
B. Cesarek attended for N. Gilbert; R. Zerwekh attend for P. Henry; B. Minor attended for F. Kitterle.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Baker, Bisplinghoff, Castle, Cummings, Egeston, Goldenberg, Gorman, Graf, Kafer, Kazmi, Nelms, Newman, Pernell, B. Peters, Smith-Shank, X. Song, Sorensen, Strader, Swanson, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’d like to call the February 16, 2005 University Council to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item is the adoption of today’s agenda as you have it. This is not a walk-in; I think that is just Carole’s report, so we have no walk-ins. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2005 MEETING

(Pages 3-8)

President Peters: On pages 3-8 we have the minutes of the January 26 meeting. I’ll call for any additions or corrections. Yes?

F. Wang: I saw my name listed here as not present; I remember I was here. I borrowed a pen to sign the sheet.

President Peters: All right. Donna, can we get that noted? That correction is noted.
D. Mathesius: I don’t know his name.

P. Stoddard: Could you identify yourself for the record?


President Peters: All right, thank you professor. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have minutes.

The minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, welcome everyone. What do you think of this room? That’s really quite a – paint can make a difference, can’t it? There’s no drinking fountain? Well, Donna take a memo and see if we can’t fix that. It’s cheery.

There are several things today. I’ll report a little bit on the Governor’s budget as I’ve heard it and as we’ve fanned out and try to get some more detail because the devil’s always in the detail and not necessarily what’s said.

Last week I spent virtually all week in Washington. That’s my usual February trip and, you know, we’re doing well in terms of our federal projects but the education budget as it relates to higher education has some things that will require some attention. There is an increased proposed in Pell Grants but it’s accommodated at the expense of eliminating the Perkins Loan Program and there was a call for either flat funding or elimination of very important programs – trio programs like Gear Up, LEAP, Upward Bound, and we’re finding out from our colleagues in the College of Education that within the budget there are several federal projects related to education that have been either drastically reduced or eliminated and so the higher education associations and specialized associations are, you know, like student assistance associations and various academic disciplines are rallying. My guess that on the issue of student aid, that those will all be put back. Maybe not, you know, at a level we’d all like but I think those are put backs but, nonetheless, budgets are tight this year because of, you know, those of who lived through the war in Viet Nam remember, you know, the old guns and butter analogy of, you know, there are costs associated with the war in Iraq and security that are overwhelming the domestic programs and other things as well. The science side, FermiLab took a hit – a considerable hit – in one of its programs but fortunately it wasn’t one of the programs that our Physics Department contributes to. Those are still pretty much in tact. The attempt of the state to lure R.I.A., which is the Rare Isotope Accelerator, to the Argonne National Laboratory has been put on hold. It was sort of a fight between Michigan State and the State of Illinois on who would get that project – billions of dollars – project. Essentially, that came through the Office of Budget and Management with no funding, a little planning money, but no major funding. Whether that means that project is in jeopardy or whether or not the budgeting hasn’t caught up with it we’re not sure, yet the State of Illinois will continue to fight for that project to be put back.
There are several changes in the Congress that will have an impact on us. The appropriate committees have been scrambled and things have been combined so that we’re trying to figure out exactly where our advantages are. Nevertheless, our own agenda, our NIU agenda, is intact and moving along nicely and in a time of difficulty.

