

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

OF THE

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**

---

**February 19, 2004**



This special meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois was held in Chicago Rooms B & C, Chicago Illini Union, Chicago campus, Chicago, Illinois, on Thursday, February 19, 2004, beginning at 1:35 p.m., pursuant to a call by the chair of the board. The secretary of the board gave notice of the meeting as prescribed by the bylaws and by Illinois statute.

Chair Lawrence C. Eppley called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to call the roll. The following members of the board were present: Mr. Devon C. Bruce,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Frances G. Carroll, Mr. Lawrence C. Eppley, Dr. Jeffrey Gindorf, Dr. Kenneth D. Schmidt, Mr. Niranjana S. Shah, Mrs. Marjorie E. Sodemann, Mr. Robert Y. Sperling. The following members of the board were absent: Governor Rod Blagojevich, Mr. Robert F. Vickrey. Mr. Nate H. Allen, voting student trustee from the Urbana-Champaign campus, was present. The following nonvoting student trustees were present: Ms. Natalie A. Garcia, Chicago campus; Mr. Andrew M. Hollingsead, Springfield campus.

Also present were President James J. Stukel; Dr. Chester S. Gardner, vice president for academic affairs; Dr. David L. Chicoine, vice president for technology and economic development; Dr. Nancy Cantor, chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Dr. Sylvia Manning, chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago; Dr. Richard D. Ringeisen, chancellor, Uni-

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Bruce joined the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

versity of Illinois at Springfield; and the officers of the board, Mr. Stephen K. Rugg, comptroller (and vice president for administration); Mr. Thomas R. Bearrows, university counsel; Mr. Lester H. McKeever, Jr., treasurer; and Dr. Michele M. Thompson, secretary. In addition, the following persons were also in attendance: Mr. Richard M. Schoell, executive director for governmental relations; Mr. Thomas P. Hardy, executive director for university relations; Ms. Susan J. Sindelar, executive assistant to the president; and Ms. Marna K. Fuesting, assistant secretary.

President Stukel recognized and introduced observers from the campus senates and from the University Senates Conference.<sup>1</sup>

Next, Mr. Eppley stated that for this very special meeting of the board to discuss the search for a new president to succeed President James J. Stukel, he would introduce several guests attending the meeting to brief the board on various aspects of the task of selecting a new president. He then introduced Dr. Stanley O. Ikenberry, president emeritus; Mr. Thomas R. Lamont, a former trustee who chaired the last presidential search; Dr. Patricia A. Langley, professor of women's studies and legal studies, Springfield; Dr. Michael Grossman, professor of genetics in the Department of Animal Sciences, Urbana; and Dr. Gerald S. Strom, professor of political science, Chicago. Mr. Eppley explained that each of these three faculty members are leaders of their campus senates and members of the University Senates Conference that Dr. Langley chairs. He particularly thanked these three for their assistance in helping with the composition of the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President. He then introduced Dr. Richard H. Herman, provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs, Urbana, and said Dr. Herman would address the board on the subject of the role of search firms assisting in searches for university administrators, based on his experience in recruiting several deans for the Urbana campus. Next, Mr. Eppley introduced Dr. Vera Mainz, chair of the University Professional Personnel Advisory Committee that represents the academic professional staff at the University, and said that she would comment on what the academic professional staff believes the board should consider in their search for a president. He then introduced Mr. Dan Sarhage, chair of the Employees Advisory Committee, representing the civil service staff of the three campuses, and said that he would bring the board views from that group. Next, Mr. Eppley introduced Mr. Mark Filip, Mr. Thomas Livingston, and Mr. Kenneth Viste, Jr., who were present representing the University of Illinois Alumni Association Board of Directors and said that they would share views of that group. He then introduced Mr. David J. Downey and Mr. Steven Miller, representing the University of Illinois Foundation Board of Directors, and stated that they would bring comments from that group. Mr. Eppley indicated that some of these individuals would be addressing the board later in the meeting.

<sup>1</sup>University Senates Conference: Ann E. Weller, professor of library science, Chicago; Chicago Senate: Elliot Kaufman, professor of biochemistry and molecular genetics; Springfield Senate: Nancy L. Ford, professor of legal studies in the Institute for Legal, Administrative and Policy Studies; Urbana-Champaign Senate: Michael Grossman, professor of genetics in the Department of Animal Sciences.

### **REMARKS FROM CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Eppley stated that he wanted to underscore the significance of the task at hand, to search for a new president for our University and said that he meant “our” in the broadest context, and said that the contributions and efforts of all would prove invaluable to the future of the institution.

He said that the board begins this task from a position of strength; that the national reputation of the University is excellent, due largely to the attention and efforts of the countless contributors who have come before. He also stated that, “the excellence of our faculty is evident, our student population is growing as it strengthens, our role as a vital contributor to the local, State, regional, and national economies has seldom been more crucial, and our devotion to our four missions leads us to further success.”

Mr. Eppley stated that the board would commit itself to finding and recruiting the very best person to lead the University to the next level. He said that it has been good fortune to have Jim Stukel fill that role for the last nine years, and that the board would have to work hard to find an individual worthy of taking on the leadership for this institution and helping it to grow and prosper.

He said that while the board accepts its responsibility as the ultimate decision maker, the board embraces the opportunity to collaborate with the broad community of the University and he stressed the importance of input from faculty, alumni, staff, students, and others in the University of Illinois family. He concluded by stating that the board’s commitment to the effort is reflected in the advisory committee composition and in the charge to the committee, and added that it is also reflected in the meeting today, where the board will have the benefit of others’ experiences and insights.

### **INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT EMERITUS IKENBERRY**

Mr. Eppley then introduced President Emeritus Stanley O. Ikenberry and invited him to share observations on the nature of the University presidency in institutions like the University of Illinois.

#### **Remarks by President Emeritus Stanley O. Ikenberry**

President Ikenberry commented that the task of searching for a president was indeed a very important one for the board and said it was fortunate that the boards of the University had had to engage in this just twice in the last 25 years. He told the board that they would be judged collectively on the decision and that if they were successful they would leave a legacy beyond their individual tenures on the board. He said that what the board does in selecting the next president is important in many ways, including the future of the State, as there is probably no single strategic resource more important to the State than the University. He emphasized that the presidency was about leadership—gaining and grasping a vision, and said that though candidates will not have this in the beginning, their own individual vision would need to equip them to learn from the board, the faculty, and the environment and synthesize all of the thinking of these groups and the

information available into a cohesive message to describe the University's vision. He stressed the need for abundant communication and said that a president needs to be in constant communication and in substantive discussions with a wide range of constituencies—from groups inside the University to external groups including the legislature, editorial boards, alumni, and professional societies. He said that the challenge of the presidency is to integrate the life and functioning of the University with the broader outside world, and to lead both to change in constructive ways.

