

Governors State University

OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship

Board of Trustees Meetings Materials and Recordings

Board of Trustees

8-24-2008

Proceedings of the Governors State Board of Trustees Retreat - August 24, 2008

Board of Trustees

Follow this and additional works at: https://opus.govst.edu/bot_meetings

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY

Board of Trustees Retreat, August 25-26, 2008 MINUTES

The Board of Trustees Retreat took place at Starved Rock Convention Center, Utica, IL, on Monday August 25, 2008 and Tuesday, August 26, 2008.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Samuels called the meeting to order on August 25, 2008 at 8:20 a.m. Roll call was taken, and the following Trustees were present: Lorine Samuels, Jack Beaupre, Kristi DeLaurentiis, Bruce Friefeld, Lois Mayer and Elizabeth Green.

Also present were: Dr. Elaine Maimon, President; Jane Rhoades Hudak, Provost; Gebe Ejigu, Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff; Alexis Kennedy, General Counsel; Joan Vaughan, Vice President of Institutional Advancement; Penny Perdue, Executive Assistant to the President; and Joan Johns, Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chair Samuels entertained a motion to go into Executive Session at 8:25 a.m. Mayer made a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining matters. Green seconded. A roll call vote was taken and the Board went into Executive Session. Trustees Samuels, Beaupre, DeLaurentiis, Friefeld and Green remained, as did Maimon, Hudak, Ejigu, and Kennedy.

A motion to adjourn the Executive Session was made by Beaupre at 9:08 a.m. Green seconded. Roll call was taken by Kennedy and all Trustees responded with ayes.

Samuels resumed open session at 9:20 a.m. The Board of Trustees met in Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining matters. No final action was taken.

ACTION ITEMS

Provost Hudak introduced **Resolution 09-01: Award of Professor Emerita to Dr. E. Joyce Mohberg**. Hudak recounted how it was a sad occasion in July when we lost Dr. Mohberg to illness. A memorial service is planned for September 19, 2008, and it is the University's wish to recognize Dr. Mohberg with this status at the service. She has fulfilled all the criteria for Professor Emerita status, with the exception that she cannot remain engaged in University activities due to her passing. DeLaurentiis made a motion to accept Resolution 09-01. Green seconded. DeLaurentiis asked if this bestowed any type of monetary compensation. Kennedy and Hudak both replied "no." Kennedy stated there is no question of making this award as far as the faculty is concerned, and therefore a formal vote of the faculty will not be necessary. The Trustees all responded with ayes to accept Resolution 09-01. Maimon thanked the Board for passing this resolution with the exception, stating it is important for the GSU Community to honor her on September 19 at 3:00 p.m. in Sherman Recital Hall. Dr. Mohberg was an exceptional educator and an important part of GSU's history. DeLaurentiis added that Dr. Mohberg was a fixture on campus in the best sense of the word.

INFORMATION ITEMS AND REPORTS RECEIVED

Draft Strategic Plan

Jim Mueller, facilitator, Professor Karen D'Arcy and Vice Provost John Stoll joined the meeting to discuss the latest draft of the Strategic Plan, dated August 14, 2008. Maimon introduced the topic by thanking the Board for giving in-depth time at the Retreat to the Strategic Plan. The goal is that by the end of the Retreat the group will be comfortable with the Strategic Plan, incorporating your suggestions from this session, and be able to finalize it. At the October Board of Trustees meeting it will be presented to the Board for adoption. She acknowledged special thanks to D'Arcy and Stoll who have shepherded the project from the start. Very special thanks were extended to Hudak and Ejigu as the administrators that have been working very closely with the Strategic Planning Committee. She then turned the floor over to Ejigu, who recounted that this is the culmination of a process that started last October. A visioning session facilitated by experts in strategic planning was held on November 16, 2007, and since then we have gone through a process that has been very thorough, reaching out to the GSU community and outside constituents. The process has been wonderful for the University.

Ejigu introduced facilitator Jim Mueller. He recounted a childhood story, the moral being don't ever underestimate people and don't try to force anyone in a direction they don't want to take. He plans to work within that framework today to help the Board envision and mold the final Strategic Plan. Mueller has studied the Draft Strategic Plan, as well as interviewed all the Trustees and President's Cabinet. He identified eight topics he found need to be addressed. They include:

1. Quality.
2. Diversity.
3. Public Square.
4. Geographic Reach.
5. Role in Economic Development.
6. Residential Life.
7. Foundation & Development.
8. Timetable and Benchmarks.

