UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2001, 3:00 p.m.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKYROOM

Those University Council members present were: Baker, Bilder, Burgess, Butler, Carter, Cearlock, Coover, Creamer, Curley, Ganesan, Graf, Goldenberg, Gotthardt, Gregory, Gresholdt, Henry, Ilsley, Jennings, Kafer, Kaplan, King, Kitterle, Kowalski, Larson, Legg, Martin, K. Miller, R. Miller, S. Miller, Mini, Miranda, Morris, Mulligan, Orem, Povlsen, Ridnour, Rubin, Schuth, Song, Sorensen, Spear, Stalker, Vohra, Wade, Wheeler, Williams, Young, Zar

E. Shumaker attended for D. Jones.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was also present.

Those University Council members not present were: Carson, Conde, Garcia, Griffiths, Harris, Kolb, Lockard, McCuistion, Mohabbat, Musial, Pavia, Perez, Pernell, Simon, Tolhurst, Wolfskill

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first item of business is the adoption of the agenda as you have it before you. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda or any additions or walk-ins?

S. Willis: We do have a walk-in.

President Peters: We do have a walk-in?

M. Gotthardt: I’d like to move to New Business a discussion of the University Council’s potential role in helping faculty, staff and students deal with the events of September 11.

President Peters: A discussion of the role of faculty and the university to help students discuss the events of September 11.

M. Gotthardt: That would be one aspect. Faculty, staff and students. Students dealing, faculty dealing, faculty being able to help students dealing, things of that nature.

President Peters: So we’ll depend on you, Catfish – that’s his nickname – when we get to that to bring it up. There’s a walk-in, Sue?

S. Willis: This walk-in is a couple of items that were referred to the University Council last
year. The Academic Policy Committee recommended some changes that have come back to us, so I’d recommend putting this on the Consent Agenda referring it back to the Academic Policy Committee just for a final review and then they can bring it back to us after they’ve had a chance to look it over. This just came to me this morning.

**President Peters:** So you’re request to move this walk-in item to the Consent Agenda to be referred to the Academic Policy Committee. Are there any other adjustments before we adopt the agenda? Is there a motion to adopt the amended agenda?

It was moved and seconded, and the amended agenda was adopted.

### III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2001 UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING

**President Peters:** Approval of the minutes of the September 12 meeting. They’re on pages 5-22 and on page 3 we have the Willis innovation which is a summary of that meeting. Are there any additions or corrections? Motion to adopt?

It was moved and seconded, and the minutes of the September 12 meeting were approved.

### IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

**President Peters:** In light of our added item to New Business, which I wanted to say something about, I’ll just say a few words about the events. It was a month ago when we were here and were dealing with the first twenty-four-hour aftermath of September 11. Since that time a lot has happened both on campus and around the world, and I just am just very pleased with the way the university community has responded to all aspects. We’re now functioning as normally as any institution can function under these difficult situations, with few acts of intolerance growing out of our grief and our anger. As we have our discussion under New Business, as we move into further phases of this situation, we have to guard against more acts of intolerance and recognize everyone’s right to hold a view and express a view without a fear of reprisal. I believe, I know, we are up to the task. I’ll just end the comments on the events by saying that we are continually reviewing every facet of university operation that has to do with anything involved with preparedness, and with security, as best we can, of course not knowing, but hoping, praying, that we won’t have to do anything. We are as prepared as one can be. So I’ve been very pleased with the cooperation we’ve all received. It’s been difficult for us but I’m pleased with the discussions that have taken place. My interactions have been largely with students in discussions and I’m having a class, a UNIV 101 class, over to the residence tonight and look forward to seeing how they’re doing, and I know that all the faculty and the staff are attempting to do that as well. All right, that’s the first thing.

Now I want to move on to the budget situation. As I indicated, my State of the University Address was difficult to prepare because it changed daily over the two months that I was preparing it, and it ended up very different than the way it started out in August. Certainly, one of the things I ended up with is the obvious budget uncertainty that we face. I wanted to give you a little context today and give you some facts and give you the information that we have at
this point and indicate what course we may have to steer. First of all, I just got something today on one of the listservs that I’m on that is sort of a review relative to higher education and what is happening to university budgets across the country. A lot of that has to do with immediate budgets and then next year’s budgets. Here’s just a brief example: there are special legislative sessions that have been called in many states to deal with the budget shortfall for this year, for the 02 budget. Alabama has a special session on budget cuts that’s going to be held in October. Arizona has scheduled one in November. In Colorado there’s one underway. In Florida there’s a special session in October. In Idaho there is a regular January session but it’s going to make permanent a rollback that’s already occurred by a spending order on part of the governor. In Indiana the regular session might open up a budget revision. Nebraska has a special session planned for October to cut budgets including those of higher education. All these include higher education or I wouldn’t mention them. Nevada has an automatic revenue kind of procedure where, if tax revenues fall, they automatically adjust their budget. Oregon is likely to call one in the biennium and in order to spare my colleague from Tennessee pain I won’t even tell you what’s happening in Tennessee because we know pretty well what’s happening there. There have already been mid-year spending reductions in Alabama. Mid-year spending reductions, they’re called prorations, are expected and this year’s budget was already cut 3% below last year’s and there are already layoffs occurring in the Alabama system. Arizona has asked all state entities to plan for a 4% reduction mid-year. They have in Arizona an estimated half a billion shortfall in their revenue stream. There are strong indications in Arkansas that revenue projections that are revised downward will result in severe cuts. Colorado has frozen all construction at the governor’s request and they have a 300-million-dollar shortfall for 2001 and 2002. They’ve got holdbacks in Florida; 5% reduction is expected for the current year. Georgia has ordered a 2.5% reduction in spending. Idaho has ordered 2% to be held back. Indiana is rolling over one month’s operating appropriation to the next fiscal year. So they’re trying to manage a cash flow; I guess that is what they’re doing there. I’ll talk about Illinois; the governor has asked universities to consider freezes on hiring and on equipment purchases as he has ordered other state agencies to do, and I’ll cover that in some depth in a minute. In Iowa, our neighbors are getting hit hard. They were hit hard last year. The governor has proposed large cuts in spending in current appropriations but the general assembly hasn’t voted. Missouri is withholding 3% and the governor has ordered another 5% of higher education funds to be withheld, so that strikes me as 8%. Also, in Missouri, capital projects have been postponed for at least one year. You know, I can go on and on and on. So, you got the picture. Illinois as a state is still in strong financial shape. There’s still a surplus and the economy is slowing, but it’s still strong. This university, as I indicated in the State of the University Address, is in strong financial shape. Many of the universities in states I’ve mentioned are starting behind and then on top of that there will be budget reductions, so relatively speaking, we’re in good shape.

