

MINUTES – BOARD MEETING
April 13, 2004

Submitted for: Action.

Summary: Minutes of the April 13, 2004 meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education held at the Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago, Illinois.

Action Requested: That the Illinois Board of Higher Education approve the Minutes of the April 13, 2004 meeting.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MINUTES - BOARD MEETING
April 13, 2004

A meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:10 a.m. in the Auditorium of the Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago, Illinois.

James L. Kaplan, Chairman, presided.
Linda Oseland was Secretary for the meeting.

The following Board Members were present:

Guy Alongi	Cordelia Meyer
J. Robert Barr	Proshanta K. Nandi
Jerry Blakemore	Kevin O'Kelly
Frances G. Carroll	Robert Ruiz
Samuel K. Gove	Gilbert Rutman
Alice Hayes	Steven Taslitz

Also present by invitation of the Board were:

Daniel J. LaVista, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Geoff Obrzut, President and CEO, Illinois Community College Board
Larry Matejka, Executive Director, Illinois Student Assistance Commission

Presidents and Chancellors

Al Bowman	Mike Murphy
Elnora Daniel	Gretchen Naff
Stuart Fagan	John Peters
Al Goldfarb	Salme Steinberg
Zelema Harris	James Stukel
Louis Hencken	James Walker
Michael Horowitz	Walter Wendler
Stephanie Marshall	David Werner

Advisory Committee Chairpersons

Allan Karnes, Faculty	Dave Tretter, Private
Ron Taylor, Proprietary	Jeff Twardowski, Student
Terry Ludwig, Community College	

1. Call Meeting to Order, Chairman James L. Kaplan

Chairman Kaplan called the meeting to order and asked the Secretary to call the roll. A quorum was present.

2. Announcements and Remarks, Chairman James L. Kaplan

Chairman Kaplan said, "On behalf of the Board and myself, I would like to thank President Charles Restivo of the Illinois Institute of Art for the exemplary reception and tour last evening and for today's meeting accommodations. The Board enjoyed dinner at the Backstage Bistro run by the culinary students at the Institute of Art.

"I would like to welcome two new Board members. Dr. Alice Hayes has been appointed by Governor Blagojevich to represent the state's independent institutions. She has returned to Illinois from California where most recently she served as President of the University of San Diego. She has deep roots in Illinois, with degrees from Mundelein, the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and her Ph.D. from Northwestern where she held a number of academic and administrative positions. We welcome you to the Board, Dr. Hayes, and look forward to your insights.

"Governor Blagojevich also appointed Mr. Robert J. Ruiz to our Board. Mr. Ruiz is the Chief of the Public Interest Bureau of the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. Previously, he was the Solicitor General of the State of Illinois. He is a graduate of the DePaul University College of Law with a juris doctorate and a bachelor's from the University of Illinois in Chicago. He served as an Executive Board Member of the Alumni Association of the University of Illinois and as a member of the University of Illinois Ambassadors from 1999 to the present. He was also president of the Board of Directors and a member of the Board of Directors Executive Committee of the Scholl College of Podiatric Medicine from 1997-2001. Bob's interest in higher education is well known to me and I welcome Bob and Alice to our Board and look forward to your service.

"The Board's Disabilities Advisory Committee, established at its February 3, 2004, meeting, is making excellent progress. I attended the group's meeting on Wednesday, March 24, in Springfield at which time several decisions were made. Among its activities, the group has been meeting to develop a work plan and identify productive activities.

"A HECA grant proposal is being prepared to develop a common metric for collecting data on students with disabilities. One of the greatest difficulties we have is that institutions do not report this information in a uniform fashion. It is expected that developing a common method of collecting data will help improve services to students with disabilities.

"In addition, the group is working on a white paper on the technical issues associated with web accessibility. This is an important area, as universities and their faculties make increasing use of the web for both educational and informational purposes.

"The Committee is examining effective practices in other states that address the issue of transition from high school to college. For example, some have an informational booklet designed to help parents and students understand the difference between the two educational levels. In that regard, I would like to thank personally Dr. Murphy and Dr. Gary Alexander for their assistance with this Committee.

"The Committee has been able to work out an arrangement with the Illinois Board of Education where, at the Directors of Special Education Conference, we will be able to make a

presentation assisting smooth transition from high school to higher education. That is something we are looking forward to in August. I will continue to update the Board on the progress of this workgroup as we move forward on these and other projects in the future.

“On March 18, we held a meeting of public university Presidents and Board Chairs along with Brenda Holmes, Deputy Chief of Staff for Education, her assistant Linda Jamali, Vice-Chair Tom Lamont, senior IBHE staff, and myself to explore ways to increase productivity and cost savings through cooperative ventures.

“We heard a very valuable presentation by Mark Pruitt of the Energy Resources Center from the University of Illinois at Chicago on potential energy savings through shared natural gas purchases among the public universities. It is estimated that such a program could save between \$2.3 million and \$3.6 million annually.

“I wish to commend the universities and their Board Chairs for their willingness to join in this effort and the cooperation they have pledged to make this work. A steering committee comprised of a Board member and staff member from each university is being formed to further explore this idea. The concept of this steering committee is something that will be invaluable to the work of the Boards of Trustees and this Board in the future.

“I will highlight a few of the items on today’s agenda that relate to increased cooperation among our institutions and enhanced productivity. We will act on the creation of the Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability Committee, on recommendations for increased joint commodities purchasing, and on the final report of the Committee on Statewide Capital Policies and Priorities.

“These are all important measures for the Board, for our higher education community, and for the state. Together, they clearly demonstrate our commitment to being good stewards of taxpayer dollars.

“We in higher education can stand tall in our response to these very difficult economic times. Instead of complaining about budget cuts, we have spoken with our actions – a 25% cut in administrative costs, measures to broaden fiscal accountability, cooperative ventures to reduce costs and reinvest in the core mission of our institutions, and now a new study of additional ways to promote productivity.

“The higher education community has been a model citizen throughout these trying fiscal times. On a personal note, this is the anniversary of my appointment. I’ve been told that this is the most difficult year that people can recall. I thank all of you for working with me, the university presidents, and the members of this Board who I’ve come to admire a great deal. The work that we do on a volunteer basis and the time that you put in unselfishly is remarkable. The Board staff have been stalwarts in their work. The Board and the higher education community will survive not only these tough economic times, but the loss of some very important people throughout our Board and throughout the system. On behalf of the Board and myself, from the bottom of my heart, I thank you.”

3. Remarks by Charles Restivo, President, Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago

“On behalf of our faculty, students, staff, and trustees I am very pleased to welcome you to the Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago. It is our privilege and honor to host this meeting of the Board of Higher Education and to have all of you with us today. I want to thank Chairman Kaplan and the Board for giving us this opportunity to help as the Board takes on the difficult challenges and critical issues facing it today.

“Our college offers academic programs leading to undergraduate degrees in the creative and commercial arts. The large majority of our 2,200 students are enrolled in bachelor’s degree programs in such fields as visual communications, media arts and animation, game art and design, visual effects and motion graphics, interior design and fashion.

“We are truly an urban institution. We have two principal locations in the heart of downtown Chicago. The main campus is here at the famous Merchandise Mart Center so students can attend classes right in the heart of Chicago’s design district. The main campus is located on the first floor, and has access to one of the two college art galleries that are managed by the faculty.

“The second downtown facility is a satellite location inside the Loop at Wabash and Lake. The Loop campus houses our audio and video digital recording studios, some classrooms, art and computer labs, preliminary kitchens and the Backstage Bistro, our well-known student dining lab that gets its name because it sits back-to-back to the famous Chicago Theater. Thousands of tourists and Chicagoans have dined there and thus tasted the curriculum outcomes of our associate’s degree program in culinary arts.

“Given the high cost of downtown real estate, we must make the most of our fiscal resources. Our average class size is less than nineteen and our largest class has only forty students. We do not maintain a large auditorium or lecture space. The convenience of the Chicago Mart Plaza Hotel serves as an extension of our main campus. We use the hotel’s conference and meeting facilities to host our graduations, student orientations, faculty meetings, and leadership conferences. So, it is most appropriate that we host this meeting of the Board of Higher Education here in the Wolf Point Ballroom of the hotel.

“Our institution traces its history back to 1916 and its founding as a commercial arts school, one of the first applied arts and design schools in the United States. After over eighty names and ownership changes, the current name, ownership, and institutional structure have been in effect since 1996. The Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago has grown rapidly since then. Over the five years since 1998, student enrollment and registered credits have more than tripled.

“We are preparing for additional growth now as evidenced by the lobby expansion taking place on the first floor of this building. In just a few months we will occupy all of that new space, almost doubling our facility space in this location and providing us the opportunity to improve and expand the academic and learning support services available to our students.

“The growth has created a graphic, vibrant environment for students, staff, and faculty and put us on a path of continual change, self-examination, and institutional improvement. In February 2004, we successfully completed the transition from the trade school of our roots, to an institution of higher education when we received initial accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.

“Our student body, employees, and academic programs reflect the diversity, cultural appreciation, and vitality of the great city we are located in. We face some unique challenges as an institution. The recent history of our college can best be described as a chronicle of change. In addition to enrollment growth, another driving force behind this chronicle of change has been the college’s firm commitment to institutional improvement achieved through self-analysis and introspection. We must maintain this commitment to quality and improvement.