Mueller began by asking each Trustee their top three priorities from the above list. DeLaurentiis identified Residential Life; Quality; and Timetable and Benchmarks. Samuels: Quality; Diversity; and Foundation & Development. Beaupre: Quality; Diversity; and the Public Square. Friefeld: Quality; Public Square; and Geographic Reach. Mayer: Quality; Geographic Reach; and Foundation and Development. Green: Quality; Public Square; and Timetable and Benchmarks.

QUALITY was identified as a concern by all the Trustees. Samuels pondered whether GSU has the facility resources to implement the policies and programs desired. GSU has hard working faculty and staff, but also an aging population. She also pointed out there is nothing in the Strategic Plan that addresses the particular issue of security. DeLaurentiis cited security is listed under goal 4, but wondered if that was the appropriate spot and whether it is prominent enough. She would like to see it expanded. Beaupre maintained that we have as much responsibility to the faculty to advance their careers as we have to the students. He questioned what mechanism is in place to allow our faculty and staff to enhance their careers. Green expressed the need to improve the presentation of information to the GSU community.

Maimon responded to the concerns expressed. She stated the Strategic Plan will help GSU implement its goals. Working with the hands dealt by the State it is necessary to make tough

decisions, such as tuition and fee increases, to allow for the *minimal* resources needed to achieve the desired goals. The philanthropic goals in place are designed to increase the quality of our offerings. Quality means having very high standards for the retention and promotion of faculty, and having very high standards for the recruitment of faculty. A healthy institution makes sure that faculty learning and development is of utmost importance. Maimon stated she charged Hudak with spearheading increased efforts towards faculty development. For the first time, New Faculty Orientation will take place this fall. Hudak stated that previously GSU did not have a mechanism for faculty development. She has assigned Stoll to develop the “Centers of Excellence” for just this purpose. Faculty development has become a priority of the Provost’s office. Samuels asked if adjunct faculty were included in this initiative. Hudak replied that for the first time at GSU there will be adjunct faculty orientation to address the many unique issues of adjunct faculty. Maimon stated our goal is to employ more full time faculty and fewer adjuncts, which surfaced as an important aspect of the PBAC budget process. Deans have been instructed to manage their resources so they aren’t taking the easy way out and hiring adjunct faculty in an ongoing effort to rely less heavily on adjuncts.

Maimon cited another area of quality that needs to be addressed: graduation requirements. This will require a tough love approach towards students in order to ensure they have learned each subject adequately. Hudak recounted the plight of a former GSU student that graduated with a 1.0 GPA. They applied to one of GSU’s graduate programs and were denied. She queried how we could have graduated a student with a 1.0 GPA. Obviously standards have to be higher. Beaupre offered that the whole goal is to raise the University up to a higher level across the board. DeLaurentiis stated it is her belief the University is responsible for helping students successfully complete their program of study once they are accepted into our doors. Hudak responded that advising is one area in particular being addressed to improve student success.

DeLaurentiis addressed goal 1.b.: *Increase to 1000 the number of students enrolled under dual-admission agreements with partner community colleges.* She emphasized the need to support the under-grad completion of a degree, in particular community college transfer students. Maimon relayed that there are two lower division courses from Prairie State College being taught at GSU in the fall trimester. An Outreach Coordinator has been appointed to work with the community colleges in helping students have a seamless transition from community college to GSU.

Mueller concluded the discussion on Quality by stating the standards that are emerging and how they are applied is at the core of the quality question.

PUBLIC SQUARE is a concept that many feel is vague. Green recalled that Maimon attended a student honors program and did an outstanding job of explaining the concept. Friefeld stated it is a concept that teaches our students how to give back to the community. DeLaurentiis questioned how well known the terminology is, and would it continually require explanation. Maimon stated it would “not hurt her feelings” if the term Public Square was taken out of the formal plan. D’Arcy explained that it has been a challenge to find another phrase that is as descriptive, and therefore the committee has been reluctant to surrender it. It is the role GSU aspires to play in the community. Friefeld felt it was a great metaphor. Beaupre stated that as chairman of the Presidential Search Committee he felt the metaphor of Public Square was exactly what the University was looking for. His only reservation was that it may not convey reaching out to the larger community. Maimon responded by stating the metaphor puts a unique branding on GSU; the university of the 21st century must be a Public Square, not an ivory tower. It defines joint ownership; a defined public space that we all share a part of and responsibility for. DeLaurentiis cautioned that we should be prepared to define it and defend it.

