at the University of Illinois at Chicago in the psychology department; at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in the labor and industrial relations department; at Senden Intercultural doing language training consulting; I taught five different classes at North Park University; I taught a summer class at Triton College; I did private tutoring; and I rated tapes of speaking skills of international students. If you ask me at any one point in time how many institutions do you work at, I probably would have said two, so I’m not sure that the question that asks how many institutions you work at actually captures how

many people are freeway flyers or the people who have to move from job to job. At most of those jobs, I didn't have job security and they were temporary. I have to be constantly looking for employment, not for one job but for two or three jobs at all times. I'm always in the job market. Beyond that, none of my jobs provide health insurance, there are no retirement benefits, and the only way I could get those would be to leave my field. There are virtually no full-time jobs in my field. This really bothers me because I'm concerned about my students.

"I think that a certain percentage of the teachers should be full-time because some people should be doing research in our field and some people should be there to have office hours for the students. At most of the places I work, every single teacher is part-time. It doesn't matter whether it's a university or a community college, private or public. I don't make those distinctions when I look for my jobs. What I really look for is, do I have access to a copy machine, are you going to give me a desk, is there a place where I can check phone messages? Those things are hard to come by, so those are the first things I ask when I get a job. I usually interview on Friday and start on Monday, which means that I can't do any preparation to speak of until after the first class, because usually I have to wait until Monday to buy the textbook. After class, I can then prepare my first lesson.

"I would encourage you to consider that it would be really nice for some of us in our field to have access to tenure, because that means academic freedom. We need that formal assurance that we can keep our jobs even if we're doing research that challenges our institutions. I think the reason you don't see more teachers here today is because they're concerned that if they came here, they would lose their jobs. I have the freedom to come here because currently I am between teaching contracts and I have a part-time job doing research. But most teachers are either too busy to come or they're afraid to come. So I would ask that you think more carefully about some of these questions and how you ask them. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Frank Brooks, Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor. Mr. Brooks said, "I teach this semester at Harper College, Roosevelt University, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. I teach American Politics for the most part, and when I teach about public opinion I urge my students to keep in mind the difference between reports of survey results, the survey itself, and the opinion that it purports to measure. Unless there are strong connections between all three levels, the findings are likely to be meaningless or deceptive. I would like to focus on one of the central findings of the survey being reported today. On Page 11 of the summary results, it is stated that majorities of all three categories of faculty surveyed 'agreed at some level that they were treated fairly relative to their compensation for teaching.'

"Problem one. This particular result of the survey does not report the exact wording of that question. The wording of the question can influence responses. Assuming that the question was pretty similar to its paraphrase, it is at best poorly worded and at worst deliberately ambiguous. Does it mean that for what they were paid, they were treated relatively well, or does it mean that they were fairly paid? Is this a question about salary or about working conditions? Wouldn't it have been simpler to ask whether respondents agreed with a statement like this: I am paid adequately or fairly for the work I do?

Problem two. Even that phrasing of the question puts the issue of salary in the context of job responsibilities and expectations, which other parts of the report suggest are not under the control of part-time faculty. This is where it seems the question is seeking some information and avoiding other issues. That is, why didn't the survey ask for respondents to agree with a statement such as this: I am paid fairly according to my qualifications, or I am paid fairly relative to others doing the same work? Best of all, how about, I am paid enough for my work.

Problem three. Public opinion surveys are as much about what they don't ask as what they do ask. This survey of faculty focuses on subjective perceptions such as overall satisfaction of teachers. It completely ignores one of the basic facts that I would have sought in such a survey. How much are part-time faculty paid? How much are full-time faculty paid? Admittedly, that's covered in the overall report, but in the survey it's absent. If the focus was on satisfaction, the question should not have been the vague, meaningless, and deceptive one asked by the survey, but the one many of us part-time faculty are asking ourselves, am I satisfied with getting unequal pay for equal work? Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Joe Berry, Coalition for Contingent Academic Labor. Mr. Berry said: "I spoke at your public hearing, and at that time I reported that I was teaching at three institutions. I can with pleasure report that I am now working at four institutions in both of the sectors that you surveyed, and also for comparison, one across the state line in Indiana. I have a long and detailed critique of this study, partly from having conducted a similar one for a think tank in Pennsylvania a couple of years ago. I will save you that for the moment and just make one point in response to what seems to be the key element, the central point that is focused on the most in the study, the question of satisfaction. I think Frank Brooks has discussed the question and what you got back from it, but I would add one point. If contingent nontenure-track faculty are as satisfied as this report implies, why is it that a year-long literature search and years of experience in the sector have failed on my part, or that of anyone that I have talked with in 20 years, to come up with one example of a situation where, when contingent nontenure-track faculty were given the opportunity to vote for unionization, they voted no. Not one in all of North America. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized John Stevenson, Part-Time Faculty Association, Columbia College. Mr. Stevenson said: "I think many of the concerns that many of us have seen with this survey have been addressed very well by some of the previous speakers. The Part-Time Faculty Association at Columbia College is a union of part-time instructors at that institution. I think that the really evil situation that part-time faculty find themselves in – which I think is reflected rather than analyzed in this report – often pits the law of teaching, which many of us have and feel, against demands for equitable treatment in regard to salary, benefits, and participation in decision-making within the institutions in which we teach. Some of these situations have been alluded to by some of the previous speakers. I'm satisfied with my teaching and with my situation with regard to teaching. I've never been in a part-time situation in which I felt that I was treated equitably. We have done our own surveys of our membership at Columbia College. We have 700-plus part-time instructors in the bargaining unit, and that's not the entire population of part-time instructors. Our surveys have reflected a high degree of satisfaction with their teaching at Columbia, which is why they're there. It has not reflected anything like that in terms of satisfaction, a feeling of equitable treatment, or a feeling of being able to do what they wish they were able to do at the institution. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Joe Laiacona, Columbia College. Mr. Laiacona said: "I am president of the Part-Time Faculty Association at Columbia College, which is affiliated with the Illinois Education Association. I am also happy to say that I have taught at Wright College as a part-timer. I just want to say, the emperor has no clothes. Your report is lousy, folks, it's lousy and that's it. I would like to add two points. If you're looking for a piece of paper and you want a whole sheet of paper and you can't find a whole sheet of paper because I've ripped it in half, that's why there are fewer full-time jobs. Administrators are tearing up full-time jobs so the part-timers can fill them. When they do that, they save lots and lots and lots of money. To teach a class is to teach a class. If you teach part-time or you teach full-time, you should be paid the same. You heard today that full-timers at community colleges are paid three and a half times