I’ll talk about the state budget in a minute but I did want to share with you before it hits the newspapers and it’s the result of – we had a special Board of Trustees meeting at 2:00, just before this meeting, to consider just two items and I want to read to you what we were about in that meeting. A couple of things were announced today and one was approved that I think are going to have far reaching consequences academically and in terms of direction for NIU and I hope I’m around to see its fruition but that start isn’t bad. You know, when I came here, we said what we always wanted to do was mesh what we do with regional needs and we try to address those and last year a lot of us, including many academics, put together a plan that would allow some of our most popular and high demand clinical health programs in the College of Health and also the College of Education to work more effectively across colleges and to expand and to provide sort of a seamless patient services. This is particularly – you know, we have outstanding clinics in hearing, speech, language, hearing, and physical therapy. They’re really amazing if you’ve ever toured them and they’re some of the best kept secrets in this region. Well, what we did in order to try to expand these and bring some seamlessness to them is that we sought federal funding for the project, turning of course to our friend and alum and our Congressman Dennis Hastert for help and about two and a half years ago, three years ago, I took him through a tour of the clinical facilities. It touched him deeply. It touched me deeply because all over this area, families bring their children in here who have hearing problems or speech problems that need to be diagnosed. They have no where to go and the kids are not performing well in school and sometimes they don’t know why. The treatment and diagnosis they get here is amazing plus our students, with our undergraduates and our graduate students, are right there and the Speaker say this and he also saw the cramped quarters. They’re good; the quarters are fine and they’re up to code but, you know, you could see we were limited. They were shuffling people in and out, so he asked me at one point if there was anything he could do to help. Oh, he shouldn’t have asked me that. So, we developed an appropriations plan that met all the congressional deadlines and requirements and university goals to expand and enhance those much sought after health programs and we began to firm up our plans and while planning was underway, the Monsanto corporate officials put the DeKalb Genetics property on Sycamore Road, on Route 23, up for sale and their initial inquiries and talk indicated they were looking for a buyer of the property who would maintain the facility’s history and as an entity that would be devoted to public service, public health and wellness and it became clear to us very quickly that Monsanto was really sincere about that and they were interested in making it work and so negotiations proceeded quickly and successfully and luckily it fit a plan that we had, an academic plan, to the point where today we asked the Board, and they approved, the NIU purchase of the Monsanto property. As I mentioned, concurrent with those negotiations with Monsanto which the Board knew about and had authorized us to negotiate, we’re also working with Denny, with the Speaker and his staff, to see if we couldn’t match federal appropriations we received and are receiving for the enhancement and expansion of our health, wellness and literacy programs to the renovation and equipping of the Monsanto facility. You know, as they say, all the stars were lined up and a lot of people worked very hard on this and we negotiated a very advantageous purchase price and we received very substantial federal funding and we’ve created an anchor program, an academic
program, to begin the creation of a health – a family health and wellness center – that will be anchored out there and here are the details. We will purchase – it’s like buying a house, well, not really – unless you want to pay 6 million dollars for a house – we’re going to purchase the Monsanto DeKalb Genetics property and furnishings for 6 million and the university is going to finance 4 million of that amount for the purchase of the actual buildings and property and I’ll describe the property for you in a minute. While the existing furniture and equipment inside will be paid for with 2 million dollars from our federal appropriations and, I don’t know if you’ve ever been in that building, it was renovated in 1998/99, 24,000 net square foot was added at a cost of 22 million dollars. That was just the add-on. It has millions of dollars of brand new, high end office furniture that’s never been used. Hundreds of orthopedic type chairs that I need for my bad back. It has it’s own phone system, its own video system, six smart classrooms, a computer room, state-of-the-art chillers, fire systems, teleconference rooms, office space that you can’t believe and, in addition to that, there’s a wet lab building right on the corner of Bethany and Sycamore, that little brick building – well, it’s not little – it’s 32,000 or 33,000 square foot. Its low tech wet lab space that’s in perfect shape for those kinds of activities, 23.03 acres in the prime corridor, the hottest property between the two cities. I can’t tell you what that goes for per acre. 356 parking spots and the walk ways and the covered areas are heated so that the snow and ice doesn’t melt. Anyway, Monsanto agreed to leave the facility furnished with primarily brand new, top quality office furniture and equipment and that will help us out as we begin to move into that over the next year. So, I’m also was thrilled today to announce, as I’m announcing to you, that NIU has received with the help of our good friend and member of Congress and alum, Denny Hastert, 8.4 million in federal appropriations to remodel the building, to purchase the existing furniture, that’s the 2 million, and to purchase very specialized health care equipment and create a world class set of health clinics. So in total, that’s a 12.4 million dollar project, three-quarters of which is federally funded – two-thirds of which is federally funded – so in that facility we intend to establish something we’re going to call the NIU Family Health, Wellness, and Literacy Center. That’s what it will be known as, anchored by NIU Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic, the NIU Physical Therapy Clinic and the NIU Reading Clinic. Now, the conceptual design of this is holistic and that is we’re creating a seamless web of services for families that recognizes the interconnectedness effecting physical health, family dynamics and academic success needed for individuals to reach their full potential and I think we’ll – we’re already know for that and I think we’re really going to be known for that. Now that location is in the heart of the DeKalb/Sycamore health corridor and that’s a huge advantage. Within blocks of that facility, there are more than 15 different physician offices, complexes, rehab centers, diagnostic and testing centers, clinics as well as the Kishwaukee Hospital and then the new Kishwaukee Hospital will be right across the street, not to mention the Ben Gordon Mental Health Center and the Y. That area, with our anchoring now, has the potential to attract even a wider array of health service providers. I see in the next decade, the next two decades, it just exploding and we can have a synergy with them because when these families come in to get a diagnosis by us, we can refer them to the various medical practitioners. So, the last thing I want to add is that, although I’ve primarily focused on services, you know what this means for our students and our faculty and adjunct faculty who participate. The academic programs in which these clinics operate will be able to greatly enhance the hands-on experience, the supervision for both undergraduate and graduate students, and that’s the anchor and we will begin – we will, you know, get the keys in June when we close and then we will begin our remodeling and well begin a careful analysis of what else might go in there. I know a high priority will be put on
academically programming the vacated spaces, you know, so that we can have a downstream effect. We are going to probably – financing of that other 4 million is secure - Monsanto does not expect us to pay – we will pay the 2 million for the furniture in June or thereabouts. Monsanto does not expect us to pay or find financing for the other 4 million for a year and yet we’ve got covered either with a bond or with perhaps bank financing but it will all be run on auxiliary money or refinancing and is really quite amazing because you have to realize, I don’t know what the estimate would be, one appraisal that I saw of that property was – an old appraisal – was at 14 million. When you think of the value of that property, this is one of the best business deals I’ve ever heard of, especially when that land is $30,000 an acre minimum and anything on Sycamore Road or Bethany has got to be a lot more than that so - $100,000 an acre for land – and so this is a pretty good business deal. I’m extremely happy. Students will not pay for this. This will not come out of general revenues and we’ll just have to make sure that the Huskie bus line gets out there, right? This is a, you know, I’m very pleased about that.