The discussion segued to GEOGRAPHIC REACH, with Beaupre asking how far beyond GSU to carry the Public Square. Friefeld offered that some people will think of the Public Square as setting boundaries; however it should create a place where there is an exchange of ideas and the boundaries are limitless. Of course it is important to serve the local population, however the Public Square can go far beyond the local region. Maimon explained that the GSU 750 acre main campus is the core, with current off-campus sites in Kankakee and Naperville. Currently there are no plans to look at other sites, but rather to institute bridge courses at community college campuses with a recruitment model rather than a geographic service model. In this endeavor a great deal of work is being put forth to strengthen the ties with the feeder community colleges. GSU is the only public university in a very large geographic area and with it comes great responsibility. As far as national outreach, Maimon explained it is very important to have intellectual excitement of our programs to attract students from far and wide, while keeping in mind GSU is a State of Illinois public university that has a duty to serve those students. Hudak added that the University is committed to serving the international student population.

Samuels called for a short break at 11:06 a.m. Open Session resumed at 11:23 a.m.

The next topic of discussion was DIVERSITY. DeLaurentiis observed that diversity is mentioned throughout the plan, but not a definition, plan, or goals to strive for. Mueller asked what strides GSU has made in terms of diversity. Beaupre stated he believes it is one of our strengths, being one of the most diverse universities around. DeLaurentiis agreed, but cautioned it would be unwise to rest on our laurels, which is why she recommends having goals. Beaupre stated this is an area where benchmarks are a real problem because they can be perceived as a quota system.

Mueller asked the group to define its vision of diversity at its best at GSU. Samuels stated it would be broad spectrum, including socioeconomic, ethnic, race, gender, etc., to include students, staff, and faculty. Maimon explained that Hudak and Ejigu are establishing a Diversity Council at GSU, which will be a very high powered group to look at all these issues. She has established such committees at other universities and they were highly successful. Another aspect of diversity she pointed out was diversity of outlook. The Cabinet, Deans, Administrators and staff are diverse in their thinking and bring different conceptual approaches to the table. From a student angle our outreach to community colleges is a diversity issue because the vast majority of students of color start their education at a community college, not only locally but nationally as well. Therefore the emphasis in the Strategic Plan to reach out to community colleges is imperative. Hudak pointed out GSU's age diversity, having had a 75 year old graduate at Commencement in June. Maimon pointed out the diversity of gender in prominent appointments throughout the University. DeLaurentiis encouraged the group to look at bilingual/multilingual faculty hiring in the future, as well as provide multilingual tutoring. Ejigu concurred what Beaupre said earlier, that generally speaking GSU has been very successful in building a diverse community. However he does find disturbing the decreasing enrollment of Latinos. There are also very few Latino faculty. That population is increasing but students don't seem to be attracted to GSU. It is important to improve this situation.

Vaughan began the discussion on FOUNDATION AND DEVELOPMENT. GSU Foundation President Bill Saunders addressed the Board of Trustees in June, at which time he made it clear the Foundation was taking a new approach to bringing resources to the University. This approach is based on relationship building. An electronic database is being instituted to track and manage the University's relationships with potential donors. The other entities under Institutional Advancement are following suit. The Strategic Plan will assist in decision making to achieve these new goals. In FY08 the Foundation raised over \$400,000; the goal for FY09 is \$720,000.

Ejigu asked Vaughan for her assessment of how successful the Foundation will be with these goals. Vaughan conceded these goals are lofty, especially since the necessary infrastructure is not in place. However the Board is committed and determined to meet the goals set. Vaughan explained that realistically it takes 18 months of relationship building to achieve large gifts; therefore part of the current efforts will entail going back to the people that have made substantial commitments in the past and ask for their continued support. Samuels questioned whether being a public institution creates any obstacles that a private institution would not face. Vaughan replied yes; people assume the State will fund all of the University's needs; however given the present economy the realization that it cannot rely on state funding is becoming better understood. Maimon reiterated what Vaughan expressed; in essence that this is practically a start-up enterprise and it is very challenging, however it is being addressed systematically and vigilantly.

