THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Booth, Bose, Burns, Clayton, Crisler, Engstrom, Espe, Fox, Gilbert, Graf, Goldenberg, Gorman, Gresherldt, Henry, Hurych, Kafer, Kamenitsa, Kitterle, Koch, Kowalski, Legg, Lockard, Minor, Novotney, Orem, Pappanduros, Powers, Richmond, Robinson, Rose, Seaver, Smith-Shank, S. Song, X. Song, Sorensen, Stewart, Stoddard, Tolhurst, Wade, Webber, Willis

M. Morris attended for L. Pernell; M. Tahrnezhadi attended for P. Vohra.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Barr, Becerra, Bisplinghoff, Buffo, Butler, Cummings, Gregory, Johnson, Kaplan, Kolb, Larson, Loubere, Nelms, Peters, Peterson, Rusin, Schneider, Spear, Wang, Williams, Wolfskill, Young

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

Provost Legg: The bylaws state that I am responsible for running the meeting so that’s why I’m here in John’s absence.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Provost Legg: I would welcome a motion to adopt the agenda. All those in favor? Opposed? So be it.

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 58, 2003 MEETING (Pages 3-5)

Provost Legg: At this time we would welcome any changes or other observations on the minutes from the last meeting. There not being any I would welcome a motion to approve the minutes. All those in favor? Opposed? So be it.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Memorial Resolution for Representative David Wirsing (Page 6)
**Provost Legg:** Obviously there will not be any President’s Announcements but we do have one very important issue here that we need to recognize and to respect and that is the memorial resolution for Representative David Wirsing. Some of you have heard me comment that when I moved from Tennessee up to Illinois, I felt in terms of higher education and the appreciation and understanding of higher education that I had moved from a third world country to a first world country. One of the people that really made me feel that way was David Wirsing. I got to know David reasonably well during the short period I’ve been here, two and a half years. He was definitely, without any question, a friend of the university and a friend of higher education and person who understood that higher education is not just another mouth at the trough but a central issue that leads to the growth and expansion of the economic strength and other aspects of the state of Illinois. It was a tragedy to have lost him, and we have a resolution to respect him. I read over the resolution several times because it was also presented for approval to the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate, and now it’s being brought to the Council for your blessings. If you go through it, I’m not going to read it to you, there are some areas that were remarkably well supported in which David had a central role in. One was to recognizing that state universities as in all states have different missions and are not just one collection of state universities. He recognized that difference and supported with a lot of strength the identification of separate Boards of Trustees for each of the state universities and, having come from a system that was run by one overall board, I can tell you it’s a lot better when you have your own Board of Trustees that focuses on your uniqueness. He was also a supporter and sponsored legislation that supported the keeping of the tuition and fees that we collect directly in the university and helping us become more effective than we would have been had they gone back to the state and then gotten redistributed. He was a very strong supporter in that respect. He was also for our students, and I think it’s a very important point, an advocate and supporter for university students participating in the university boards both by representation and by vote; that has happened, as you all know. There are many other issues here, for example, he was also a strong supporter of NIU and getting the construction that we needed for maintenance and for our growth as a university; he gave us a considerable amount of support in this area. Therefore, it is resolved that the University Council of Northern Illinois University in formal meeting herein assembled, confirms and extends its grateful appreciation to David A. Wirsing for his outstanding commitment and dedication to furthering public higher education in Illinois. I would welcome a motion. Those in favor? Opposed? So be it.

The motion passed.

**V. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES**

**Provost Legg:** There is no Consent Agenda so we’ll move on to item VI, Reports from Councils, Boards and Standing Committees.