more for doing the same thing part-timers are doing. Why are part-timers paid one-third amount for the same job with the same students in the same classroom? It's not right. Please fix it. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Liesl Orenic, Illinois Education Association. Ms. Orenic said: "I had the opportunity to speak at the hearing last fall. I came then as a staff person at the Illinois Education Association, but also as a veteran of the adjunct faculty lifestyle, as we might choose to call it, because it certainly isn't really compensated as a job. I taught at Roosevelt University, Dominican University, Northeastern Illinois University, DeVry Institute of Technology, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. I did this for several years. I have a Ph.D. in history. What concerns me is that all the testimony that you heard from adjunct faculty in Chicago and in Springfield really seems to be missing in this study. You received surveys back from 342 people, and there are actually thousands and thousands of adjunct faculty in this state, and I don't believe 342 would be representative.

"My second problem with the study is the questions and the information supplied about compensation. My concern is the examination of how much a household income is made up of adjunct wages. I believe this is an inappropriate and dangerous precedent to set. This is the same kind of position employers took at the turn of the last century about women's wages, that if women are part of the household, then they are really working only for pin money. That is not relevant. The question should be what the compensation is for the job itself, not how much of someone's household income that job makes up. I think this sets a bad precedent. What does it say about how Illinois values the hard work of educating our citizens? The income and benefits an adjunct member receives through other employment or household members is irrelevant. Adjunct faculty should be compensated for the work they do, not whether or not they're paying for vacation or gifts, which is really the implication I think the study is presenting. In the same tone then, are administrators' salaries justified by their household income or by the demands of the job? That's how people should be compensated, for what they are doing. If you're teaching, you're teaching. Thank you."

Mr. Duffy said, "Let me summarize by saying I believe you will find the report to be extremely comprehensive and that it will answer many of the questions raised in testimony today. In fact, included in the report are recommendations which also address many of the concerns expressed this morning. However, it is our belief that you as a Board need to have the time to review this. Others in the field, such as those who spoke this morning, need to have time to comment on it, and we would ask for the adoption of the resolution to give us the opportunity to do that."

The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Duffy and seconded by Mr. Lamont, unanimously accepted the report of the Committee to Study Nontenure-Track Faculty. The Board directs the Committee to solicit comments and reactions to the report from members of the Illinois higher education community and other interested persons and to report back to the Board at the April 2002 meeting with a final report and recommendations.

Chairman Rock thanked everyone for their comments.

5. Teacher Preparation and Competency

Chairman Rock said that Don Sevenser would present the item. Mr. Sevenser said: "This report is the result of inquiries by Board Members concerning the series of articles published by the *Chicago Sun-Times* about the number of public school teachers who had failed state

certification tests. The newspaper reported that thousands of teachers had failed a simple test of basic skills and/or a content test for the subject matter they were certified to teach. In some cases, teachers took multiple attempts to pass the tests. Some teachers never passed the tests and were working on temporary credentials which have no testing requirements. The articles noted that the quality of a teacher has a powerful influence on the quality of student learning, and revealed that students from the most educationally disadvantaged backgrounds were far more likely to be taught by teachers who struggled to pass the certification test than were students from more privileged backgrounds. As this report makes clear, the *Sun-Times* exposed problems in teacher preparation and certification that need to be repaired. But the series also underscored the fundamental strength of the process to equip teachers with the basic knowledge and skills to enter classrooms. For example, more than 90 percent of the individuals who took the basic skills or the content tests since 1988 passed on their first attempt. Just over 9,000 test-takers failed the basic skills test since 1988, five percent of the nearly 200,000 who took the test. Twelve thousand failed the subject matter tests since 1988, about seven percent of the 180,000 who took them.