DeLaurentiis began the discussion on RESIDENTIAL LIFE by asking, "What is the plan?" Mayer stated student housing was needed. Green wondered when it would go into effect, while Samuels questioned how such a project would be financed. DeLaurentiis emphasized the need to avoid the pitfalls that have plagued other institutions. Ejigu explained that GSU is approaching student housing in a way that will not require an upfront or ongoing financial impact for the institution. In other words, if the Board expresses an interest in pursuing student housing the University will embark on forming a public/private partnership. This entails requesting proposals and inviting firms to develop a plan within the guidelines we specify. Nationally there are 6-10 developers that have cornered the market. The selected party works with the institution in either creating a project based 501(c)3 corporation, or using an existing tax-exempt entity of the University such as the Foundation. The developer does all due diligence to make sure it is financially feasible, and their study is what financing is secured upon. The University assumes no financial risk under that arrangement. The only encumbrance is the ground lease to the developer, typically 30-35 years. Typically the title to the land will stay with the university. Most projects he has studied or been a part of have been successful. Failures are typically due to using the wrong developer, poor property management, or not enough amenities attractive to students.

The real issue on the table is whether student housing is needed at GSU. Ejigu stated he believes there is a need and a demand. The University is constantly in touch with the owners of Brittany Woods and the University Park Police Department, where many of the international students live. It is not a safe environment and it is the responsibility of the University to serve the students better. A survey done at GSU in fall 2007 overwhelming indicated there is a demand for student housing. Studies have shown that there is a good educational purpose for student housing. It enriches campus life. It creates very happy graduates that end up being committed supporters of the institution. There is also a higher success rate among graduates.

Ejigu stressed that the timing of such a project is a function of the marketplace. If the Board approves pursuing housing the project will be fast tracked. The list of companies in the White Paper is those that have cornered the market. They are experienced. They know how to work with the system. However the Request for Proposal will be an open bid request and it is likely numerous responses will come in. The Administration will come back to the October Board of Trustees Meeting to discuss how it would like to proceed. The analysis process is long; however once a partner has been chosen they will be the ones that perform extensive due diligence work in order to access the capital market. If the project is fast tracked it is feasible to have student housing as early as January 2010.

Samuels asked how management control over the facility would be maintained. Ejigu emphasized the University will not recommend an arrangement where the University does not have control over management control of the housing. That may include on-site living of a Resident Assistant,

on-site tutoring and computer labs, recreation activities, etc. This will be stipulated in the RFP. Maimon agreed that control over the management of housing is an absolute must. One option is to allow the developer to manage the housing under a wholly owned subsidiary, while another is to manage the facility on behalf of the developer. Discussion ensued on single vs. married housing, international students, room options, and “going green” in the development. The consensus at the end of the discussion was that the potential for student housing should be pursued.

Mueller asked what the critical questions are regarding ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. Samuels questioned how to go about marketing GSU as an economic catalyst in the area. She stated she did not think enough has been done to let the region know the impact GSU has on the Southland region. Ejigu offered that most universities do an economic impact study, using their own faculty, and he recommended doing one. However generally speaking it is common knowledge that universities contribute significantly to the surrounding area. He estimated the economic impact of GSU to be \$200M. He pointed out that there are an increasing number of grant donors and as those grow they will positively impact the region. He also pointed out the tremendous resources on the University campus. Maimon urged verifying the data; for example, “Are we the largest employer in Will County?” The economic impact of research, particularly in health care, needs to be marketed. Center Pointe is doing phenomenal work with local entrepreneurs. She urged commencing work on collecting the data and getting the information out to the public.

Chair Samuels called for a lunch break at 12:36 p.m. The meeting resumed at 12:53 p.m.

Mueller introduced the topic of TIMETABLE AND BENCHMARKS by asking, “How are we going to put the Strategic Plan to work?” Ejigu stated that once the Board adopts the final Strategic Plan the real work will begin. There will be a series of operational plans, first and foremost of which will be an academic plan. Hudak stated at the recent Provost’s Council Retreat a template was developed that outlines who is responsible for what, timelines, and measurable outcomes to track progress. Currently a prioritized list of objectives is being written. Ejigu reported The Site Master Plan should be complete in the fall of 2008. This will help to prioritize projects, and in turn determine the scope of the financial plan. Projections, assessments, and assumptions need to be tracked. An annual evaluation and reporting of progress is necessary. DeLaurentiis mentioned the University of Wisconsin-Stout Award Winning Strategic Plan, and how they reported on the plan’s progress to stakeholders. Ejigu agreed that is an important aspect of an effective operational plan.

Samuels thanked Mueller for facilitating the Board session on strategic planning. That portion of the agenda concluded at 1:14 p.m.