A. **FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report** (Pages 7-10)

**Provost Legg:** As usual, we have a report from Patricia Henry on the FAC to IBHE.
P. Henry: I’ve got two reports for you here because there were two meetings in the interim since our last meeting of the University Council. Some of you on the Faculty Senate have already seen part of what is the report from the November 7 meeting at Northeastern Illinois University and I’ll just touch on a couple of points. There was a teleconference with Dan Layzell who is Deputy Director of Planning and Budget with the IBHE. There were a number of uncertainties, as I’m sure there still are, regarding the budget. We did have some discussion about the guiding principles, the IBHE guiding principles, if you’ll look at the third bullet point there under number 2. He listed several of them. The FAC then had some discussion with him about this under 3 in various bullet points there. The underlined portion shows the points that were stressed by Layzell or by the Faculty Advisory Council. In particular, on your page 8, the second bullet point, the FAC really wanted to emphasize to him that these budget priorities did not really address the issue of programs that had been cut over the past several years and that the FAC thought it was an important priority to bring things back to where they’d been before; strengthening academic quality, after all, being part of the *Illinois Commitment*.

Another point is that the FAC has been trying to get across to the IBHE that it would be a very good idea to use the *Illinois Commitment*, as long as it’s there, as a document to hold up as a way of demonstrating to the public and championing the case of higher education to the public at large. This hasn’t seemed to have happened so far.

One other point, speaking of the *Illinois Commitment*, that I’ll get to later. There’s going to be a mid-term review of it and I’ll get to that later. I think the rest you can read yourself, and if you have questions ask me.

With item number 4 on page 8, the FAC did continue to emphasize or to discuss this response to Chairman Kaplan and there is a summary of that response on page 9 with, I believe, a url if you want to read the entire 25 page report. This was requested by Chairman Kaplan, the IBHE Chair, concerning faculty productivity and this has been a process that’s been going on. I think the bottom line here and at the December meeting was that, as we discussed, we wanted to give the IBHE a clear picture of how productive faculty already is, for one thing, and how, in many respects, quality will have to be sacrificed if there are more cuts; and in general give a picture of what is involved in looking at faculty productivity. As I mentioned in the summary here on the top of page 9, there are some mixed feelings in terms of the whole question of to what extent this is the FAC’s issue, to address. It seems to be pushing us into a somewhat difficult situation. The members of the FAC met with the Board yesterday and I’ll discuss the outcome of that in a minute. Once again, however, the key points that were stressed and will continue to be stressed is that solutions should be long-term, strategic and that institutional missions should control the models rather than the sort of simplistic model being used to discuss productivity across the board in higher education.

The next page, I think it’s page 10 in your report or your agenda, was another ongoing item here, speaking of productivity. This was discussed at the Board on Tuesday and did pass as a framework basically for reviewing priorities, productivity and accountability in Illinois higher education and there is a url there to look at if you want to see the whole framework. This is basically the new PQP only without the “Q”. I’m combining things here because when we discussed this last Friday, the FAC actually did try to highlight that and yet hopefully get that
point across to the Board, although I don’t think we actually succeeded in doing so, that speaking of productivity without reference to maintaining quality is not a good plan in the FAC’s opinion. If you see there and, again, this is just a very brief summary of the framework, validation of existing priorities, identification of new priorities, this is not unexpected – exploration and identification of efficiency, productivity enhancements opportunities across all activities – this is the part that directly has been feeding into the FAC discussion as well. There is an ongoing effort on the part of the Board to respond to our concerns that the accountability system or assessment frequently results in quite a lot of redundancy and that there are processes perhaps that can be eliminated; this is something that will be looked at as well.

Report number 2 is the walk-in that reports on what we did last Friday in Springfield. This was a meeting with the staff of the IBHE. There are some changes that I should note in passing: Doug Day, who is the liaison and the Deputy Director for Policy Studies, is leaving, and this is a real loss of institutional memory and continuity. He is one of several members of the staff who are leaving. There’s potentially a problem with continuity and facilitating communication between the FAC and the IBHE. I think a lot of help and very excellent service and, how did he put it, “contextualizing” was one of the things that Doug Day did very well in terms of sort of explaining to us what effect things were going to have on the IBHE and what things were becoming priorities so we’ll miss him very much. We again continued to discuss the white paper. Hopefully, what we’ll do over the course over the next period of time is develop some of this material into some shorter, punchier versions that can be shared with a wider audience. This meeting, as I said, did go on Tuesday and I’ll touch on that in a moment. I think that pretty much reviews some of the same stuff I talked about previously.