Now, I want to talk about two aspects of the budget. Again, remember there’s not a lot of information right now but it is the time to be prudent and thoughtful and careful. First of all, let me deal with budget preparation for ’03 and I’ll deal with this year’s budget last. That is the budget as being prepared for the next fiscal year. It is moving forward from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. It was reported to the Board Finance Committee. Our capital project requests have gone forward. Now the IBHE currently is meeting with the Bureau of the Budget staff in the governor’s office and that, of course, is a time when projections for revenue for next year are meshed with the requests and then some target figure will be announced. Dr. Williams, about
December, maybe? In December, we will get kind of a preview of that and react to it. Last year, higher education received from the state somewhere in the neighborhood of about 150 to 160 million in new money, and a big part of that was salary increases and benefits. Of the total resources to the state, education got 51% and of that 51% higher education got 34%. This governor is committed in any given budget year, to put 51% of whatever is on the table into education and whatever that number is, higher education usually gets 34%. These are some planning assumptions. The other thing they plug in is the revenue estimates. Those things are being reevaluated downward as we speak. There are those who say that the situation that we’re in aside, that there is a feeling of a pretty strong rebound in the general economy, but probably not until the second quarter of next year. All right, so when you think about it that’s perhaps a year of budget stringency. The priorities of the IBHE reflect priorities of the member institutions like us and the U of I remains at the top of the list. The salary package request is similar to the kind of packages we’ve had before. Your guess is as good as mine what that will mean.

Number two, there is a shortfall because of the investment in the SURS retirement account that has to be off the top and that is, Dr. Williams, about 30 million? That’s about a 30-million-dollar shortfall because of portfolios and so forth. That has to be plugged plus some health insurance and deferred maintenance. My guess is that those will be the priorities and then the last thing that will get funded if there’s anything left will be programmatic priorities. You know, new academic programs. My guess is that the priorities will be salaries, retirement, health benefits, deferred maintenance and maybe utilities, I’m not sure, but anything that’s left over will go to program money. There may be nothing left over. So that’s the discussion that goes forward. We won’t know anything until December and then those of you who have been around know that the dance continues throughout the spring. We won’t really know anything through April or May. Okay, that’s ’03.

Now let me talk about the current year, our current budget that we’re in. The state put together a budget based on revenue assumptions, and other things like tobacco money, a budget that was very good to higher education. Maybe the best budget in the modern era. Good salary increases, everything. The estimates of revenue that came in for the first quarter that just ended were in the neighborhood of 300 to 400 million dollars less than anticipated. That is not trivial. As a result, the economists and the revenue estimators will say “well, is this just a cash flow thing?” “Is revenue going to come back in the second, third and fourth quarter’s or do we need to revise state budgets downward”? Well, what the governor said was optimistic, that things would come back, but he said that they may not come back all the way and therefore he issued, right around the time of September 11, an executive order to the code agencies, the agencies that report directly to him, to make mid-term cuts or adjustments, or to stop spending, to the level of about 50 million dollars. Immediately. That was to be accomplished by a hiring freeze with hiring only permitted at the approval of the deputy chief of staff for the governor and there’s some high-level committee dealing with that. In other words, the governor was pulling in all vacancies and making the decision that all travel outside the state, all non-essential travel outside the state, would be curtailed, again with a waiver process. All major equipment purchases would be delayed and there would be a limitation of 2% on transferring across funds. That’s been put in place. The clear implication is that before the governor would move on other aspects of the state budget, especially education, that the code agencies would be asked to step up and adjust their budgets. To me, that’s the clear implication. However, in his executive order and in the letter to Phil Rock, who is the head of the IBHE, he requested that institutions of higher education
consider similar measures and we had a little bit of discussion about that at the IBHE, but of course, Northern Illinois University is governed by a Board of Trustees and so we obviously want to be good citizens and be prudent along with the governor but we have to determine what’s the best way for us. So, here’s what we’ve done so far and that’s what we know so far. First of all, I don’t think we’re going to know much definitively about the total state budget picture until January for this year. When the next quarter estimates come out I think that’s a critical time, January. As of right now, the best thing we can do, as I said in my speech, is that we have to practice fiscal prudence at this time. Normally, as we do every year, come November 1 through January, what we do is we sort of look very carefully at every vacant position and we usually don’t fill those positions unless there’s vice-presidential approval that they’re essential. We do that for a lot of reasons and it’s prudent. We do that every year and that’s expected, and so we’re doing that again this year, I put that in place last Friday instead of November 1. So any vacant position now can be filled only with the approval of the vice president that controls that position. We'll watch that pretty carefully. That’s one thing. Then the second thing we’re doing is that we’ve asked everyone to be prudent about their balances and, as we normally do, we will review quarterly the expenditures in all of our accounts. We take a look to see what kind of shape we’re in. Let me just say we’re in good shape, but right now you have all the information that we have. I won’t sugarcoat it, as I said, because I do think that this is going to be a tight year, but relative to what’s happening around us in other states, relative to what could happen to other institutions in Illinois, we’re in good fiscal shape. We’re going to watch and you watch too. Essential things we’re going to do. Essential hires we’re going to make. Essential equipment we’re going to purchase. Searches that are ongoing, we’re going to continue with those that are already approved, but we’re going to start being prudent and then wait and see. It’s no time to panic but it’s time to be prudent and smart and that’s what we’re going to be. All right, so that’s part two of what I wanted to say in terms of announcements.