Next, he spoke to the nature of the university and how intangible and thoroughly unique many aspects of any university are. He stressed the fact that a university is a community with many members living together constantly. He also noted the large number of stakeholders in a university like the University of Illinois and the need for a leader to understand all of them and to manage linkages.

Next, he addressed the specific characteristics of the University of Illinois and pointed out how important it would be for the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President and the board to be able to define the individual traits of the University at this time. He explained that this would include knowing what was on the agenda for the University for the next five to ten years, how the University really functions now, and what challenges lie ahead in this time frame of five to ten years. He stressed the importance of knowing these things in order to present the University externally and to inform the candidates for the presidency. He suggested the following as important things for candidates to know immediately: the outstanding academic programs on the three campuses; the strengths and weaknesses in these areas and others; the strategic issues for each campus; and finally, a definition of a land-grant institution in the 21st century. He opined that there was a crisis in higher education regarding the role of land-grant institutions and that redefinition was in the offing. He also suggested that having a plan for balancing income and resources in the long run was needed.

President Ikenberry then commented on the nature of the University in terms of whether it was a university or a university system, and said that the limited number of campuses made it more of a hybrid, which makes it very important to be able to describe the relationships among leaders within the University. Adding to this he said that he thought it important for a president to develop roots within the university and to know the internal operations intimately, because these are the basis for making beneficial decisions for the future of the institution, and to interpret it to the outside world.

As for personal characteristics in a president he said that a president must be one who can mobilize plans and build consensus, as well as build teams. He also observed that presidents tend to fail because of personal weaknesses, and that it would be important for the board to identify someone who could move from one situation to another instantaneously and maintain personal equilibrium, even in the face of intensely emotional situ-

ations. He added that the person must be comfortable living in a highly visible position as well. He stated that trust, confidence, and integrity were essential.

In concluding his remarks, President Ikenberry stressed the importance of thinking long-term and being pro-active in seeking out candidates, noting that the best candidates will have to be sought out. He also emphasized the need for confidentiality to optimize the candidate pool, and he cautioned against damaging an individual by a breach of confidentiality. He also assured the board that the position of president of the University of Illinois is an incredible opportunity and will be one of the prime higher education leadership posts available.

#### **COMMENTS FROM MR. THOMAS R. LAMONT**

Mr. Eppley introduced Thomas R. Lamont as a former colleague on the Board of Trustees and noted that Mr. Lamont was the chair of the board at the time of the last presidential search. He asked Mr. Lamont to share his recollections and observations about that process.

Mr. Lamont described the task of the search for a president as a daunting one and noted that at the time of the last presidential search it had been 16 years since the board had searched for a president and that no sitting member of the board at that time had any experience with such a responsibility. He observed that prior experience in interviewing candidates for the position of chancellor helped then and would help in this search. He advised the board to discuss fully the criteria against which they will measure candidates. He particularly emphasized the need to have clear expectations about what characteristics and experiences candidates should possess.

He said that the assistance of a search firm was helpful to the board during the last search and indicated that the services of such a firm would help in finding candidates who are not obvious, and would ensure an ample pool of prospective candidates. He also noted that the work of the consultative committee, done in a relatively separate fashion from the interviewing of candidates by the board was helpful. Mr. Lamont described the interactions with the committee and the search firm in the periodic reviews of prospects as becoming ever more intense as the pool of prospective candidates was winnowed. He also commented on the interactions with the search firm and the committee in determining the final list of candidates, and the fact that the board took over the assessment process at this point.

He advised the board to pay particular attention to references of candidates and to observe strict confidentiality with all information. In terms of interviewing candidates, he urged the board to come to consensus on expectations for the future development of the University before discussing these with candidates for their views. He also counseled the board to take care in reporting on the deliberations of the board with anyone outside the board, and to be ready to handle occasional pressure from external groups that will be awkward. He hastened to give reassurance that this was all man-

ageable if the board is prepared. He also suggested a fairly structured approach to interviewing candidates for consistency in evaluation.

In closing, he said that the entire experience was very satisfying and enlightening.

#### **COMMENTS FROM PROFESSOR PATRICIA A. LANGLEY**

Mr. Eppley introduced Professor Langley and asked her to share thoughts with the board from the perspective of the custom of shared governance within the University. Professor Langley stressed the importance of sharing responsibility with the faculty for the search for a president, and referred to the 1966 statement of several higher education associations that attempted to clarify the roles and responsibilities among various constituencies of an academic institution. She stated that this statement recognized the importance of joint effort in the selection of a new president mainly because the president must be the main communication link between the board and the faculty. She indicated that the faculty is concerned that a president must understand the core academic values of the institution and to be able to comment on these to many audiences.

Professor Langley then referred to the tradition at the University of recognizing the primacy of the faculty in representation on committees to search for major administrative officers at the University, and referenced a board document from 1991 that the board reaffirmed in 2000 containing recommendations for search procedures. She then announced the composition of the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President as follows: eight faculty members, three students, one academic professional, one civil service staff member, one administrator, three members selected from the Alumni Association and University of Illinois Foundation, and one alumnus at large. She said that each constituent group would nominate several individuals as potential committee members. Further she noted that the faculty nominations would come from the campus senates and be forwarded to the University Senates Conference, and then to the chair of the Board of Trustees.

Next, Professor Langley stated that one of the committee's first tasks would be the development of a white paper to guide the search and set forth expectations. She also described the cooperation between the committee and the search firm and said that the search firm would be important in developing a pool of prospective candidates for the committee members to review. She described this process as the heart of the committee's work, and said that it would involve reviewing hundreds of dossiers of prospects and determining which were best qualified. She also reported that concurrently the search firm would be checking background information about the prospects. She then described the process of checking references by the search firm and by some of the committee members. Professor Langley described the work of the consultative committee as basically complete once the list of candidates is given the board, and that at that point, the board's work in interviewing and assessing would begin. She observed that this two-tiered process of assigning a committee the work of reviewing

prospects and turning over a list of a few qualified individuals seems to be favored by most peer institutions. She concluded by stating that the size of the consultative committee is comparable in number to other Big Ten institutions.