GOVERNANCE ISSUES

Ethics Training

Kennedy presented on ethics and conflicts of interest. She stated the AGB recommends all Trustees formally discuss ethics on a yearly basis. Starting in the fall the University has to administer and manage ethics training to all employees. In addition the external auditors will be back on campus. The AGB allows for the Board to meet privately with the auditors if requested. The AGB also recommends new trustee orientation, which will be an issue once the governor appoints new trustees to the Board. Ethics and conflicts of interest are important aspects of that training. Trustees should have discussions and include in their bylaws what the principles of trusteeship are. In their discussions the trustees should also address anticipated issues including but not limited to conflicts of interest, trustee perks, requests for employment, etc. Former Board

Chair Friefeld explained that the Chair should be the one to address any such issues brought before the Board, and the issue will be addressed as a Board, not individually.

BOT Bylaws and Regulations

Friefeld and Kennedy presented. Kennedy explained the current BOT Bylaws were passed in 1996, and there do not appear to have been any revisions in the interim. Therefore it certainly is time for a review of the bylaws. She explained the methodology utilized to revise them including moving items for better structure, refining verbiage, assessing statutory items (not subject to a lot of revision), and taking into account AGB bylaw recommendations. It was reiterated that the Board of Trustees is the ultimate authority for the University. Kennedy stated that since there are numerous revisions being made at one time they will be presented to the Board as a whole for adoption at the October meeting, rather than addressing each revision separately. Kennedy then went on to outline the suggested amendments. The proposed revisions were provided to the Trustees as a handout. She asked the Trustees to email any further suggestions to her, and a new draft will be provided to the Trustees prior to the October meeting. The committee meetings are currently scheduled for Friday, October 10, 2008, with the Full Board Meeting being held on Friday, October 17, 2008.

Plan for Updating and Revising HR-Related Regulations

Ejigu and Gail Bradshaw, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity, presented. Ejigu introduced the topic, explaining that some policies and practices do not reflect current practices. For example, GSU currently has a practice of entering into Special Services Contracts which essentially pay an employee for work that is not specifically listed in their job description. Ejigu and Bradshaw have been studying these contracts, which have amounted to a significant sum of money. As Chief of Staff, Ejigu is asked to sign-off on these contracts, however over the past year he has markedly reduced the number he has approved. To that end this practice as well as many others is being scrutinized and new procedures are being put in place. Ejigu praised Bradshaw for the experience she brings to the project and the hard work she has put into it.

Bradshaw stated that most HR regulations can be found in Section II of the Board Regulations. She has researched other state universities and almost all read word for word the same as when instituted by the Board of Governors in 1996. Issues that need updating include the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act, call to active duty, as well as others. DeLaurentiis, Board Representative to the Civil Service Merit Board, stated it too is undertaking some revisions to better reflect current conditions. Bradshaw stated that HR currently has some practices that will be formalized into policies within the scope of this project. She reiterated the need to get control of those policies and practices, and how they are applied. Beaupre related that policies are typically written as management tools, but they need to be clearly defined and enforced. If not there can be considerable legal consequences, and this is something that needs to be cleared up. Once done management can be better trained to implement those policies.

Break

BUDGETING

Study Session on the GSU Operating Budget

Ejigu, Jeff Slovak, Deputy Vice President for Administration and Finance, and Karen Kissel, Associate Vice President for Financial Services and Comptroller, presented. Ejigu opened by explaining a presentation on the budget process is primarily being done to respond to the Board's inquiries on resource allocation. It also makes sense to have a governing board that is familiar

with the policies and practices of allocating resources. He also stated that guidance from the Board is being sought because the FY09 Operating Budget will come before the Board for approval at the October meeting.

The discussion was enhanced by a PowerPoint presentation from Kissel. Ejigu explained the purpose of the Planning and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC), which is three-fold: 1) to create effective links and relationships between planning, priority setting, and resource allocations; 2) to promote transparency and accountability; and 3) to ensure meaningful participation by appropriate governance groups. The charges and expectations of PBAC are to 1) provide leadership and guidance for the continuous improvement of GSU's planning and budgeting processes; 2) provide guidance for the annual allocation of resources; and 3) to review and advise the President on all fees and charges. The strategic goals and priorities of PBAC were outlined:

1. Enrollment and retention through graduation.
2. Quality instruction and scholarship.
3. Innovation and improved productivity.
4. Enhanced collaboration and partnerships.
5. Diversified revenue sources through philanthropy.