The third thing is that this morning we officially welcome to campus our consulting firm, Lipman Hearne, a very, very good group from Chicago that met with the Senior Cabinet and others to begin talking about this process we’re going to go through, in cooperation and partnership with the NIU Foundation and the NIU Alumni Association, to do a marketing study of NIU. Remember in my speech, I talked about the gap between our quality and the perception of our quality – I want to close that gap. They’re a very good group of people. We’re all eager to get involved and this first phase is going to be one of education and reflection and talking to a lot of people. Everyone has to be involved in this in some way if we are going to be successful in determining how to best present NIU, what is the NIU future, what is our future. It’s time for us to take a serious look at that and I think this approach can give us the opportunity to do that. Focus groups will be brought together with perspective students. We’re having focus groups with current students and faculty. As needed, we will do surveys. We’re not sure exactly where this will end up but there will be a lot of input, and there has to be, and it’s hard work and it requires diligence. What it is not is a firm coming in and giving us a new brand that we see and stamp on us. That’s not what we’re about here. We’re about fundamental thinking about who we are and where we’re going and how we can best present ourselves. I’m excited about that. I think this is a top-notch firm and my judgment is that we’re all ready for it. I was very interested to the press reaction to some of the things I said in the State of the University Address and I was a little surprised that they picked up on image. Maybe it was the inflection with which I delivered the speech, but I didn’t think that would be what they picked up although I’ve hit a
nerve. Therefore, I’m pleased at that and we’re going forward. The other thing is I want to publicly thank Ron Carter and the NIU Jazz Ensemble for playing at our donor dinner on Friday and someone -- you know, how Bush is upset about a leak – someone told him that I liked to polka. If I ever find out --- anyway, thank you Ron. I can’t believe that the NIU Jazz Ensemble could reach into their sack and pull out sheet music on the Beer Barrel Polka. Thank you very much. Is there a motion to accept the Consent Agenda?

P. Henry: I have one question on this marketing study. I see the Chicago Tribune has educational supplements from time to time, and the only ad I ever see in there for NIU is for the MBA program, and it seems to me that that may not be the only thing we can do to improve our image. Since all the others, DePaul and everyone else, is in there advertising like mad in those sections it’s something we might want to look into.

President Peters: You’re way down the line. That’s implementation strategy. One would really like to have free publicity. Those are pretty expensive but you’re absolutely right. If that’s a good recommendation that we all feel comfortable with and that comes out of this study then we’ve got to find the resources to do it. I’m sure what you have seen is paid for by resources from the MBA program.

P. Henry: And I have nothing against that.

President Peters: So, you can buy your way into this. You can go into TV; we can buy TV. How much money do you want to spend on this? You know, you’re absolutely right. I just think that when you do open up the Tribune’s educational supplement NIU ought to be just staring people in the face in some way. Maybe one global ad. I don’t know.

P. Henry: Actually, we were quoted in several articles in that as well. NIU was mentioned in the body so that was good.

President Peters: So we’re going to make sure that we get the marketing/image people to talk to you. That’s what’s so great about this. But it goes beyond just that. It’s not just about marketing, it’s about who we are. What image do we want to project? Is there a tag line that you can use? I guess that the tag line we have now is “NIU works.” That’s our tag line. A lot of people like that, some people don’t. U of I is, what is it Dean Zar?

J. Zar: “Always thinking.”

President Peters: “Always thinking.” So that’s not exactly what I mean. It’s more fundamental. All right? Let’s move forward. Is there a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as it appears? All those in favor of accepting the Consent Agenda?

V. CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda was approved.

1. University Council, Past and Future – refer to University Affairs Committee.
2. Review of Residence Hall Meal Plans – refer to University Affairs Committee.

3. Changes for the Committees of the University, to the Educational Services and Programs Faculty Advisory Committee – refer to Rules and Governance Committee.

4. Addition to the Committees of the University: Teaching Assistant Training and Development Advisory Committee – see memo from Jerrold Zar – refer to Rules and Governance Committee.

5. Guidelines for Online Courses Carrying Undergraduate Credit – walk-in – refer to Academic Policy Committee – walk-in

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sue Willis – report

President Peters: Sue do you have a report from the FAC to the IBHE?

S. Willis: Yes. Normally our representative is Pat Henry. The IBHE met last Tuesday and Pat was unable to attend so I attended in her place. This was a full meeting of the IBHE. The Faculty Advisory Committee met over lunch afterwards. I’ve been out sick for a couple of days and so I’m a little behind the eight ball here. It occurred to me as I was sitting in my office about an hour ago that I had given Pat all my materials at the Faculty Senate meeting so I will just tell you what I recall although I did take some notes. In any case, in the full IBHE meeting there were a number of informational items. They have this best practices thing that every university is supposed to report. What’s your best academic practice? And I forget what the other category is but it’s something like fiscal.

President Peters: Programmatic and fiscal.

S. Willis: They chose three of those to highlight so there were little presentations about which universities were doing things that were particularly wonderful. Then there were some action items. Those that I think would be of most interest to people here concerned the University of Phoenix which you may be familiar with. The University of Phoenix runs a very large online program. What they’re requesting to do now is to establish actual physical programs within the state of Illinois. They’re planning on opening one in Schaumburg fairly soon and then another one in one of the western suburbs. I’ve forgotten which – Naperville, okay, thanks--a little further down the line. So they came asking for approval to start offering courses, which they were awarded. This does not give them approval to award any degrees. When they are ready to have an official degree program then they have to come back to IBHE and each degree program also has to be approved, but they have to have approval to operate before they can do that. They did that; they received that approval. There were some questions that were brought up, particularly having to do with their library resources which apparently are entirely online, and also to the rather heavy use of part-time and temporary faculty; but it was decided that there was nothing in there that would preclude them from offering courses. As I say, when they want to
offer degree programs then they will have to come back for those and, hopefully, people will look at those fairly carefully.