#### **COMMENTS FROM PROVOST RICHARD H. HERMAN**

Mr. Eppley thanked Professor Langley for her comments and introduced Dr. Richard H. Herman, provost and vice chancellor for academic affairs, Urbana, and stated that Dr. Herman would comment on his experiences in utilizing search firms to assist in selections of individuals for various administrative positions.

Dr. Herman thanked Mr. Eppley, President Stukel, and members of the board for the opportunity to address them at this important moment in the history of the University. He stated that when he came to the University of Illinois he brought a newcomer's desire to understand the institution and learn how it came to achieve its stature and excellence that attracted so many to its ranks. He said that he discovered that the shape, aspirations, and future possibilities of the University were determined by the skillful advocacy and critical decisions made by a succession of great presidents. He stated he was pleased to support the trustees in the process of selecting a new leader, as there was no more important decision for a board.

He said he had been asked to speak about the use of search firms, but first acknowledged that many with the board today have had considerable experience in recruiting for leadership positions. He went on to state that all present appreciated that the measure of one's stewardship of the institution was to a significant extent based on ability to recruit and select leaders of uncommon vision and ability.

Provost Herman also stated that one of the most demanding and consequential duties he had as a provost was the selection and support of the executive officers appointed to lead the colleges, schools, institutes, and the library at Urbana, as their skill and talent would significantly shape the excellence of the University. He reported that he had conducted 11 searches for such positions and had been able to fill the positions with people of exceptional ability, sometimes with the aid of a search firm and sometimes not.

He noted that using search firms was common in presidential and chancellorial searches, and then commented on the advantages of using a good search firm. First, he said that such a firm's most valuable asset is the ability to collect information that can be critical to decision-making, and otherwise difficult to obtain. He said that this information-gathering ability often comes in part from the firm's experience with other searches. He observed that a firm's accumulated knowledge of candidates, their strengths, their weaknesses, and their potential to fit a particular kind of institution is extremely valuable, and difficult to come by otherwise. He also said that relations between key individuals in different search firms can expand the pool of relevant knowledge about individual candidates; again stating that this is not easily gotten otherwise. He cited an example of how a

search firm had been able to advise him about a candidate and provided information he would not have been able to get without the aid of the search firm.

Second, he cited the ability of a search firm to ensure greater confidentiality, pointing out that if the search committee chair were to call to inquire about a potential candidate the institution would be identified immediately whereas anonymity is preserved if a search firm makes the inquiries.

He cited these two important reasons for the growth in the use of search firms in selecting major academic administrators, and then focused his comments on the best utilization of a search firm and the importance of choosing a search firm that will work well with a search committee and the trustees. He stressed that it is important to know who within the search firm will direct the firm's efforts in behalf of the University, what that person's experience has been, if searches have been completed in a timely fashion, and if other institutions have been pleased with the potential candidates identified by the search firm. He advised employing a search firm that would pledge to work on no other major university presidential search until the University of Illinois search was complete. He also emphasized that it was important to define the role of the search firm in the search process; for example, should the committee assign the search firm the role of receiving and evaluating nominations. He noted that the search process cannot be ceded to the search firm. He stated that the trustees would be the ones to define the experience and the kind of leader that the institution needs today.

Dr. Herman lauded the experience that search firms possess and said a search firm would be very helpful in identifying potential candidates. He also said that the committee members must be the ones to review the nominations and related materials. He added that managing the relationships among the search committee, the board, and the representative of the search firm is often the key to concluding a search successfully. Based on this, he emphasized that it was very important to focus on the individual at the firm that would be working on the search for the University of Illinois. He suggested that the performance of the firm's representative assigned to work with the consultative committee should be carefully evaluated. He suggested asking questions such as: were other searches completed within the timeframe set out; did the client get the candidate desired; and has the representative attended meetings with the other committees assigned to work on searches. He also urged the board to ask how many other presidential searches a firm was engaged in simultaneously, and suggested that having a search firm devoted to one search at a time was preferable.

Next, Dr. Herman told the board it was important to define the scope of work it wished a search firm to carry out. He stressed that neither the committee nor the board should cede control of the search process to the search firm. He advised that a search firm might be very helpful in evaluating nominations and recruiting potential candidates and in making inquiries about the backgrounds of prospects. However, he noted that the



consultative committee must be responsible for screening dossiers. He also stated that some highly qualified nominees or potential nominees might wish to speak with board members before deciding to be considered.

Next he remarked on the importance of choosing a committee chair capable of keeping communications flowing among the search firm, the committee, and the board. He also reminded the board that the search firm was one source of nominees, and that faculty and administrators at the University ought to be encouraged to urge qualified individuals to agree to be considered.

In summing up, he said that the elements of a successful search involve finding the right person at the right search firm; defining the firm's task carefully; managing the process as it progresses with timely communication and exchange among the search firm, the search committee, and the trustees; and providing enough information about the process to the campus community to engender trust and confidence in the process.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

Following a brief break, Mr. Eppley introduced the next set of speakers and stated that they were representatives of constituent groups in the University family who would bring comments from the perspective of these groups. He then asked Mr. Steven Miller, representing the University of Illinois Foundation Board of Directors, for brief remarks.

#### **Remarks from Mr. Steven Miller**

Mr. Miller spoke as a member of the University of Illinois Foundation Board of Directors and from the experience of having chaired the search for a president of Rice University. He also noted that he had participated in several executive transitions in major corporations.

Mr. Miller advised the board to step back to assess the University and then decide where it wanted the University to be in the next few years. He spoke from the experience of the search for a president at Rice University and suggested that the greatest help to that process was a white paper that was prepared by the search committee very early in the process. He commended Mr. Eppley for including this assignment in the charge to the consultative committee. He stated that, in his experience, this document specified the vision for the institution and helped to define the qualities desired in the next president. He observed that knowing what a university is to become helps define the role of the president. He urged that expectations for the next president be clearly stated in the white paper. He said it took the search committee for Rice's president about two and one-half months to complete this document, and he informed the board that it was available on the Web. Next, he urged that the committee talk with as many people as possible and seek out sources for information about what the vision for the University ought to be.

Also, he told the board that the best candidates are going to need coaxing to be considered, and that they ought not to expect candidates to apply. He gave praise for the document sent to the board and others participating

in the board meeting that had been prepared by Michael Thomas Kelly, Ed.D., and urged a close reading of that for a thorough understanding of the process for such a search.

