

**MINUTES – BOARD MEETING**  
April 2, 2002

**Submitted for:** Action.

**Summary:** Minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education held at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

**Action Requested:** That the Board of Higher Education approve the Minutes of the April 2, 2002 meeting.



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**MINUTES - BOARD MEETING**  
**April 2, 2002**

A meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:10 a.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois on April 2, 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
Jerry D. Blakemore	Steven H. Lesnik
Edward T. Duffy	Lourdes Monteagudo
Samuel K. Gove	C. Richard Neumiller
James L. Kaplan	John C. Thompson

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  
James M. Hacking, Executive Director, State Universities Retirement System

Presidents and Chancellors

Victor Boschini	John Peters
Elnora Daniel	Richard Ringeisen
Stuart Fagan	Salme Steinberg
Louis Hencken	David Taylor
Daniel LaVista	James Walker
Sylvia Manning	David Werner
Stephanie Marshall	

Advisory Committee Chairpersons

Ken Andersen, Faculty	Gretchen Naff, Community College
Katie Cox, Student	Ronald Taylor, Proprietary
Donald Fouts, Independent	

1. Announcements and Remarks by Chairman Philip J. Rock

Chairman Rock called the meeting to order and noted that a quorum was present. He said: “We have a great deal to cover, so my remarks will be brief. I want first to thank President Victor Boschini and the Illinois State University community for the reception last night and for the very nice accommodations for the meeting today.

“Jane Williamson, who has resigned from the Board, unfortunately will not be with us. She is in New York. Later today, we will present a resolution on her behalf.

“I would be remiss if I didn’t thank Keith Sanders for his leadership during the past four and a half years as the Executive Director of our Board. This is the last meeting at which Keith will be with us as the Executive Director. We will have a resolution in his favor a little later.

“I’d like to take this opportunity to introduce Daniel LaVista, who will succeed Keith as the Executive Director on May 1 this year. Dan was selected from a list of very impressive candidates and has an exemplary professional record. He started his professional career at Illinois State University, and currently serves as President of McHenry County College.” Those present warmly applauded Dr. LaVista.

Chairman Rock continued, “I learned last night that Katie Cox, who has served as the chair of the Student Advisory Committee, will shortly be joining the Board as the student representative. We welcome that and commend those students who voted for her and her obvious interest and commitment. We will be meeting in executive session for a short time following the conclusion of today’s meeting. It is an advisory meeting and no action will be taken. Following the executive session, Board Members are encouraged to meet with the members of the Executive Committee of the Student Advisory Committee.”

2. Remarks by Victor J. Boschini, President, Illinois State University

President Boschini said: “Good morning, and thank you very much for coming today. I want to welcome all of you on this great spring day to Illinois State University in Normal. Professor Gove told me earlier that Richard Browne was the first Executive Director of the IBHE and was also a political scientist from Illinois State University.

“I want to congratulate Dr. Sanders and thank him on behalf of the University and everyone here for all you have done for higher education. I know we have a big agenda today and a limited amount of time, so I just will once again welcome everyone to Illinois State University.”

Professor Gove said: “Dick Browne really established this Board and got the master plan going. He was a fine gentleman.”

3. Remarks by Keith R. Sanders, Executive Director

Dr. Sanders said: “I want to thank President Vic Boschini for arranging an event for me last evening where the presidents and chancellors had a chance to say some kind things about me, some of which were actually true. I appreciate his hospitality and their kind remarks.

“On March 7, at this University, the Board and its co-sponsors held a conference on the future role of community colleges in teacher preparation. It was well and enthusiastically

attended. The Dean of the College of Education at ISU came and saved the day. President Boschini and many of his colleagues were there. I can promise the Board that in the coming year, you will see a series of very productive and constructive collaborations, even more than we have now, between community colleges and four-year teacher degree-granting universities.

“I want to congratulate Illinois State University on the receipt of a \$5.25 million gift from Caterpillar for campus technology, business programs, and the library. I congratulate you, Mr. President.”

Chairman Rock said that Item 4, *Resolutions Honoring Board Members*, would be deferred to the end of the meeting.

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

Chairman Rock said a few individuals had asked to comment on the item, and they would be given the opportunity to do so. He said that Doug Day would present the report.

Dr. Day said: “First, I would like to make some general comments on some issues concerning this report, and then I will briefly talk about the recommendations. Many have commented on the contrast and apparent discrepancy between the positive attitudes shown in our survey results and the strong public criticism of some nontenure-track faculty. On this point it is worth keeping in mind that nontenure-track faculty are a very diverse group, and it is not surprising that there are differences of opinion. Also, it should be emphasized that while most nontenure-track faculty reported to us that they were satisfied with their situation, this should not be interpreted to mean that they were pleased. Nor is the committee. The report’s recommendations advocate the need for change in the way that many colleges and universities use nontenure-track faculty.

“Second, I want to comment on the methodology used in the report. Early on in the development of this report, the decision was made to undertake a survey of nontenure-track faculty, since these instructors are less visible on campus and we wanted to know more about their backgrounds, demographics, responsibilities, and attitudes. Since the best survey work requires special expertise, the Board contracted with the Center for Governmental Studies at Northern Illinois University. The Center is widely respected and has previously undertaken a number of surveys for the Board. Under the leadership of Professors Pete Trott and Michael Peddle, the Center did its usual fine job in this survey and produced a report according to the highest professional standards. Nontenure-track faculty were randomly sampled, then surveyed, and the response rates were very high. In the terminology of the trade, the survey has an accuracy rate of plus or minus five percent with a 95 percent degree of confidence.

“For this report, we did something in addition to contracting with the Center. Knowing that the survey would be closely scrutinized because of the controversial nature of its subject, we also convened a technical committee to advise on the procedures used in data collection and survey development. The group met periodically for about a year, and included members of the IBHE and ICCB staffs as well as high-ranking campus staff with responsibility for academic affairs, human resources, and data collection and analysis. Faculty were active members of this group and representation included the chair of the Board’s Faculty Advisory Committee as well as faculty union representatives. The group reviewed recent reports and surveys that have been conducted by other states such as California and Ohio on general issues such as the advantages and disadvantages of using one form of survey technique versus another and narrow technical

questions. The members of the group closely examined the draft surveys and discussed and sometimes changed the wording of individual questions. The Board staff is highly appreciative of the contributions made by members of this technical group.

“As I turn now to the recommendations, I would like to emphasize one main point. The committee believes that public colleges and universities can make improvements by creating a more stable, supportive, and productive environment for nontenure-track faculty, and that these improvements will benefit not only nontenure-track faculty, but also students and student learning. These recommendations should create a more positive learning environment at Illinois institutions of higher education. Moreover, these improvements can be made without disadvantaging anyone at our public institutions. Tenure-track faculty have much to gain from having a better prepared and more active and involved nontenure-track faculty. Academic administrators will still be able to retain the flexibility that they need in hiring nontenure-track faculty. We ask that public colleges and universities take the next year to formulate plans that will identify short-term and long-term goals, objectives, and strategies for making the best use of nontenure-track faculty and implementing the proposed policies. Institutions are asked to report to the Board on these plans by December 31, 2002. The committee will review these documents and report back to the Board on the results of our analysis. I will now ask the co-chairs of this committee, Tom Lamont and Ed Duffy, to comment.”

Mr. Duffy said, “I think the results of the study certainly speak for themselves, but let me speak about the process that was used to come to these conclusions. For those of us who don’t work on a daily basis in higher education, I think we expected to see far more people that were dissatisfied with their work, and we expected to see situations where there was disorganization and problems in all of the state’s colleges and universities because of what was reported to be an over-reliance on part-time staff. The fact is, however, that from the very beginning it didn’t point that out, which caused me to pay more attention to the process than to the outcome, because I was suspect at first of what we were finding. But after getting into it, I began to understand it better. I think the staff did a remarkable job. There are those that will be critical of this because their expectation of the outcome was far different. I understand that, but let me assure them – at least from my perspective – that this process was undertaken in a way in which we could prove their feelings rather than try to disprove their feelings. I want to thank the staff, and I want to give my co-chair, Mr. Lamont, an opportunity to comment. After that we will take questions.”

Mr. Lamont said: “I share your thoughts and your concerns with the outcome of this report. We have all had a chance to review some of the letters that came in with regard to our methodology and some of the criticism of the report, and I do not believe those individuals are particularly well served by those criticisms. I would like to stress a couple of points from the recommendations of the committee that I think can easily be implemented. I know it will be difficult to bring the compensation levels up to where some might wish them to be, but as we move toward full-time teaching loads for some of these individuals, I think we truly have to pay some attention to the compensation and benefit factors. Another recommendation suggests that institutions provide resources to nontenure-track faculty so they can perform their assigned duties in a professional manner and have opportunities to interact with students outside the classroom. I think this goes to the quality of education being offered by these individuals. Give them a location, a desk, a meeting area, a telephone, and e-mail capabilities – just as their peers have – to interact with their students. This would go a long way toward the overall educational process that they’re offering in the classroom. I think we do a disservice to our students if we don’t provide them the same capabilities and resources in that respect that someone taking a class from a tenured faculty member would have. We are disadvantaging our students. Perhaps that’s a much easier recommendation to accept and work with than some of the others that deal more with

compensation concerns. I think we would all be well served if the institutions would take this coming year and truly try to work with some of these recommendations. As you know, there will be legislative issues to be addressed and potential bills that may try to take this away from its being an internal issue, and I think we would be well served to try to address it head-on and reach some accommodations that are satisfactory to everyone.”