The Faculty Advisory Committee then met over lunch and this was discussed at some length and some interesting questions were brought up, like whether would we have to accept transfer courses from them. Questions for which the answers were not clear. There was also some thought that if one of the public universities wants to offer a new program it has to demonstrate need, that there’s a need for this program. If a private university wants to offer a program they just do it. They don’t have to demonstrate need as part of the program approval, and so there was some thought that perhaps this ought to be looked into. Now obviously the Faculty Advisory Committee can’t do anything directly about that but they can raise questions with the IBHE can then look at. That was the main gist of what went on there. Fortunately, the rest of the Faculty Advisory Committee meetings are on Fridays and I think Pat should be able to go.

President Peters: I’ve got a comment on that. This is a serious policy issue because there should be a level playing field in the State of Illinois for the authority to offer degree programs, or really any program, and there’s not right now. It’s rather strange. A duly constituted and established university like NIU or the U of I has to show need for a new degree program, go through a lot of hoops and appropriately so, but an outside agent can come in and the IBHE grants this out of courtesy. The University of Phoenix does not need the approval of IBHE and so my view is that I intend to work to get some legislation or something to level the playing field because the people of Illinois should have some certainty that the programs that are offered are quality educational programs. The other thing is that the University of Phoenix and others like them will probably hire me and you to teach those courses and that means you and I bear the costs of the preparation and the training and they probably will even use our structures and our buildings. So, I think it’s a serious issue and I’m not against it. I’m for the level playing field however. That’s a personal view.

S. Willis: That’s my report.

President Peters: I do not believe we have a report for Academic Affairs; or Finance, Facilities and Operations; or Legislative and Audit. Is that correct? All right, but we do have a report from Jim Lockard on the BOT?

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones and Dan Griffiths – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen – no report

E. BOT – Jim Lockard – report

S. Willis: Actually, Jim asked me to give the report.
President Peters: All right.

S. Willis: The Board of Trustees met on Thursday, the 20th of September. Many of their action items came from those committees whose reports you have already heard. Basically, they passed all those things, the budget recommendations and what have you. Other than that, there were a number of informational items. Probably the zippiest one was from a company called Twin Lights, which apparently has a contract with the College of Business to develop a video game like instructional package which was demonstrated at some length so we all got to watch it. That was interesting. Apparently this involves no university resources. I’m not sure exactly what that meant. I guess it means no money. It does not necessarily mean no people. That was sparkly. Then there were a lot of informational reports. The other one that involved some audio/visual component was on the turf replacement where, as you may know, we saved a lot of money by recycling the old turf and putting in new turf that was made of recycled material, so there are a number of little wooden boxes with glass sides and pieces of dirt and turf that were presented to the Board members - one of whom said that he could assure everybody that he certainly did not already have one of these - to commemorate this event.

President Peters: I can’t believe how many people have asked me for one of those.

S. Willis: They don’t have one either?

President Peters: I gave mine away, no I didn’t.

S. Willis: In any case, what I would consider the main action items really were the recommendations forwarded by the committees, particularly concerning the budget items which I already reported to you last time. They were passed pretty much without question or comment.

President Peters: Any questions?

F. Academic Policy Committee – Mary Larson, Chair


G. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – Gary Coover, Chair

President Peters: Resources, Space and Budget, Gary? No report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair – report.

President Peters: Rules and Governance, Susan always has a report.

1. Revised Language for the Statement of Professional Ethics – First Reading

S. Mini: Yes, always has a report is right. First let’s go to the Statement of Professional Ethics.
This was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in our April meeting and, in fact, it is currently on their Web page. The University Council endorsed it at their May meeting with the provision that we make some language changes, and, the Rules and Governance Committee believe that they’ve done this. Particularly, there was a question about paragraph 3, I believe this is on page 27 of your packet. The language that we added was “exploit” and “other faculty members or staff” so the sentence would read “faculty do not discriminate against, exploit or harass other faculty members or staff”. For continuity we added also a sentence in paragraph 2 “they do not discriminate against, exploit or harass students”. We’re submitting this for a first reading, but I would say that we’ve already endorsed this so if nobody objects perhaps we should waive the first reading. That would be my suggestion.

President Peters: All right, is there discussion? Did everyone hear what Susan said? We discussed this in the spring and it was sent back. There’s some added language from the Committee. I got the feeling that the Committee is solid behind this now and the suggestion that Susan is bringing is that we consider it and perhaps waive the first reading, I think that’s what she said so now we need a discussion.

H. Rubin: What is the motion?

President Peters: I think the motion now would be to waive the first reading and then go to action on this item.

M. Gotthardt: I might be wrong, but I don’t see anywhere on this statement anything about respect for diverse backgrounds or views as it reflects to faculty, staff or students, I may be mistaken, there may be something in there, but I personally think including something of that nature would be appropriate.

President Peters: Does anyone on the Committee want to respond to that?

S. Mini: I’m not sure how to respond to that. You want to add an extra statement at this stage about diversity or respecting diversity? Was that correct?

M. Gotthardt: Yes.

S. Mini: I’ve been reminded that the statement that you’re referring to is already in the Constitution and that’s University policy. This is a statement of professional ethics. It’s supposed to be a statement of our aspirations.

M. Gotthardt: I would hope the faculty would aspire to achieve what I mentioned. I guess I’m not understanding. I don’t understand why, just because it’s in the Constitution, it doesn’t have enough merit to be in this statement.