Slovak provided an explanation of the timeline and the budget hearing process that produced the FY09 Budget Proposal (it does not include salary increases previously approved). He stated the entire process was completed before the governor's proposed budget, and it was that uncertainty that drove a very conservative strategy. Ejigu echoed Slovak's statement. Kissel provided Ejigu with a statement from the State Comptroller's office, which is 30 days in arrears in reimbursing state universities. She stated GSU's conservative approach to budgeting will aid the University in getting through these difficult economic times.

Maimon praised the PBAC Budget Process, stating the budget management training the Deans received was crucial to its success. She stated it was the best first year implementation of such a process she had ever experienced. The process raised a lot of good questions along the way. Ejigu added that another benefit was it allowed for the correction of some anomalies, i.e. tenured faculty being paid out of soft money, and moved budget lines as appropriate. Maimon noted that the majority of budget increases went to academic units.

Slovak moved onto a discussion of the FY10 Budget. IBHE requests the development of that budget begin now. At the October meeting the Administration will make FY10 appropriation requests to the IBHE, who in turn will compile these requests into their total higher education budget requests, confer with university presidents, and submit a budget proposal to the governor in February 2009. Also in February the Administration will bring before the Board formal proposals for tuition and fees for FY10.

Kissel provided an update on the financing of deferred maintenance. She explained a sale of bonds can only be done once a year. An informational report will be presented at the October meeting to prepare for discussion in December when the Board will be asked to approve the sale of additional bonds. Maimon praised Ejigu, stating his personal review of all the bids led to re-bidding that saved the University over \$1.2M. Ejigu in turn praised the Deferred Maintenance Team and their excellent management of each of these projects.

At 4:09 p.m. Chair Samuels called for a recess until the next morning.

August 26, 2008

Chair Samuels called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

REPORTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

Academic Calendar Changes Update

Hudak presented a PowerPoint and a handout. Hudak recounted how she instituted an Academic Calendar Task Force, led by Dean Linda Samson, shortly after coming to GSU in order to study the current academic calendar and suggest changes to better serve the students. Numerous problems were identified. Countless WHY NOT? suggestions to change the academic calendar have been received. The Board was informed of the new task force at the April 18, 2008 meeting, and was briefed again at the June 9, 2008 meeting. The task force completed their study in a timely fashion and submitted a report, suggesting three options, to the Provost on July 23, 2008. Option 1 was the overwhelming favorite, outlining 15-week fall and spring semesters, and a 12-week summer session. The report was presented to Cabinet, the Provost's Council, and the Faculty Senate. After presenting to the Board today, the task force will hold two town hall meetings on September 9 and 10 to solicit input from faculty. At Convocation September 11 Maimon will also discuss changing the academic calendar. The goal is to implement the change in either AY09-10 or AY 10-11.

DeLaurentiis asked about historical information as to why the calendar was set up this way. Maimon replied that Samson found some information pointing to the emphasis on GSU's uniqueness when it first opened. DeLaurentiis asked if block scheduling would continue and Hudak replied "yes." Mayer asked if accelerated courses would still be available. Maimon replied "yes." She acknowledged there is some pushback from faculty because they aren't used to teaching this way, however a choice of teaching 4-week or 8-week blocks in the summer will be given. The faculty is being asked to think more flexibly about their time. Hudak reiterated that this is a work in progress, and acknowledged the transition will be painful for some, however in the long run it is believed it will be beneficial to all. A fortunate aspect is that curriculum will not have to change at all, and the workload will be the same for faculty (currently a 10-month contract). However the UPI contract is up for negotiation in 2009. During the last contract bargaining Samson recalled the faculty wanted a 9-month contract. Hudak stated she will not allow faculty to use changing the academic calendar as a bargaining issue, stressing it is a delicate balance.

Samuels asked whether any other universities utilized a trimester schedule. Hudak replied "no." Many universities use a quarter system, but our trimester system is very unique, and it is very difficult to find any advantages to it. Friefeld supported changing to a semester calendar system and asked if it would help the Administration to have a resolution from the Board at the October meeting to implement this. Both Maimon and Hudak replied "yes, very helpful." DeLaurentiis wondered if further calendar options should be explored, with Friefeld replying that he felt Option 1 should be implemented as outlined. Ejigu cautioned the need to think it through thoroughly because of the upcoming collective bargaining with UPI. Kennedy recommended drafting a resolution that is initiated to improve the University. Friefeld stressed that this has to do with policy, and that is our job: form and enforce University policy. Maimon reiterated that Board support is very important in garnering acceptance of a calendar change. DeLaurentiis concluded the discussion by asking if there were any budget implications, to which Hudak replied as far as has been determined thus far it will not cost anymore to deliver classes. In addition there is the potential to increase summer session revenue.