Chairman Rock recognized Peter Miller of the Illinois Education Association (IEA). Mr. Miller said: “Thank you for allowing public comment. I thank Dr. Day also for taking the comments and the study so seriously. It’s important to see that the Board is addressing the issue of nontenure-track faculty. However, I’m going to recommend that you not accept the report in its current form. In February, the Board heard public feedback on this report and at that meeting, several nontenure-track professors spoke out and described their disappointment with the study. As a staff member for the Illinois Education Association and as a former adjunct professor, and without any disrespect for the staff and the work that went into the report, I encourage you not to accept the report. The report’s conclusions are weak, suggesting only that a second lower-tier wage scale be established for part-time faculty. This is a principle that I find it hard to get behind. I believe in equal pay for equal work. Just because someone is working part time seems to be a bad justification for paying them less than someone who is working full time doing the same work.

“The report recommends that colleges and universities monitor the proportion of nontenure-track faculty, conduct a study, that educational institutions write policies for nontenure-track faculty, that professional development be provided, and so forth. I’m disappointed, and I feel that these amount to weak platitudes that will do little or nothing to change trends in the usage of nontenure-track faculty. At Illinois State University alone, an institution the report cites as a model institution, six years of study have not produced significant improvements in nontenure-track faculty treatment – only more study. Indeed, over that past six years, the number of nontenure-track faculty has risen by 70 percent – a 70 percent increase in the use of nontenure-track faculty – while the use of tenure-track faculty has increased by only 1.3 percent. The Board of Higher Education will only embarrass itself by endorsing six years of study as an example of best practice. One has to wonder what we would expect from an institution that had good practice or even average practice.

“The survey on which many of the recommendations are based also deserves some criticism. In academic writing, journal articles are approved or rejected after being reviewed by a group of peer researchers. The study that you’re being asked to approve today was not subject to peer review. However, a group of IEA leaders, the Higher Education Council, did offer a critique of the study, and this is the closest thing to a referee’s report that the Board of Higher Education may see. In it, the Higher Education Council rejects the study, citing deficiencies in research design, ambiguous use of language, omission of literature citations where those citations disagree with the author’s thesis, and a lack of justification for the report’s conclusions. The IEA Higher Education Council notes that the study compares poorly with another study undertaken in California, and anecdotal information supports the idea that this is not a well-constructed study. At the University of Illinois, instructors in the English department dismiss the report and its findings since many individuals refused to respond because they didn’t believe that their identity would be kept confidential. Internet surveys and phone surveys don’t guarantee confidentiality for the respondents.

“The state legislature passed House Joint Resolution 19 because legislators were concerned by the rapid growth in the use of nontenure-track faculty, faculty who lack academic freedom, do not participate in governance, and who don’t enjoy tenure. The legislature

recognized that those are the keys to creating an intellectually active academic community, and those keys are being lost. Again, I remind you that at Illinois State University, the nontenure-track faculty population has risen by 70 percent since 1976, while the tenure-track positions have risen by only 1.3 percent. The study and the recommendations do not address the seriousness of this change. They suggest that everything is fine and that only minor changes are needed. I do not believe that the citizens of the state or the state legislature would agree and, indeed, nontenure-track faculty themselves do not agree. On behalf of the Illinois Education Association, I request that Board Members vote against this report and reject it in its present form. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Gretchen Knapp. Professor Knapp said: “I am speaking to you as a nontenure-track faculty member at Illinois State University. I have two comments to offer you. First, I want to thank the committee for revising the IBHE report on nontenure-track faculty to include a portion of comments made by the faculty themselves. Although the report has many flaws about which I am sure you have been informed, this revision is a much-needed step in the right direction. But despite that small change and for reasons that others have offered repeatedly and forcefully, I respectfully request that the Board reject this report. Since we here at Illinois State University don’t know how many of our nontenure-track colleagues were included in this random phone survey or in the Internet survey, and since we’ve never been studied as a group like all the other employees here, we decided to conduct our own self-study. I won’t take your time with the results, but I do have copies of preliminary results which I will be glad to share with you. My point is that our self-study, which was based on an anonymous questionnaire sent to all nontenure-track faculty, does not corroborate your data.

“Second, while the revised IBHE report does contain a few more nontenure-track voices, I must tell you that as a citizen and a state employee, I am very concerned about repeated attempts to silence my voice. Last week, the executive director’s office phoned me to suggest that I not tell you that my teaching position was not renewed shortly after I testified at the November hearing. This is not my personal grievance against this university. As a matter of fact, it is impossible for any nontenure-track faculty person at Illinois State University to have a grievance, as there is no official grievance policy or procedure for us, unlike the other employees. What should concern all of us is that state employees in Illinois may not be able to speak freely before our state agencies without retaliation from their employer. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Liesl Orenic, representing the Illinois Education Association and the Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL). Ms. Orenic said: “I want to submit to the Board an official response on the part of COCAL. I want to reiterate what Peter Miller and Gretchen Knapp have said in terms of not following through on this report and this study and instead, facilitating a second survey that would include the input of labor organizations and adjunct faculty themselves in constructing and then implementing a study. Thank you.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Duffy and seconded by Mr. Lamont, unanimously accepted the final report of the Committee to Study Nontenure-Track Faculty and adopted the policies contained therein, as follows:*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should ensure that faculty that are paid at a part-time rate do, in fact, work part time. Nontenure-track faculty that work near or at a full-time rate should receive higher rates of pay than other truly part-time faculty.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should monitor hiring and seek to ensure that the balance between tenured/tenure track and nontenure track is educationally appropriate.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should establish campus workload and compensation policies for nontenure-track faculty. These policies should provide guidance to deans and department chairs and identify criteria that should be considered in setting compensation rates. These policies should also seek to eliminate inequities among nontenure-track faculty of similar responsibilities and profiles.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should actively assist the efforts of nontenure-track faculty to develop the knowledge and skills they need to be more effective teachers. All nontenure-track faculty should receive a written, annual performance evaluation.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should involve nontenure-track faculty in departmental and campus-wide meetings and decision-making bodies.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should provide resources to nontenure-track faculty so they can perform their assigned duties in a professional manner and have opportunities to interact with students outside of class. Institutions should ensure that students are not disadvantaged by the resources allocated to nontenure-track faculty.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should compensate nontenure-track faculty in a manner that recognizes and rewards performance, among other factors, and the continued contribution of nontenure-track faculty to their department and institution.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should provide contractual commitments and assurances to nontenure-track faculty that are commensurate with their long-term roles, responsibilities, and contributions to the institution.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should look for opportunities to combine part-time positions.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should establish campus-wide policies, programs, and practices that support the development of nontenure-track faculty.*

*Illinois public colleges and universities should establish plans that identify short-term and long-term goals, objectives, and strategies for developing and making the best use of nontenure-track faculty and that implement the Board's policies for nontenure-track faculty. Institutions should transmit these plans to the Board by December 31, 2002.*

6. Review of Program Approval Statutes: The Private College Act and the Academic Degree Act

Chairman Rock said: "You will recall that there was some discussion in prior meetings concerning the current approval processes for Illinois private colleges and universities, and we've asked Marcia Langsjoen to report on that topic. Ms. Langsjoen said: "Item 6 responds to requests from several Members of this Board for a review and analysis of current standards and authorities for the approval of private colleges and universities. During the past few years, this Board has seen a significant increase in the number of applications from institutions characterized as nontraditional, not just in their mode of instructional delivery, but in their financial structure, administrative organization, and in their use of faculty and systems of faculty governance. During this period of rapid change, it is responsible to ask whether consumers are adequately protected, and in recent discussions, Board Members have asked staff to explore the feasibility of specific proposals that would encourage or extend current authorities for approval under the

Private College Act and the Academic Degree Act. General questions have also been raised concerning the purpose and scope of the Board's authority, which this item attempts to address.

“Part I on Page 7 presents a brief history of existing statutes. Part II describes the scope of these Acts and discusses their strengths and weaknesses in protecting Illinois consumers. A comparison among states shows Illinois to have relatively strong statutes which combine the best features of several regulatory systems. This Board is empowered to assess institutions' success in meeting their objectives, to assure that they meet minimum quality standards based on common practice, and to assure the accuracy of information provided to students. As Part II indicates, the coverage of existing regulatory statutes is incomplete. Approval statutes do not reach institutions serving Illinois residents from out of state if these institutions have no physical presence in Illinois. Approval statutes also exempt, at their original location, 73 Illinois institutions that were established prior to 1945. These gaps in regulatory coverage justify concern. However, staff believes that the greater challenge to quality derives from the practical difficulties in conducting thorough and timely review of approved programs while simultaneously processing an increasing number of new program requests. Annual degree authorizations for private colleges have increased by over 1,400 percent since IBHE began administering these statutes in 1979, leaving approximately 1.5 full-time-equivalent staff members to analyze more than 198 degree programs during calendar year 2001. These demands on staff time have restricted program review to such an extent that review now occurs primarily in response to consumer complaints.

“Part III addresses in detail various strategies for strengthening regulatory authorities. Strategies addressed include: 1) enlarging state jurisdiction to include Internet-based and other distance learning institutions serving Illinois residents from out of state; 2) adding a ‘need’ criterion for the approval of new programs in the private sector; and 3) raising approval standards from the present standard of common practice to a higher standard.