Item number 16, again, what we mentioned was the desire to keep quality driven productivity at least reasonably in the crosshairs. The other part of the meeting consisted of discussion with Cathleen Kelly who is a former IBHE staffer. She’s now serving as a consultant and dealing with the mid-term review of the Illinois Commitment. They’re getting input from the FAC. I think they also got input from provosts and other academic officers of various universities; there will be something on the web eventually to elicit comment as well. The questions posed had to do with whether it’s been effective, whether it’s done what it’s supposed to do, should it be modified and what should be expected of it. I have listed here, lest we forget, the six goals of the Illinois Commitment. This was actually a very nice opportunity for the FAC to really pour out its heart with regards to certain problems that we’ve been having with the Illinois Commitment in terms of what priorities are given, big highlights there. There is concern that research and quality of life issues, or quality of general education, has not been paid enough attention to. Such things as civic involvement, ethics and independent thinking are also things that higher education is supposed to contribute to, and there’s really not much weight given to them. Assessment sometimes is used to measure kinds of things, some of which are important but cannot be measured in the way that the IC is frequently trying to measure them; so we had some feedback that was listened to and hopefully it will have some result.

Finally, I just this morning got an e-mail from the members of the FAC who went to the Board meeting Tuesday at Robert Morris College in Chicago. A summary of the productivity white paper was presented to the Board at the meeting and then afterwards the Board and several members of the FAC met together for lunch and discussed it. The bottom line evaluation was
that it wasn’t great but it wasn’t completely horrible as far as sort of getting the sense – what the FAC hoped was that we could get across to the Board and in particular to Chairman Kaplan, that this productivity issue really did not have any quick fixes that we were able to come up with and I think that was part of what he wanted and so to that extent he was not happy completely with the report. The members there had some support from people who realized that we are between a rock and a hard place and it is our role in the FAC to defend quality. It’s really not clear to what extent others can learn from this document or whether it’s simply going to be brushed aside. One point was that Chairman Kaplan said that he was under considerable pressure and that the idea of cutting faculty lines or increasing faculty productivity is, you know, very much around in terms of the administration so this is probably something that is going to continue to affect us. What the FAC members tried to emphasize is that this is something that should come from the institutions, that if the IBHE says “you have to decrease your budget by x amount” institutions will have to find their own way of doing it. This PPA is probably the way in which it is going to be implemented on us, that productivity and priorities and assessment will be the things that will be the watchwords. We’re probably looking at further budget cuts, is the assessment of the people who were there. I think that’s it.

Provost Legg: Do you have any questions for Pat? Yes, in the back of the room.

F. Kitterle: Pat, thanks for your report. I’d like to address your attention to number 3, Catherine Kelly and the questions posed to FAC for discussion.

P. Henry: Sure.

F. Kitterle: Questions 1-6, first thing I’d like to do is focus on the first question. I think it’s essential and an important one and wonder if you folks have addressed this? The Illinois Commitment devised by the Illinois Board of Higher Education because higher education is situated in a public domain and is responsible for that in terms of work force training and in terms of research and that’s why the questions 1-6 in italics are here.

P. Henry: Yes.

F. Kitterle: What I’d like to do is ask the question is – the Illinois Commitment was devised by the IBHE, why are they asking FAC? Has it been effective in terms of the IBHE setting its priorities? Has it been effective for the IBHE in increasing productivity of the IBHE in responding as an oversight board to universities and finally, has it helped us with quality? In other words, when you apply PQP, does it apply to the IBHE or not?