Okay, now budget, and we have press packets somewhere in case you’re interested in this. The Governor in today’s budget emphasized what he called closing what he called a 1.1 billion dollar gap with two or three things. He’s asked to help with capital projects including university capital projects but basically K-12 projects. He is requesting a .75 cent per pack increase in cigarette tax. I don’t know what that makes a pack of cigarettes but it’s pretty expensive. It’s about as much as bottled water. A barrel of bottled water versus a barrel of oil – there’s no contest – but there are a couple of areas that have an impact on us. One is an attempt to get control of the pension systems and what he’s proposing is a merging of the three pension systems – not a merging, but at least a bringing together of common benefit levels. The Governor was quick to add that it wouldn’t affect existing employees but new employees might face reduced benefits and we’re tracking this. You know, the details are coming in now. Steve Cunningham, I don’t know where he is, he’s tracking on this and we’re on it and there are special meetings but we thought that the Governor was going to require a 1% increase on employee contributions. That is not in there. There’s enough uncertainty about it for us to be very serious about it because even if it may not affect us, you and I directly, it will affect our ability to attract good people to this university and that’s the argument I will be making but we have to analyze it first. The other issue was the raising cost of health care for state employees. The focus on this seemed to be controlling the costs, the runaway costs, associated with state employees, pensions and health care costs and the Governor’s message talked about the different costs that are charged a state employee from a medical provider versus others and it is more and that’s a matter of negotiation so he is suggesting that there be one negotiation of these programs and that it be focused on the Department of Public Aid and I think Public Aid takes care of the health care of the penal system, right? They probably get – anyway, we’re watching that as well.

Then the final thing is that the Governor’s budget for higher ed, we just took a peek at the detail, is a flat budget for higher ed. You remember, I think the last time I reported to you, I indicated that the IBHE had a very small increase in the personal services of 1.5. That’s gone in the Governor’s – the Governor’s budget is flat. We will lobby to the IBHE recommendation. That’s certainly appropriate so we’ve got, in Springfield, an awful lot of work to do and we’ll be keeping you informed as we analyze this budget. We will be meeting with the various employee groups and there are meetings already scheduled of various higher education people to get at
what this is all about. Some of what the Governor proposes makes sense; I don’t think it will all
go through but those were the main components of the Governor’s budget message.

I’ll take questions now. All right? Good, no questions.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We ready to move? Adoption of the Consent Agenda. Is there a motion to adopt? Second? All those in favor say aye.