“The college offers career-focused education designed to prepare graduates for employment in very dynamic career fields. This also leads to rapid institutional change, as curriculum must be reviewed frequently to ensure marketplace relevance.

“Many of the major fields of study at the college lie somewhat outside the realm of traditional academic disciplines. This, coupled with the career focus nature of the college’s programs and a rapid change in relevant career fields, makes it essential that we partner with the business community to ensure that our academic programs deliver the requisite technical skills and the general education necessary for graduates’ personal and professional success.

“The Illinois Institute of Art, Chicago is a for-profit institution, which contributes to its nontraditional profile. A focus on sound fiscal management and financial objectives must be accompanied by a focus on meeting the educational needs of students and on the college’s effectiveness and efficiencies.

“The higher education marketplace is changing. The popular buzzwords today include on-line, blended delivery, flex schedules, articulation, and consortium agreements. We must innovate and collaborate so we stay a step ahead without sacrificing quality.

“Every institution has its own set of challenges in this dynamic environment and so does the Illinois Board of Higher Education. We wish you a productive and successful meeting.”

4. Remarks by Daniel J. LaVista, Executive Director

Dr. LaVista said, “I want to speak to the obvious and that is that this particular agenda is very diverse and substantial. In our view, this agenda speaks to a number of important Board values.

“You will hear a report on the results of the recently conducted midterm review of *The Illinois Commitment*. What you will hear as well is that in the way that the original so-called ‘citizens agenda’ was highly participative, involving voters from across the state, this review really narrows the same characteristics.

“One important group in this review is membership in the current higher education community. I wanted to thank those who helped us develop the recommendations that you will hear this morning.

“In this agenda is clear evidence of innovation. You will see that reflected in proposed new units of instruction as well as in requests for program approval -- new initiatives in both undergraduate and graduate education. They represent good evidence of higher education’s responsiveness to both the needs of diverse learners as well as the needs of the state in terms of workforce development.

“You will hear a recommendation to have the Board establish a new committee on Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability. This is designed to study what we think is an important relationship that exists between institutional quality and a whole host of resources, be they human, physical, or financial. This is an important next step in the Board’s work in the coming months.

“Mr. Blakemore will present to you the Capital Committee recommendations. In this spirit of fiscal restraint, these are designed largely to improve criteria to manage limited capital resources and expanding capital needs.

“Finally is the work that has been done in university procurement practices. These activities speak to good stewardship of existing resources.

“I want to give you an update on the IBHE Collegiate Artists Competition. The exhibition is on May 4th. The initial judging has occurred, and thirty-eight finalists have been selected from hundreds of applicants, representing a wide mix of students from two- and four-year institutions, public and private. Michael Dunbar, who coordinates the Art in Architecture Program for the Capital Development Board, served as a juror for this program. Four winners will be selected and will receive \$1,000 each. I hope you will be able to attend the art exhibit’s kick-off on May 4th at Illinois State University at the University Galleries.

“This competition has been one of cooperation involving the Governor’s Office, the Capital Development Board, the Board of Higher Education, the Community College Board, the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, higher education members from all strains and interests, art department faculty, and the private sector. This initiative has raised over \$30,000 in support of this effort, and pledges and gifts are welcome from other new donors. It is important to comment on the fact that the planning and execution of this event has been a cooperative effort. Financial support has come from all of the organizations I just mentioned as well as a number of individual gifts.

“I want to recognize President Al Bowman and his staff at Illinois State University who have gone the extra mile to make this work, particularly the staff in University Advancement, from the Gallery, and your Fine Arts College. I wanted to close with a salute to Don Sevener, Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, Tim Rock, Carol Mullen, and Kristi Vose who have worked with these external folks to make this work.

“I have heard the art is splendid and diverse. I hope that all of you will make a special effort to attend. We are very excited about it, and I want to thank you for your support.”

5. Advisory Committee Reports

Chairman Kaplan recognized Allan Karnes, representing the Faculty Advisory Council.

Mr. Karnes said, “The Faculty Advisory Council welcomes Dr. Alice Hayes and Robert Ruiz as new Board members. The FAC looks forward to working with the new Board members and all of the members in the coming years.

“I am requesting that the minutes of the February 3, 2004, Board meeting be amended to correct an error in interpreting the Board’s FY2005 Budget Proposal. I request the striking of the first two paragraphs on page eight of the minutes and adding the following:

The FAC recognizes the fiscal pressures the Board is operating under and agrees that funding should be directed at the highest priority needs. Although the overall budget for

higher education is down nearly \$80 million, the Board's proposal holds general revenue appropriations for public universities level. The FAC strongly supports the Board's recognition of need to adequately fund the state's public universities. The FAC is concerned however about the reduction in state appropriations for community colleges. The large reductions in the state's grants will adversely affect the ability of the state's community colleges to accomplish their missions. It is also regrettable that such quality initiatives and programs like the Consortium for Accelerated Research, the State Geological Survey, and the Argonne National Laboratory cannot be funded, and others like workforce development grants to community colleges have been drastically reduced. The FAC is ready and willing to do whatever it can to assist the Board and the Board staff in securing the funding level sought by the Board in its FY05 budget proposal."

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Chairman Kaplan and seconded by Mr. Barr, unanimously agrees to the amendments made by Mr. Karnes to the minutes of the February 3, 2004 Board meeting.

Chairman Kaplan said, "With regard to the budget, I want to make a statement. The Board of Higher Education budget was based on the best judgment of the members of this Board, this staff, and from all the colleges and universities and the Community College Board. The budget was focused and based on priorities that the Board established through extensive consultation by and among ourselves, the staff, and with others. That budget is still correct, but we represent one sector of a global budget. I still maintain the correctness of our budget, and I repeat the position of the Board before all legislative groups. We are aware of continuing problems with the budget and what the Governor is facing in trying to meet the disparity between the revenues and the expenses. All of us are conscious of that. While we maintain our position, we are also aware of the Governor's position and we will try to work that out accordingly."

Mr. Karnes said, "You have a document entitled Position Paper on General Education which was proposed by the FAC's quality committee and adopted by the Council on February 27, 2004. This position paper addresses two crucial issues -- transfer problems that continue to crop up despite I.A.I. agreements and the perception that breadth and diversity of study, which is one of the core concepts underlying general education requirements, is not applied to all students on an equal basis.

"The first issue is addressed by recommending that when a student repeats a course at a participating I.A.I. institution meeting that institution's general education requirements, the student shall be deemed to have met that segment requirement at other participating I.A.I. institutions, whether or not the student has completed an associate's degree. Under the current regimen, some transferee institutions do not always give full transfer credit if the student has not been awarded an associate's degree.

"The second issue is addressed by recommending that students should complete some courses offered in academic programs other than those in their general area of study and that institutional representatives on the general education panel should be selected for a term of three years, alternating between academic programs that comprise the traditional liberal arts and those in the other academic programs offered by the institution.

“The Board will be asked to create a committee on Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability. The FAC recognizes the appropriateness of a coordinating board periodically determining if the institutions under it are acting in accordance with their missions. However, we do have some concerns.

“First, the last exercise of this nature was a process referred to as PQP, the ‘Q’ stood for quality. This process is being referred to as PPA. Where is the emphasis on quality? We are still concerned with quality. In fact, the FAC is of the opinion that quality should be the first criterion by which all institutions should be judged.

“Second, we notice an inherent danger in the PPA of trying to reinvent the system of higher education in Illinois. Higher education in Illinois is strengthened by its diversity and the many access points for students all over Illinois. When reviewing the match between each public university’s mission and the array of academic programs it offers, the focus should not be if the mission is appropriate, but rather whether its program is in congruence with its mission. Recommendations to eliminate these degree programs at a public institution could limit access to a degree program by a significant number of Illinois citizens who may not be able to leave their home communities to access the degree program they want to pursue at a distant campus.

“Third, we agree that reporting requirements should be streamlined and as many reporting requirements as possible should be eliminated. Funds required for reporting activities no longer can be improved -- what can be eliminated? Adding accountability measures will surely increase reporting. The FAC asks the committee to consider carefully the addition of any new reporting requirement, even if it is in the name of accountability.”

Chairman Kaplan recognized Jeff Twardowski, representing the Student Advisory Committee.

Mr. Twardowski said, “The Student Advisory Committee met at Western Illinois University and held our annual elections. Mark Weber was elected our student Board member for the upcoming year. Mark is a student at UIUC and currently serves as an alternate Student Board Member. Entering student Mark Rumstead will be serving as next year’s alternate Student Board Member. I was re-elected for my third term as chair. Denise Kozlowski will serve as our executive vice-chair for the upcoming year. She is a student at Kishwaukee College. Piotr Mejewski from NIU serves as our executive secretary.

“We would like to congratulate Gary Alexander for his work with the IBHE, as well as his service in the past with the Student Advisory Committee.

“The Student Advisory Committee expresses a continuing interest in being involved with Board committees. We are looking forward to assisting the Board in whatever way possible with the new committee on Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability. The Student Advisory Committee has been stressing that in these difficult economic times we need to strictly focus on the core academic mission of our institutions.”

Chairman Kaplan recognized Ronald Taylor, representing the proprietary institutions.