“Several arguments are developed in the item, but the item concludes that it is unworkable to restrict approval of private institutions to those that are better than average, or to require private institutions to demonstrate need for new programs. Moreover, while enlarging jurisdiction would theoretically increase protection of Illinois consumers, this requires regulation of colleges in 50 states and in an untold number of countries. Simply put, the budgetary and practical constraints are prohibitive. In the final analysis, the item suggests that the best approach to improving the quality of higher education in Illinois is for existing institutions to act cooperatively to maintain high standards on their campuses, thereby raising the bar of common practice. I would be pleased to respond to questions or comments.”

Mr. Kaplan asked how many institutions are on the financial watch list in Illinois now. Ms. Langsjoen responded that she has a file that includes 15 to 20 notices from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE). Mr. Kaplan asked if it would be advisable to have that information put on the IBHE web site. Ms. Langsjoen responded, “I’ve actually discussed that with staff of the U.S. Department of Education and their decision has been not to make public on a web site a list of institutions on their watch list. I think that is because they fear that that could precipitate further problems at those institutions. We could do that, it is public information, but that would be up to the Board.” Mr. Kaplan asked if the Board has any authority to do anything with regard to a school that may be impaired. Ms. Langsjoen responded, “The 73 grandfathered institutions in Illinois do not fall under the Board’s regulatory authority. They report to the North Central Association and they might have something to say about this, but we do not.” Mr. Kaplan asked what the IBHE could do to protect the consumer. Ms. Langsjoen responded, “Some time ago we brought an item forward proposing a consumer information system, and I think that is still a very good idea. I’m not so sure about listing institutions that are on the USDE watch list, but I

think listing institutions that serve students well or identifying institutions where degree completion is a problem would be very useful to consumers.”

Professor Gove said, “At the last meeting, I raised the question on the Internet interstate aspect of this, which I think is a federal issue. I think we should be looking into that and we should be taking the lead to try to have some federal legislation to handle some of the misuse of the Internet.”

Mr. Blakemore said, “I would hope that, in the event the Board takes action and there is a requirement for legislative changes, we look again at whether the housekeeping issues are going to be helpful, particularly in terms of our regulatory responsibilities. I understand that the issues now are of such little significance that it will not make a big difference now. However, as we go forward and we do open up these Acts, that may be the only opportunity to do some of the housekeeping matters that have not been discussed in detail. The more fundamental issue for me, though, is that the report discusses or alludes to the fact that this Board does not have the authority to take away. We have the authority to give, but not to take away. I would like to see some consideration of the implications of enhancing that power so that we at least understand what the implications would be if we had both, particularly as we’re looking to make it more uniform and consistent in terms of our regulatory responsibilities. I’m not suggesting at this point that that is the action the Board should take, but it is an action in terms of review that I believe the staff should do.”

Ms. Langsjoen responded, “I want to clarify that the Board does have authority to revoke an institution’s degree-granting authority and operating authority for private colleges and universities. It is for public institutions that the Board can only approve and does not have the authority to revoke.”

#### 7. Proposed Legislation to Prohibit the Use of Fake Degrees

Chairman Rock said that Ms. Langsjoen would present the item. Ms. Langsjoen said: “Item 7 requests the Board’s endorsement of proposed legislation that would make it a Class A misdemeanor – not a Class 1 felony – to falsely hold oneself out as a graduate of a legitimate Illinois institution for the purpose of securing business, employment, or admission to other colleges and universities. The staff’s purpose in seeking passage of this act is to make a public statement that it is not okay to use fraudulent credentials just because you can easily obtain them and pay for them over the Internet or through the mails. You’ve probably seen a news article or two on this proposed legislation. There have been criticisms that the law would have a rather narrow effect, which is true. Our expectation is that there will be few prosecutions under this statute. The law does, however, provide prosecutors with a useful tool in their arsenal to apply against particularly egregious cases of misrepresentation using fake degrees. I know there are several attorneys on this Board who might wish to suggest changes to the wording of the proposed law, and we are open to any suggestions.”

Mr. Barmak said, “My only question is why we are limiting it to Illinois institutions as it is now written. Perhaps there is a constitutional or legal reason why someone could manufacture a degree in Illinois for Indiana University and they would not be violating the statute. Similarly, a person could obtain employment by faking a degree from Indiana University and use it in Illinois and not be violating the statute. I’m not sure why it is we wouldn’t promote the end of that kind of practice, as well. I would recommend if there is no reason why it shouldn’t be extended, that this Board extend it to those institutions as well and that we stop the practice entirely, whether it’s an Illinois institution or not. As written, it would be limited. With the

Board's permission, I would be happy to amend this as written so it would be broader than it is now."

Mr. Lamont asked if there have been instances where the institutions themselves attempted to go after individuals who may be holding themselves out as possessing degrees from those institutions. Ms. Langsjoen responded that she did not know of any institution that has pursued an individual in such a case. Mr. Barmak said, "I am not sure what an institution could do. As an attorney for a large major employer, we had this happen from time to time. There isn't a lot you can do as the employer, nor am I aware that the institutions would have any power to do anything legally or as a civil matter." Mr. Lamont asked if institutions could not seek some declaratory judgment to stop this.

Mr. Duffy said, "The staff report talked about the difficulty in tracking down businesses that sell fake degrees. Is it against the law in Illinois to sell fake degrees?" Mr. Kaplan said, "It probably violates federal mail fraud statutes to use or obtain something by use of a fraudulent degree. Also, a company that sells fraudulent degrees is getting a consideration for the issuance of those fraudulent degrees. Whether or not the federal government would step in and do something is a different issue."

Mr. Duffy said, "If I went on the Internet and said these are gag gifts and they're not intended for the use of attempting to obtain employment fraudulently, you might be able to avoid any violation of federal law. I think we ought to make sure that individuals don't buy these and seek employment, but we ought to at least make an effort toward preventing someone from selling them, as well."

Mr. Lesnik said, "Why did we decide to make this a criminal offense rather than a civil offense? Are there damages appropriate here? And, what is the penalty for a Class A misdemeanor?" Ms. Langsjoen responded, "The penalty for a Class A misdemeanor is up to one year in jail and up to a \$2,500 fine."

Mr. Thompson said, "I think it should be a crime to lie about your academic achievement, and I think a misdemeanor is a slap on the wrist. I would think that universities have trademarks and copyrights on their seals and logos, and I would think that unlawful reproduction of those would be a crime also."

Mr. Barmak said, "Perhaps we ought to look into the possibility of providing civil remedy to universities to enjoin people who are creating degrees that are false for their particular university. I would think we could do that, as well. For example, the University of Illinois could enjoin someone who is creating these degrees, and I don't know why they couldn't do it extra-territorially if it is civil – that is, to enjoin someone in the state of New York from creating fake degrees. It's worth exploring."

Chairman Rock said, "We're trying to call this to the attention of the General Assembly. I shouldn't be able to go on the Internet and get a degree from any institution. They shouldn't be able to sell it to me. So, the recommendation from the Board is to submit this to the General Assembly and let them have at it."

Mr. Barmak said, "The intention was to devise a Class A misdemeanor statute to be considered by the legislature. I would be happy to attempt to amend the resolution to include all universities, not just Illinois universities. If need be, we could try to develop a civil law, as well,

for them to consider.” Chairman Rock said, “That would be fine. Obviously, once it gets to the General Assembly there is no guarantee.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Professor Gove and seconded by Mr. Kaplan, unanimously endorsed the passage of legislation that would create penalties for individuals who falsely hold themselves out as graduates of legitimate Illinois colleges and universities for the purpose of securing business, employment, or admission to legitimate academic institutions, and directs the Board of Higher Education staff to work with legislators to enact a law to this effect.*

#### 8. Allocation of Governor Ryan’s Fiscal Year 2003 Budget for Higher Education

Chairman Rock said: “As you know, the state is experiencing some dramatic shortfalls. The Governor has had to literally retrench in many areas, and looking forward is not a happy prospect. Debra Smitley will present the item.”

Ms. Smitley accompanied her report with a power point presentation. She said: “With your permission, I will present Items 8 and 9 in one presentation. Item 8 presents a summary of Governor Ryan’s fiscal year 2003 budget for higher education, and the item proposes an allocation of the funds for higher education operations and grants as requested by Governor Ryan. In his letter to Chairman Rock, Governor Ryan described the budget as a difficult one made necessary by recent economic events. The budget includes \$2.6 billion in state general funds for higher education operations and grants, \$26 million less than fiscal year 2002 appropriations. The budget provides about \$1.3 million less than current year spending authority, that is, current year appropriations minus the \$25 million that higher education institutions and agencies will hold in reserve during the course of the current year. Once funds are earmarked for the State Universities Retirement System to meet statutory requirements in the coming year, the Governor’s budget provides \$50 million, or 2.1 percent, less than current year appropriations for institutional operations and grants.

“While the budget proposes less funds for higher education next year, it is nevertheless a good one in the context of what is happening in other states and in the context of the current economy. Higher education funding in Iowa has been reduced annually for the past three years. Missouri institutions have been asked to hold back 10 percent this year and are bracing for an additional 10 percent in the coming year. Both Indiana and Ohio will experience reductions of approximately 12 percent between fiscal years 2001 and 2003.

“Governor Ryan has continued to place priority on higher education. The mid-year reserves were proportionately less for higher education than other areas of the state budget, and the reductions proposed for fiscal year 2003 are greater for many other areas of the state budget, with some posed for reductions of nearly six percent.