He referred to the two-step process described earlier for the search and suggested that the board be involved in the description of the vision for the University and that the board be certain it supported the white paper. He described queries the search committee at Rice University received from candidates about the white paper that indicated the candidates had studied it diligently and wanted to be certain the board was committed to it.

Mr. Miller commented on the need for confidentiality in the entire process and said that this could not be stressed enough. He cautioned about use of email in reference to candidates, and warned that breaches of confidentiality cause candidates to withdraw from consideration. He also said that the search committee at Rice University tried not to use names of candidates, but codes.

With regard to seeking nominations, he suggested seeking opinions widely and talking to everybody from the head of the National Collegiate Athletic Association to the head of the American Association of Universities, and heads of other leading universities. He said many national leaders will want to be involved in making nominations for the president of the University of Illinois. He also noted that it is very important to let everyone who does help with nominations know that his/her suggestion was valued and was considered by the committee. He reminded the board of President Ikenberry's comment that this process is about reputations and that whatever the outcome, the University would need to have all involved think well of the process.

Mr. Miller acknowledged that the work of finding a new president can be daunting, and urged the trustees to be vigilant, stating that if the selection is right, the next ten years would herald a presidency that would build on the great success of the University of Illinois. He observed that the great strength of the nation in the 20th century and the element that differentiated the U.S. from other nations was the success of the major public universities to provide high quality education to a broad number of people across this country.

He predicted a realignment in the importance of the public universities and in their future roles in society. He advised that the University of Illinois has a chance with its past successes and with continuing strong leadership to transform this University into a model of what public higher education is about in the 21st century. He said he regarded the time the board would spend on selecting the next president of the University as the best gift they could give the citizens of Illinois and the United States.

#### **Remarks from Mr. David J. Downey**

Next, Mr. Eppley introduced Mr. David J. Downey, a member of the University of Illinois Foundation Board of Directors, to bring remarks from that organization. Mr. Downey began his remarks by stating that the new president of the University should understand the growing significance of pri-

vate support in a public institution. He added a new president must be adept at working with all external parties, the governor, the legislature, and everyone who's involved in funding for the University of Illinois and to help them recognize how private monies do make for the margin of excellence difference that Jim Stukel has so eloquently spoken of in recent years. He commented that the University needed to be able to count on the State for support, but also be able to build extra support from the private sector.

He stated that the Foundation Board believes the new president should be actively involved in working with the Foundation leadership to plan and execute strategies to significantly increase private giving to the University. He stated that this involvement would not only include participation in the next major campaign, but be an important part of the next person's job as president. He said this would include active cultivation and solicitation of gifts from major contributors to the University, and also follow-up with those major contributors to make them feel that their money had been well spent.

Mr. Downey observed that in the past the Foundation has asked the president for assistance in closing some gifts, and that now they would be asking the next president to be a salesperson as well as a great academic leader. He said that this should be clear from the beginning of the search process; that it is expected that the next president will be heavily and personally involved in raising private monies for the University.

In closing, he stated that the Foundation Board expects the president to be the chief spokesperson for this great university and the chief salesperson for the University, and, therefore, very much involved with the Foundation and obviously the Foundation very much involved with the president. In short, he said that we need someone with the experience and the aptitude to make what is a truly great institution even greater, and that the Foundation Board looked forward to being a major part of that process.

#### **COMMENT FROM MR. EPPLEY**

At the conclusion of Mr. Downey's remarks, Mr. Eppley stated that both the University of Illinois Foundation and the Alumni Association would have representatives on the consultative committee because both organizations are so important to the University and the president works closely with both. He added that there will be three seats on the committee for the two organizations and that the organizations would work together to recommend three individuals.

#### **Remarks from Mr. Mark Filip**

Mr. Mark Filip, a member of the Alumni Association Board of Directors, noted that there are more than 500,000 living graduates of the University and that the majority live in Illinois. He said that the alumni care deeply about the University and about the search for a president.

He stated that in his view the alumni are looking for certain attributes in the next president that include that the person be a deeply respected academician, that the next president demonstrate leadership in times of

financial adversity, and that the next president must be able to coalesce support externally for the University. He added that the alumni want the president to be able to generate and solidify support for the University, to be good at administration, alumni relations, fund raising, and legislative relations. Further, he indicated that alumni want the next president to be a statesperson, that has confidence in the University and can defend it and lead others to support it.

More specifically, Mr. Filip stated that the alumni want the new president to respect the independent voice of the alumni registered through the Alumni Association and to respect the opinions of alumni from all walks of life.

In closing, he said the Alumni Association and the University of Illinois Foundation would each select one member for the consultative committee, then work together to select a third member—all to be recommended to the board.

#### **COMMENTS FROM STUDENT TRUSTEES**

Each student trustee then addressed the board concerning the process by which he/she consulted with students at each campus and solicited student opinion regarding what the students considered important in their relations with the president.

##### **Ms. Natalie A. Garcia, Student Trustee, University of Illinois at Chicago**

Ms. Garcia reported to the board that she had consulted all the student groups at the Chicago campus and asked for their opinions of what they considered important for a new president to know or be prepared to do. She stated that students at the Chicago campus want the president to recognize the differences of that campus, especially the diversity of the students, and to appreciate the needs of students at Chicago, especially when it comes to financial aid needs and the fear that access to higher education for these students will be limited if financial aid is decreased.

She also said that students want to know more from the president about legislative relations and legislative issues that would impact students and to know what they might do to help the University in this regard. In addition, she said the students would like more access to the president. In conclusion, she said the most important responsibility of the president from the students' perspective was maintenance of the quality of education at the University.

##### **Mr. Andrew M. Hollingsead, Student Trustee, University of Illinois at Springfield**

Mr. Hollingsead stated he was speaking on behalf of the students at the Springfield campus that the new president must know the needs of a small, liberal arts institution such as the Springfield campus, and further, the pres-

ident should work with the chancellor to recruit more freshmen students for Springfield.

He also said that for the academic health of the Springfield campus, the president should work to make more courses available, and when the budget rebounds, courses that have been canceled ought to be restored.

He also noted that a task for the new president would be to study pay equity for the faculty and staff at Springfield.

In closing, Mr. Hollingsead stated that the University needs a president who is politically adroit and can work with the governor and the legislature to advance the University. More specifically, he stated that he hoped the new president would work to involve the Springfield campus with the governor and legislature in governmental relations.