Mr. Taylor said, “The committee has not met since the last Board meeting. I would like to offer one observation as a member of the Board of Trustees with the Higher Learning Commission for the North Central Association. As this new committee to review priorities, productivity, and accountability gets started, I encourage coordination with the staff at North Central to incorporate changes in the accreditation process and procedures that they are going

through as it impacts the institutions in Illinois because there is an overlap between the influence on institutions between accreditation activities and regulatory activities. Patterns of evidence that are required for accreditation may have relevance for the work of this committee and I would be happy to facilitate that. I encourage the staff to look broadly at the other influences on institutions of higher education in Illinois.”

Chairman Kaplan introduced Terry Ludwig, representing community colleges.

Mr. Ludwig said, “It is my privilege to represent the Illinois Council of Community College Presidents at a very challenging time -- a time when fiscal crisis in the state is causing us all to reflect on the values that we support and express in the higher education sector. For community colleges our key characteristics highlighted by students over time have been and continue to be, relatively low cost, nearby locations, and needed programs.

“Agenda, Item 7, *Higher Education Statewide Capital Policies and Priorities*, I note the importance that the development of these guidelines has had to the community college system. Particularly the provisions for equity among sectors and a need for life-health safety measures that have been noted. I would like to hear as this develops more on the coordination that would be required with the Office of Management and Budget as our projects and priorities are defined.

“In Item 8, *Overview of Current Procurement Practices and Processes*, one of the things that stood out was the community colleges exemption from the act. I would like to note that community colleges have been using procurement processes along these lines for many years. We have CMS procurement contracts, frequent bidding, consortia arrangements, and regional consortia. An example for us is that we currently buy our computers and supplies through an arrangement we have with Southern Illinois University at Carbondale Bookstore. There are a lot of arrangements out there that are working to save money for the system.

“In Item 9, *New Units of Instruction at Public Community Colleges*, I was very pleased to see four of our institutions submitting programs for your consideration today--programs that they needed within their communities. The position paper on general education that was circulated today by the Faculty Advisory Council is one that is extremely important and has a couple of items of concern. The statement on whether a student has completed an associate’s degree is needed, but should not be considered as discouraging completion of those degrees. The statement ‘provisions should be made for the institution’s representative to be chosen by the primary faculty government’s body’ might want to recognize the institution’s role in considering input from the primary government’s body, but reserve it for the institutions to make that choice.

“Regarding Item 12, *Legislative Report*, this past month I had the privilege of testifying before the House Appropriations Committee as part of continuing controversy with our system over equalization funding. In the course of that testimony a resolution was passed supporting these concerns. That resolution was passed both by the President’s Council and the Illinois Community College Trustees Association. The resolution says:

The President’s Council of Illinois Community College System thanks the House Higher Education Appropriations Committee for the opportunity to address them concerning an issue critically important to the economic welfare of the entire state as well as the well-being of all its citizens. Community colleges are essential to the economic development of our communities and our state. Community colleges provide the means of higher education for 64% of all persons who accept public higher education in Illinois. This system is the only choice for many students serving 65% of all minority students in public higher education. The community college system is now in grave danger,

suffering from significant, unremitting decline in state support over the past three years. Colleges understand the state's financial plight and have long been frugal stewards to state resources entrusted to them. Nevertheless, it is critical to the future of Illinois, that this course of funding be reversed. Student access to higher education is compromised every time a community college is forced to raise tuition or slash programs and services. The formula that allocates funds to individual community colleges is viewed as a national model and receives continuing support from the presidents. Recently however, the City Colleges of Chicago have endured reductions of such a scale as to contemplate major reductions in programs and/or the closing of the college. Other colleges can see that reality just ahead. The President's Council urges the committee to support funding that provides a permanent additional grant to the City Colleges of Chicago without reducing funding for the rest of the system. The reduction of the City Colleges, as experienced, has a disproportional impact on the Illinois economy, where the need for workforce training is significant.

"Nothing less than the welfare of the state of Illinois and the American ideal of opportunity are at stake. The City Colleges of Chicago serve a unique role among Illinois community colleges by accessing higher education to the arisance of the inner city to one of the largest cities in our nation. This largely urban market has seven different campuses throughout the city of Chicago. In 2003, the City Colleges of Chicago generated 21.2% of the Illinois Community College System's credit hours. Due to the decline in state funding community colleges received over \$6 million less in state funding from 2002 to 2003.

"The President's Council, therefore, recommends full support of the City Colleges of Chicago funding request as part of a permanent solution that reiterates its support for the pivotal role of the Illinois Community College Board in coordination with our system funding request.

"I summarize that by saying that we continue to work to resolve this problem within the system at the ICCB level. We are prepared for other options should that develop, but that is our preference. Elements of the solution are being worked out now and it is my proud hope that we do not have to bring this out of the bag."

Chairman Kaplan said, "It was never the intention of our Board to eliminate the community colleges from the procurement ideas that we are developing, especially with energy purchase. In fact, the use of energy by the community colleges has been considered by the Energy Resources Center and we will be coming to you with a proposal on that as well, Mr. Alongi."

Chairman Kaplan introduced Dave Tretter, representing the private institutions. Mr. Tretter said, "Let me extend my welcome to Mr. Ruiz and Dr. Hayes as they join the Board. Their significant Illinois higher education experience will certainly be an asset to the Board. If we can be of help, let us know. We look forward to working with you.

"On agenda Item 6, we endorse the establishment of the committee to review priorities, productivity, and accountability in Illinois higher education. Although the initial work of the committee will focus on public universities, we look forward to working with the Board and staff during the second phase of the committee's work, which presumably will look at the other institutions of higher education and how they contribute.

“This exercise presents an opportunity to review not only the current efficient, productive use of resources but it also affords us a chance to systemically plan for increases in the future demand for higher education, and to determine the wisest allocations of what probably will continue to be limited state resources to deliver these services in Illinois.

“On Item 11, I thank the Board and staff for our involvement with the review process of *The Illinois Commitment* and a special thank you to Dr. Kathleen Kelly who spent a good amount of time talking to the independent colleges through the review process. We look forward to working with you through the remainder of session and with the higher education community.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “Last week I had the privilege of meeting with the new Inspector General of the State of Illinois, Zee Scott, and her staff. Ms. Deborah Steiner, the First Deputy Inspector General, is going to give us a presentation on the ethics rules that pertain to us. The Inspector General is the agency ultimately responsible for training on the Ethics Act.”

Ms. Steiner said, “Inspector General Zee Scott could not be here today, and she does send her apologies, but hopes that she has the opportunity to meet and work with many of you in the future.

“As you are probably aware, the Inspector General’s office was created by the Governor, initially by executive order last January, and Zee Scott was appointed to be the Inspector General in April of last year. She started work in May and I joined her in June, both of us coming from the U.S. Attorney’s Office here in Chicago where Zee had worked for over fifteen years.

“We started the office officially last June and since that time the office has accepted over 1,100 complaints from employees of the state. Some of those have been in the wrong place, so to speak, not within our jurisdiction, and we have referred those on. But, suffice it to say, there has been plenty of work for our office to do.

“We view our office as having two components at this point in time. The State Officials and Employees Ethics Act was signed into law in December by the Governor. It is our primary enabling legislation. Under that Act, there are two components for our office. The first is ethics training and, as you are probably aware, the ethics training began for the Governor’s agencies, boards, and commissions late last year. As of today, it is my understanding from our primary coordinator of that program, Dave Keel, that over 50,000 state employees have taken the ethics training on a primarily Internet-based testing, which involves both reading information about the Ethics Act and understanding some of the new laws that came into existence through the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act and then, at the end, taking what amounts to a little test to test your knowledge of those ethics laws that you just read about. So, with over 50,000 employees trained, there are only a few more under the Governors agencies, boards, and commissions that will be trained.

“The other component of what our office does is investigate allegations of waste, fraud, and abuse and a number of other things, as you read the act, occurring within the agencies, boards, and commissions that fall under the Governor’s jurisdiction. As I have mentioned, we have been essentially inundated with complaints since our initiation. We have hired staff, and now have a staff of approximately thirty people, the largest number of whom are investigators. We have an office in Chicago at 32 West Randolph and we have an office in Springfield to investigate those complaints.

“The Act signed in December gave us subpoena power, which is significant in our ability to investigate allegations where we need information that does not come directly from an agency

board, or commission. Under the Act, every state employee is compelled to cooperate with the Office of Inspector General in its investigations and anyone who brings an allegation to the Office of Inspector General is protected by the confidentiality rules that occur in that Act. Finally, the Act also legislated whistleblower protection for anybody who brings a complaint to the Office of Inspector General.

“We understand that the relationship between the Office of Inspector General and the university and community college system is one that is evolving and changing. We look forward to developing that relationship and understanding how the university system and community colleges fit under this new legislation. We are aware that there are some sticky points, and we have heard from some of your general counsels, and we have talked with a number different people about some of the areas of this legislation that do not appear to address some of the concerns that are apparent with universities and community colleges. So, we have begun discussions along those lines, and we expect that those discussions will continue, particularly with some of your general counsels and others at the universities and community colleges.

“We do look forward to working with you. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call us. We are definitely here to serve you and we look forward to working with you.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “I want to point out that your office does not go out and look for issues, you only act on issues that are brought to your attention.”