“The basic skills test was too easy. It tested skills at about an eighth- or ninth-grade level of difficulty. Last fall, a new enhanced basic skills test was given for the first time, which raised the bar to a college sophomore level of difficulty. Pass rates dropped to about 75 percent, an indication of the increased rigor. Those are positive indications that overall, the teacher preparation and certification systems work well. On the other hand, 1,100 people who failed the basic skills test were graduates of approved teacher preparation programs at Illinois colleges and universities and had been recommended for certification by their institutions. In addition, there were more than 3,000 individuals recommended for certification by approved Illinois teacher preparation programs who failed one of the content tests.

“Steps have already been taken to help alleviate at least some of the issues revealed in the *Sun-Times* articles. The new enhanced basic skills test has apparently become a condition for admission to or graduation from teacher preparation programs. In addition, the State Board of Education has instituted a regulation permitting teacher preparation programs to require passage of the subject matter test as a prerequisite for student teaching. These actions are commendable. However, the staff believes that public confidence demands more definitive measures. First, that passage of the basic skills test be a condition for admission into any approved Illinois teacher preparation program; and second, that no candidate be allowed to student teach until he or she has passed the content certification test. Endorsement of these measures would send a clear and unambiguous message to teacher candidates, to colleges of education, and to the public that these minimum expectations must be fulfilled. In addition, this report suggests steps the State Board of Education might consider to further tighten restrictions governing certification tests, including whether to set a limit on the number of times a teacher candidate could fail the test; what appropriate opportunities for remediation should exist; and whether to make the test scores available to superintendents or school principals in the context of hiring decisions. The State Board of Education may also wish to consider provisions of the certification statute that exempt certain categories of certificates from the testing requirement and/or review with the Chicago School Board and the General Assembly the provision that permits substitute teachers to hold full-time permanent assignments in Chicago public school classrooms.

“Finally, it is important to acknowledge that while tests of basic skills and content knowledge are a valuable tool for assuring some minimum level of classroom competence, passage of such tests offers no guarantee of effective teaching or student learning. Therefore, to underscore that the question of teacher quality is larger than the narrow focus on basic skills, this report recommends the Board join with the State Board of Education and the Illinois Community College Board to ensure that graduates of teacher education programs and existing teachers are

well prepared to teach to the Illinois Learning Standards; to reduce the number of teachers teaching outside their collegiate field of study through greater use of technology; and to encourage Illinois colleges and universities to move steadily toward meeting or exceeding the NCATE 2000 standards for evaluating teacher preparation programs. Thank you. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Chairman Rock recognized Nan Giblin, Illinois Association of Deans of Public Colleges of Education. Dr. Giblin said, "I am the Dean of the College of Education at Northeastern Illinois University. We thank you for this opportunity to respond to the recommendations that are set forth in your paper. Also with me here today are other public university deans, Dr. Diane Ashby, Dean of the College of Education at Illinois State University; Dr. Sandra Westbrook, Dean of the College of Education at Chicago State University; and Dr. Bonnie Smith Scripps, Dean of the College of Education at Western Illinois University. We affirm the importance of teacher education candidates passing the Illinois test of basic skills and subject area test. We believe that they are excellent requirements and we affirm that they should be used.

"Item one, the test of basic skills. Most public universities currently require a passing score on the Illinois test of basic skills as a condition for admission to all Illinois teacher preparation programs. Item two, all public universities are currently engaged in a discussion concerning if and when a passing score on the subject matter test used for certification should be a prerequisite for student teaching in their field in all Illinois teacher preparation programs. We are in general agreement that our students should be required to pass this test at some time prior to the completion of their program. We are debating the issues concerning requiring students to take the content test prior to student teaching. We affirm that passage of the subject content area test is critical for future teachers. However, we think that before we engage in discussions concerning legislating these exams, they should be revised from the 1988 versions that are currently being offered. Also, we recommend that the test be offered more frequently so that students have access to the exam. They should have feedback time, remediation time – which we are willing to provide – and retake opportunities prior to student teaching. We don't want a student to get to student teaching and not be able to go in because they have not passed the test.

"We are in agreement that Illinois teachers should be able to teach in accordance with the Illinois Learning Standards, that professional development funds should be used to help current teachers teach to the Illinois Learning Standards, and that technology should be used to decrease the number of teachers teaching outside of their collegiate academic major. Throughout the state, student needs vary, and for this reason we would appreciate retaining the option to require the passage of the subject area test. We do not feel that legislation is required regarding these tests. The structure of the Title II report card encourages universities to mandate both the basic skills and the subject area tests. We would like to retain the option of deciding when the test should be required so that we may best serve the needs of the students at our individual universities. We support the recommendations listed in this document. However, we do not see the need for legislation on this matter. Thank you."