**Mr. Nate H. Allen, Student Trustee,  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

Mr. Allen told the board that he spoke with various student groups at the Urbana campus to glean a listing of the interests of students concerning the next president of the University. He reported that students opined that the next president should be a leader in the area of tuition policy, supporting a separate policy for each campus and seeking student involvement in determining the appropriate amount for each campus.

Next, he said that students at Urbana are concerned about the availability of financial aid and wanted the next president to demonstrate a track record on advocacy for financial aid. He also said that the students wanted a president with abilities to lobby for the appropriation from the State. He also stated that students wanted more interaction with the president.

Further, he said that students are concerned about the reduction in the number of teaching assistants, particularly those who work with the large-enrollment classes. He also said that the residence halls and other student housing on campus need attention from the president.

In addition, Mr. Allen said students hoped the current emphasis on diversity at Urbana would be continued and fostered by a new president. He gave credit to the achievements in increasing diversity on campus, stating that integrating cultures was stressed at Urbana through academic programs and other means. He also said that there is a need to recruit more minorities for administrative positions. He cited Chief Illiniwek as a problem for making the campus more diverse and stated that the board's indecisiveness regarding Chief Illiniwek would have an impact on the success in recruiting a new president and a new chancellor at Urbana.

In closing, he asked the consultative committee to talk with students as a part of the committee's work.

**COMMENTS FROM THE FACULTY**

Mr. Eppley stated that the next comments would be offered by representatives of the faculty from the three campuses. He indicated that all of the faculty commentators represented that campus and its campus senate.

**Professor Gerald S. Strom,  
University of Illinois at Chicago**

Professor Strom spoke to the defining characteristics of the Chicago campus, stating that it is among the top 50 research institutions nationally; a major health sciences center, providing professional education and health care; and an urban university with a strong urban commitment. In addition, he observed that the campus is diverse economically and in terms of the representation of minorities on the faculty and among the students. He stated that the students come from all economic strata, and that this creates opportunities and also difficulties that must be dealt with on campus.

In conclusion, he said that the next president would need to appreciate and be able to understand the many characteristics of the Chicago campus. He stated that the faculty and students liked President Stukel because he had spent so many years at the campus and knew it well. He noted that he hoped the board would take these features into account in selecting a new president.

**Professor Nancy L. Ford,  
University of Illinois at Springfield**

Professor Ford told the board that the appointment of a new president is critical to the Springfield campus, particularly in light of the remarkable changes the campus has undergone since becoming part of the University of Illinois and the threats presented by recent budget cuts.

She stated that first and foremost, the campus seeks a president who has the vision, determination, and leadership ability to ensure that the campus is successful in achieving its distinctive mission and vision. She said that the campus' vision was to become the best public liberal arts university in the region, and to grow in size to 6,000 students, attaining strong academic quality within a diverse campus community. Further, she indicated that the Springfield campus hoped to rebuild and to continue its commitment to public affairs and to maintain its place as a national leader in on-line education.

She said that most assumed that the next president would be familiar with the environment of a Research One university and that, in order to help the Springfield campus achieve its goals, the next president will need thorough experience or awareness or an appreciation of the distinctive contributions and challenges of a small liberal arts campus like UIS. Professor Ford told the board that she hoped the new president would appreciate that at the Springfield campus, a budget reduction that might not have a great impact in a larger setting might have dire consequences for a campus the size of UIS.

She also stated that a new president should realize the advantage of location presented by the Springfield campus and use that to the benefit of the University, while also being able to maintain independence in the political environment in Springfield. She added that a new president ought to

be able to garner support from sources other than the State in order to make up for declining State support. In addition, she stressed that a new president must be an academic leader, capable of addressing academic issues on all three campuses, respectful of academic freedom, and committed to shared governance.

**Professor Michael Grossman,  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

Professor Grossman noted that several other speakers have referred to the search for a new president as the single most important responsibility of the board, and added that it is perhaps awesome. He observed that the president of the University would have an enormous impact on people on campus, among alumni, and also a far-reaching influence in the State, nation, and the world. He noted the significant role of the president in seeking resources to replace State support. He also stated that a new president must be able to work with public policymakers to seek increased appropriations to support, among other things, faculty salaries in order to recruit and retain outstanding faculty.

He stated that the new president must be competent in raising funds from individuals, corporations, and foundations. In addition, he emphasized the need for a president who is an academic leader who would foster an environment in which the faculty would also be able to attract external support. He also indicated that the new president must be an advocate for higher education and a champion for the University. Professor Grossman stated that the new president should have a broad appreciation of a complex, multi-campus, public land-grant institution.

In closing, he told the board that the Urbana-Champaign Senate Executive Committee and the Urbana-Champaign Senate believe that the controversy over Chief Illiniwek must be resolved before a new president is recruited. He said that a resolution approved by the Urbana-Champaign Senate Executive Committee, the Urbana-Champaign Senate, and by the Springfield Senate seeks to retire the Chief. He thanked the board for its attention.

**COMMENTS FROM OTHER CONSTITUENCIES' REPRESENTATIVES**

**Dr. Vera Mainz, Chair,  
University Professional Personnel Advisory Committee**

Dr. Mainz briefly described the role of the University Professional Advisory Committee (UPPAC) as the group that represents the professional staff on the campuses and advises the president with regard to interests of this group. She explained that UPPAC represents 6,200 professional staff and, since this group is not proportionally represented in the campus senates, it looks to the president to represent their concerns to the board. Thus, she indicated that a new president should be one who can continue the representation of the professional staff to the board and make clear the differen-

tiation between this group of employees and the faculty and civil service staff. She gave examples of academic professional employees as managers of technology systems, providers of student support services and of research support, and a variety of other functions in the University. She stressed that the president must understand the contributions of this group in the changing environment of the University and be willing to foster professional development and ongoing training for the group.

Also, she stated that the academic professionals seek a president who is first and foremost a scholar, and said that a scholar can fully articulate the mission of the University to those outside and sometimes to those inside the University. She added that the academic professions seek a president who understands the importance of public service and outreach, exemplified by the University of Illinois Extension. In addition, she said that the group seeks a president with innovative ideas about the role of the University and the goals of the marketplace. As an example, she noted that on-line education is changing the traditional notion of the marketplace and the University must continue to play a leadership role in this new frontier.