“The allocation proposed in Item 8 honors the Governor’s request to place priority on a number of programs and follows the priorities identified previously by this Board in budget recommendations and policy decisions. The allocation targets \$24.2 million for the State Universities Retirement System as required by law. Slightly more than \$15 million in new state funds over current year appropriations are allocated for the Monetary Award Program to ensure that financially needy students have access to the state’s colleges and universities in the coming year. These monies, combined with federal and other state funds, will allow the Illinois Student Assistance Commission to increase the maximum award by \$198, offset tuition increases of five percent, and process more awards in fiscal year 2003.

“Pursuant to the Governor’s request, \$3 million are allocated for a new teacher loan repayment program. This program, recommended by participants at the Governor’s Education Summit, is designed to enhance teacher recruitment efforts in the future. Supplementing earlier efforts to develop career academies to better prepare high school students for the workplace of the future, the budget allocates \$910,000 beyond current year appropriations for the development of two new career academies – the Public Policy High School and the Economics and Finance High School.

“Governor Ryan also requested that the allocation include continuing commitments from higher education for the state employee group health insurance program. These commitments remain at fiscal year 2002 levels. You will recall that nearly \$15 million were specifically earmarked in the fiscal year 2002 appropriations for the state group health insurance program. In December, public universities were asked to contribute an additional \$45 million from their fiscal year 2002 appropriations for the group health insurance program. These contributions, combined with funds that are being held in reserve in fiscal year 2002, will require the institutions to either hold in reserve or redirect up to 4.2 percent of the state general funds appropriations to public universities.

“The Governor’s fiscal year 2003 capital plan includes nearly \$284 million for college and university capital improvement projects. The budget includes \$30 million for continuation of the Capital Renewal program, which provides each public university and each community college with funds to undertake minor remodeling projects. Fifty million dollars are earmarked for the second year of a five-year program to replace temporary facilities on community college campuses throughout the state, and funding is specifically earmarked for 18 projects, including the first 11 on the Board of Higher Education’s priority list.

“Higher education institutions and agencies are scheduled to appear before the Senate Appropriations Committee this coming Monday.”

## 9. Setting a Context for Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Development

“As the General Assembly works with Governor Ryan to finalize a state budget for fiscal year 2003, our processes and schedules require us to look forward to fiscal year 2004. Item 9 marks the beginning of the budget development process for fiscal year 2004. As we look forward to the next set of budget recommendations, it is difficult to predict the amount of revenue that likely will be available for higher education more than a year from today. The fiscal year 2003 budget is pending before the General Assembly; President Bush has signed a federal economic stimulus package that will, in effect, reduce available state revenues in fiscal year 2003 by some \$250 million; and revenue estimates for 2003 continue to be modest. Most states around the country are experiencing budgetary constraints. Forty-six will end this year with less revenue than projected, 39 will implement budget cuts or holdbacks, and 26 are dipping into reserve funds to complete the current fiscal year. It is within this context that we will begin budget development for fiscal year 2004. Item 9 identifies the various activities and programs that will be important to advancing the goals of *The Illinois Commitment* in fiscal year 2004. I would be happy to answer any questions about either of these items. I would ask the Board to endorse the allocation presented in Item 8 and that they support the budget priorities outlined in Item 9 for fiscal year 2004.”

Mr. Thompson said, “I want to reiterate the comments I’ve made before. Just keep in mind that students are financing these tuition increases and we will for several years. I want to encourage you all to continue the belt-tightening because students are obviously making up for

the loss of revenue from the state. Governor Ryan and the General Assembly have been good to higher education the past three years, and now it is getting tough and tight. I continue to see tuition increases when I read the paper. It's tough on students and it's tough on our families. Please continue tightening those belts.”

Mr. Lesnik said: "I wish to commend the IBHE staff for the quality of the staff work on formulating the budget under exceedingly difficult circumstances. While some of these numbers are painful and are not what we would all like, when you compare them to what is going on in other states, we are indeed fortunate. The staff has done an excellent job in allocating the funds.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Barmak and seconded by Mr. Blakemore, as requested by Governor Ryan, allocated the Governor's fiscal year 2003 budget for higher education operations and grants as presented in Tables 1 through 18A in Appendix B of Item 8 dated April 2, 2002.*

The roll call vote on Item 8 was as follows: Yes – Barmak, Blakemore, Duffy, Gove, Lamont, Lesnik, Monteagudo, Neumiller, Rock, Thompson. No – none. Present – Kaplan.

*And, the Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Barmak and seconded by Mr. Blakemore, unanimously approved the fiscal year 2004 budget priorities set forth in Item 9 dated April 2, 2002.*

The roll call vote on Item 9 was as follows: Yes – Barmak, Blakemore, Duffy, Gove, Kaplan, Lamont, Lesnik, Monteagudo, Neumiller, Rock, Thompson. No – none.

#### 10. Redesign of Public Institution Academic Program Approval and Review Processes

Chairman Rock said that Diane Gilleland would present the item. Dr. Gilleland said: “Historically, IBHE has had two main quality assurance and public accountability processes – academic program approval and academic program review. In October 1998, the Board passed a resolution directing the staff to streamline the quality assurance processes. Several months later, you passed *The Illinois Commitment*. One of the key elements of *The Illinois Commitment* was contained in Goal 5 that required that all programs implement assessment of student learning by 2004. This is a systematic (throughout the program) and end-of-program assessment, not only course-by-course assessment. You received an update in August 2000 about the redesign processes, and in the summer of 1999 you adopted new definitions for programs to be included for the program inventory. You granted additional flexibility to the institutions to change the emphasis of a program without submitting a new full-blown program proposal, which is called a ‘reasonable and moderate extension’ of a program; you endorsed changes to the program approval process and changes to the off-campus approval policies which decrease the times that an institution would have to come back to the Board for approval; and you delegated certain approval authorities for certificate programs and temporary approval of certain other programs to the Illinois Community College Board.

“In the interim, we have been working on the redesign of the program review process, and in addition to that, the development of guidelines for the Goal 5 requirement of the assessment of student learning. This item brings to you an update on those activities and also references some additional sharpening of the focus of the program approval form to include the new requirement for assessment of student learning. It also adds back a question that was deleted earlier in the program approval redesign process, specifically, that after implementation, the institutions and the staff agree to reinstate questions on institutional resources and capacity for

implementing and maintaining a quality program. In particular, what we bring to the Board today are guidelines developed for existing program review at public institutions. I'd like to clarify that, by and large, what we are talking about is public universities. The Illinois Community College Board does its own program review, but their program review falls within the broad guidelines of the redesigned program review, and representatives of the community college chief academic officers have been a part of this redesign process, as well.

"I think it would be easiest if you would turn to Page 38, and I can show you what the historical program review looked like and how it compares to the redesigned program review. At the top of Page 38, you have program approval. However, this item focuses on program review, which is the chart at the bottom part of the page. In the old program review, the state determined the schedule. Each discipline was reviewed once every eight years, and it was on our schedule, irrespective of the fact that the institutions may have had their own ongoing internal program reviews and also specialized reviews from specialized accreditors. So, we had multiple redundant processes that were not connected, and the Board determined that we could streamline our processes and redirect quality efforts in a more targeted and substantive way. Now, the institutions may substitute findings from specialized accreditors or external and institutional reviews. Before, it was a fairly lengthy report, and now we have asked for a very brief report targeting findings, evidence of student learning outcomes, actions taken since the last review, current recommendations, and specific actions to be taken. The old process was more of a static process; this process is a continuous improvement process. In addition, the institutions have agreed to, and in fact suggested, that they have a monitoring process. Therefore, we asked for evidence that that monitoring process is going on.

"We've changed the emphasis from a state-determined program justification to an emphasis on a developmental approach and program improvement. This redesign requires institutions to identify the problem programs and the potential solutions. As you know, we had a statewide program review once every eight years, but you expressed concerns that new programs need to be reviewed sooner than every eight years. In the redesign, new programs will be reviewed at the third year, and programs that require specialized accreditation for a student to sit for licensure will report on a three-year cycle to the Board until the time they are fully accredited, so we can avoid any kind of problems that we experienced last year.

"In addition, institutions have agreed to flag their programs that need attention. We're trying to open up the process so they identify their own programs and they will report on those programs every three years, as well. We've agreed also to a temporary enrollment suspension for a program where an institution notifies the Board that it is going to suspend enrollment for a time, tells us why, and then at the end of three years reports to us what they have done. At the end of that three-year period, if we don't hear from them, we will consider the program terminated. Previously, the institution had no opportunity for a voluntary suspension, and presently, we have already received notification from one institution.

"The old program review was input and resource focused. While we have maintained the input and resource focus, we have placed a heavy focus on student learning and outcomes. We have set up an integrated and more discreet and nimble improvement process that will work to students' benefits and the institutions' benefits as well.

"The overall advantages of the new quality processes are that they focus attention and effort on improving student learning, curriculum, and instruction. It focuses on the public accountability for quality to academic programs and institutions; it places assessment of student learning on every academic program as a key quality assurance element; it builds on existing

institutional processes, capacity, and mission; it moves from a justification to an improvement model; it streamlines and focuses the processes, reducing paperwork. The redesigned processes integrate the historical processes into a comprehensive IBHE quality assurance and public accountability program that includes program approval, program review, assessment of student learning, institutional results reports, the statewide results report, and the statewide performance measures currently under development. This constitutes the Board's redesigned comprehensive quality assurance and public accountability program.