Ms. Steiner said, “That is exactly right. There are a couple of components of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act that could be highlighted, one of which is it specifically says that the Office of Inspector General cannot investigate on its own prerogative. In other words, we cannot look around and say, ‘Let’s go into that agency and see what we can find.’ We investigate upon receipt of a complaint only. Another important factor that impacts how we operate is that we cannot accept anonymous complaints. So, if we receive either a letter or a telephone call from an individual who is unwilling to share his or her name or give us contact information, we also cannot investigate that complaint. So those are a couple of protections that were built into the Act.”

6. Establishment of the Committee to Review Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability in Illinois Higher Education

Dr. LaVista said, “This particular item builds on an earlier item that was presented to you in December 2003 in an information report presenting the initial policy framework. We were trying, with that framework, to call attention to the accomplishment of three means.

“The first of these items had to do with a long-standing interest of the Board in trying to determine the best means for achieving higher education goals and priorities with clear evidence of diminishing state support.

“In recognition of Mr. Karnes’ comments regarding quality, my recollection of the early discussions provides two memories which might be relevant here. One is that quality is one of the mainstays of the current version of *The Illinois Commitment*.

“The other is that the means for achieving higher education’s goals and priorities is really part of a larger model that says quality assurance is what this is all about. It is about trying to provide some particular direction to colleges and universities so that quality assurance can be maintained -- not only in placement on a national report card -- but the quality that we know exists in our fine system of higher education.

“The second end that was a part of that policy framework is the logic of it all -- mainly trying to tie those means to the results of the midterm review. The good logical thinking of the Board will be at play if this connection is made.

“The third means that was a part of that policy framework discussion in December had to do with your view that there was a need to continue to study the academic and administrative efficiencies at Illinois public universities. I am sure that many of you are thinking parenthetically that a good deal of work has already been done on that since December. That particular means is designed to continue to enhance a sense that public accountability, vis-à-vis higher education, is in good shape.

“This item tries to add substance to that framework by offering two things. We are recommending a scope of work and a five-point charge. Because of earlier actions, which included a good deal of cooperation with public universities, the first phase of this study will focus on public universities. With respect to utilities purchase, vis-à-vis community colleges, it is possible that the second phase might include community colleges or other aspects of higher education. The thinking is that since we have done so much good work with universities, that is the place to continue.

“The second offering in this item is fairly straightforward. We are recommending that work start with a review of institutional missions at each public university. What is appropriate for institutions across the state? Should array consideration be a part of the study? We are hoping to have some results at the end that universities can use in their continuing efforts to reallocate resource to core mission activities.

“The Board has had some beginning discussions with the Faculty Advisory Council and it is our thinking that this committee can go a bit further in formalizing discussions having to do with how we might define academic productivity. The nature and scope of university faculty work will be considered in the study as well.

“Next, the recommendation to look at state level regulatory and other recording requirements might mistakenly be seen only as an interest in removing onerous barriers, duplication, etc. While I imagine the committee will delve into that, it seems to me that we are involved in an opportunity to reappraise the focus as it exists either for qualitative reporting or quantitative reporting. That focus might help us with the first question having to do with quality.

“The next item, examining current accountability practices, is nothing more than continuous improvement. Everyone is aware of the extensive academic and financial recording that our colleges and universities are involved with. This is a chance to have a look at those and see how that might play out. We are recommending a rather vigorous schedule and are hopeful that this particular committee’s results can be considered in the Board’s work in developing a fiscal year 2006 budget.

“We hope to work through preliminary recommendations by October with final recommendations of the committee being presented in December. We invite Board participation in this activity with enthusiasm. Our hope is that we can launch this committee by the end of the month or the first part of May.”

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Professor Nandi and seconded by Mr. O’Kelly, unanimously accepts and endorses the Establishment of the Committee to Review Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability in Illinois Higher Education.

Chairman Kaplan said, “Thomas Lamont will be the Chairman of the Committee to Review Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability in Illinois Higher Education. Other Committee members will be: IBHE Board members Dea Meyer, Guy Alongi, Sam Gove, Steven Taslitz, Gilbert Rutman, and Alice Hayes; Paul Keyes, Provost of Governor’s State University; Ken Andersen, University of Illinois retired professor; Lou Hencken, President of Eastern Illinois University; Scott Guziec, Superintendent School District 103; Gary Grace, University Center of Lake County; and myself. We will pursue an agenda and a timeframe and the members of the committee will be so notified.”

7. Higher Education Statewide Capital Policies and Priorities

Mr. Blakemore said, “I am presenting this report on behalf of former Board member Bob English who chaired this committee with Mr. Lamont. I was privileged, along with Mr. O’Kelly, to serve with them on this committee.

“Item 7 represents the work of the Committee on Statewide Policies related to capital policies and priorities. This committee convened in April of 2001 and the purpose was primarily on three things -- evaluate current statewide facilities policies and recommend revisions where necessary, review current practices for prioritizing capital budget recommendations, and make recommendations concerning policies and practices for prioritizing projects in the future. Those were the three formal purposes and from those purposes resulted a re-examination of the role of the Board of Higher Education, vis-à-vis the guidance, coordination, and the responsibilities we have to the ultimate decision and policy makers, the Governor and the General Assembly. The Committee took a hard look at what we were doing and what we needed to do to provide the best advice and counsel to the Governor and to the General Assembly.

“The Committee met several times and was reconvened in 2003. It was a very inclusive process and recommendations were posted which provided anybody who had an interest to make their comments. The report includes an overview of higher education facilities, a history of funding for higher education capital projects, a description of higher education, and a description of the higher education capital budget process.

“The second to the last paragraph of Page 16 summarizes the history, but also gives us some indication of what the future holds and what has actually been done. This paragraph tells us what we are up against in this area. Let me quote parts of that paragraph. By way of history, ‘In fiscal year 2002, a year in which appropriations enacted for higher education projects were the largest of any single year in the last two decades, total final action represented 41 percent of the amounts requested and 76 percent of the amount recommended by the Board. However, the \$412.4 million appropriation approved by the General Assembly and the Governor included only \$180.4 million, or 33.4 percent, of the Board’s recommendations.’ There are obviously credible reasons for the differences, but the paragraph puts into play the significant role that we as the Board need to play in terms of advising the Governor and the General Assembly on the impact of

the government and policy decisions that are made. That was the best year for funding, and even during the best of times we fall short. That gap will continue to grow.

“The Board’s capital recommendations are also a very important part of this report. For example, over 25 years ago the Board adopted the current policies and many of them are relevant today. However, there are several that have been expanded or modified. For example, the Board then and now gives priority to remodeling existing facilities to protecting the state’s investment. The revised policies also recognize the importance of improvements to address necessary health, safety, and emergency infrastructure needs and improvements to provide energy efficiencies. The report provides a framework to address life, health, and safety projects. The revised policies support community colleges and their goal to utilize taxing authority afforded to them to address such projects, and not to be constrained by the current statutory provisions that include taxing authorities for protection health and safety purposes under the tax cap.

“The committee also recommends the use of capital renewal funds be expanded to allow their use to provide infrastructure improvements in conjunction with auxiliary enterprise revenues matching funds. Along the lines of protecting the investment in higher education facilities, the new policies speak to identifying the estimated life cycle cost of the facility, the cost for initial construction, daily operations and maintenance, and finally the major renovations and upgrades of building systems to ensure the building’s integrity over its expected life. This particular provision really goes to having a comprehensive approach as opposed to a narrow one, or to put it a different way, we are really not looking at just what it costs to build, but what it costs to properly maintain the building, and constructing the building in such a way as to be able to adapt to future and changing needs.

“Current policies are silent as to institutional priorities. The Committee felt very strong that one of, if not the most important, roles that the Board of Higher Education could play as a coordinating Board is to speak and articulate what the institutional priorities are, particularly in this area where decisions made one year may change in the next year given the changing nature of what we do. The report addresses that.

“Twenty-five years ago, for example, the Board agreed that it would not approve the construction of dormitories for commuter institutions. Revised policies provide that the Board will consider requests to projects that help to ensure that an institution has adequate facilities to engage in activities consistent with its mission including resident halls, if necessary.

“There are a couple of examples where funds have been utilized for that very purpose. The new policies seek to ensure that the Board, as well as the governing boards of the universities, the Illinois Community College Board, and the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy are provided sufficient flexibility in their respective processes for developing capital projects and priorities and to acknowledge the changes in institutional project and priorities. Flexibility will enable the institutions to place a high priority on funds, to match gifts for capital projects, which is recommended by the committee. Flexibility will also allow an institution and the Board to consider and support gubernatorial and legislative initiatives. Finally, the policies provide the Board’s recommendation for capital improvements will promote institutional missions and statewide goals as articulated in *The Illinois Commitment* and other policy documents. It is critical in terms of even the PPA Committee that we continue to improve upon *The Illinois Commitment*.

“I would like to give a special note of thanks to Dan Layzell who along with staff member, Sharon Ward, led this effort and to former staff member, Deb Smitley, who played a very critical role in the development of this report.”