**Mr. Daniel Sarhage, Chair,  
Employees Advisory Committee**

Mr. Sarhage described his role as chair of the Employees Advisory Committee, which represents the civil service employees at the University. He added that he is also a member of the State Universities Civil Service System Advisory Committee, which represents all civil service employees in the public universities in the State. In his comments, he said that the greatest concern of the civil service staff is the privatization of work long performed by civil service staff at the University. He told the board that he and his co-workers very much like working for the University, and they hope that the president will be supportive of the civil service positions within the University. He said that the civil service system at public universities was 50 years old and that he and many others hoped it lasted another 50 years.

Mr. Sarhage went on to tell the board that privatizing work now within the province of the civil service classifications at the University affects employee morale and that in turn affects performance of employees. He also spoke of new programs to make hiring employees less complicated and other changes in the civil service system to make it more responsive to the needs of the universities. In closing, he said that the civil service employees are committed to the University.

**COMMENTS FROM MR. EPPLEY**

Mr. Eppley thanked all of the speakers for their remarks and asked if anyone else in attendance would like to comment. Then he asked the board if any member had comments or questions to pose. There were no requests to comment and no questions.



**REVIEW OF MILESTONES IN THE SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT**

Following a brief break, Mr. Eppley reviewed with the board the milestones in the process of searching for a new president. He indicated that these illustrate the complexity of the search process. He then enumerated the tasks that must be accomplished to complete the search for a president:

1. Discussion of the search procedure—Mr. Eppley stated that this occurred at this meeting.
2. Board of Trustees approves composition of Consultative Committee to Assist in Selection of a President—he indicated that there was an item on the agenda for today's meeting to approve that.
3. Board approves charge to committee—he stated that there was also an item on the agenda for today's meeting for the board to approve that.
4. Board appoints committee—he stated that he planned for this to occur at the next regular board meeting scheduled for March 11, 2004.
5. Special committee of board reviews search firms and makes recommendation to board—he indicated that he would recommend the appointment of a board committee today with the assignment of reviewing search firms to assist in the search.
6. Board approves a specific search firm to aid in the search process—Mr. Eppley said that he hoped the board could approve the engagement of a search firm at the board's next meeting, March 11, 2004.
7. Consultative committee and search firm disseminate information about the search for a president and receive and review dossiers of nominees, and later interview a group of nominees—he stated that this would be a lengthy process consuming the spring and summer of 2004, and maybe beyond.
8. Committee reports to board at each board meeting until review process is concluded—he said that the board would receive regular reports on the progress of the search from the chair of the consultative committee.
9. Committee recommends to the board five to ten potential candidates—he said that this would be expected in the fall 2004.
10. Board reviews and decides which individuals to interview and consider for the position of president—Mr. Eppley explained that the board would carefully review the candidates referred by the consultative committee and then conduct interviews of some or all of the candidates.
11. Board of Trustees announces the selection of next president—he said he thought this would be toward the end of 2004.
12. Board votes formally on election of president at a board meeting.

Dr. Gindorf asked if the milestones would be parallel in some cases and Mr. Eppley acknowledged that some would be. Dr. Gindorf also reminded all that there are several peer institutions also seeking presidents at this time, and that moving with alacrity in the search process would be prudent.

Following this review, Mr. Eppley expressed appreciation on behalf of the board to all the speakers who shared experiences and counsel with the board in this special meeting.

He then announced the appointment of the committee to review search firms and recommend one to the board, stating that Mr. Vickrey would serve as chair of the committee, joined by Dr. Carroll and Mr. Bruce as members. Further, he invited all other board members to join meetings of this committee and announced that any decision on hiring a search firm would be the decision of the entire board at a future board meeting.

Mr. Sperling opined that if the recommendation of the committee is ready before the next board meeting that he would suggest the Executive Committee meet to approve the recommendation in the interest of advancing the search process as soon as possible.

#### **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Eppley asked Chancellor Cantor to present information regarding agenda item no. 5, "Contract for Revenue Guaranty with Delta Air Lines, Urbana." Chancellor Cantor stated that this contract was recommended as a means for increasing traffic at Willard Airport and to aid the University and community by providing more transportation through Willard. She thanked Vice Chancellor Steven F. Schomberg for his work in negotiating this contract. Mrs. Sodemann supported this item and said that the availability of additional flights at Willard would help those wishing to travel through Willard, and that these additional flights would assist in revitalizing the airport.

Next, Mr. Eppley asked Chancellor Manning to present agenda item no. 4, "University Librarian, Chicago." Chancellor Manning described the candidate's background in library management and experience in managing budgets for libraries. She also thanked Professor Nancy R. John, acting university librarian, for her service since the untimely death of Professor Sharon Hogan, former university librarian at Chicago.

Mr. Eppley then asked Vice President Rugg to present agenda item no. 6, "Contract for a Review of the University's Human Resources Functions and Organization." Mr. Rugg stated that this recommendation is for a consulting contract with Mercer Human Resources Consulting to review the organization of the human resources function at the University now that there is new leadership in that area. He said that the recommendation was for a contract not to exceed \$393,420; with an opportunity to withhold 25 percent pending completion and that the planned timetable for the review was March through July 2004.

Mr. Shah requested a progress report of the work prior to completion, and after 75 percent of the project was complete.

### AGENDA

The board considered the following reports and recommendations from the president of the University.

By consensus, the board agreed that one vote would be taken and considered the vote on each agenda item nos. 1 through 4 inclusive. The recommendations were individually discussed but acted upon at one time.

(The record of board action appears at the end of each item.)

#### **Recommendation to Employ a Search Consultant to Assist in the Selection of a President, 2004**

(1) The Board of Trustees has initiated a search process to identify candidates for president of the University. The chair of the board recommends the employment of a professional search consulting firm to aid the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President. This firm would be expected to provide advice and expertise in the identification and recruitment of potential candidates for review by the Board of Trustees. Consideration will be given to search consulting firms with special expertise in aiding presidential searches of large public universities.

In order to identify such consultants capable of providing the services required, the purchasing division has begun a request for proposal process for search consulting firms throughout the country.

Once proposals are received and reviewed, a committee of the board will interview representatives of some of the search firms submitting proposals and recommend one to the board.

On motion of Mr. Shah, this recommendation was approved.