“As to specific advantages for students, the redesign places their learning and achievement as the top priority of the state and each academic program. It emphasizes each academic program's responsibility and accountability for student knowledge, competence, and skills. Students should have more confidence about the rigor and the results of their education for further study and success in the workplace.

“Specific advantages for institutions are that it provides more flexibility in responding to state needs for new programs and more flexibility in dealing with whatever specific needs their own programs have for improvement. It ensures that program faculty are engaged in and agree on expected student learning outcomes, and the appropriate assessment of student learning for the purpose of ongoing improvement in curriculum, instruction, and learning.

“For the Board, the major benefits are that there is increased trust between the institutions and the Board of Higher Education. This process has been created by a redesign work group which includes the institutional academic officers responsible for program review and approval on the campuses, as well as the chief academic officers. Also, this helps the Board focus its efforts on students, their preparation, their learning, and their success in higher education and the workplace. In addition, it allows us to bring in a broader set of review expertise from peers and specialized accreditors. The most important benefit to the Board and, therefore, to the public, will be the evidence provided about student achievement of the expected learning outcomes, and the knowledge that all programs and faculty in the state of Illinois are involved in an integrated quality assurance and continuous improvement effort for the purpose of improving learning for Illinois students.

“Mr. Chairman, the staff recommends the resolution on Page 40.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Duffy and seconded by Ms. Monteagudo, unanimously approved the proposed “Guidelines for Review of Existing Units of Instruction, Research, and Public Service at Public Institutions” contained in Item 10 dated April 2, 2002.*

#### 11. Illinois Century Network: Activities Update

Chairman Rock said: “I think it's fair to say that if Keith Sanders is remembered fondly for anything, it will be the Illinois Century Network (ICN). We are the most wired state, and today we have an update. The Illinois Century Network has grown by leaps and bounds, and we are the envy of states across the country. Neil Matkin will present the item.” Dr. Matkin said: “The Illinois Century Network has enjoyed phenomenal growth in the last year, about 90 percent. We now have 5,500 institutions connected and serve over 2,000,000 Illinois students. Clearly, throughout the other 49 states, there is nothing like the Illinois Century Network. I am grateful and humbled to be involved in the Network and the efforts put forward to reach that status. Early on, we met with all of our other state networks at an annual meeting and will continue to meet with the eight Midwest networks later this month. One of the things that sets us apart is the

establishment of Regional Technology Centers with certified technicians to make sure that the Network stays up and operational. When you're relying upon a resource for educational delivery and it's not available, there is no regaining that time, so those staff are extraordinarily important to our long-term success.

"We've revisited how we're going to fund the staff. The last two years, they've been part of regional grants and they've been hired through fiscal agents. Through moving those staff directly to the IBHE payroll, we save about \$700,000 when coupled with some other reductions to regional operations that are made possible in part because of the earlier technology investments and the high cost of build-out for offices, furniture, and equipment in the first year. That brings the total staff headcount of the Illinois Century Network to about 70, of which there are currently 67 on staff with three vacancies. Other state educational networks – namely, Missouri, which is our closest competitor – have less than a third of the connectivity and 80 to 110 staff, so we feel quite good about the economies of what we're doing. So good, in fact, that recently we had a call from the office of the Speaker of the House in Texas where they are considering putting in an infrastructure modeled after the Illinois Century Network.

"The Illinois Century Network, in an effort to further reduce costs, is working in collaboration with research institutions and the Department of Central Management Services to utilize state-owned dark fiber resources as well as other dark fiber resources across the state. Dark fiber is fiber that lays along the roadways and is yet to be utilized. It allows us to grow at a tremendous rate at incremental cost to meet the demands, which is very positive. Another thing that has been happening is that the Illinois Century Network has negotiated statewide agreements for reduced cost for educational customers connecting to it. Savings of anywhere from 16 to 40 percent have been recognized by educational customers, and that is also spurring a great deal of increased connectivity. We're expecting the Network to grow by 800 to 1,000 connections this year, focusing mainly on private K-12 connections as well as municipalities.

"The ICN has grown beyond its budget appropriation. For the last three years, we've had level funding of \$27 million, which has been very generous, albeit level. With the kind of growth that we have sustained, we've had to make some hard decisions. One of those decisions is to implement cost recovery and pass along certain costs beyond what our budget will allow to the connecting institutions. From all measures and everything we can tell, we remain competitive, and I know that we're absolutely the best value in terms of the Network environment in the state.

"We held recently a chief information officers' meeting of all higher education in both Springfield and Chicago to enjoin our friends in education to help us write the future. It was a very successful meeting, and we will do it twice a year. We're convinced that our next steps will be stronger and better placed with that kind of input on a broad basis. We're working to leverage what we've built together to enhance the environment for educational content. One of the things we're most excited about today is the addition of Internet2 connectivity for every single education constituent that is on the Network. The Illinois Century Network is now a sponsored education group participant and has the ability to bring Internet2 resources, which include a wealth of information from the Smithsonian and from NASA – there's nothing quite like looking through the Hubble telescope directly – to every K-12 school and every institution of higher education, whether it is a research Carnegie institution or not, through the Illinois Century Network connection. It's a very exciting time, and we expect it to yield great fruits in the future.

"There are some pieces of pending legislation. House Bill 5910 codifies an existing fund and allows the Illinois Century network to receive funds from federal and state sources, and

House Bill 5911 is cleanup legislation that enacts agreements and other operations that are currently ongoing.

“I remain grateful to the Board and to Dr. Keith Sanders, who is a founding member of the ICN Policy Committee. He has been at every single meeting and has shown a tremendous interest and been a stalwart supporter of the Illinois Century Network’s growth and development. Keith, I’d like to say thank you here at your last Board meeting. I’d be happy to answer any questions.” There were none.

## 12. Public University Noninstructional Project Approval

Chairman Rock said that consideration of Item 12 was deferred at the last meeting to afford Members the opportunity to acquire further information. He said that Sharon Ward would present the item.

Ms. Ward said: “Item 12 is a noninstructional capital item wherein the University of Illinois requests that the Board approve a \$77.6 million project to expand and renovate the Intramural Physical Education Building and the Campus Recreation Center East at the Urbana-Champaign campus. The scope of the project provides for the addition of 190,000 square feet of space to the existing facilities and the renovation of the current space to meet the recreational and exercise needs of the users. In November 2001, a total of 5,459 votes were cast on a student referendum held on the proposed improvements, and 4,020, or 74 percent, of the votes were cast in favor of the project and the general fee increase to pay for it. The fee increase will not exceed \$77 per semester and will be implemented over three years beginning in fall 2004. The University plans to issue revenue bonds to finance the project, with the debt being retired with revenues generated from the fee increase. State general funds will not be used for the construction and renovation or for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facilities. As requested at the last meeting, representatives from the University of Illinois are present today to answer any questions.”

Mr. Lesnik said, “At the last meeting, I indicated that I had some concern about the financial viability of what was being presented, and have since had the opportunity to get some additional information about this project. First of all, much is made of the fact that several thousand students said they were in favor of this. I have seen a fair amount of informational materials that were sent to students urging them to favor this project, and by no means was this referendum done according to strict researchers’ statistical guidelines. At best, 4,000 students represent a relatively modest fraction of all of the students – 40,000 or so undergraduates – who will be required to pay a substantially increased activity fee in order to at least partially finance this project.

“I have looked into the financing of it and, unfortunately, the information that I was provided last week was somewhat inadequate and not the kind of fulsome information that we would expect to receive if this were in the private sector. So, I have substantial misgivings about the financial planning that has taken place. For example, the debt service will not be covered for the first 12 years by the increase in activity fees, it is only after a 12-year period that the amortization schedule catches up with the increase in activity fees. During the first 12 years, there will be a shortfall, and I am not clear even today how that shortfall will be addressed. I have been informed just this morning that the activity fees should cover the increased operating cost of this expanded facility, but we haven’t really seen any hard data that would verify that in any way. There seems to be some question even about the number of students versus the number of faculty members that would be regularly using this facility. So, just as I questioned at the last

meeting the financial planning that has gone into this facility of \$77.6 million, those same questions remain today. However, there has been a *bona fide* effort on behalf of University officials to provide us with what we've asked.

"Also, I should say that we looked into the need for this facility, and the result of that in my own judgment is that it certainly would be desirable to have a facility like this in order to keep the University of Illinois competitive with its peers, not only in the Big Ten but at schools throughout the Midwest. It is extremely desirable given the age and the condition of the current facilities. So I would say it's desirable. Whether or not it is absolutely essential at this moment in time, given all the pressures that we're facing from a financial standpoint and given the fact that tuition is also going up and this will require activity fees to go up, is a matter of judgment. It's a matter of judgment, in my opinion, for the administration of the school and its board of trustees to determine. Since it is not a policy item, but an action item, I think it would be inappropriate for us to superimpose our specific judgment on the administration and the board of trustees of the University of Illinois.

"However, I would recommend that our staff develop a set of guidelines which I do not believe currently exist, including financial modeling and financial planning guidelines that would enable this Board in the future to make an informed decision, or at least would provide specific criteria that the Members of this Board could use when a project of this magnitude comes before it and our affirmative approval is required. I would hope that we could develop those criteria and guidelines somewhat general in nature and not totally restrictive, so that in the future, rather than being presented with a situation like this where we really do not have all the information we need to make a sound and informed judgment, we would have it the next time we are faced with this kind of situation. We certainly do not want to usurp the prerogatives of an individual institution. I would hope that during the period of time that these guidelines and criteria are being established, we could work further with this particular institution on this particular project and staff could assure itself that there is more adequate financial planning and documentation of financial planning than there has been to date."