Chairman Kaplan said, "I would like to comment that this project started after an appearance by Dr. LaVista, Dr. Layzell, and myself before the House Higher Education Appropriations Committee, chaired by Representative Ricca Slone. We represented to the Committee that the Board would develop current and new policies with regard to statewide capital policies and priorities. In line with that commitment, we have today this item before the Board. If there has been unfairness in the past with regards to capital projects, this item sets in concrete our opinion -- the way the universities and education institutions will establish their needs for their capital improvement. To the highest extent possible, I pledge to you the Board's commitment to live by the provisions and terms of this item for all future time."

Mr. Taslitz said, "I just have one question about the kind of analysis that has been done when capital requests are made -- what type of payback analysis there is -- as far as different measures? Normally when people are looking at capital expenditures they are looking at measuring return, but I did not hear anything about a method of return on capital dollars."

"I would have a problem with any kind of capital expenditure without any kind of return analysis being done. Obviously return can be measured in lots of different factors."

Mr. Blakemore said, "I would agree with you in terms of having some type of analysis that says what are we buying and what are we getting from that. What we traditionally have done in the higher education community is work to the actual missions and purposes of the colleges and universities. It is not going to be the same type of return that we would see typically in the private sector setting. It is not the same type of analysis, but there is an analysis with respect to making sure that it is tied to the overall mission and purpose of that university. Which is why there is a change in certain circumstances for building residential facilities when the mission may have changed -- we are looking at how we can accommodate that change."

Chairman Kaplan asked, "Looking at this in a fresh way, is there some benefit that higher education could achieve in looking at it in a more commercial business-like sense?"

Mr. Taslitz said, "Not only from a commercial benefit point of view, but there are obviously lots of different people looking for a few scarce dollars, so where is the independent objectivity as far as whose mission is more vital? I think some sort of methodology looking at independent people judging what the priorities are because it is all coming out of the same pocket and needs to be incorporated into the analysis."

Chairman Kaplan said, "That is what the Board is supposed to do. This document in terms and provisions is the recipe for us conducting an independent review and establishing priorities."

Mr. Taslitz said, "But without that as part of the work that we are going to see -- we need to see that independent analysis. So when we sit here in these meetings we can make informed independent decisions."

Chairman Kaplan said, "And you will get that."

Dr. Rutman said, “A cost-benefit analysis could be done. I do not see why we could not list a benefit of the costs and make some sort of comparisons, but there is no real revenue stream coming in that you can put against the cost and make an estimate on the return on the investment. But you could do a cost-benefit analysis.”

Mr. Taslitz said, “How many students are going through? When we are talking about return, there are a lot of ways to compute it. I agree with that. Part of what the specific recommendations call for is exactly those types of issues, in terms of student use, how it sort of fits that overall mission but it gets to be very specific.”

Dr. LaVista said, “The issues that you are raising are correct and have been addressed on the proposal side. One of the great breakthroughs in committees and their recommendations have to do with assessing, as people do in proposals, the relationship of the building carrying out the mission, service the students, the cost, etc. This condition of life cycle costs has to do with the Board having a clearer understanding of the long-term costs, be they operating, etc., that approving a building will require. We can keep listening to that if there is something that the Board feels we can do. The criteria for decision-making really rests with the Board. Right now, the criteria, I think, are front-end loaded. We have not gone back after the fact to review those kinds of questions. But maybe we could.”

Dr. Rutman said, “I vote to look at a couple more recent submittals and see what came out.”

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Carroll and seconded by Dr. Rutman, unanimously accepts and endorses the Higher Education Statewide Capital Policies and Priorities.

8. Overview of Current Procurement Practices and Processes At Illinois Public Universities and Opportunities for Enhanced Efficiencies and Savings

Dr. Layzell said, “Item 8 presents information on current procurement practices and processes in place for public universities including a review of joint purchasing arrangements that are in place to maximize savings in these activities as well as some recommendations to enhance these processes and the joint purchasing arrangements in place. This item grows out of the Board’s on-going interest and desire to investigate and enhance administrative and operational efficiencies throughout higher education and it began last year. As such, a committee was formed last summer to identify best practices and recommend enhancements regarding administrative and support-service efficiencies. The committee was formed and included both representatives of the public universities as well as Board staff.

“The primary focus of this committee to date has been in the area of commodities procurement, which is really the purchasing of goods and services to support academic research and public service activities that all public universities do on a daily basis. Regarding the best practices that the committee investigated, they did find public universities do and have participated in several joint purchasing arrangements that allow them to realize cost savings ranging anywhere from ten to twenty percent on average. Many of those examples are included in the item.

“The most established of these joint purchasing arrangements is the Illinois Public Higher Education Cooperative, which was established in 1978 and provides a formal structure for joint purchasing of common goods and services such as office paper and supplies, computer diskettes, financial services, and the like. As the committee deliberated on the information and focused on recommendation, it became clear that the focus of these recommendations ought to be on the Illinois Public Higher Education Cooperative (IPHEC). The Committee felt that it had the most potential for the additional utilization and savings throughout the system.

“There were three recommendations that the Committee put forth for consideration. First, is to publicize and continue to strongly encourage utilization of IPHEC at all levels. The organization itself has been in place since 1978 and has done a very good job in terms of making its services and opportunities known. Again there was agreement on the Committee that more in particular be done at the state level. The Board is not taking an advocacy role for IPHEC, but that should be considered.

“Secondly, the Committee felt that each university, since it does have its own mix of goods and services that it purchases each year, should identify specific areas for improved utilization of IPHEC. For example, the University of Illinois has recently gone through that example and did find many areas for improved utilization of IPHEC to provide additional savings. Again, the feeling is that each institution will need to do that to identify its own areas where it can improve.

“Thirdly, the Committee felt that improvements could be made by expanding participation of IPHEC to include community colleges where feasible. A couple of examples that were given were 1) put forth that vendors could be asked whether or not to put community colleges in their response, and 2) that perhaps regional partnerships could be formed between public universities and local community colleges to maximize purchases through IPHEC.

“I would like to thank the members of the Committee for their assistance throughout this process, and to Bob Baker, Director of the Illinois Public Higher Education Cooperative, for all the assistance he provided throughout this review.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “What was the makeup of the committee?”

Dr. Layzell said, “There were members from each public university, including President Goldfarb from Western Illinois University, and including people who are involved in financial administration, such as purchasing directors. There was a good mix of folks from the institutions who brought their perspectives to our work.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “Are there members now from the community college system?”

Dr. Layzell said, “They were not members of this initial committee. Again, the focus was on public universities. As they were looking forward to developing the recommendations they did see some potential to include community colleges.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “As we go forward, we could include representatives from that sector. As I mentioned briefly before, we had a convening of public presidents and board chairs to talk about energy. That committee is going to be chaired by Dr. Rutman. I believe that there is a great source of savings for the universities and for the community colleges if we can put a consortium like this together, and looking forward to perhaps sometime in the future, include risk management, payroll, and the like. I am looking forward to the continuation of this committee and its work.”

Dr. Carroll said, "Would it be under our jurisdiction if this Board wants this Committee for the procurement of combined contracts to also make sure that there is minority representation?"

Chairman Kaplan said, "That is a requirement of contracts that the state enters into. It is a general requirement of minority participation."

Dr. Carroll said, "At the Governor's New Opportunities Conference I asked the same question and was assured that minority vendors, who are now currently left out, would be given access to this new information, especially since now it will be like one hand probably making the decisions."

Chairman Kaplan said, "I think minority vendors have to qualify as such and then there is a list of these minority vendors who are certified and they have the information concerning our fees and the like. I think that process is in place, but to the highest extent possible, the Committee will make sure that minorities are certainly considered in the process."

Dr. Carroll said, "Are there opportunities for the Board to support that all people get opportunities for the RFP's? I understand that they do not even know about the RFP's."

Chairman Kaplan said, "All qualified people have been hired, all these things are published, but they have to be certified also. Once that is done, these things are published on websites. All that is a present and ongoing process."

Mr. Taslitz asked, "What other states have gone through a similar process, if any? In your research, did you find that any other state has been through this?"

Dr. Layzell said, "I know at least one state recently went through this. The University System of Georgia has gone through this process within the last couple of years. Through the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, which is a group of agencies such as the Board of Higher Education across the country, it appears that there is increasing interest in this particular topic."

Mr. Taslitz said, "I would think we may want to take a leadership role in contacting some other states and leveraging our initiatives with another state and try to get some mass behind it."

Chairman Kaplan said, "There is the Midwest Higher Education Commission and Jerry Blakemore is our representative for that group."

Mr. Blakemore said, "That is an excellent point. Part of what the Midwest Higher Education Commission has done is across-the-board telecommunications, insurance, and other areas. They combine the market of ten Midwestern states in terms of purchasing."

Mr. Taslitz said, "You were talking about textbook purchasing earlier on. Obviously how that would be coordinated would have a significant impact as well."

Mr. Blakemore said, "I agree and I think recommendations that we should take a more active role in encouraging that is absolutely right on point. That role can be in encouraging colleges and universities within the state to take advantage of the state programs and other programs outside of the state. The other issue is that in any detail there are obstacles that we have because of the state's procurement statutes and regulations and they prevent us from actually utilizing the market and the mass market that we have. I think we have to examine that as part of this process because our hands are tied -- or the colleges and universities -- their hands are tied. We need to be

looking around us in the country to see what is going on because everybody is facing the same fiscal conditions.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “MHEC meets in the summer, is that correct?”