#### **Composition of the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President, 2004**

(2) By State statute, the Board of Trustees is directed to "...elect a regent who shall be charged with the general supervision of the educational facilities and interest of the University. Said regent shall be known as president of the University and his term of office shall be at the pleasure of the board of trustees."<sup>1</sup>

In fulfilling this responsibility, the trustees wish to have assistance from essential constituent groups of the University. To provide this assistance, the board hereby establishes a Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President, to include the following members:

1. Eight faculty members from the broad, diverse, and engaged faculties of the University's three campuses—Chicago, Springfield, and Urbana—These members shall be selected by the board from candidates suggested by the respective campus senates, and referred by the University Senates Conference.
2. Three students, one from each of the University's three campuses—These members shall be selected by the board from candidates suggested by the coordinated efforts of the student government organizations of the respective campuses, in consultation with the student trustees. Consideration shall be given to undergraduate, graduate, and professional student involvement.
3. One member of the academic professional staff—The Professional Advisory Committee at each campus will be asked to submit names of nominees to the University Professional Personnel Advisory Committee (UPPAC), who shall forward candidates for consideration and designation by the board.

---

<sup>1</sup>110 ILCS 305/4, University of Illinois Act.

4. One member of the civil service staff—The Staff Advisory Council at each campus will be asked to make nominations to the Employee Advisory Committee who shall forward candidates for consideration and designation by the board.
5. One administrative officer, who shall be selected by the board after consultation with the president and chancellors.
6. Three members from the University Alumni Association and the University of Illinois Foundation—These members shall be selected by the board from candidates suggested jointly by both organizations.
7. One alumnus at large to be selected by the Board of Trustees.

On motion of Mr. Shah, this recommendation was approved.

#### **Charge to the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of a President, 2004**

(3) The Board of Trustees has authorized and composed a consultative committee to assist in the search for a president. This resolution specifies the charge of the committee and the general procedures within which it will operate.

Several broad constituencies of the University are reflected in the committee's composition, but no member should regard herself or himself as a "representative" or "delegate" of any single interest group. Rather, each member shall exercise his or her own best judgment as to what will be in the best interest of the University of Illinois as a whole. Diligence, thoughtfulness, and thoroughness, not speed, shall be the driving forces. The committee shall conduct a pro-active search and identify and recruit the person best able to fulfill the mandate.

The committee shall be managed by a chair and a vice-chair, who shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees. The chair and the vice-chair of the consultative committee and the chair of the board will confer as often as necessary throughout the duration of the committee's work. Periodic meetings shall be held to review the status of the prospect pool and available background data. Also at regular meetings of the Board of Trustees, these representatives of the committee shall report on its progress.

The search shall be broad in scope, using all available resources to identify potential candidates for the position of president of the University of Illinois. The several constituencies of the University, including faculty, students, staff, trustees, alumni, supporters, and friends of the University shall be encouraged to suggest suitable candidates. The committee shall not be constrained from considering candidates from all appropriate sources, including other institutions of higher learning, government, and elsewhere. The Board of Trustees will maintain a continuing interest in the identification of outstanding potential candidates, and will receive periodic reports from the committee on the development of the pool of prospects.

The committee's first task will be to develop a white paper that will serve as the cornerstone of the search. This white paper shall delineate the job description of and the expectations for the next president as well as the expected qualities and criteria crucial to the position.

The expected qualities and criteria to be used as the basis for evaluating potential candidates shall be organized around several key expectations for the candidates. Among these are:

- a record of effective leadership including evidence of strategic vision and ability to be an effective change agent;
- a commitment to institutional excellence in teaching, research, service, and economic development as mandated by the State, and to support the University's excellent faculty;
- the ability and willingness to initiate, foster, and cultivate relationships with the public and private sectors, including donors, businesses, civic groups, and local, State, and Federal governments and agencies, to represent and advocate for the University;

- an understanding of the changing nature of public higher education and its vital role in local, State, regional, and national economies;
- the ability to adapt to changing fiscal environments;
- the ability to work within a complex administrative structure and to add rationality to that structure.

This white paper may also set forth procedures and milestones (including time estimates) to be followed and reached to carry out the search process. It shall include the input of the search firm that is retained, and shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval. The white paper shall guide the work of the committee throughout the process.

The committee shall devise a method for conducting preliminary screening designed to identify those judged to be the most promising prospective candidates. Detailed information should be secured concerning these candidates, initially from public records such as professional directories and bibliographic sources and, in a second stage, the chair and vice-chair should make calls to individuals who know and can assess the qualities and potential of the prospective candidate. In some cases a delegation of this responsibility may be made to other committee members. In such informal inquiries, it should be made clear that the search is in a preliminary stage and that no approach has yet been made to any candidate, and that strict confidentiality is necessary.

The committee shall identify the most outstanding and qualified potential candidates. The committee shall submit a broad list of candidates, which may be ranked or categorized, before a list of finalists is presented. The list of finalists shall be between five and ten individuals.

The board and the committee will consult and discuss the procedures to be followed in approaching finalists. Consensus will be important, but the board is statutorily charged with the responsibility of making the final decision.

The secretary of the board will serve as staff to the consultative committee, and assist in sustaining strong lines of communication and coordination between the committee and the board. The secretary of the board shall also be the board's agent in the procedural and liaison tasks involved in the search process.

The search process shall adhere to University affirmative action policies, and the committee shall affirmatively seek candidates representing diverse backgrounds and perspectives. The university director of equal opportunity shall brief the committee about the pertinent policies and guidelines. Also, university counsel shall assist and advise the committee on legal matters.

The committee is advised to consider the use of the Internet to assist in the search process. The white paper and other information may be posted on a dedicated site.

The Board of Trustees emphasizes the importance of careful coordination and channeling of all committee communications concerning candidates through the chair and vice-chair of the committee, who are charged with the responsibility of keeping the board fully informed. The board also emphasizes that discretion and confidentiality are required of all committee members. Public communications, including those with the media, shall be channeled through the secretary of the board, who shall consult with the Office of University Relations.

The secretary of the board and the comptroller of the board are directed to prepare an estimate of anticipated expenses to be incurred in the search process and to present that estimate for review and approval at the March 11, 2004, meeting of the board.

On motion of Mr. Shah, this resolution was adopted.

#### **University Librarian, Chicago**

(4) The chancellor at Chicago has recommended the appointment of Mary Margaret Case, currently director, Office of Scholarly Communication, Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C., as university librarian, beginning July 1, 2004, on a twelve-month service basis, at an annual salary of \$115,000 with an administrative increment of \$45,000, for a total salary of \$160,000. Ms. Case will also hold the rank of professor, Uni-

versity Library, on indefinite tenure on a twelve-month service basis, on zero percent time, effective July 1, 2004.