S. Mini: Would some of my committee like to comment on that?

P. Henry: We were noticing that faculty demonstrate respect for students as individuals in part two, in a sense, that covers that.
M. Gotthardt: I considered that but I didn’t think that was sufficient.

President Peters: Professor Rubin wants to comment.

H. Rubin: Why not?

M. Gotthardt: I just feel there should be something specific to the respect of diversity somewhere along those lines. I think the line that you were referring to, “respect for students as individuals,” seems too vague. I mean, it could be applied to it, but I just don’t feel that’s sufficient.

H. Rubin: As a substantive comment has been made, I would oppose waiving first reading because clearly there’s a substantive issue on the floor.

President Peters: All right, so what I’ve heard is a suggestion that we not waive first reading. This would permit us to consider this over the next month and then as we take up action on this item next month, we may at that time entertain motions that would either add or not add language that would make it explicit that the Faculty Professional Responsibility Statement would state that faculty members would not discriminate against individuals on the basis of ethnic origin, gender and so forth. I think that’s the sense of what we’re hearing. My suggestion is that we consider in a month what the role of a statement for everyone of professional ethics entails. Usually these things surround the role of exercising good judgment and respecting academic freedom and the intellectuality of every individual in the classroom and outside the classroom situation, and those statements work best when they have that focus. The question is, do we have enough non-discriminatory language in other aspects of our Constitution to cover those behaviors? You wanted to say something, Herb?

H. Rubin: I’m treating this as an apple pie statement and I think in apple pie statements one ought to have parallelism in terms of the depth of the statements that are being made. So I support our thinking about this. That’s why I made my motion on the second part. Going back to point one, we have apple pie statements about intellectual honesty that aren’t specified in the same parallel level, and what constitutes it, and the question comes about in a statement like this as to what level of detail do we really want. I mean, if it exceeded a page I’d be violently opposed to it. If it’s one paragraph, I totally support it and so I’m concerned about how many very specific things we want to mention just on the nature of it. The minute we start mentioning specific statements, we’re into enforcement or into what do we really mean by it, how do we implement it. This is a statement, a guiding statement, almost like a catch phrase for the University and so I’m concerned when we try to get down to every little detail.

President Peters: You captured what I was trying to say. Susan, where this leaves us is I hear no motion to waive and therefore this matter will be for action next month.

J. King: Before we get off this topic, is there anything to report about statements from the Supportive Professional Staff or from the administration in the pipeline – professional ethics statements?
President Peters: I’ve asked our lawyers to scour the rules and regulations to see if embedded within them are statements of professional ethics and then come back to me. I have not received that yet.

J. King: Are there, other statements of ethics, because you know this faculty statement grew out of the AAUP statement of professional ethics. Is there something like that for administrators, may I ask? I mean, in your professional organizations, in the best of them, have they something like a template statement of professional ethics?

President Peters: That’s an oxymoron. I’m sure there are. I’ve never seen any. I am very familiar with statements like this from my other institutions and I’ve been through discussions like this at other institutions. At one institution there was a statement of responsibility within the bylaws, rights and responsibilities of faculty. Rights and responsibilities of staff. Rights and responsibilities of students. If you violated any of those rights and responsibilities, that was actionable at a professional conduct committee composed of individuals from those three peer groups, and they were not pie in the sky. They were lofty but they were pretty specific and violation was actionable. If you were a faculty member and you violated the intellectual environment in your department, you could be brought before the professional conduct committee because you violated the code of ethics, the code of conduct I think it was called. So depending on where you are, it takes different forms. This AAUP statement appears in many university catalogues and bylaws across the country. Sometimes you see a code of conduct for students in the student manual, and usually grievance procedures, depending on the state that you’re in, rule over administrators. That’s a long winded way of saying it depends on where you are, but I’ve never seen a code of professional conduct for college presidents or deans, but they probably are out there.

J. Povlsen: Actually, thank you for raising the issue in terms of where the other councils or constituency groups are because I was going to jump in. As for the Professional Staff Council, it currently has in a draft form a statement of professional ethics that council members have been working on. I would expect that it would be adopted soon. I hope that we would have it within the next month; at least that’s my goal, to try to get some unfinished business from last year done. The other statement that I have, however, is whether or not you folks are actually looking for us to submit our formal statement of professional ethics. I think any statement on professional ethics is very valuable and I think it shows how we expect people to act in our community and I was wondering how the University Council will be distributing this. I mean, policies are good but how do we get people to value this? I was wondering if the University Council had thought along those lines.

President Peters: Judy?

J. Burgess: Operating Staff Council is also currently working on it.

President Peters: Jim, there’s your answer.

J. Povlsen: Do we then submit it to you? Are you looking for this? Is this going to be
published? Where is this going?

**President Peters:** I think the motion or the action item from here was a request that your groups look at this. I think that’s about what it said. It wasn’t clear what we do with those. All right, you have one. We have to remember that once we get all this done we have to do a legal check to make sure that everything that is in these statements comports with what is in our Constitution. That’s the key. I remember at another institution that I was at they passed one of these statements and then it was unenforceable relative to the bylaws of the university. It became a pie in the sky statement of values rather than something that was enforceable.

**P. Henry:** I don’t think we had reached any decision of how to distribute. I think it would be good to distribute it as widely as possible as perhaps part of the material that is given to students along with the judicial code. I think that would be perfectly appropriate.

**President Peters:** I think one thing I’m going to do on my own is take all these statements and have legal look at them and make sure that we’re okay.

**S. Mini:** Well, this particular statement of professional ethics is already on your Faculty Senate Web page.

**President Peters:** It is?

**S. Mini:** It is.

**S. Willis:** It was passed by the Faculty Senate.

**President Peters:** Again, the question is, it’s an empirical question or a legal question, is it anything more than a statement that’s on the Web?