Mr. Blakemore said, “We have two meetings in the summer. The meetings were reduced to help cut back costs. We have successfully held most of those meetings in Chicago which has been a way of bringing everybody together. Illinois has played a major leadership role, even in the development of the Midwest Higher Education Commission, twelve or thirteen years ago. We do have active members of both the legislature and the executive branch, but I would be the first to say that we could do a lot more in that regard.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “Some of these issues could be brought to their attention?”

Mr. Blakemore said, “Yes, and you have a broader portfolio with that organization than you do with just one state, whether it is textbooks or whether it is insurance.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “With regard to the textbook issue, that may be the proper venue for this Committee to look at, and that may be something we can do.”

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Mr. Blakemore and seconded by Ms. Meyer, unanimously accepts and endorses the Overview of Current Procurement Practices and Processes At Illinois Public Universities and Opportunities for Enhanced Efficiencies and Savings.

9. New Units of Instruction at Public Community College

Dr. Alexander said, “Item 9 asked approval for four new associate degree programs at four community colleges. These are an A.A.S. in Graphic Arts Design at William Rainey Harper College, A.A.S. in Medical Office Specialist at Richland Community College, A.A.S. in Paraprofessional Educator at Illinois Valley Community College, and the same degree at Lincoln Land Community College. These programs meet the criteria for approval and the requirements for licensing and certification where appropriate. As we agreed at the February 24, 2004 teleconference, staff provided these programs to Board members in advance of the mailing and the resulting conversation was very fruitful. We hope that it helps your deliberation and certainly it helped guide the staff. We plan to continue this procedure unless you oppose it and encourage Board members to discuss issues with the Executive Director and with me before meetings. We will use this same procedure for Item 10.

“Regarding the two paraprofessional programs, please note that follow-up reports are requested from the community colleges at the Board’s October 2004 meeting regarding the need for assessing graduates. The second report is requested in August 2005. It would pay attention to the efficacy of these programs in training paraprofessionals, whether students understand that much of the coursework will not articulate with four-year programs, and again the need for greater transparency and skills assessment.”

Ms. Meyer said, “I wanted to extend my appreciation to the Community College Board for working with us. I think it is important that we establish a good dialog as these things proceed on a regular basis. If there are new things that are being developed well in advance, then we have a good understanding of what is going on and it will make things even better.”

Dr. Carroll said, “I also wanted to extend my appreciation to the staff and to Dr. Alexander’s follow-up to address questions that were raised within the reading of the report. In

the future, if there could be a meeting announcement for any meeting establishing and discussing the criteria -- just as an observer -- so that we could be able to hear about it.”

Dr. Alexander said, “We will need to work on a procedure. Generally, we do not do that in a meeting. Individual staff does that, so we do not have a staff meeting to discuss that. We can talk about better ways to communicate.”

Dr. Carroll said, “I was not speaking of a staff meeting, I was speaking of an actual meeting with the community colleges.”

Dr. Alexander said, “We normally do not do that. Our staff is in touch with campus staff and they work this out staff to staff -- on an individual basis.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “Dr. Carroll, if you have an interest in that, I think staff should sit down with you and work out an arrangement where you could have input and an idea what is going on.”

*The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Gove and seconded by Mr. Alongi, unanimously granted authority to **William Rainey Harper College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Graphic Arts Design.*

*And granted authority to **Richland Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Medical Office Specialist.*

*And granted authority to **Illinois Valley Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Paraprofessional Educator.*

*And granted authority to **Lincoln Land Community College** to offer the Associate in Applied Science in Paraprofessional Educator.*

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

Dr. Alexander said, “Item 10 requests approval of eleven programs at six independent institutions. The six institutions are Chicago School of Professional Psychology, DeVry University-Illinois, Franklin University, International Academy of Design and Technology, Old Dominion University, and Robert Morris College. Representatives are in attendance from the Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Franklin University, Old Dominion, and Robert Morris College if they need to respond to issues.

“Each of these programs meets the criteria for approval, licensing, and certification requirements where appropriate. Two of the programs, those at Franklin University and those at Old Dominion University, involve online education.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “Do any of these approvals require state licensing?”

Dr. Alexander said, “They all meet those requirements.”

Chairman Kaplan said, "With regards to Old Dominion and Franklin, specifically and generally, do they meet the requirements of our state statute and our Board's rules and regulations?"

Dr. Alexander said, "Yes, they do."

Professor Gove said, "Today we are asked to approve online degrees by two out-of-state universities, Franklin in Ohio and Old Dominion in Virginia. I have questions on the direction that these programs are taking us. I do not think that the staff is wrong in bringing them here. The staff is following the state law and the programs meet the criteria of Illinois law. I do raise questions on public policy. Is this a desirable improvement? Because both Franklin and Old Dominion are not public institutions -- they are not-for-profit -- they do not need to prove that there is a need for the program.

"Let us look at Franklin. If we approve Franklin to offer junior/senior courses to graduates from our community colleges, can this meet the request for a bachelor's degree as I remember was approved by a six-to-five vote by this Board in 2000? Some 31 community colleges have offered Franklin university degree programs.

"Staff tells me that when we met in 2003, there were 151 students enrolled at 31 community colleges. Since 2000, 75 students have completed degrees. That is not very many. Although City Colleges of Chicago are part of the group, no students have enrolled in these degrees.

"In 2000 I raised the question, 'Are we slowly moving towards four-year universities at our community colleges?' It looks like that.

"Old Dominion University presents different issues. They propose to offer six degrees through Moraine Valley Community College, three bachelor's, two master's, and one Ph.D. Old Dominion plans to use video-conferencing, which is a little different than the Internet.

"My main concern here is offering a Ph.D. at a community college. Ph.D. degrees vary from institution to institution, but this is a new variation. I have discussed my concerns with Dr. LaVista, and he has met with the staff to provide me with some helpful material. Incidentally, I would say that this is not a normal issue -- it is a national issue. I was talking to Dr. Hayes, former president of the University of San Diego, and she has real concerns about quality of all of these programs.

"I would suggest that these need a serious study and analysis by this Board. We should think online education would be a good topic for the agenda of the Committee for Priorities, Productivity, and Accountability that was created today. I am not making a motion to delay, but I am very concerned with what is happening."

Chairman Kaplan said, "I am concerned with it as well. I have voted with you on a number of these issues in the past, when I was a member and not the Chair. The difficulty that we have is that they meet the criteria and the requirements that this state requires -- so you cannot say to them that they cannot do this. It does warrant a study, and you are a member of the PPA Committee."

Dr. Rutman said, "I am troubled by giving a bachelor's of arts degree with three-quarters of it lower division courses. Does Franklin do that on their main campus? Do they have a degree program at home where three quarters of the hours could be at lower division?"

Dr. Alexander said, "My only comparison is in another state -- Wisconsin -- where they accept 72 credits as transfer. Some of the schools require more, but the issue is that roughly one-third of your B.A. should be upper division. So in that sense this program is roughly in the parameters."

Dr. Rutman asked, "As little as one-third?"

Dr. Alexander said, "This is hotly debated in certain circles. They are within the acceptable parameters -- whether we want to increase the minimum or not."

Dr. David Pierce, Strategic Consultant for the Community College Alliance of Franklin University, said, "Dealing with the question you proposed, there are several community college programs that reach out to that length, many of the health related and nursing programs do, and some others. It is within the acceptable band of number of credits, but it is at the upper level, no question about that."

Dr. Rutman said, "I am concerned at what the baccalaureate is going to mean. I taught for 40 years, and I could not tell you what percent were lower division, but I always thought there were freshman courses, sophomore courses, junior courses, and senior courses. Approximately half of the courses would be at the upper level. A minimum of 84 out of 120 hours. It concerns me about what a baccalaureate degree means."

Dr. Pierce said, "Eighty-four is the maximum."

Dr. Rutman said, "What is the minimum?"

Dr. Pierce said, "In terms of the number of credits that will transfer from a community college, eighty-four is the maximum, not the minimum. I do not think we have time to get into what the baccalaureate means, but this is not totally unusual or out of bounds in terms of what exists out there."

Dr. Hayes said, "I do not have any generic concerns on online education, my own institution did it, nor do I have any generic concerns about either Franklin or Old Dominion, which are fine institutions. I just have some questions about quality control -- who is responsible for it? Is Moraine Valley Community College giving doctoral degrees? Who is giving these degrees? Who is responsible?"

Dr. Pierce said, "I was tangentially involved in the discussion with the president of Old Dominion University back when he was starting up this distance education program, who, by the way, is a graduate of Illinois State University and the one who started James Cook Community College. First of all, that is a public university, not a private university. Old Dominion University in the state of Virginia would offer the degrees. They use Moraine Valley as a conduit. Studies done in Ohio in 1982 or 1983 showed that there were more students with doctorates attending community colleges than there were students enrolled in the state's public universities pursuing a doctorate, so there is a lot of gray out there."

Ms. Meyer said, "I am reminded of our discussion in 2000 when concerns were raised -- the notion that this is a national issue and how is it we can be open to online education and the like? How also can we assure quality? We talked about the notion of the Board of Higher Education providing that online assurance mechanism or something beyond this approval that would indicate perhaps some sort of quality evaluation. It was urged that, as we thought about it, talked about it, and as we looked at this issue, that would sort of be built into the recognition. In light of that, there would be some additional thing that we could provide, or someone could provide, that provided some sort of method."