Chairman Rock thanked Dr. Giblin for her remarks

Dr. English said, "The Board action today does not preclude our taking into consideration the comments that were made by Dr. Giblin, it is just saying that our staffs will work to strengthen the process. We are still open for discussion. Don Sevens mentioned the *Sun-Times* article of September 6, 2001. I think most of the Board Members know, but the public may not, that these issues were under discussion in the year 2000 by the Joint Education Committee, and we've had long and interesting discussions about when to apply these testing processes. So, the

Board of Higher Education, the State Board of Education, the Human Resource Investment Council, and the Illinois Community College Board were working on these issues prior to the *Sun-Times* article. Our response today is not in response to the *Sun-Times* article. I think this is an important action because it further enhances the joint work of all of the boards and the direct connection between the Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education in the teacher education process. I think it's one of the most important things that we have done at the Board of Higher Education in the last decade.

“One of the pieces that I think that the Board should have is the Governor’s Council on Educator Quality report, *Illinois Policy Inventory on Teaching and Learning*. Members of the Joint Education Committee received this document, but the Members of the Board of Higher Education did not. I want to compliment Hazel Loucks on the fine work she did on this report. I think if we follow this blueprint on quality education, it will only enhance this action that we’re taking today. I would make a motion to approve the resolution.”

Ms. Meyer said, “The focus that this Board and the Joint Education Committee under Hazel’s leadership have taken on teacher quality and all of higher education in the state of Illinois over the last couple of years is great. When I joined the Board of Higher Education, it wasn’t talked about so much, but a lot has come to the floor in the meantime. I think there is much to be done in this area, from the recruitment of teachers through the training of teachers, the mentoring of teachers, the ongoing professional development, and the evaluation as teachers proceed through a professional career in this area. I would suggest that we supplement our resolution with a general statement that recognizes also the need for mentoring and induction processes. It is critical, as we’ve seen with the vast majority – up to 50 percent – of the teachers leaving the profession in the first five years, that if you don’t do that you will continue to lose them. This addition would encourage the Board of Higher Education, the State Board of Education, and the Illinois Community College Board to work together to ensure all aspects of recruiting, training, retaining, and developing teachers to their best of their abilities, to meet standards on an ongoing basis.”

Ms. Monteagudo said, “I am so pleased that we have some concrete information and recommendations. On Page 9 where the report talks about the Chicago public schools being the only school district that assigns substitute certificate holders to permanent classrooms, I want you to know that that could be an issue of a substitute teacher who is there for years, touching 30 children every year. That teacher never had to take the certificate exam. No one really pays attention to them, except for the principal, and as long as the person is able to hold onto the kids and no one gets killed, they’re going to be there for years because there are not enough teachers coming into the school system. If we know we’re putting these people in front of the children because we don’t have teachers, I think we have a responsibility that there be programs supporting these people. It’s not just induction of new teachers, but induction of people that are in the classrooms because we have no other way of serving the children. That is a different type of training and development from one that is necessary for one who is coming into the profession as a teacher to one who needs to grow in his or her profession. Someone has to attend to these people, and it is the responsibility of the system. The only way they can get to be a substitute teacher is because they have a bachelor’s degree from a college or university.”

Dr. English said, “I made the motion to approve, and I would like to amend it, or at least give my interpretation of the motion that the staff will also include in this process the recommendations of the Governor’s Council on Educator Quality wherever possible in implementing this item.”

Chairman Rock said, “I think Dea has an amendment to the motion also that sounds compatible to me.”

Ms. Meyer said, “We should add that the staffs of the Board of Higher Education, the State Board of Education, and the Illinois Community College Board work to ensure the strong recruitment, training, mentoring and induction, professional development, and evaluation that supports teachers throughout the development of their professional careers.”

Mr. Lamont said, “I know we’re dealing with a horse of a much different color, but we go to great lengths to discuss the preparation and competency of our K-12 instruction, but I note with some irony that there is not any kind of equivalent to ever deal with that same situation with our instructors at the college and university level. I don’t think that should be ignored.”

The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. English and seconded by Mrs. Williamson, unanimously approved the resolution in Item 5 dated February 5, 2002, as amended, that the Board of Higher Education, working in partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Community College Board, should require a passing score on the Illinois Test of Basic Skills as a condition for admission to all Illinois teacher preparation programs.

And, working in partnership with the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Community College Board, should require a passing score on the subject-matter test used for certification as a prerequisite for student teaching in that field in all Illinois teacher preparation programs.

And should work with the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Community College Board to establish policies and programs that will:

- *Ensure graduates of Illinois teacher education programs are able to teach to Illinois Learning Standards;*
- *Use professional development funds to help the existing teaching force teach to Illinois Learning Standards;*
- *Use technology and other means to reduce the number of teachers teaching outside their collegiate academic major; and*
- *Ensure the strong recruitment, training, mentoring and induction, professional development, and evaluation that support teachers throughout the development of their professional careers.*

The Board of Higher Education encourages Illinois colleges and universities with teacher preparation programs to move steadily toward the goal of meeting or exceeding NCATE 2000 standards.

Chairman Rock said: “I am going to defer until our April meeting Item 6, *Review of Program Approval Statutes: The Private College Act and the Academic Degree Act*, and Item 7, *Summary and Review of Unequal Opportunity: Disparities in College Access Among the 50 States*. We will move to Item 8.”