Ms. Case will succeed Nancy R. John, who served as acting university librarian from March 18, 2002, through May 19, 2002, and then as interim university librarian from May 20, 2002, through June 30, 2004. Ms. John will return to her position as assistant university librarian and associate professor, University Library.

This recommendation is made with the advice of a search committee.<sup>1</sup>

The vice president for academic affairs concurs.

The president of the University recommends approval.

On motion of Mr. Shah, this appointment was approved.

By consensus, the board agreed that one roll call vote would be taken and considered the vote on each agenda item nos. 5 and 6. The recommendations were individually discussed but acted upon at one time.

(The record of board action appears at the end of each item.)

#### **Contract for Revenue Guaranty with Delta Air Lines, Urbana**

(5) The Urbana campus, in partnership with the local community through the Champaign County Economic Development Corporation (EDC), desires Delta Air Lines (Delta) to provide scheduled air service between Cincinnati, Ohio, and Champaign, Illinois. In order to partner with Delta to facilitate providing service to Willard Airport, the University of Illinois will enter into an agreement with Delta to provide a revenue guaranty. The guaranty is a way for the University and Delta to share the financial risk during the initial two years of service as Delta develops its presence in the local Champaign-Urbana market. A projection of local market share by an independent consultant indicates that the market share is achievable within the two-year period and likely will be achieved sooner as traveler loyalty returns to Willard Airport (now more than 50 percent of the local air travelers depart from other airports).

The chancellor at Urbana recommends that the University enter into a revenue guaranty with Delta based upon passenger revenues. The guaranty is capped at \$850,000 for year 1, and at \$500,000 for year 2. The funds will be placed in an escrow account to be drawn upon if the required annual minimum passenger revenues are not achieved. To support the community-wide effort to bring Delta regional jet service to the Champaign-Urbana area, EDC will also participate in the revenue guaranty. Various community programs have pledged, through EDC, to contribute funding in support of the guaranty in the amounts of \$100,000 for Year 1 and \$25,000 for Year 2, and may pledge additional funding for this purpose in subsequent months. In addition, local businesses, units of government, and individuals have pledged to deposit funds in a ticket trust at one of two local banks. These funds are to be used exclusively to purchase Delta Air Lines' tickets. In the event that revenues are less than the guaranty, any unspent funds in the ticket trust will be drawn upon by the EDC to contribute to the guaranty.

The president of the University with the concurrence of the appropriate University officers recommends that the Delta revenue guaranty contract be approved.

---

<sup>1</sup>Susan C. Scrimshaw, professor, Division of Community Health Sciences, and dean, School of Public Health, *chair*; Farhad Ansari, professor of civil engineering and head, Department of Civil and Materials Engineering, College of Engineering; Joan Betty Fiscella, bibliographer for professional studies and associate professor, University Library; Sharon P. Holland, associate professor of English, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; William G. Jones, assistant university librarian and associate professor, University Library; Hannelore T. Loevy, professor of clinical pediatric dentistry, Department of Pediatric Dentistry and in the Dental Clinics, College of Dentistry; Robert G. Mrtek, professor of pharmacy administration, College of Pharmacy, and adjunct professor and head, City Based Program, Department of Medical Education, College of Medicine at Chicago; Hayat Onyuksel, professor of pharmaceuticals and assistant head, Department of Biopharmaceutical Sciences, College of Pharmacy; Victoria Pifalo, health sciences librarian and associate professor, University Library; Antonio Amador Vasquez, predoctoral fellow, Graduate College

On motion of Mrs. Sodemann, this recommendation was approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bruce, Dr. Carroll, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Dr. Schmidt, Mr. Shah, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Sperling; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich, Mr. Vickrey.

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Hollingsead; no, none.)

#### **Contract for a Review of the University's Human Resources Functions and Organization**

(6) The vice president for administration with the concurrence of appropriate University officers, recommends approval of a contract with Mercer Human Resource Consulting for an amount not to exceed \$393,420 to provide a detailed review of the University's human resources (HR) functions and organization, and to develop recommendations for new strategies, service delivery models, structure and organization.

In response to a Board of Trustees resolution at the March 13, 2003, meeting, University staff has been conducting a detailed review of administrative and academic support services to identify opportunities for cost reductions and service improvements. One aspect of this review identified the need to enhance the value of the University's HR operations by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of human resource management activities and the HR organizations dedicated to supporting them.

The University issued a request for proposal for consulting services to conduct a seven-part assessment of current HR operations. Mercer Human Resource Consulting was selected by an evaluation committee based on a review of written proposals from ten firms, personal interviews followed by best-and-final submissions from the four firms receiving the highest technical ratings, and a second round of best-and-final negotiations with two finalists. Mercer will conduct in-depth reviews and assessments and provide written recommendations for each of the following seven phases of the project: HR activity analysis and activity based costing; qualitative and quantitative assessment of customer satisfaction; identification of benchmarks and best practices; program and process assessment of 19 specific areas within HR; alternative sourcing opportunities and vendor management practices; post-Banner information systems strategy; and overall strategy and organizational structure.

A task force of HR personnel will be directly involved with and oversee the coordination of assessment activities.

Funds for this contract are available from the Fiscal Year 2004 Institutional Funds Operating Budget of University Administration.

The vice president for administration recommends approval.

The president of the University concurs.

On motion of Mrs. Sodemann, this recommendation was approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bruce, Dr. Carroll, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Dr. Schmidt, Mr. Shah, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Sperling; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich, Mr. Vickrey.

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Hollingsead; no, none.)

#### **MOTION FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Chair Eppley stated: "A motion is now in order to hold an executive session to consider pending, probable, or imminent litigation against, affecting, or on behalf of the University."

The motion was made by Dr. Schmidt and approved by the following vote: Aye, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bruce, Dr. Carroll, Mr. Eppley, Dr. Gindorf, Dr. Schmidt, Mr. Shah, Mrs. Sodemann, Mr. Sperling; no, none; absent, Governor Blagojevich, Mr. Vickrey.

(The student advisory vote was: Aye, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Hollingsead; no, none.)

A CONTINUING NEED FOR  
CONFIDENTIALITY  
EXISTS FOR THIS SECTION.



A CONTINUING NEED FOR  
CONFIDENTIALITY  
EXISTS FOR THIS SECTION.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURNED**

There being no further business, the executive session was adjourned.

There being no further business, the board adjourned.

MICHELE M. THOMPSON  
*Secretary*

LAWRENCE C. EPPLEY  
*Chair*