P. Henry: A very good question. Some of the points that we tried to raise had to do very much with the kind of conflicts that arise between some of these commitments; I mentioned in particular the goals that involve accessibility are often very much in conflict just in terms of practicalities with things like getting everybody through in time. It’s really not clear to us exactly how the IBHE views this document. I think originally it was meant to present to the public and to the legislature a way to explain public education and what it’s good for. It seems to have taken on a kind of life, at least as far as some of the staff is concerned, as something that we should be evaluated by and it’s being held up as a template. I urge you to share your concerns
with the IBHE in terms of evaluating – this is basically to see how good the *Illinois Commitment* is doing and at this point, I think the IBHE has its own ideas but is also soliciting other opinions from those in the higher education community.

**Provost Legg:** Yes, in the back of the room?

**W. Tolhurst:** It’s also been noted that when the IBHE places further demands on institutions like this, those demands use university resources and those costs are administrative costs which we are being expected to cut so on the one hand the Governor is telling us to cut administrative costs and the IBHE is forcing us to increase them.

**P. Henry:** We have made that point repeatedly and I think that with some staffers it’s getting through. I’m not sure with all, but it’s a very valid point.

**Provost Legg:** Any other questions? I know I’m preaching to the choir but I need to say this. I taught for 21 years before I became involved as a dean and I chaired the chemistry department at Washington State University during 8 of those years and when I was responsible for faculty workloads as a chair I became very curious as to how many hours are really spent in doing courses; the students need to hear this. You may not appreciate how long you really spend just on one course but ranging from freshman chemistry lecture courses which are four to five hours depending on the length of the lab and the commitment to the lab all the way to graduate courses there were 3 hours. When I logged over several years my involvement in teaching, it would range from 10 hours to 20 hours a week per course and that involved not only the lecturing, the preparation, particularly if you had new material, it involved working with students outside the classroom who not only visited during visit hours but would corner you in the hall and talk with you more. It involved preparing tests; it involved grading tests. In laboratories it involved working with teaching assistants to prepare them for the laboratory. It was easily 10-12 hours per course if you were doing it justice. So if you’re faculty and you’re teaching 3 or 4 courses, you’re already up in the 50-60 hour line without any time for scholarship and other types of informal interactions with students as you do have with graduate programs. Again, I think it’s good for our students to hear this because they are both our mission and our advocates; I just wanted to add that to the picture. Yes, Pat?

**P. Henry:** Actually, this reminds me; I appreciate having gotten from Beth Miller a document talking about how much we assess ourselves as well. Part of the point that we were trying to get across to Cathleen Kelly was that assessment is not something we’re unfamiliar with and that faculty, departments, individual faculty in terms of preparing new courses and doing research and so forth, are constantly involved in a form of assessment and to say nothing of accrediting bodies and so forth so that this is not something that involves us trying to hide how much we do.

**Provost Legg:** All right, but those concepts that I raise are very hard to market because legislatures look at one thing; they look at the time you spend in the classroom and don’t look at all the other material that gives you the quality of education in a classroom.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Paul Loubere and William Tolhurst – no report
Provost Legg: Well, if there are no more questions or comments, we’ll move on to the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee and I have this listed as no report.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Xueshu Song – no report

Provost Legg: BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee also no report.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe – report – walk-in

Provost Legg: D, the BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bev Espe, report

B. Espe: Yes, the Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee did meet before the BOT meeting last week; had a short meeting, about 45 minutes. This is the first time we have met since June so basically we went over some updates. I’ve submitted the report on the substantive legislation that Ken Zehnder did give us an update on. You’ve heard about these bills before. Some of them have passed since the June meeting and the effective dates and all are on here for you. I won’t go through all of those and there’s just a brief overview there of what the bills contain but they’re quite lengthy so if you wanted to go to their website you could get more information on them.