Reorganization of the School of Interdisciplinary Learning (SIDL)

Hudak presented a PowerPoint and a handout on the subject. She explained that in the recent past the SIDL program had an embarrassing lack of rigor. The program was not located in an academic college, and it was called a “school” but did not qualify as a higher education school. It’s a program, a good program, but not a school. There have also been accreditation issues. The past director was not qualified to run the program, and was not tenured. In addition the program advisors were approving poor curricular choices and granting graduation status to students that were unqualified. The faculty’s perception was that the quality of the program had diminished, citing regular incidences of being asked by the director and the advisors to bend the rules, even at the expense of accreditation and certification standards (ex: Early Childhood Education). Standards were being compromised. Samuels questioned whether the students actually were being helped to which Hudak replied they were not. They were not earning the credentials needed to thrive in their careers.” She went on to say she felt the program could really grow if put into a college and the standards were elevated.

Hudak gave an update on recent activities in the School of Interdisciplinary Learning. Dr. Michele McMaster resigned as Director. Dr. Jim Howley was named Interim Director July 1. The advisors moved to the Office of Admissions July 1, and SIDL moved into the College of Arts and Sciences. Dean Eric Martin has communicated with other SIDL program directors across the state. This fall a national search for a director will be initiated. CAS has reconfigured the Dean’s office suite to provide space for the permanent director and a staff person. Beaupre asked if it was necessary to go before a governing board to institute these changes and Maimon replied no, however if the program/degree requirements were changed then it would be necessary to go before the IBHE. Maimon noted that historically the SIDL degree program was in CAS; however it broke off into a “school” with no faculty in the past several years, and was done without the consultation of faculty. In essence, then, the original program is being restored. She stated many of the faculty were offended by the way it was moved out of CAS in the past, and are happy to see the program restored to its previous position in the University. Ejigu stated the Board rules and regulations are now very clear, and any change in a College requires specific Board approval. The Board has to be vigilant in enforcing these Board policies.

Maimon and Hudak detailed a plan being implemented to serve our military with this degree. DeLaurentiis stated she has read about other universities initiating special programs for returning vets, and she thought it was an excellent opportunity to provide a service, engage military, and generate very good press. Maimon stated she wanted GSU to be the institution to lead in this initiative. She explained that the State of Illinois has a law that allows veterans to receive a free education; however the State does not reimburse the University. There are some federal funds in the GI Bill; however the University may not see any of that. Therefore GSU will serve veterans at its own cost. DeLaurentiis stated that during the reaccreditation process we should get a good look at how our programs are doing. She expressed concern that if the SIDL program was lacking, other programs may be lacking too. Hudak stated that she will report to the Board at each meeting on all program reporting and concerns with regard to the IBHE.

Suggested Change of Venue for Commencement

Vaughan reported. She explained the limitations of the Tinley Park Convention Center. A search of the Southland and Chicago was done, looking for a venue that would accommodate an unlimited number of guests for each graduate. The “House of Hope” in Chicago was identified as a possible alternative. It is home to a church congregation, lead by Senator Reverend James Meeks, but its auditorium arena also accommodates trade shows, conventions, graduations, concerts, and sporting events. It can seat 10,000, with parking for 2000. The cost to rent it for Commencement probably will be less than the Tinley Park Convention Center, whose price has

risen from \$33,000 to \$40,000. Ejigu described Tinley Park's lack of space for students, faculty, and family to mingle after the ceremony. He, Hudak, and Karen Caesar Smith, Director of Event Planning, toured the House of Hope and the consensus was that it was the kind of facility needed. Maimon explained that there are no religious symbols within the venue; it has an auditorium feel. (Several pictures of House of Hope were provided to the Trustees.) She did not believe holding Commencement there would indicate any alignment with Senator Rev. Meeks. Friefeld responded by stating that no matter what we say, others will think we are aligning with Meeks. DeLaurentiis added that she thinks this could be a very risky move. Meeks may be running for governor in the next gubernatorial race.