8. Status Report on Engineering Education in Illinois

Chairman Rock said that Gary Alexander would present the item. Dr. Alexander said: “We were asked to do a brief examination of supply and demand projections in engineering. We did one through the year 2008. I want to make it clear that it was not an in-depth study. Based on the data that we looked at, both nationally and in the state, and the report that you have, we can make at least three observations. One is that the demand for engineers will remain steady or will rise somewhat in the first decade of the 21st century. You can see, for example, nationwide a projection of a 10 percent rise in demand for engineers in chemical engineering up to 26 percent for electrical and electronic engineers. The second point we can make is that there has been a decline in the total number of graduates in every major engineering field in our programs. The third point is that there is currently no shortage of graduates reflected in the data that would call for us to make major adjustments. While these last two are not necessarily contradictory, we think they do indicate that the situation in engineering is fluid and bears watching.

“I would emphasize also that this study does not take into account in- and out-migration of engineers and engineering graduates of our programs. It does not consider the impact of foreign engineering students on the Illinois market. And, finally, it does not distinguish local from statewide concerns. This was a quick look at the statewide situation. We didn’t look at particular areas of the state. We recommend continued monitoring of trends in engineering education given the fluctuations in supply and demand in the fields. In addition, to ensure the flow of students into engineering, the report encourages the development of pre-engineering programs in two areas: one, those designed to interest more high school students in engineering; and two, those designed to increase the diversity of the engineering pool. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock introduced John Landgraf, Vice President for Corporate Engineering at Abbott Laboratories. Mr. Landgraf accompanied his remarks with a power point presentation. He said: “First I want to say what a great job the state of Illinois is doing with graduates. We’re very pleased with the quality of all of the graduates we hire from the state of Illinois. I’m slightly biased, being a graduate of one of the schools in Illinois and having two children who have gone through the system.

“For those of you who don’t know Abbott, we’re a small Illinois company up north with about \$16.3 billion in sales. We employ about 77,000 people worldwide. Let me share with you my perspective regarding engineering on a global basis. Our demand for engineers from 1980 to 1990 doubled. In 1990, we said it couldn’t increase any more, but it doubled again by 2000. I see no reason why that trend will not continue to increase. I think equally alarming is that a large number of engineers will retire in the next five years. We estimate that approximately 30 percent of the Abbott engineers will retire in the next five years. Our average retirement is age 57. We have engineers going into many different fields within Abbott. A past president of Abbott Laboratories was a chemical engineer and our current chairman is a mechanical engineer, so we do have many different engineers at Abbott that have chosen other occupations.

“My final point is that technology continues to change. I’ve been with Abbott 25 years. In the factories we built 25 years ago, we had 25 direct employees to every professional. Today, a \$50 million factory requires two direct operators. Technically, it requires one, but we have one for a backup. We have four or five engineers behind it to operate it, so technology is truly driving the need for engineering at an even greater rate. I’ve been talking with other colleagues and looking at articles, including the *Wall Street Journal*, and they’re saying the same thing. For the United States to be competitive, we must have more engineers in the future. I did a simple review of the supply and learned that the general supply of engineers has been basically flat to somewhat

declining. I took some of the data that I've gathered from the major schools that we recruit from. Equally alarming, I think, is that we're trying to build a more diversified workforce. Only 16 percent of the total engineers coming out of school are minority and only 20 percent are female. It's hard for me to build a diverse workforce if they're not coming out of the universities where we recruit.

"How do we approach these problems? I see that we have two major problems that we need to jointly address – increasing the number of females and minorities in the field of engineering, and the need to graduate more engineers in the future. This is something Abbott alone cannot tackle. No one company, no matter how large, can tackle it. No one school can tackle it. I've been to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and to the University of Chicago, and every school is working on the minority/female engineers and no one is doing an exceptional job across the board. This is an area in which we need to work together as a team. We have a lot of high-tech companies in Illinois and some of the key schools of engineering that we recruit from. I propose that the companies, the schools, and the government form an alliance, pooling our resources and finances, to tackle this problem. What would it take to increase capacity? Two of the questions I have for this group are: how long would it take you to increase the number of engineering graduates – total graduates, minority graduates, and female graduates? And, what would you need to do?"

"In today's environment, when we build a building, that's the easy part. The funding up-front can take longer than it takes to build the building, and staffing it afterwards is an equally long challenge. As I look at the supply chain, how do we get more engineers into business? We go to the universities to recruit, but we can't get that diverse workforce. If you go to the high schools and try to get a more diverse student body into your schools, you have a challenge. I think we need to focus back on the middle schools. If we have a grassroots program, which I think we need, we start doing that with seventh- and eighth-grade students today. That means that it will be five to six years before you see them in your universities. They go through your universities in the next four to five years, so it will be 10 more years before I see them. This is not a program that we can fix overnight. On the other hand, if we don't start today, we'll never get it fixed.