A couple of things to draw your attention to – higher ed appropriations update – and it has to do with some funding things that are nothing new really but maybe put in a little different terms. We are still expecting a shortfall for FY05 even though we are starting to see an increase in revenues for FY04 at the state level but one thing that was pointed out was to recognize where some of these increases are and they really don’t translate into areas that were going to be usable money for higher ed and that when you factor out those different items, technically we’re still below, even though revenues are up, we’re still below as we go into FY05. I did list there some of the items under the third bullet under Kathy’s report there – yes, the third and fourth bullet refers to this – that’s what I’m talking about there. Another point to mention is the AFSCME contract is going to expire in ’04. That covers about 37,000 employees. Whatever new contract is approved and takes effect in ’05 sets the basis for benefits for many of the rest of us and depending on what gets approved there in a contract, is going to impact the budget also so that’s still to be determined what’s going to happen there.

Then moving from there, every 5 or 6 years there are authorization acts that are reauthorized by Congress. This is at the federal level and there are 2 acts in particular that are very controversial and therefore have not been approved yet and one deals with accessibility and the other affordability. That’s the second to the last paragraph there. The bill that deals with affordability is looking at a college affordability index and in that – I’ll try to explain this – this is rather complicated and I know I’m not going to be able to explain it fully but, what it is that increases in the percentage of tuition for a full-time, undergraduate student – the increases between their first year and their third year can only increase by the percentage of increase in the consumer
price index and if it goes over that, there will be penalties put into place for the university and some of those penalties are pretty severe. I listed a couple of them there - fines, loss of funding. There’s a whole list of different things depending on how that all falls. So because of that, it’s very controversial and not quite sure of where all that’s going to go with that.

Lastly, we heard a report from WESTEC. Their representatives gave a presentation and they’re part of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and they’re the group that we have contracted with to look at technology enterprises in Illinois and where the university fits into that, the partnerships that are there and they gave a report on that.

Provost Legg: Questions or comments? Yeah, Pat?

P. Henry: Just one observation, would the truth in tuition that’s operating in Illinois now take care of that affordability index because in effect it sets the tuition the first year? Now the next first year might go up but between the first year and the third year, it wouldn’t change that much, presumably?

B. Espe: I don’t know if I can answer that, Pat.

S. Willis: I think, if I understand the bill correctly, that it would attack the other side of tuition increases, which is how much do this year’s freshmen pay compared to last year’s freshmen.

Provost Legg: Yes, because adjustments do have to be made on the truth in tuition to generate the resources that we do need to run the university. People fail to understand that the reason tuition has outpaced the cost of living index is because state support for universities has decreased dramatically. What people fail to understand is that education is not free. You have to pay for it one way or another. You either pay for it indirectly through your taxes which then get funneled by the state back into higher education or you pay it directly and people don’t look at it in that holistic way. They look at it in units because it’s politically a strong issue to look at in that manner. Yeah?

X. Song: I have a comment to make. I believe to parallel the consumer price index with the affordability index is utterly false. We have a Ph.D. program in this university majoring in economics and I think any economic student can debunk this logic. It is good only if we are not a university. Only if we are a chicken meat plant or producing eggs, or we are producing some fundamental necessity for human life like the clothes or footwear, but we are a university. It is not even included in the government surveys that constitute the consumer price index. So it is definitely wrong logic. I’m wondering how could people say this in an official setting.

Provost Legg: Because they’re politicians. Any other comments or observations?

S. Willis: I just wanted to make a couple of other observations on the particular issue. One is that, as proposed, this would affect every institute of higher education in the country, not just state funded ones, but private institutions would also be at risk of losing their federal funding if they raised their tuition too fast. Community Colleges and everything. The other thing I wanted to mention was that this bill is basically a Republican bill; the Democrats have proposed a bill of
their own, although I don’t know how seriously exactly, which would punish states if they cut their support for their state institutions. Which certainly I would prefer.