Chairman Kaplan said, "It seems like an appropriate idea. I would ask Dr. LaVista to have some type of a recommendation for us at the next Board meeting."

Dr. Gove said, "Dr. Pierce reminded me that Old Dominion is a state university. Dr. Alexander, should not we have asked them for the need of this program?"

Dr. Alexander said, "Traditionally we have done that with any state school. I am going to go back and look into that. I also wanted to speak to the quality issue and the stamp of approval. One point to be made is that these are institutions that have chosen to come through us in order to gain legitimacy, or at least the scrubbing that staff do on them. Our concern really is the ones who do not come through us. I would whole-heartedly agree that we need to enhance our expertise and beef up our ability to look at these programs in terms of essentially the good, the bad, and the ugly. We are just at the beginning stages of being able to do that. Obviously we are much more familiar with traditional types of education. We also have a pretty good nose for the very poor ones that come through, and the illegal ones.

"There is one thing I would caution. It is difficult to put up a list saying 'these are approved' because they change so quickly, and it is difficult to keep an accurate list. We are going to have to really think about what is the best way."

Chairman Kaplan said, "Years ago we thought about the idea of putting approved programs on our website."

Dr. Alexander said, "All of our programs are on the website. We may be able to make that more transparent. What we do not do is keep a list of programs that are unapproved or we feel are unacceptable."

Chairman Kaplan said, "We might do that too."

Dr. Alexander said, "That is a little trickier."

Chairman Kaplan said, "What is trickier about that?"

Dr. Alexander said, "Some unapproved institutions will simply change their name and move on. We could get in trouble if we put it up as acceptable, and it is not. We do need to come up with what is the best way to make the information known to the public."

Mr. Taslitz said, "Does that not fall under the State's Attorney, if someone is offering a product online, and they do not fulfill their obligation?"

Chairman Kaplan said, "If they are out of state it probably is going to be a federal issue. We passed a resolution here last year and a statute was enacted making it a misdemeanor to issue a phony degree, but if it is done out of state, our law does not have weight."

Mr. Taslitz said, "You think there are phony degrees that do not meet our standards?"

Chairman Kaplan said, "They do not meet anyone's standards."

Mr. Taslitz said, "They are frauds."

Chairman Kaplan said, "If it is done outside of the state, our law has no extraterritorial effect, so it is a federal problem. Really, these things are not done in Illinois."

Mr. Alongi said, "Why do the out-of-state institutions approved by other states have to be under the same governing rules as our state? Why can't we make them accountable just like our state universities? If they are going to offer a course in this state, then they need to work under our requirements."

Dr. Alexander said, "If they are on-site in Illinois, they come under our jurisdiction."

Mr. Alongi said, "Do we ask the institution to prove need for the program? This institution has not."

Chairman Kaplan said, "There is an issue if we can even require need. Our general counsel will have to tell us whether or not we can insist on need. This is a real issue that Professor Gove is not far off the mark. There is so much that needs to be looked at. The problem is it may not be an Illinois issue. It may be a federal issue. Maybe we should take it up with our Senators or Congressmen."

Dr. Alexander said, "It is certainly an issue that our office and my staff should look at, and we will do more investigation."

Dr. Rutman said, "Echoing Professor Gove's point about community colleges and doctorate degrees, that is really not the proper environment. Is that considered?"

Dr. Alexander said, "Old Dominion is offering the degree. Community colleges offer their facility."

Dr. Rutman said, "People there are not conducive to a doctorate at the site."

Dr. Alexander said, "The Old Dominion faculty are offering the doctorate. They need the technical ability to offer the teleconferencing and such. Moraine Valley is providing that."

Dr. Alongi said, "They are probably paying rent to the school for using the facilities, which reduces our budget deficit."

Chairman Kaplan said, "The University Center of Lake County is somewhat similar, because we have all these institutions banding together in the formation of giving us curriculum and faculty, and we are just giving them a building out of which to operate. There really is not a qualitative difference."

Chairman Kaplan addressed Dr. Dennis Gregory, Director of Doctoral & Graduate Programs in Higher Education at Old Dominion University and said, "The concern of our Board members is, is it appropriate circumstances to offer a doctorate program at a community college? Could you explain that?"

Dr. Gregory said, "We are using Moraine Valley as a podium, a place where we can offer the classes. Most of those involved will be faculty and staff of the community college system

who already possess advanced degrees and are seeking senior credentials to move up to higher education administrative positions at community colleges within Illinois and elsewhere throughout the country. The program that we offer is offered by Old Dominion faculty, myself included, who are credentialed to teach in doctoral programs. We are a research-intensive university. All of our credentials are checked out very closely. Quality issues that were mentioned earlier are addressed to make sure that we do meet all of the appropriate Illinois standards.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “What do you do internally on quality? The concern of the Board is what do you do to insist on quality inside your institution in a distance learning environment?”

Dr. Gregory said, “All of our programs are approved by the Southern Association and our regional accrediting board, NCATE, the national association that accredits colleges of education. It looks at all of our faculties’ credentials, assesses programs in various areas in higher education, and assures the college meets professional standards for all of their respective programs. For example, NCATE approves accreditation for our counseling program.”

Professor Gove said, “Do you know if any Illinois university offers the Ph.D. in community college leadership?”

Dr. Gregory said, “Not that I am aware of. I believe there are several that offer it in higher education leadership, but not community college leadership.”

Mr. Alongi said, “Have you applied in any state that has turned you down?”

Dr. Gregory said, “Not that I am aware of. We have sites in Georgia, Washington, and Arizona. All of our programs have been approved at this point.”

Mr. Alongi said, “Is it the strategy to have a national classroom in various states where you can deliver your product?”

Dr. Gregory said, “That would be our goal.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “On Page 77 of our packet there is a complete summary of assessment on how this is done.”

Dr. Gregory said, “I would like to point out to the Board concerning this online education that we do present this through video, with real faculty presenting it. They are available by two-way video and two-way audio communication, so questions can be immediately responded to by the faculty who are there at the site on the university campus.”

Dr. Rutman said, “What do you do about a library?”

Dr. Gregory said, “We give you access to all of the electronic resources that are available to any degree students. Any student who takes a course at Moraine Valley can access any of the resources at the Old Dominion library and any of the other electronic resources as well.”

Chairman Kaplan asked, “Is this a provisional research degree?”

Dr. Gregory said, “That is correct.”

Dr. Nandi said, “The reason this is bothering us is most of us went to school with the old kind of values, where the doctorate is looked at as a research degree and where extensive interaction is almost mandatory -- partly among the faculty and students, but also among the

students who are pursuing similar objectives. This process seems more like a mail-order degree. This is something we are not familiar with. I do not know if we can have a position on this, because according to the recommendation, they are within the parameters.”

Dr. Gregory said, “We make every effort to keep that from happening as part of our program. One of the requirements of our program is that students who are admitted come to campus for two weeks during the first summer after their admission to the program. They are eligible to come to campus in the summers thereafter until they complete their coursework. We would also invite any Illinois resident that begins the program by taking courses at Moraine Valley to come and study full-time at the university for a year during their matriculation. We also will be involving faculty and presidents -- particularly at the community colleges from which our students come -- as members of their dissertation committees, assuming they meet all the academic qualifications that are necessary, so that we can have more of a presence on the campuses where the students are taking courses where they are coming from -- where they would serve their administrative responsibilities once they complete them. We are working very hard to keep this from becoming that kind of program.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “This is a very gripping discussion. What I think we should do is take a roll call vote over all of this. I am suggesting to the Board that Dr. Alexander and Bill Feurer, our counsel, look at what significant effect this Board can have and whether or not state legislation can affect the outcome. As everyone has agreed on now, these folks meet our criteria. This is something that Dr. Gove is concerned with, and I have been concerned for three or four years as well.

“Dr. Alexander, I think it is time we give this thing a heavy look. Let us suggest that at our October Board meeting this be an agenda item for serious and intensive discussion. General counsel will review, Dr. Rutman, Dr. Gove, Professor Nandi, Mr. Taslitz, if you have an interest in this, I would suggest that Dr. Alexander sit down with you folks and let us have a real intensive discussion in October.”

The roll call vote on Item 10 was as follows: ‘Yes’ -Alongi, Barr, Blakemore, Carroll, Gove, Hayes, Kaplan, Meyer, Nandi, O’Kelly, Ruiz, Rutman, Taslitz.

Professor Gove and Dr. Rutman voted ‘present’ for Franklin University and Old Dominion University.

*The Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby grants to **Chicago School of Professional Psychology**, Authorization to Grant the Doctor of Psychology in Business Psychology in the Chicago Approval Region. This recommendation was made subject to the institution’s maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which this authorization is granted.*

*And granted to **DeVry University**, Authorization to Grant the Associate of Applied Science in Health Information Technology in the Chicago, West Suburban, and South Metropolitan Approval Regions, subject to the institution’s maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which this authorization is granted.*

*And granted to **Franklin University**, Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, Statewide, subject to the institution’s maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which this authorization is granted.*

And granted to **International Academy of Design and Technology**, Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Applied Science in Internet Technologies in the Chicago Approval Region, subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its application and that form the basis upon which this authorization is granted.