Mr. Lamont said, "I absolutely concur that Mr. Lesnik's concerns are well taken here, but I want also to assure him and the rest of the Board that as a sitting member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, we also were very concerned about the magnitude of the request here and did not let this go through without serious discussion and concern and, hopefully, the due diligence that was required for a project of this size. I also believe that it is absolutely appropriate for Members of this Board to be cognizant of these kinds of things that are going through on our institutions that raise those concerns. I have no problem with that at all. The primary building being renovated here was being built when I was a student there and is in serious need of renovation. The points are well taken and we appreciate the concerns. I would also commend you for your recommendations to this Board, but there was much gnashing of teeth over this project."

Mr. Thompson said, "I see on Page 57 where it refers in the second paragraph to a 'wet' classroom. Obviously, that's a swimming pool. It uses the term 'classroom.' Will students be able to receive credit for classes in this classroom?" Ms. Ward responded, "A wet classroom is the swimming pool and an accompanying classroom which are used in coordination with each other. It could be lifesaving, water volleyball, or water basketball that could be taught, so it is both a classroom and a swimming pool combination."

Chairman Rock recognized Pat Askew, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Ms. Askew said: "The Division of Campus

Recreation reports to me. We've used the term 'wet' classroom, but that is actually space that is used when we're training lifeguards or for instruction in the swimming area. It allows individuals to move back and forth from this space to the actual pool area, which is very helpful in doing that type of instruction and training." Mr. Thompson asked if students would receive credit for such training or instruction. Ms. Askew responded that students would not receive credit for such certification. Mr. Thompson asked if classes for credit will be offered in the building. Ms. Askew responded, "In the past, there have been some classes that have been offered in the building, and we expect those would continue, but we're not seeing an increase in classes." Mr. Thompson said, "That answers my question, because we are approving a noninstructional building here. It concerns me when we start using student fee dollars on buildings where classes are being offered. But, I do want to commend the University of Illinois for holding a referendum. I believe in them, and our policy on student fees says that a student referendum is one of the options in order to have involvement from the students. The referendum makes my decision on this item much easier. I've spoken to the student government president at the University as well as with the student trustee and they are all supportive of this project. "

Mr. Lesnik asked, "In order to make everyone more comfortable in voting on this item, is there a way to amend this so we could have something regarding criterion guidelines or should that be in a separate motion?" Chairman Rock responded, "I think that would be a separate motion. I think it is a good one and there should be no problem with that."

Mr. Kaplan said, "I don't understand where the funds are for the first 12 years of debt service. Where does that come from if it's not going to be supported by the student fee increase?" Ms. Askew responded, "My understanding is that it is only in the first three years that there would not be the payment on the debt. That is standard practice in bond financing for revenue-generating facilities, that until the facility is completed, the fees are not paid by the students, so the interest is actually amortized in that initial period, which is three years." Mr. Kaplan continued, "I can understand the three-year period, but I am having difficulty with the 12-year period and where that timeframe came from."

Mr. Lesnik said, "I saw an amortization schedule, and compared to the amount of money generated by the increase in the activity fee, since it is cumulative, it doesn't catch up. Unfortunately, I did not bring the exhibit. Perhaps Chet Gardner can speak to this." Dr. Gardner said: "I am the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Let me answer a series of questions that have emerged here. This does sound like a large project. The total cost of the project, including the design fees, interest, etc., is projected to be about \$71 million, but you need to be reminded that we have 38,000 students at the Urbana-Champaign campus and about 11,000 employees, and faculty, staff, and spouses do have options to purchase memberships to use these facilities. So, it's simply an issue of scale. It's a big university. We have need for a lot of new and improved recreational space for our students. The total fees that will be generated once the fees are fully implemented – I think in about six years – will be about \$6 million a year. That will be sufficient not only to pay the interest, but also to pay the principal on the mortgage on the bonds that we are issuing for this. In terms of what happens initially, it takes us about 18 to 24 months to issue the bonds. Once those bonds have been issued, the monies are actually invested because we don't need to expend them until the bills come due on construction. So, we have an opportunity to earn some interest on the bond money to help pay the mortgage on those bonds, and we also capitalize the difference that we don't make up for those early years of not collecting the fees. I should point out also that the University of Illinois has managed numerous large construction projects over the years, so this is an activity that people in our Capital Programs office are quite familiar with, so this is not a project that we're doing for the first time."

Mr. Kaplan asked if it is three years or 12 years before the student fees are enough to support the debt service. Dr. Gardner responded, “The student fees begin after the project is completed, and then only a third of the fee is assessed the first year. We have a period of three years where we’re adding about \$25 per semester to the student fees, so it will take three years to phase in that total fee. After the student fees are fully phased in, we will be generating enough income from those fees, about \$6 million a year, to pay the mortgage on the bonds.”

Mr. Neumiller said, “Are there any provisions that would allow this fee to go no higher than is now projected in terms of protecting the students and their parents?” Ms. Askew responded, “Yes, there is a provision that the fees cannot be higher than \$77 in total. That’s how the referendum question was stated that the students voted on, and that’s a covenant that we have with the students.”

Mr. Lesnik said, “We do have that exhibit, Chet, and it does show that the student fees equal the debt service between the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> years. That’s the information that the University provided. I should point out also that to the best of our ability to figure, the use fees that the 4,000 members of the faculty and administration would pay are intended to cover the operating costs, with the activity fees intended to cover the debt service, but they don’t catch up until between year 11 and year 12. That’s our fundamental understanding.” Mr. Lesnik said he would submit the exhibit as part of the record (attached to these minutes as an appendix).”

Chairman Rock recognized Katie Cox, Student Advisory Committee. Ms. Cox said, “Board Member Jim Kaplan asked that the Student Advisory Committee make some comments on this, so we discussed it at our meeting, and I do have a few brief points made by the students. The students were very pleased with the use of the referendum for the students and they were pleased with the turnout. However, we were somewhat concerned about the methods used in the marketing campaign. We’re concerned about the priorities of the state if a \$77 million recreation center is a top priority in a time of a budget recession. We’re concerned about what impact this might have on financial aid throughout the state, not just at the University of Illinois campus. We’re concerned that state and federal awards that cover tuition and fees will be fewer as we continue to raise fees in such large amounts.

“Board Member Thompson mentioned the noninstructional aspect. I know that many recreation centers throughout the state are used to provide courses in volleyball or other activities. However, I think most people would say this constitutes a significant restructuring of a fee, and it was made clear in the student fee policy adopted by this Board in August that student fees are not to be used for instructional purposes. In that same vein, I believe a delegate from this institution, ISU, told us that they are considering something similar to this and they have self-imposed a fee, but the University also will be contributing funds from within to cover the academic portion of the recreation center, and that seems to be much more appropriate, in our opinion. Finally, as Board Member Thompson mentioned, we hope that there is a sunset clause, as recommended by the Board in its adoption of the student fee policy in August.”

Mr. Blakemore said, “I was personally involved in the bond financing of a \$400 million recreation facility that is in development now, so I will say that bond financing of this type for recreational purposes using capital interest as a way to assure payment of the bonds for the first years, though more expensive, is typical in these transactions. So, based on what I am aware of in terms of the schedule, I am comfortable with the ability to do it and to do it successfully. I’d like to point out also that as indicated in the record of the materials submitted to us, the rates that they are looking to get are consistent with where we see that market at, and that’s a very important

issue. So I think your question is more than legitimate, but in bond financing, this method is typical, it is done, and it is a way to assure payment.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Duffy and seconded by Mr. Lesnik, unanimously approved the noninstructional capital improvement project included in Item 12 dated April 2, 2002.*

The roll call vote on Item 12 was as follows: Yes – Barmak, Blakemore, Duffy, Gove, Kaplan, Lamont, Lesnik, Monteagudo, Neumiller, Rock, Thompson. No – none.

Chairman Rock said that now would be the time for Mr. Lesnik’s motion with respect to the study and promulgation of guidelines and criteria for Board Members to use when considering noninstructional capital improvement projects.

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Lesnik and seconded by Ms. Monteagudo, unanimously approved that staff provide Board Members with guidelines delineating specific criteria to use when considering institutions’ requests for approval of noninstructional capital projects.*

Chairman Rock said that Item 13 would be deferred to the end of the meeting.

#### 14. Consent Agenda

Professor Gove asked that on Item CA-10, he be recorded as voting ‘present’ on the request for Old Dominion University.