**Provost Legg:** Any other wise or otherwise --- Okay.

E. BOT – Sue Willis – report

**Provost Legg:** I should point out the reason the committees referred to in B and C had no reports as they did not meet before the BOT meeting. The BOT did meet, the Board of Trustees did meet and Sue Willis, being the official rep, does have a report.

**S. Willis:** Okay, most of the meeting was fairly routine. A couple of things that I did want to note. The NIU Foundation has seen enormous increases in giving. One of their categories is up something like 50% over last year, which is just astounding, and they believe that part of that is probably due to the publicity that we got on account of the football team being in the news all the time although they’re not sure if that accounts for all of the increase or not. In any case, they’re very happy. It’s good to hear that somebody is getting more money and some of that will come to the academic side.

The memorial resolution for Dave Wirsing was endorsed by the Trustees and they suggested that it be written up and put on a plaque and the suggestion was to put that plaque in Altgeld because Dave was instrumental in getting the funding for the refurbishing of Altgeld.

Let’s see, the President’s appointment was extended to the 30th of June, 2010. They did vote also to give the President a raise. What it is is the same raise that we’re all getting, 1.5% retroactively effective in July and 1.5% on the first of January. So what they’re doing is giving him the same raise as everybody else got. I know that he is very reluctant to take any kind of a raise when times are tough, and has turned down larger raises in the past because he just didn’t think that was a good idea at all, but my own view is that to give him the same percentage as everybody else certainly is not unreasonable.

I also just want to put faculty on notice that I made a suggestion to the Trustees that it might be a good idea for them to shadow a faculty member around for a day, so that they get an idea of what we really do; it was suggested to me afterwards that it might make sense for them to do that with staff too. Maybe they don’t know what an admissions officer does all day, for example. They were quite interested in that; we’ll see where that leads, and I’ll be calling some of you.

**Provost Legg:** They did not mention shadowing students, but that’s a possibility.

**S. Willis:** They didn’t want to take any tests.

**Provost Legg:** Thank you Sue.

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair

**Provost Legg:** The Academic Policy Committee I believe did not meet so there is no report.
G. Resources, Space and Budget Committee – William Goldenberg, Chair

Provost Legg: Resources, Space and Budget Committee did not meet either, right Bill?

B. Goldenberg: That’s right

Provost Legg: So there’s no report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report

Provost Legg: Rules and Governance Committee did meet. Carole Minor, Chair reporting.

1. Office Privacy Policy.

C. Minor: You’ll find our report on page 11. The first item is the office privacy policy which was proposed by the Faculty Senate. This was sent to the Committee at the beginning of the year and we discussed this extensively and discussed it also with Ken Davidson, NIU General Counsel, and the policy that we propose has a few changes to, we thought, make it more inclusive and give office occupants more information about what’s done in their offices. So the parts that were added from the Faculty Senate proposal are underlined. They’re basically specifying that NIU faculty emeriti are included if they have offices, their offices are also under this policy and that student employee offices are also covered under the policy and the addition of the particular sentence – it says in the middle of the second paragraph – “except for routine cleaning, other limited accesses, or for emergencies, faculty, staff and student employees will be provided notification of such access and, whenever practical, notification will precede access”. We wanted to have something so that faculty or staff would be notified after an emergency access to the office about what had been done so we added this sentence. “After an emergency access, the office occupant will be notified in a timely manner about the reason for the access and the actions taken unless there are compelling reasons why this cannot be done.” The General Counsel could think of some compelling reasons why this couldn’t be done but we put that notice – we argued about the words “will” and “should” and what would be said there, so we proposed that the occupant “will” be notified unless there are compelling reasons why this can’t be done. So the Committee proposes what is written in your packet on page 11 as the office privacy policy. We believe this would appropriately in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manuel. We move that this policy be adopted.

Provost Legg: Second? Is there a second to the motion? Discussion? Jim?