And granted to **Old Dominion University**, Authorization to Grant the following degrees: Bachelor of Science in Communication: Professional Communication in the South Metropolitan Approval Region and Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies: Professional Writing in the South Metropolitan Approval Region. These recommendations are made subject to the institution's maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and which form the basis upon which these Authorizations to Grant Degrees are granted.

Dr. LaVista said, "There was a question earlier with interest in a June report and measuring quality for distance learning, which by the way is an enormous task. I think given the subsequent discussion that might be something we could put into a later report."

11. Mid-Term Review of *The Illinois Commitment*

Dr. Layzell said, "Items 11a and 11b include information related to our efforts on the on-going midterm review of *The Illinois Commitment* consisting of (1) an assessment of achievements since the establishment of the plan in 1999 as well as remaining key challenges for the future; and (2) stakeholder views and opinions regarding *The Illinois Commitment* gathered through interviews and a web survey.

"The items include an analysis of achievements to date and key challenges for the future. There were interviews and meetings with stakeholders that were in and out of the higher education community, with 19 of these being conducted by Dr. Kathleen Kelly. There was a web-based survey that approximately 250 interested members of the public participated in. I wish to thank all of those who participated in interviews, and meetings, as well as the survey and other means. Their input was invaluable.

"On Page 9 of the PowerPoint in front of you is a summary of the overall findings and next steps. The preceding slides focused on many of the specifics aspects of *The Illinois Commitment*. In terms of the overall findings, the Illinois system of higher education has indicated that there was significant progress in many of the areas initially established in 1999. Through the interviews and the survey, the analysis of what we have accomplished to date is the six goals established in 1999 remain valid and valued for the future as well.

"At the same time there were several challenges that were identified for future consideration, not just in regards to *The Illinois Commitment*, but also in regards to higher education in general. In terms of the stakeholder suggestions that we received, the majority stated that the six goals should be retained, but definitely much has changed since 1999 and we need to recognize that the priorities among the six goals have changed. The themes that we have heard -- affordability, accountability, and access -- are all opinions that have arisen from the progress and the change in priorities.

“There is a strong feeling among faculty and others within the higher education community that the goals should more prominently reflect higher education’s contribution to the state’s quality of life. You may remember the Faculty Advisory Council suggested a seventh goal to this end. Across the board, there was definite feeling that much needed to be done to enhance the broad-based visibility and buy-in to *The Illinois Commitment* and the strategies -- particularly the Governor, the General Assembly, as well as the public.

“As previously discussed, there is a definite need to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of accountability mechanisms to eliminate unnecessary reporting and focus on what is really needed by policymakers and the public. Through the interviews, we heard different perceptions within the higher education community, particularly that reporting was excessive and that other quality-control aspects are in place. As we talked with those outside of the higher education community, the General Assembly, and elsewhere, there were suggestions that perhaps more could be done to demonstrate higher education’s good stewardship of resources and we plan to look again at the effectiveness of that.

“There was a sense that the primary purpose of *The Illinois Commitment* needs to be clarified. There is some confusion as to whether or not what we have here is really a strategic plan with specific actions steps that will lead us through the next years, or whether it is more of a broad policy framework, within which the Board and higher education community will develop and establish specific objectives.

“Based on the information, the next steps will be for staff to put together a preliminary list of potential refinements that you might consider as an information item. This will be presented in June 2004. Following the June meeting, the higher education community and other key stakeholders will be asked to provide input on these refinements. Most likely we will put it out on the web, but also have meetings with other constituency groups. Final recommendations based on the input we receive will be presented for your consideration at the August meeting.

“I would like to recognize the excellent work of staff colleagues Silas McCormick and Sandi Gillilan, and consultant Kathleen Kelly in preparing these items.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “This is going to be revisited at our June meeting and then we are going to take action, correct?”

Dr. Layzell said, “Yes, June and August. That is correct.”

Chairman Kaplan said, “The comments of the stakeholders are in section 11b and they can be read by those folks that wish to do so. In June and August we will take action, is that correct?”

Dr. Layzell said, “Yes.”

12. Legislative Report

Mr. Sevenser said, “The General Assembly is at the halfway point of its spring session and the dominant issue concerns the state budget and the continuing bleak outlook for the state’s fiscal health.

“Board staff have begun a series of individual meetings with members of both the House Appropriations Higher Education Committee and the Senate Appropriations II Committee. We have used these sessions to advance the Board’s budget recommendations as representing the essential needs of the higher education system for Fiscal Year 2005, to explain the differences between those recommendations and the budget proposed by the Governor, and to explore issues raised by the divergent capital spending blueprints as recommended by the Board and proposed by the Administration.

“Testimony before each appropriations committee is scheduled for later this month. This is a budget session, but there are a few substantive bills and issues capturing our attention. The first of these is Senate Bill 3107, which would revamp the two minority incentive fellowship programs as recommended by the study of faculty diversity adopted by the Board last August. Sponsored by Senator del Valle, this bill would consolidate the Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity and the Illinois Minority Graduate Incentive Program under a single board with a strengthened focus on placing graduates in Illinois higher education faculty positions. It passed the Senate without dissent and now awaits a hearing in the House, where it is sponsored by Representative Kevin McCarthy, who chairs the House Higher Education Committee.

“One area of concern related to the Minority Graduate Incentive Program is the proposal in the Governor’s budget to transfer funding of the Illinois Consortium program to the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. Although ISAC does an exemplary job of operating various student grant programs, these graduate incentive efforts are unlike any other grants. We have advised Senator del Valle and others in the General Assembly that -- although we will work with ISAC to make these programs work no matter where they are administered -- we would prefer to have them remain with the IBHE.

“We also have been working with Representative McCarthy and a host of others in the higher education community, as well as advocates of early childhood education, to address his concerns over the articulation of community college programs in early childhood education with teacher training programs at the baccalaureate level. This is another issue that relates to the No Child Left Behind mandate.

“We have assisted Representative McCarthy -- along with the University of Illinois, the Illinois Community College Board, the State Board of Education, and early childhood advocates - - to draft a House resolution that will direct the Illinois P-16 Education Initiative to develop a model Associate of Arts in Teaching degree in early childhood education by 2006.

“Finally, there is another teacher education issue being addressed through companion bills that have passed each house -- Senate Bill 1550, sponsored by Senator Iris Martinez and House Bill 4788, sponsored by Representative Marlow Kolvin. Each is named the ‘Grow Our Own Teachers Education Act,’ and would establish competitive grant programs to fund consortia of public schools, a four-year institution with a teacher education department, perhaps a community college, and community-based organizations with a strong involvement in school reform efforts. The targeted clientele for this program is community-based advocates, involved parents, and paraprofessionals such as teacher aides. Both bills currently place administration of the grant program with the Illinois State Board of Education.”

Chairman Kaplan said, "Is there a reconciliation going on with the placement between ISAC and IBHE?"

Mr. Sevener said, "We are in discussion with Senator del Valle and others and have indicated that we would like for that to happen."

13. Consent Agenda

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

CA-1. Board Minutes - February 3, 2004

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the minutes of the February 3, 2004, meeting.

CA-2. Board Telephone Conference Minutes - February 24, 2004

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the minutes of the February 24, 2004 teleconference meeting.

CA-3. Financial Report

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the financial report dated February 29, 2004.

CA-4. Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program: Fiscal Year 2004 Grant Allocations

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program: Fiscal Year 2004 Grant Allocations.

CA-5. Engineering Grant Program: Fiscal Year 2004 Allocation

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Engineering Grant Program: Fiscal Year 2004 Allocation.

CA-6. Public University Non-Instructional Project Approval

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Public University Non-Instructional Project Approval.

CA-7. Public University Capital Project Approval

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Public University Capital Project Approval.

CA-8. Appropriation Transfers for Fiscal Year 2004

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Appropriation Transfers for Fiscal Year 2004.

14. Other Matters/Public Comment Period

Professor Gove said, "I have a correction to the minutes of the February 3, 2004, Board minutes. We voted to put off the approval of certain associate degree programs. There was a roll call vote on that which is not in the minutes. I would like for staff to amend that."

The following roll call votes are amended to the minutes of the February 3, 2004, Board meeting:

The roll call vote on Item 6 FY2005 Higher Education Budget Recommendations: Operations, Grants, and Capital Improvements, was as follows:

Yes - Alongi, Barr, Carroll, Gove, Kaplan, Meyer, Nandi, O'Kelly, Rutman, Sloan, Taslitz; No - Lamont.

The roll call vote on Item 7 Personnel Policies for Public Universities, was as follows:

Yes - Alongi, Barr, Carroll, Gove, Kaplan, Lamont, Meyer, Nandi, O'Kelly, Rutman, Sloan, Taslitz. No - none.

The roll call vote on Item 9 New Units of Instruction at Public Community Colleges, was as follows:

Yes - Alongi, Barr, Carroll, Kaplan, Lamont, Meyer, Nandi, O'Kelly, Rutman, Sloan, Taslitz; No - Gove.

Chairman Kaplan said, "The next Board meeting is Tuesday, June 8, 2004, at Richland Community College in Decatur."

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Kaplan adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Linda Oseland, Secretary to the Board.

Note: Copies of all items referred to in the minutes (i.e., letters, statements, reports, etc.) are on file with the official minutes of the April 13, 2004 meeting.