**S. Mini:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** All right, you have one more item.

2. **Mail Ballot Provision** – report

**S. Mini:** Yes, it’s the mail ballot provision. This idea came up in the April 11th meeting when we didn’t have a quorum for a vote that we were having on an amendment, and the Rules and Governance Committee was asked to consider a bylaws change to have mail ballots. We decided that we weren’t interested in this and we weren’t going to act on it. The reasons are because it is the nature of bylaws and constitutions to be difficult to change or amend, and it’s a characteristic of the University Council to have a discussion or arguments whether we want to change something or not. We certainly can’t do that if we have mail ballots. The third thing that was brought up was that one way to conservatively indicate you’re not interested in having a motion passed is not to show up to a meeting.

**President Peters:** All right, so therefore ---
S. Mini: We’re not going to act on this.

President Peters: You have reviewed, you have discussed, and you bring forth no action.

S. Mini: That is correct.

H. Rubin: I hadn’t really thought about the statement before the meeting. I read the thing and was of two minds. I mean on one hand, if you care about something you show up, and that’s there. And certainly bylaws have to be handled in a conservative way. You can’t have impulsive changes and by a carefully structured set of mail ballots you could prevent impulsive changes. But I’m pretending in my background as a political scientist, not simply as a sociologist, I need to admit that, but when you’re reading about political apathy especially in depressed communities, why don’t poor people, why don’t people of color, vote and the answer is they have a sense it doesn’t matter. Well, if you get over that sense, you could do some structural change and I’m hearing some statements that Professor King has made, and with which I totally concur, that there’s a large sentiment on this campus that a very sanguine view of shared governance isn’t really, at least in this body, universally shared and there are people who are more nominally participating because they don’t see a way of accomplishing what they want to accomplish which could require some sort of bylaw change. So we’re caught in a situation. On one hand you don’t want somebody coming in and impulsively, being high on the sugar from the cookies, making the changes. On the other hand, when we look at attendance the faculty frequently do not technically get a quorum. That’s indicative of something being wrong and maybe something being wrong is the bylaws do not give people sufficient power, so we’re really trapped in a catch 22. I don’t want instant changes but I would like somebody to be able to say let’s make these changes, so people begin to feel empowered. So, I would have been happier if somebody had come back and said we don’t want an instant change; we want another hurdle before we go to the mail ballot. We don’t want to do it instantly but at least set up something that doesn’t perpetuate a situation that I think is deteriorating. End of speech.

President Peters: Well, this issue is at an end unless there’s some action, for the time being.

J. Zar: I think the points that Professor Rubin just raised are important and it seems to me they relate to the current issue that’s been sent to committee on the role of the University Council. Maybe those points can be addressed when that is further discussed.

President Peters: Would the body agree to that? That committee, their scope, their authority is wide in this and they can consider anything that they want. Do we want to give them a specific instruction?

S. Mini: That went to a different committee, not Rules and Governance.

S. Willis: The thinking of the Steering Committee in referring that to the University Affairs Committee rather than to the Rules and Governance Committee was that University Affairs would have a more global outlook on what the role of the University Council is and should be, and then once they took a look at that if there were some substantive changes in the bylaws that
might be useful then they would come back and make recommendations and we could go to Rules and Governance with it. The idea was to have University Affairs take a more holistic look at it rather at just looking specifically at the bylaws.

**President Peters:** I think it will be part of that; could be part of that.

**S. Willis:** I would not like to limit the kinds of things that they consider. I would like to open it up as wide as possible, so any suggestions or input I’m sure are quite welcome.

**President Peters:** I think we’ve got it covered. Thank you for your report, Sue.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

**R. Orem:** No report today.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Winifred Creamer, Chair

**W. Creamer:** The report is very brief. We finished counting ballots for the hearing panel for the Faculty Grievance Committee and we have another election coming up which is--Donna what’s the one we’re preparing ballots for now? We’re not? Okay, then we’re all set for the moment.

**D. Mathesius:** We’re sending out letters informing the people, the twenty lucky ones.

**W. Creamer:** The twenty lucky members of the hearing panel, who we hope won’t need to exercise too much of their services.

**President Peters:** Thank you. Any questions?

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Is there any unfinished business to bring before the body?

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**M. Gotthardt:** An issue was brought up in the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment yesterday, basically what I referred to. I’m going to speak on the student perspective first. I found that students are experiencing two types of emotional difficulty in the wake of these events. The first one, obviously, is grieving and the second one is a little more difficult to explain. It’s a sort of alienation from all of the influx of patriotism, all the flag waving that has gone on lately. A lot of students are uncomfortable with that and, you know, don’t want to express anything that would be seen as anti-American in these times. I’ve had several faculty members mention to me that test scores in their classes have dropped dramatically since these events and a lot of students have expressed concerns that nobody is really talking about it. It’s on everybody’s mind but it’s become something that we’ve pushed to the back of our mind and we deal with on an individual basis. I am just wondering what this Council might view would be an appropriate action to take to possibly address these difficulties. Students are
having difficulties that the faculty and staff may have dealing with these events, and difficulties faculty and staff may have counseling students and talking to them about it fairly, objectively and supportively.

**President Peters:** Does anyone want to comment? There’s a whole series of obvious things that are in place. I know Sue along with our Provost is working on a set of formal activities to discuss these issues and the events. Gary Gresholdt is here who can inform us about the immense effort that all of our counselors are making. It’s anecdotal but it’s fairly accurate based on a number of conversations with faculty who have taken the time; not all faculty are ready to do that depending on their discipline or comfort doing that. All students react differently to that but I think we have a lot of people here who have been involved in a lot of activities and I think maybe we should share some information on what is going on and then determine if we do have an issue that we have to deal with more than by the programs we’re putting in place.