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Professor Gove and seconded by Mr. Blakemore, unanimously approved the following items, with the exception of Item CA-10, on which Professor Gove voted ‘present.’*

#### CA-1. Board Meeting Minutes – February 5, 2002 and February 15, 2002

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Minutes of the February 5, 2002 and February 15, 2002 meetings.*

#### CA-2. Financial Report

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the financial report dated February 28, 2002.*

#### CA-3. Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program Fiscal Year 2002 Grant Allocation

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously allocated the fiscal year 2002 appropriation of \$2,100,000 under the Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program for the projects and the amounts designated in Item CA-3 dated April 2, 2002.. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or to adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform to the existing statute or the rules implementing the statute.*

CA-4. Illinois Century Network Content Development Grants Fiscal Year 2002 Allocations

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously allocated \$900,000 from the fiscal year 2002 appropriation for Illinois Century Network Content Development grants for the projects and the amounts designated in Item CA-4 dated April 2, 2002, subject to receipt of all required documents. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or to adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform to existing statutes or rules.*

CA-5. Illinois Century Network Regional Technology Centers Fiscal Year 2003 Grant Allocations

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously allocated \$936,569 in accordance with the Illinois Century Network Act for the projects and amounts designated in Item CA-5 dated April 2, 2002.*

CA-6. Higher Education Cooperation Act Fiscal Year 2002 Grant Reallocation

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the reallocation of \$150,000 for the fiscal year 2002 Higher Education Cooperation Act grant program to the institutions specified and in the amounts shown in Item CA-6 dated April 2, 2002. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or to adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform to the existing statute or the rules implementing the statute.*

CA-7. New Units of Instruction at Public Community Colleges

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted authority for **Danville Area Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Health Information Technology.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **Kankakee Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Paralegal/Legal Assistant Studies.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **Richland Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Radiological Technology.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **Southwestern Illinois College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Respiratory Care.*

*And unanimously granted authority for **Triton College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Leadership for Paramedics.*

CA-8. New Units of Instruction, Public Service and Research at Public Universities

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted the following universities approval to establish the new degree programs identified: **Eastern Illinois University**, Master of Science in Education (MSE), Master Teacher, Off-Campus, Statewide; **Illinois State University**, Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in University Studies, Master of Social Work, Off-Campus in North Suburban Region 1, Fox Valley Region 2, West Suburban Region 3, South Metro Region 6, and Chicago Region 10; **Western Illinois University**, Bachelor of Science in Graphic Communication.*

CA-9. Authorization to Establish a School of Pharmacy and Offer the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted **Southern Illinois University Edwardsville** approval to establish a School of Pharmacy and to offer the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree, subject to the following conditions: that, as the School of Pharmacy is developed, SIUE will address and resolve the concerns and recommendations expressed by the external consultants; that the school annually demonstrate satisfactory progress to the Board of Higher Education, in accordance with the structure outlined in Item CA-9 dated April 2, 2002; and that SIUE will establish and maintain operating and capital funding in accordance with its commitments as outlined in Item CA-9 dated April 2, 2002.*

CA-10. New Operating and/or Degree-Granting Authority for Independent Institutions

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously granted to **DeVry University** Authorization to Grant the Master of Public Administration degree in Chicago, North Suburban, South Metropolitan, West Suburban, and Fox Valley regions, based upon the institution's maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.*

*And granted to **Old Dominion University** the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate in West Suburban and South Metropolitan regions, and further grants Authorization to Grant the following degrees in these regions based upon the institution's maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted: B.S. in Business Administration (majors in Accounting, Finance, Management, Marketing, and Information Systems), B.S. in Human Services Counseling, B.S. in Health Sciences, B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies (Professional Communication Major), B.S. in Computer Science, B.S. in Criminal Justice, B.S. in Occupational and Technical Studies, B.S. in Engineering Technology (majors in Electrical Engineering Technology, Civil Engineering Technology, and Mechanical Engineering Technology), B.S. in Nursing, B.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies (Pre-K through Grade 6 Teacher Education Track), M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education (Pre-K through Grade 6), M.S. in Nursing, Master of Engineering Management, M.S. in Occupational and Technical Studies.*

CA-11. Appropriation Transfers for Fiscal Year 2002

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the appropriation transfers presented in Item CA-11 dated April 2, 2002.*

15. Information Items

There was no discussion on the following information items.

II-1. Legislative Report

II-2. Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics

II-3. Summary and Review of *Unequal Opportunity: Disparities in College Access Among the 50 States*

## 16. Advisory Committee Reports

Chairman Rock called upon the chairs of the advisory committees for their reports. He recognized Kenneth Andersen, Faculty Advisory Council. Professor Andersen said: “I would like to begin with the recognition of the service of Keith Sanders. Keith has worked with the Faculty Advisory Council in exemplary ways. We certainly will miss him and we wish him well. We look forward to the opportunity for his being with us at a future meeting so we can roast him as we say goodbye to a good friend. Secondly, we would like to say that we regret the departure of your Chair, Phil Rock, who has given leadership to higher education for many years. We commend his work in this as well as his other contributions to the state in his many public service roles. And, Jane Williamson will be missed for her many contributions to the Board.

“You found at your place today two items. One of them is a resolution welcoming Dr. Daniel LaVista as the director-designate of the IBHE. We look forward to a strong, cordial, and active working relationship with him in the years to come. Secondly, there is a copy of a statement made a year ago in February on the issue of part-time faculty. We felt that was an appropriate document to forward to you again as a reminder of our views at that time. We did not have an opportunity, given the cancellation of our February meeting, to formulate a considered response to the draft report of the final document that you voted on today. We will probably be forwarding to you a series of statements dealing with specific issues within that larger context of the part-time and full-time nontenure-track faculty. We are very strongly committed to the view expressed there, that while we approve the work of adjuncts – professional people who are coming into the classroom to share their expertise – we also are very concerned about those part-timers who are often working in the introductory-level courses. We feel it is very important that they be treated fairly and properly in all respects. We adopt a budget today, which is very stringent in pulling back on support for higher education, and at the same time, we recognize that part of the problem of dealing with part-time faculty is exactly those budgetary stringencies. So we know there is a disconnect in that respect, and we hope we will be able to address that in the future.

“I will close by commenting that there is very grave concern on the campuses of public institutions about the implications for the students and for our curriculum program with the cutbacks. We recognize that the budgetary cutbacks will mean larger classes, fewer classes, and higher tuition for the students, and faculty are very concerned about those issues. There is a great sense of unease about the future, because we know we didn’t fully recover from the impact of the budget cuts of the early nineties, and here we are facing that same problem again as we enter the next decade. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Katie Cox, Student Advisory Committee. Ms. Cox said: “We’re very concerned, along with some faculty, apparently, about the state ensuring that public institutions are its top priority in a time of economic recession. We are hoping that you all are keeping that in mind, because we educate the masses and we as students appreciate the opportunities we get there.

“The Student Advisory Committee held elections for the Executive Committee, and the new Chair of the Student Advisory Committee is Jeff Twardowski from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. Our new Vice Chair is A. J. Harshbarger from SIU Edwardsville. Reelected was our Secretary, Nikki Verba, who is currently from UIS and hails from McHenry County College. Also reelected was the Alternate Student Board Member, Ryan Purdy from Eastern Illinois University.

“The Student Advisory Committee presents awards at the end of the year, not only for within our membership but throughout the state. We always vote on an administrator of the year. We traditionally send the award home with the delegate from that institution, but it happens that we are at the awardee’s institution today. So, with much pleasure and with many thanks for his commitment to students and his support of students not only at his own institution but also across the state, the Student Advisory Committee has voted to honor President Vic Boschini as the Administrator of the Year. We also voted for a Board staff member of the year, because we tend to interact as much as possible with members of the Board staff. This is a very big honor. I have trouble finding words for our honoree this year. I would just say that I think it’s difficult at times for people in positions such as the Board of Higher Education to maintain as much contact with students as they do, and sometimes it’s hard for people in administrative positions to remain teachers. I think that Keith Sanders never left the classroom. We all know the best teachers are those who not only speak, but listen, and who challenge us and inspire us to want to be better and to want to learn more. I think Keith Sanders has done that for so many people and for so many students. I am glad he never left the classroom, because the lessons learned in his classroom have been unparalleled. We honor Keith Sanders as the Board Staff Member of the Year. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Donald Fouts, Independent Colleges and Universities. Dr. Fouts said: “I’d like to add a couple of thoughts from the Federation on Phil Rock, Keith Sanders, and Jane Williamson. We’re sorry Jane couldn’t be here, and we will write her a letter. We want to thank Keith Sanders very much for his leadership of the Board staff. He has been always accessible and he has made a real contribution to Illinois higher education. For Phil Rock, not only Chairman of the Board, but also the private college and university representative on the Board, thank you very much. To both Keith and Phil from the Federation, hail and farewell.

“I would add one note on the item that was extracted from the consent calendar, CA-10, with regard to Old Dominion University. This is an institution that has come in that is offering quality programs. There can’t be any question about that. The Board staff review was appropriate. There are some questions we have long term about the impact of this kind of entry into the Illinois market. We hope to be able to discuss that with the Board. Perhaps a special study group can be convened or in some other way we can look at this initiative, which is really just one indication of the profound revolution we’re seeing – the digital revolution, the demographic revolution – in the state. We’re hoping to have some additional discussion on this item. Thank you.”

Chairman Rock recognized Gretchen Naff, Community Colleges. Dr. Naff said: “This meeting certainly represents a period of transition, and I do want to thank Chairman Rock and Dr. Sanders for your strong leadership and support of the various educational initiatives associated with the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. As President of the College of Lake County, I want to very sincerely thank both of you for recognizing the need for additional higher education opportunities in Lake County and for developing the University Center of Lake County. Dr. Sanders, I’ve certainly appreciated your friendship and support, and I know it will be very difficult to replace you, if not almost impossible. However, Dr. LaVista, welcome. We certainly applaud the Board’s selection of a very fine individual. Having worked with Dr. LaVista for a number of years, I know him to be a very strong leader who will work with all sectors of our education community to continue to provide quality higher education opportunities in Illinois.