"I would like to work with some of the other Illinois companies to raise funds for programs to educate young females, minorities, and all students that engineering is an okay thing to do. As I talk to many young students in the middle schools, they have no clue what an engineer does. We've recently made a short CD-ROM, since young people don't read so much but do use computers, which is targeted to what engineering is really like at Abbott Laboratories, mainly to attract the college student, but I would propose that we could do something similar across all industry. Engineers build airplanes at Boeing, develop cellular phones at Motorola, and develop high-tech drugs and other devices at Abbott Laboratories. They design products, they build the machines that make those products, and they build the facilities that manufacture those products. That is what I would like to propose, and it will take your support, as well."

Dr. English said, "The person to talk to is Hazel Loucks, the Co-Chair of the Workforce Investment Board Human Resource Investment Council. They have a program called Education to Careers which works with seventh- and eighth-grade students to try to bring them along saying, what are appropriate careers for you in the future? I think through the ETC program in the 40 regions throughout the state that coincide with our community college districts, that's the fine entry point to get that message across. I think Hazel would be happy to know that Abbott is willing to step up."

Ms. Monteagudo, “A second approach would be to try to help the teachers in the elementary and middle schools that do not know enough math and science to pass on the skills to the children, which is the reason we don’t have a pipeline of young people who want to go to high school and take the subjects necessary to prepare for engineering school. Until we address the issue at the elementary and middle school level and help those teachers teach so that the children will feel capable of tackling being an engineer, we will never have enough engineers.”

Mr. Landgraf said, “When I go to the middle schools, math and science are the most difficult things. You can’t wait until they are seniors in high school. We have to get down to that level to encourage them that math and science is cool and this is what you can do with it.”

Mr. Lesnik said, “I would second what Lourdes said, and I would recommend to you that in trying to put this committee together, you go directly to the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, which is under the jurisdiction of this Board. It is almost entirely funded by the state and the main part of its mission is to do just what you’re talking about – to prepare those students in the middle school and high school to use math and science and to prepare for the kinds of careers that you’re discussing. I think you will find an ally there and also an organization that will provide you with resources and information.”

Chairman Rock thanked Mr. Landgraf for his presentation. He said, “I apologize to Marcia and Dan since I have deferred Items 6 and 7 until the next meeting.”

Professor Gove said, “On Item 6, *Review of Program Approval Statutes: The Private College Act and the Academic Degree Act*, I think there are some problems with this report. It does not emphasize the need for federal action on this matter. In the last *Chronicle of Higher Education*, there was an item about Masters Institute, which went belly-up and a lot of students got hurt in that process. So I think this is a bigger problem, and I do hope that we will have some recommendations for action.”

CA-6. New Units of Instruction, Public Service and Research at Public Universities

Chairman Rock said, “At the request of two of the Members, we pulled two items off of the consent agenda. Item CA-6 is a recommendation for approval for Southern Illinois University Carbondale to establish the bachelor of science in elementary education in the North Suburban Higher Education Region #1.”

Dr. English said, “In reviewing this item, I realized that in a number of other reports that I have read, it states that we have an over-supply of elementary school teachers and we have an under-supply of teachers of math, science, special education, and reading specialties. Yet, today we’re going to approve – and I’ll make the motion to approve – this program. I realize it is a placebo issue, that we are not providing appropriate amounts of baccalaureate degree completion programs in Lake County, and we need to do this. But, I would suggest that rather than bring the old model up from Carbondale, that we emphasize the areas of shortage that we have within the curriculum, that it not just be the same old B.S. in elementary education. I note on Page 32 of the report that there are going to be courses in teaching mathematics, science, and concepts for teachers, reading, English and language arts, et cetera. What it refers to is the pedagogy of teaching and not the knowledge and skill content or the base of information they need in mathematics and science and reading. So I would hope that we can impress upon SIU Carbondale that we would like them to modify the curriculum so there is more content information than pedagogy information.

“It all fits together with Item 5 today that we approved and the quality of teachers and Hazel Loucks’ report from the Governor’s Council on Educator Quality and The Needs of the Community. Diane, I hope you take that back to SIU. I move approval of this item as presented with the added emphasis.”

Dr. Gilleland said, “I already see nods from SIU. Actually, the program and the detail that is presented does address your concerns more than the short summary does, in addition to having folks staff this that are national board-certified teachers, which is a new twist. We probably didn’t capture all of it, but we have full agreement.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. English and seconded by Mr. Blakemore, unanimously granted the following university approval to establish the following new degree program: **Southern Illinois University Carbondale, B.S. in Elementary Education in the North Suburban Higher Education Region #1.***

CA-8 Public University Noninstructional Project Approval

Chairman Rock said: “This item was removed from the consent agenda at the request of a couple of Members. The item recommends approval for the public university noninstructional capital project for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to renovate and expand the campus recreation facilities in the amount of \$77,600,000. It was recommended that the Board approve the item.”

Mr. Lesnik said: “I would like to recommend that we defer consideration of this item until our next meeting. I am concerned about an item of this magnitude being brought before the Board on relatively short notice and without prior discussion. And, there is not a great deal of explanation in our Board materials. I think at a time of scarcity of public funds for education, which has been well documented in the media and in discussions among the Board, the Board ought to be quite circumspect about items of this magnitude. I might add also that in a period when the public expects perhaps more of their boards of directors in the aftermath of Enron, maybe this kind of thing should get a little more scrutiny.