**S. Willis:** Two or three weeks ago the Provost asked me to organize an ongoing university response to these events. I’ve been doing that. There hasn’t been any obvious indication of that yet because it’s still all in progress. I’ve been focusing on two things at the moment. One is just gathering a bunch of Web resources that would reside on our Web page that people could go to for information and discussion. That’s, of course, more in the nature of just informing yourself and more of a personal kind of thing. I thought that it would be helpful both for students and for faculty and staff. The other thing I’m working on is organizing an ongoing series of discussion groups. I’ve so far got two of them scheduled, one on the 31st of October and one on the 7th of November. I still need to get rooms for them so there hasn’t been publicity yet. The first one will be a discussion lead by Dr. Thomas Barone from the College of Education. He has some experience with multi-cultural education and also has lived in Islamic countries for some time. The second one will be lead by Dr. Christopher Jones; he’s in Political Science. He has a lot of expertise with international politics and U.S. security policy and that kind of thing. I have been talking to the military science people on campus to see if I can get them to come and discuss things from a military viewpoint. Right now we’re playing phone tag but I’m working on getting things scheduled. I also have a long list of other people that I’m going to keep trying to get in touch with and get them scheduled for these things. The idea would be that these would be relatively informal discussions so the person leading the discussion would give a short presentation, maybe five or ten minutes and then would open it up for questions and back and forth kind of things with the audience which hopefully would be there. Also at the meetings that I had when we discussed this, one thing that we talked about that might be relative to the concerns you’ve been raising would be to have the President designate perhaps a week where he would specifically encourage faculty members to focus on these things during class time. In some disciplines they’re more relevant than others, obviously, and some the faculty might not want to take time for something that was very far away from the scope of their class, but others might wish to do so. There was some feeling that having guidance from the top would legitimize that and would help that actually occur.

**Provost Legg:** I want to point out that this came out of a meeting of some of the leadership of the university and we had Sue there and we also had invited Troy but he could not come to either meeting. One of the things that I encouraged was the cooperation between the student government leadership and Sue in keeping the communication lines open because they were
considerable other things, like brown-bag lunches in the dorms and stuff like that that came out of that list of items that Sue was so good in preparing with the executive committee. I would encourage you or anybody in the leadership group of the Senate, Troy or others, to meet with Sue periodically and to share the information that you get from the student body because that may help guide us in how we do these programs. Your points are well made.

S. Willis: One of my concerns in organizing these things is to get things that will get the interest of students and be in places and at times that are convenient for them so that some people actually show up. If we could get together that would be good.

M. Gotthardt: We will do that. Thank you for the suggestion Dr. Legg.

President Peters: Gary, I want you to talk about this psychological counseling. One thing that strikes me as I went through the catalogue and started asking questions about is what is the depth at this university of our curriculum and the languages and the culture and the geography of the Middle East? I think the answer is there’s some there but it is not as vibrant as it might be in other areas. It might be we have to bring some experts in. The other thing is I think we’re at the beginning of this and events are going to raise issues, and you raised one, and you expressed really a kind of ideological viewpoint about the reaction to super-patriotism and how you handle that. Well, okay, we’re at the tip of this. I also heard that some of our community have taken the occasion to make anti-Semitic remarks, a form of intolerance. So all of these things are going to start unfolding. We don’t know militarily what will happen or what our political agenda will be but the university is the best place to begin openly to discuss and to educate ourselves on all these issues. So I’m glad you brought this to our attention. Then there is the community aspect of this, taking care of each other no matter what you believe or what you know or don’t know. Gary, would you talk a little bit and then we’ll get to Professor Rubin?

G. Gresholdt: I think we’ve been fortunate that the university community has been very tolerant of one another and of individual differences and there has been considerable respect shown on this campus. That is a real plus at this particular time. I understand that students experienced a wide range of emotions as we all did on September 11 and the days that followed, and we continue to experience a wide range of emotions about the events that are taking place. Our counseling center has reported there has been an increase in the number of students who have sought counseling at the center, and our counselors are prepared to work with students who are experiencing emotional difficulties in dealing with the events of the day. So I think it’s really important that we make students aware that these services are available and make referrals to our Counseling and Student Development center. They also made arrangements to meet with groups of students as well as individual students, and that is one way of responding to a need that may be out there. In addition to that, I think we’ve seen opportunities for a number of student organizations to do a variety of things in response to the situation that occurred. There have been a number of student organizations that have engaged in fund-raising to support the American Red Cross, for example, and the disaster relief effort. That’s a very positive thing that the students can do, that we all can do. I understand that the Muslim Student Association, which is a recognized student organization has planned a series of workshops introducing students to concepts or tenets of the Islamic faith, so there are some very good things that are going on and we need to make sure that this information is widely disseminated. I think all of us need to be
available to each other and to students and allow time for individuals to speak about the feelings that they have as incidents unfold over the days ahead.

**Provost Legg:** I say the following with some trepidation, but I did volunteer to Sue and the programs to participate in brown bag discussions and so on; with all the time I have, I would certainly be able to do that. You were supposed to crack up, Catfish. I do live in Stevenson North and it’s easy for me to get together in the evening if you want to pull a bunch of students together for any issue you want to talk about.

**President Peters:** My observation from really trying to be around is that the university and the whole community are handling this very, very well relative to—I see many other people out there who are of my vintage—those who went through Viet Nam and some other situations. I think we’re starting out a lot better but I think the future is uncertain.