“Back to several of the agenda items or comments made during today’s meeting, Dr. Sanders mentioned that in March you convened a group to consider the role of community colleges in teacher preparation. We felt this was a very good meeting. There was good and

positive support for developing cooperative relationships, and we look forward to working with our colleagues on this very important issue. Regarding today's agenda, we applaud your work in conducting the nontenure faculty study, and we're in general agreement with the findings. In regard to your recommendations, there was basic agreement among the presidents. However, there were a few concerns, primarily because of local governance and control issues, so I cannot tell you that there is 100 percent agreement with all of the recommendations. Nevertheless, you did a very good study and we applaud your work in that regard. Last but not least, we support your approval of the Governor's budget for higher education. We know these budget recommendations might not be our preferences, but we recognize the condition of the state's economy. We appreciate being a part of the decision-making process, and we feel that under the circumstances the best decisions have been made. Thank you."

Chairman Rock recognized Ronald Taylor, Proprietary Institutions. Mr. Taylor said: "As we are all aware, we stand at a time of unprecedented change. There is significant budget pressure that we've talked about today, on both the state and individual institutions. There are new technological innovations that dramatically impact learning, learning resources, and pedagogical methods, and further impacts the selection of faculty. Another topic on our agenda, new institutions and new students entering higher education are creating new demands on all of us in this room, and provide increased competition for students and for financial resources. With all that as backdrop, I want to mention again in this time of change that one of the strengths of higher education in Illinois is the breadth and depth of educational institutions which are available to serve the broad needs of the student population of the state. As we look to the future with new leadership on the Board, we would like to urge the Board to continue to encourage change and innovation. A couple of things occur to us in that regard. One is to resist pressure to adopt measures which reduce or eliminate competition. I think that throws a blanket on change and innovation. The second is to continue to adopt measures to assure program quality, but to do that with an even hand. I think that's one of the hallmarks of IBHE for the years that Keith and Phil have been here, and I hope it will be in the future. So, speaking for private for-profit institutions across the state, we congratulate Dr. LaVista on his new responsibilities and we wish Chairman Rock, Executive Director Sanders, and Jane Williamson our best as they move to their new activities. We look forward to joining with IBHE, IBHE staff, and all the other institutions represented here in serving the needs of students across Illinois. Good luck to you. Thank you."

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

#### 4. Resolutions Honoring Board Members

Chairman Rock said: "I'm standing in for Lucy Sloan, who wished to be here but she is ill. I will read the following resolution:

*'We, the members of the Board of Higher Education, recognize and express our gratitude to Jane Williamson, a member of the Board since 1985 and Vice Chairman since 1991, for her outstanding contributions to the citizens, students, and colleges and universities of Illinois.*

*'Throughout her time on the Board, Jane has been actively engaged in the most pressing issues facing higher education in Illinois.*

*'As a member of the Board's first Committee on Undergraduate Education in the mid-1980s and then chair of the committee when it reconvened in the 1990s, Jane moved undergraduate education to the forefront of our state's higher education agenda, leading efforts*

*to rethink and restructure general education to ensure that all undergraduate students have the benefits of a rich, rigorous educational experience.*

*'As vice chair, Jane worked closely with Chairman Arthur Quern and other members to develop and implement the Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (PQP) initiative, which strengthened the quality of educational programs at Illinois colleges and universities and maintained support for Illinois higher education in a time of fiscal stringency.*

*'Throughout her tenure, Jane has called attention to the needs of elementary and secondary education. An active member of the Joint Education Committee, she has worked to coordinate the efforts of the state's educational agencies to ensure that all precollegiate students are well prepared to succeed in college or the work place.*

*'In these and other activities, Jane always has been willing to lend an ear or hand and to serve as needed. She made important contributions to some of the Board's most important select committees of the past two decades including the Committee on Affordability, the Committee on Underserved Areas, the Committee on the Educational Needs of Lake County, and the search committees for hiring two Executive Directors.*

*'Jane's dedication to education has been personal and lifelong. Education has formed an integral part of her life as a guidance counselor, mother of three, Chair of the Kenilworth Elementary School Board, and member of the National Advisory Committee for Institutional Eligibility and Accreditation for the United States Secretary of Education.*

*'Whatever the situation before the Board, Jane has responded with grace, strength and a quiet leadership focused on substance. Board members have found her a pleasure to work with and staff a pleasure to work for. She leaves a Board that has been shaped by her actions in countless ways and a legacy of stability, civility, and accomplishment. We are grateful for her friendship, joyful presence, and unfailing courtesy and realize that, thanks to her example, we truly understand the requirements and spirit of public service.'*

*"The resolution will be forward to Jane. Her husband, Rich, has accepted a position with the Bush administration which requires his presence in New York, so Jane has joined her husband in New York. We wish them both well."*

*The Board of Higher Education unanimously adopted the above resolution.*

Mr. Kaplan said: "On behalf of the Board, I will read the following resolution:

*'We, the members of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, express our profound gratitude to and deep respect for Philip J. Rock for his exemplary service to the citizens of Illinois and to students throughout the state during his three decades of public service.*

*'During twenty-two years in the Illinois General Assembly – the longest serving Senate President in Illinois history – and six years on the Board of Higher Education, Phil Rock has been a potent voice for students at all levels of education. He played a pivotal role in passage of an income tax increase that has benefited millions of students from kindergarten through graduate school. He has, in particular, been the voice for those who have had no one else to speak for them in the halls of power. The Philip J. Rock Center and School in Glen Ellyn for those who have both visual and hearing disabilities is testament to his commitment to young people and his leadership for education.*

*‘For the past six years as a member and as Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, Phil Rock has exercised his leadership and influence on behalf of students, citizens, elected leaders, and colleges and universities throughout Illinois. He has been a willing and able advocate for the Board and the higher education community on budget matters, on issues of legislative concern, and on policy initiatives.*

*‘His reputation for integrity, for fairness, for standing on principle is universally recognized and widely emulated as a model for public leaders everywhere. His intimate knowledge of legislative process and politics and the esteem in which he is held by the state’s elected officials have well served higher education and the citizens of Illinois.*

*‘His tenure as Chairman has been marked by significant milestones for the state and its colleges and universities – strong budgets for higher education operations and record capital spending, development of the Illinois Century Network, creation of the University Center of Lake County, a rapid and effective response to the shortage of information technology workers, endorsement of far-reaching policies for improving access and expanding diversity in higher education – and each bears the imprint of Phil Rock’s steady, wise, and bold leadership.*

*‘The Board of Higher Education, the higher education community, the public, and students are better off today because of Phil Rock’s commitment to public service, his leadership, and his dedication to the ideal that education fosters good citizens.’”*

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Kaplan and seconded by Mr. Barmak, unanimously adopted the above resolution.*

Those present warmly applauded Chairman Rock.

13. Resolution Honoring Keith R. Sanders, Executive Director

Professor Gove said: “First, I would like to say some kind words about Chairman Rock. I’ve seen him in bookstores; he reads; he thinks. We would have welcomed him to the academic ranks, except he refused to take a vow of poverty.

“This is a statement about Keith Sanders:

*‘We, the Board of Higher Education, congratulate Keith R. Sanders for an extraordinarily dynamic and productive tenure as the Board’s Executive Director and for his distinguished career spanning four decades as a professor, dean, chancellor, and state higher education executive.*

*‘Illinois has been fortunate to have a person of Keith’s experience and talent at the helm of the **Number One** system of higher education in the nation. His knowledge, vision, and leadership in shepherding the Board’s initiatives these past four and one-half years, have produced an impressive roster of accomplishments, notably:*

- ***The Illinois Commitment** has proved a trustworthy set of principles to guide higher education into a new millennium and help colleges and universities meet the needs of students, faculty, institutions, and citizens.*

- *Illinois Century Network* has opened new portals of opportunity for students throughout Illinois.
- *The University Center of Lake County* will open its doors next year to offer high quality, affordable baccalaureate and graduate studies.
- *Generous state appropriations* for operations and capital expenditures have enabled institutions to meet important state and campus priorities, such as raising faculty salaries, reducing a backlog of deferred maintenance, and undertaking new programs.
- *Grant programs* have been revitalized through an alignment with the goals and aspirations of “The Illinois Commitment.”

*‘Keith’s legacy to Illinois has not yet been written in full. His vision in creating special studies of access and diversity and of college persistence and degree completion will pay dividends long into the future for students, institutions, and the state economy.*

*‘It is, therefore, with deep gratitude and respect for his record accomplishment – past, present, and future – that we, members of the Board of Higher Education, applaud Keith R. Sanders for his commitment to students, his dedication to the ideals of higher education, and his leadership.’*

“Keith, we really appreciate what you have done.”

*The Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Professor Gove and seconded by Mr. Kaplan, unanimously adopted the above resolution.*

Those present warmly applauded Dr. Sanders.

Dr. Sanders said: “There is a person here who is the most important person in my life. She and I just celebrated our 41<sup>st</sup> anniversary. She is my biggest cheerleader, she is my best critic, and I want to introduce her to you, for those who have not had the privilege of meeting her. I would like my wife, Carol, to stand.” Those present warmly applauded Carol Sanders. Dr. Sanders continued, “Thanks for all of your kind words.”

#### 17. Other Matters

Chairman Rock said that the Board would go into executive session to discuss personnel matters. He said the next meeting of the Board would be June 4 at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Rock adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Patricia Sexton, Secretary for 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 April 2, 2002 meeting.