J. Lockard: One quick question Carole. In the part that you were reading, what on earth are other limited accesses? “Except for routine cleaning, other limited accesses”? I can understand cleaning, I can understand emergencies, I’m not sure what other limited accesses are.

C. Minor: The one that we talked about was – you are the chair of a search committee for a new faculty member and you have the files in your office and you get sick and the department chair then comes into your office so the rest of the committee can carry on with the meeting. That
would be another limited access.

**S. Willis:** Another thing that we had talked about in the past was, besides routine cleaning, there’s also some minor maintenance. You know, they change light bulbs and fix the thermostat or whatever.

**Provost Legg:** Other questions or comments? It’s been seconded, right? All those in favor of supporting the proposal say aye. Opposed?

The motion passed.

2. Composition of University Council. **FIRST READING.**

**C. Minor:** The second item we have is a proposal for a change in the composition of the University Council. This was also sent to us early in the year. The Supportive Professional Staff Council and the Operating Staff Council requested that both of their members to the University Council would be voting members rather than one being voting and one non-voting as now exists. So I suppose since this is the first reading, we’re going to have to read it?

**S. Willis:** No.

**C. Minor:** For the proposed change, the second member of the Supportive Professional Staff who is on the University Council would be a voting member rather than a non-voting member, and the same with the second member from the Operating Staff Council. As you will note on page 12 under rationale, the second paragraph, the Constitution requires that the University Council have a certain composition. 51% to 60% of the membership must be faculty; 25% to 30% of the composition must be students, and if we add each of these members, the faculty would fall below that range, so we would have to add one more faculty member in order to accommodate and to be consistent with the Constitution. I presented the current situation of the composition: 51.7% of the University Council is faculty, 26.7% are students, 18.3% are administrators and 1.7% are SPS and Operating Staff. So if we make this change, the faculty would have 50.8% of the membership on the University Council. Students would have 25.4% and the administrators would have 17.5% and each of the Operating Staff and the Supportive Professional Staff would have 3.2%. So this is what we propose.

**Provost Legg:** This is a first reading. It will be brought up at the next meeting for an official vote. Are there any observations or comments that you would like to make at this time? Okay, next item.

3. Amendment of Bylaw 5.34.

**C. Minor:** The third item is that there was a proposal for a Bylaw change which was left over from two years ago that was proposed by, I believe, by the UCPC about time to promotion for the Law School faculty. The Committee requested that the Provost and Dean of the Law School meet with us to discuss this and during that discussion it was determined that no bylaw change is needed in order for the Law School to have its needs met in this area. So there will be no
proposal brought for a bylaw change in this area.

4. **Student Grievance Procedure**

**C. Minor:** The fourth proposal is that – we received a proposal for development of a Student Grievance Procedure and there was general agreement that this was a good idea and the Committee will work to propose to the University Council the composition of a task force to develop this grievance procedure and a proposed charge that be given to that task force. So that is something that we are continuing to work on. That is the end of our report.

**Provost Legg:** Thank you.

I. **University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair**

**Provost Legg:** We now move on to – are there any comments that anybody would like to make on any of these items or the last one? Okay. Thank you Carole. University Affairs Committee, Richard Orem, no report?

J. **Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Deborah Smith-Shank, Chair**

**Provost Legg:** Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee, Deborah Smith-Shank, no report.

VII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Provost Legg:** We move on to Unfinished Business and I believe there is no Unfinished Business.

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**

**Provost Legg:** Any New Business that anyone would like to bring to the table?

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

**Provost Legg:** Comments and questions from the floor? I did have one comment, Shaun Crisler who is President of the Student Association gave me a new publication. The Student Association now – students are publishing a magazine and it says right here Volume I, Issue 1, and it covers a lot of subjects including something that, particularly at this time when we’re testing students, there’s a section in here called “testing of the teachers” so I thought maybe faculty would be interested in seeing what they have to say about that. Any other comments or observations that you’d like to make at this time?

X. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
B. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XI. ADJOURNMENT


The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.