**H. Rubin:** Sorry for talking so much. There were several things I was going to attack you on later on but I won’t today. Personally, I think we have to see this issue beyond students. Maybe I’m just speaking for myself. I’m still in the nightmare stage, not of the terror but all those anxieties. Faculty, staff we need ways of talking. I’m thinking the thing that has actually kept me going in many ways is something that occurred on 9/11. I hugged one of the members of the Presidential Cabinet and had a very warm handshake/hug with somebody else. One person I’m close to; somebody else with whom I’ve often quarreled. But it was absolute solidarity, you know, hey we’re sort of in this together somehow. I’ve been using that as a crutch and I think that’s very, very important to happen. I’m very pleased with all the informational stuff. I remember how much we learned from the teach-ins of the 60s and all that stuff, psychiatric and psychological counseling. It’s very important, but I think we have to think of this more than simply cognitively and more than psychologically. There’s an effect and I can only draw on my own experiences. In my classes I deal with questions of race, ethnic identity and stuff like that and in the very best classes I structure things where we let it all hang out, and some of these are heavy. It doesn’t occur too often, but it gets down to some fairly broad dimensions going back to the 60s. I’m not thinking of the street protests, most of which are a good part of my memory. I’m thinking of the things where people were smoking funny stuff and sitting around a room and letting it come out, you know, who am I as an American, what does racism mean, what am I doing to this woman (girl, whatever we label people these days), these whole basic issues. In the climate that we’ve established on this campus where we are being very careful not to be offensive, it gets very, very difficult to get down to some of these core, gut emotional issues. On one hand, we don’t want racism rearing its ugly head. On the other hand, when fundamental anger takes on ethnic coloring and people are fearing these things, we need a safe environment. Maybe everybody should put brown bags over their heads so nobody sees who it is so you can almost emote on these levels to work it out. What I get nervous about is that we over intellectualize it and we have the Koran, a wise document, and we’ve learned about political and military strategy and we’re not really getting into the stomach or the gut where we’re feeling this sort of stuff. I don’t really know how to go on. I find one of the obstacles is the idea that some of these discussions are going to offend. There’s no way around it because these are the emotions that we’re dealing with.

**President Peters:** Okay, thank you. Well, there’s no getting around the fact that there are
people out there who want to do us harm, and that will get to the gut reaction if we have an incident, and I think we are as prepared as we can be.

**P. Henry:** One thing on this campus that is tough, I think, is that so many students commute and the sort of community of the campus is hard to build under those circumstances; so I’m hoping some of these group discussions and possibly teach-in types of things will help mitigate that.

**M. Larson:** I just want to echo Herb’s statement from another point of view. In the Department of Communication I guess one of the things I’m sensitive to is that it seems like people are not very good at interpersonal communication; with all the other kind of mediated devices that people attend to, we spend less time just talking casually. When I met with my classes after the 11th I said you know, look up and down your dorm floor and see if there’s someone who’s decided to kind of not be part of the group and who’s decided that this is too horrible to talk about. Organized discussion groups aren’t necessarily the only thing we need. We just need to see if someone looks like they’re hurting to say “jeez, isn’t this horrible”, or if there’s somebody who can’t talk let’s say “grab a Coke and let’s see what’s on CNN” just so there’s some way of getting in contact with other human beings.

**President Peters:** Good point. Anybody else want to add anything? I’m sure we could do this all night, and I’m even more eager to get to talking to the students tonight. All right, is there any other New Business? Hearing none, is there anything for the good of the order, comments from the floor?

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**M. Gotthardt:** I have two comments. First of all, mid-terms are next week and those faculty that are supportive of the notion of the value of constant feedback between students and faculty in regards to evaluation, I would ask that you consider administering an informal evaluation in your classes and get some feedback from students before the end of the semester; and if you feel strongly about this I’d ask you to encourage other faculty in your department.

My second little piece is that I just want the minutes to reflect my disappointment with the student turnout today for University Council and I would just like to say that we will work to improve on our numbers. Thank you.

**J. King:** The mention of mid-terms leads me to comment about the following, that if we had for the fall semester what we had for the spring semester we’d be looking at the fall break, a one week break coming up right around now, and I think this is something that would really be a service to our community. Fall is the time when we get two freshmen classes. We get undergraduate freshmen. I think the idea of having a week to catch up on your work is remarkably valuable, but I think we also have the freshmen graduate-student class coming in. There are teaching assistants in many departments. They’re confronted with a ferocious amount of work as new graduate students. They’ve got a ferocious amount of work in grading. In the fall term, a break would be really life saving for many of them, so we’d be talking about the idea of a fall break with the purpose of academic service. Let’s notice also that several departments, like Geology, have lab experiences off campus that are terribly important, and a fall break would
in fact give those students and those departments and other departments like that catch-up time, terrific catch up time. I think it’s a selling point for the university. A lot of colleges, private colleges, make a very big point of the fall break, but the argument that I’m offering for you is not recruitment, it is academic service. To make life easier for our students. I’d like to ask you all to kind of think about this. Thank you.

**President Peters:** How long would it last? About when it would occur?

**J. King:** One week.

**President Peters:** One whole week.

**J. King:** Right; we start a week early or we go a week later. That’s the trade-off.

**President Peters:** I’m used to fall breaks that are like a Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday.

**J. King:** You mean the Thanksgiving break?

**President Peters:** No, there are places that have fall break and it’s four days.

**J. King:** Well, look, I’ll settle for four days. But in the spring we get a week. Okay? I think if we start a week early we can do it. It depends on the terms. Some terms we’re finished very early in December.

**President Peters:** Do we have a calendar committee or something like that that looks at these things? Maybe we can have the calendar committee look at that and see.

**D. Mathesius:** The Academic Calendar is set through 2010 already by our Academic Policy Committee, I believe it is. That was when Charlie Larson was chair or executive secretary.

**J. King:** Donna is quite right. The calendar is set as a matter of fact and it was set through the authority of the University Council. However, what’s been set can be unset. Okay. We can start again.

**President Peters:** I’ll tell you what, administration on the academic side, will have a little discussion of this, okay, rather than rush it off to a committee. Maybe we can clear away the underbrush and see what the reasons are we do it and why and report that.

**X. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Alternate Policy List (Page 28)

B. University Council Membership List (Page 29-30)

C. UCPC Membership List (Page 31)
D. Faculty Senate Membership List (Pages 32-34)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Herb moves for adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.