“I am concerned about not only the magnitude of it, but how it is going to be paid for. The materials we have indicate that the University of Illinois would take a bond and that the debt service would come from an increase in student usage fees. If the debt is retired by an increase in usage fees, who is going to pay for the incremental cost of operations from vastly expanding these recreational facilities, which are going to be used by faculty, staff, and students? If the increase in use fees, which I would expect should pay for operations, is going to be used to retire the debt – and, incidentally, we haven’t seen that arithmetic – then will other funds from the University be used to pay for operations, or will we have to look to increases in tuition, for example, to subsidize the operations of noninstructional facilities like these? I think that in the context of what the residents of Illinois are discussing and we are discussing among ourselves, at this moment in time this kind of request of \$78 million deserves a little more scrutiny. I would suggest also when we do review this at our next meeting, that more substance be given to the documentation of the need for a \$78 million facility. There is reference to a survey of about 5,000 students. I don’t know to whom that survey went or under what circumstances it was done. Since it is noninstructional at a time when every single dollar is needed for instruction, teaching, and learning, I think we ought to take a little bit closer look at this.”

Mr. Lamont said, “Mr. Lesnik certainly raises some good points, and I would support the motion that we defer. I will only say that as a member of the Board of Trustees of the University

of Illinois, this question was debated at some length at our board because we also are concerned about the number, and the administration went to great pains to point out the support of the student body in favor of this. But I think Mr. Lesnik's point is well taken that this Board should be comfortable with what is taking place here. We will ask representatives from the University of Illinois to come to the next meeting and address the concerns of Mr. Lesnik and other Members of the Board."

Mr. Kaplan asked that the Student Advisory Committee come forward at the next meeting with a report on their concerns, as well.

The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Lesnik and seconded by Ms. Monteagudo, unanimously approved deferring action on Item CA-8 Public University Noninstructional Project Approval until the April 2002 Board meeting.

9. Consent Agenda

The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Professor Gove and seconded by Mr. Blakemore, unanimously approved the following items:

CA-1. Board Meeting Minutes – December 11, 2001

The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the minutes of the December 11, 2001 meeting.

CA-2. Financial Report

The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the financial report dated December 31, 2001.

CA-3. Illinois Financial Assistance Act Fiscal Year 2002 Grant Allocation

The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the fiscal year 2002 grant allocations totaling up to \$22,169,100 as provided for under the Illinois Financial Assistance Act for Nonpublic Institutions of Higher Learning. Payment of grants is subject to the receipt of all required documents. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or to adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform with the existing statute or the rules implementing the statute.

CA-4. Health Services Education Grants Act Fiscal Year 2002 Grant Allocation

The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the allocation of fiscal year 2002 grants authorized by the Health Services Education Grants Act detailed in Table 3 and the grant rates detailed in Appendix I of Item CA-4 dated February 5, 2002. Payment of grants is subject to the receipt of all required documentation. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform with existing statute and rules.

CA-5 New Units of Instruction at Public Community Colleges

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted authority for **College of DuPage** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Dental Hygiene contingent upon the College's*

submission of a report within three years on the progress the College has made toward having the program attain accreditation.

*And unanimously granted authority for **Kennedy-King College** of the City Colleges of Chicago to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Culinary Arts.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **John A. Logan College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Diagnostic Medical Sonography contingent upon the College's submission of a report within three years on the progress the College has made toward having the program attain accreditation.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **Waubensee Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Construction Electrician.*

CA-7. New Operating and/or Degree-Granting Authority for Independent Institutions

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted to **Northwestern Business College** the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate in West Suburban Region, and further grants Authorization to Grant the following degrees in this region subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions which were presented in its application and which form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted: A.A.S. in Paralegal, A.A.S. in Business Administration, A.A.S. in Executive Accounting, A.A.S. in Business Computer Programming, A.A.S. in Web Design and Maintenance, A.A.S. in Business Information Systems.*

*And unanimously granted to **Robert Morris College** the Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Graphic Design in West Suburban, Central, and South Metropolitan regions, subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions which were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.*

*And unanimously granted to **Trinity Christian College** the Certificate of Approval to Operate in the Chicago region, and further grants Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education, the Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education, and the Bachelor of Science in Organizational Management in the region, subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions which were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.*

*And unanimously granted to **The Vanderschmidt School** the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate at 4825 N. Scott Street, Suite 76, Schiller Park, Illinois, and further grants Authorization to Grant the following degrees: Associate of Applied Science degree in CAD/Architectural Drafting; Associate of Applied Science degree in Computer Network Engineering; Associate of Applied Science degree in Computer Network Technology; Associate of Applied Science degree in Computer Programming and Software Technology; and the Associate of Applied Science degree in Graphic Design and Multimedia. These authorizations are subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.*

10. Information Agenda

There was no discussion on the following information items:

- II-1. Report on Dental Education: A Report to the Illinois General Assembly in Response to House Resolution 334 – Phase II
 - II-2. Progress Report and Plans for Calendar Year 2002
 - II-3. Overview of Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Development
 - II-4. Legislative Report
 - II-5. Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Update
11. Advisory Committee Reports