Mayer asked what other venues had been looked into. Maimon stated a thorough search was done of both Cook and Will Counties, and House of Hope was the one that most closely met our needs. Green stated that she had submitted this as a Why Not?, and she thinks it is a great location. DeLaurentiis replied that she wanted Commencement to come back to campus because it is more moving and personal. Maimon agreed, stating the goal of this administration is to bring Commencement back to campus. However until a multimillion dollar facility can be built on campus it will be necessary to find a better venue as a temporary measure. There is the option of returning to Tinley Park, but at a greater expense. Friefeld stated he could live with this choice for the winter 2009 Commencement. He expressed strong reservations about any affiliation with a religious venue. He advised against using State funds to support the work of Senator Rev. Meeks, as ultimately it is unknown exactly where the money will go. Maimon stated that the honorary degree for the winter 2009 Commencement is being given to School Superintendent Blondean Davis, who has a very good relationship with Meeks and other politicians. She admitted this could be good and bad; however she could see how it could be interpreted by others in a bad light.

Ejigu stated that it was not necessary to make a decision today. Maimon reiterated by stating the Trustees had been heard and the issue will be reconsidered. In the meantime ongoing systematic plans to bring Commencement back to campus will continue. She thanked the Board for their very helpful input.

Administration Report

Ejigu reported on some good news. At the last Board meeting a contract award was approved for the reconstruction of Parking Lot B, using permeable pavers, and coming in under the expected budget. A contract for Lot C is being fast tracked in an effort to take advantage of the fact that the contractor will be on site for the next two months. It is felt that the reconstruction can be done this season, before winter. If the bids that come in are acceptable they will be brought before the Board for authorization to proceed with the award of a contract for this construction season. Friefeld stated the Executive Committee could approve this action before the next Full Board Meeting if necessary.

Repair of the Motor Control Center continues. Ejigu's staff was able to negotiate a significant savings on the contract by allowing three power outages, which will enable the contractor to complete a great deal of work in a shorter period of time. The outages will occur on Saturday and Sunday, October 4 and 5; Thursday November 27 (Thanksgiving) through Sunday November 30; and over the holiday break between Christmas and New Year's Day. He explained temporary power will be available for labs, ITS, DPS, and food service. DPS will be on site throughout each power outage.

Ejigu explained there have also been a number of small improvements on campus. Outdoor seating was installed; classroom furniture has been replaced; White Boards have been installed in

classrooms; rooms and hallways have been painted; obsolete TV equipment has been removed and replaced in classrooms; and the carpet in E and F wings will be replaced using a type of carpet that can be removed and reused when renovations take place.

Closing Remarks

Maimon opened by stating the Retreat has been a very valuable experience. She gave special thanks for the full participation of the Board. Samuels summed up her thoughts on the Retreat, stating she thinks the Administration will benefit if the Trustees continue to share their observations, comments, and suggestions. She felt it was a highly effective Retreat, having dealt with important issues that will have a lasting positive impact on the future of GSU. She thanked Friefeld and Kennedy for the hard work they put into revising the Board Bylaws. She praised Ejigu for the in-depth presentations and discussions on the budget. Samuels thanked Maimon for the many initiatives she has started and her speed in accomplishing so much in so little time. She concluded by thanking her fellow Trustees for their dedication to the service of this great University. Samuels turned the floor over to the other Trustees for their comments.

Mayer praised the Administrative team for their tremendous planning, observing that every detail seems to be grounded in the needs of the student. She requested more information on student housing at Purdue University Calumet at the next meeting. Friefeld expressed his thanks to the Administration and Staff for a good Retreat. He stated that he felt fortunate to have been here (on the Board) from the beginning, and to be working with an Administration that is focused on the University and moving us into the 21st century. He expressed special appreciation for the transparency and great communication, and sees nothing but good things ahead for GSU. Green followed up by stating Trustee Friefeld said it all. She expressed how proud she is to be on this Board, working with such a phenomenal Administration. Beaupre stated those were his sentiments as well, especially in regard to the Administration and how things are moving along. It is very valuable to have these retreats and re-focus on our responsibilities as Trustees. DeLaurentiis found the Retreat very informative in terms of all the moving parts and pieces we are working with. Faced with many issues and challenges it has allowed the Board to add perspective and guidance to their decisions. She echoed the other Trustees on congratulating Maimon for putting the Administration on the right track.

Information Item

Board of Trustees Meeting Calendar Dates for 2009 was presented.

Maimon concluded the meeting by expressing her appreciation for the hard work of the Board, especially in light of being down two members. Samuels entertained a motion to adjourn. DeLaurentiis made a motion. Green seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Johns