Chairman Rock called upon the advisory committee chairs for their reports. He recognized Kenneth Andersen, Faculty Advisory Council. Professor Andersen said: “The Faculty Advisory Council canceled its meeting last Friday due to the weather, so we will have no formal report for you today. I would like to comment that the testimony on *All Faculty Matter!* recalls to me my statement in public testimony that the problem is the continuous failure of the state of Illinois to adequately invest in the intellectual capital of its citizens. There is no greater contribution the state could make to its future than to increase the investment in intellectual capital in elementary, secondary, and higher education. Obviously, there is great concern on the part of faculty about the loss of funds appropriated for public higher education. There is growing alarm about next year’s budget and the implications for the quality of education, and particularly worrisome to faculty are some of the issues surrounding the benefits dimension of total compensation which has been a long-term problem area for the state of Illinois’ faculty. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Katie Cox, Student Advisory Committee. Ms. Cox said, “The students wish to comment on the part-time faculty report. I will submit a statement that was formally approved to the secretary. In summary, they want to see that part-time faculty are provided with more support services and a better working environment. A large number of students who come to our meetings attend community colleges or universities which rely on part-time faculty, and they do feel that there is not equity there that should be.

“My other comments referred to Item 7 which was deferred to the next meeting. We look forward to a report from the Board on an update as to the affordability of higher education in Illinois. I do have one student comment that I would like to read to you. This is an e-mail from a young woman at a public university. ‘I am a 19 year-old female attending a public university in Illinois. My older sister also attends here and will be graduating this summer with \$10,000 in loans to pay off. I’ve accumulated myself \$2,000 in my first year alone. My younger sister will attend school here next year and my younger brother enters college the year after that. My educational costs, in addition to my older sister’s, even with loans, required my parents to re-mortgage our home last year. The planned tuition hikes for next year will impact not only my costs but my younger sister’s.’ That is one example of the impact of these tuition hikes can have directly on the students at a time of an economic slowdown or recession. There is a member of our Student Advisory Committee whose father worked for United Airlines and was laid off in November. Her mother works for K-Mart. She can’t pay for school right now and there is no

financial aid out there that is accessible to her. I doubt that financial aid and student assistance will rise at the same rate as the tuition increases according to the headlines I've seen. So, please keep us in mind. We are living through this recession also, and just because our parents claim us on their tax returns doesn't mean that they have the money to help pay for our education. We will have a comment on the University of Illinois' recreation center next time. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Gretchen Naff, Community College Presidents Council. Dr. Naff said that in the interest of time, she would have no report.

Chairman Rock recognized David Tretter, Independent Institutions. Mr. Tretter said: "Even though Dr. Layzell did not have the chance today to give his report, I would like to address one issue. I notice that the American Council on Education has done a survey of their own, and although I hesitate to comment on the findings of surveys, one of the main points in there is that there is a basic misperception on college cost by the general public. One of the items estimates that some members of the public overestimate the cost of attendance by as much as 70 percent. Even though the Lumina Foundation report has some methodological problems we may not agree with, it's an issue that is going to be with us and we need to address it. Also, this gives us an opportunity to better explain the cost of attendance versus sticker price, which is what we normally see. We look forward to working with the Board and staff in the upcoming legislative session. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Jerry Dill, Proprietary Institutions. Mr. Dill said, "I would like to make a quick comment on the status report on engineering education. I would ask that you consider another alternative, that students from degree-granting proprietary institutions in engineering technology programs can also be a source for highly skilled employees in the state. We have certainly appreciated the relationship we've had with colleges like the Illinois Institute of Technology that have taken our electronics engineering technology bachelor degree graduates into their MSEE program and get them on the track to becoming recognized as engineers in industry. Thank you."

Chairman Rock thanked the representatives of the advisory committees for their reports.

12. Other Matters

There were no other matters to come before the Board.

13. Executive Session

Chairman Rock said: "The Board will meet in Executive Session and under the Open Meetings Act, there must be a motion adopted in open session to authorize that Executive Session. A quorum must be present and the motion must be approved by a majority of the quorum with a recorded vote. We do not contemplate taking any further action of the Board today. Therefore, we will not return to open session. A quorum is present. I would ask if we could have a motion and a second to authorize an Executive Session, as follows: 'Move that the Board of Higher Education go into Executive Session at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 5, 2002 for the purpose of discussing the employment of staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, pursuant to Section 2(B)(1) of the Open Meetings Act.'" Mr. Barmak made the motion and Ms. Meyer seconded it.

The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Barmak and seconded by Ms. Meyer, unanimously approved the above resolution.

The roll call vote on Item 13 was as follows: Yes – Barmak, Barr, Blakemore, Duffy, English, Gove, Kaplan, Lamont, Lesnik, Meyer, Monteagudo, Rock, Sloan, Thompson, Williamson. No – none.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Rock adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Patricia Sexton, Secretary to the Board.

Note: Copies of all items referred to in the minutes (i.e., letters, statements, reports, etc.) are on file with the official minutes of the February 5, 2002 meeting.