A. Review of Student Evaluation of Instruction – refer to Academic Policy Committee

B. Four-year review of Nature Preserves and Research Committee – see memo from Paul Stoddard. (Page 9)

The Consent Agenda passed.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report (Pages 10-11)

President Peters: I don’t think Pat Henry is here today but she does have a written report.

P. Stoddard: Right, Pat’s report is on pages 10 and 11. I really don’t have much to say about them. I’ll let you read them. However, I did want to mention that Pat, she’s attending to a family health situation and is going to be out for a while as a result and is going to miss the next FAC meeting which is February 25 in Macomb at Western Illinois University and I’m going to hereby ask for a volunteer to attend that meeting in her place. It’s important that we have somebody go, unfortunately, I can’t go. I’ve got teaching obligations both the night before and the day of the meeting but I would appreciate anybody who would like to fill in for Pat if they could let me know in our office.

President Peters: Any volunteers?

P. Stoddard: It’s a Friday. Generally, she goes out Thursday night and meets with the group informally and then the meeting is on a Friday.

President Peters: If I could on this one, the IBHE gave its report on the textbook and that is available on line or if you need a copy I can get you a copy. It was a good analysis of the pros and cons of this in a statement indicating that this is a real issue but probably at the end of this analysis, they concluded that textbook rental programs probably were much more costly than the benefits that would be derived. So I think they’ve spoken on this. Whether there’s legislation introduced by the Governor or others, I think it’s almost too late for that unless there’s a shell bill out there somewhere. So we’re going to continue at our level in the committees that have been working on it, to try to get those costs contained. We’re going to continue to work on it but I
don’t know if we’re going to see any state legislative action on it this year. I could be wrong about that but I think the IBHE report was pretty definitive.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee – William Goldenberg, Chair – no report

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

President Peters: We have no reports on these committees until we get to Carole, Rules and Governance.

C. Minor: Thank you. Our material is in your walk-in packet that was at your place when you came in. The Rules and Governance Committee has three requests of you, three motions to make. Two of them were referred to us at the last University Council meeting and these are for bylaw changes and so we’re going to talk about those first. The first one you have is for a bylaw change for 18.3.2 and just for your information; we included all the rest of that section, 18.3. This was brought to us last month by former Dean Jerry Zar who had noticed it in the communication he had with another dean at another university and suggested that we delete from 18.3.2. the title and the statement “Deans and the Dean of the University Libraries”, indicating that we would certainly not differentiate other deans saying “Deans and the Dean of the University Libraries”. That seemed to be useful and efficient and so the Rules and Governance Committee moves that – this is the First Reading of this, okay? This is the First Reading so we will make a motion at the next meeting that we will delete those two.

The second one is on the next sheet of paper. Last time, the University Affairs Committee I believe brought us the review of the Office of the Ombudsman and suggested changes be made to the bylaws regarding the review of the Office of the Ombudsman. The changes they requested were two. The first one is on the first page there 19.1 at the bottom. It’s in bold. They suggested in addition to an annual report to the University Council, a written report, that the university ombudsman provide an oral summary of that report at a University Council meeting each year. So that is the first change that we’re recommending and the second one has to do with the formally quadrennial evaluation of the Office of the Ombudsman and that was to be changed from 4 years to 8 years and that is our second recommendation. This is the First Reading since
it is a bylaw change and those will come up again next time. Please think about those. If you have any objections let us know or suggestions, whatever, that’s what the committee suggested.

**President Peters:** So First Reading requires no action on it but it is appropriate to have discussion?

**C. Minor:** Sure.

**President Peters:** Any discussion? Yeah?

**K. Gallagher:** If you’re changing the 18.32, 321 and 322 you’ve got to go through and get rid Dean of the University Libraries in the subsequent paragraphs which they haven’t been lined out in this copy.

**C. Minor:** Oh, okay. We will do a search and destroy on that. No, no, actually I read that last night. Those are special provisions for the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of the University Libraries so those are special. I didn’t notice any others that referred to Deans and Dean of the University Libraries”.

**President Peters:** Can I ask a point of information? Does deans as it is now in 18.32 include or exclude the dean of the graduate school?

**C. Minor:** It includes all deans so I would assume that would be – would be the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the Libraries, Dean of the Colleges.

**President Peters:** So this is just Jerry’s wanting to get rid of a redundancy here?

**C. Minor:** Right, um-huh.

**President Peters:** I’m all for that.

**R. Bose:** A point of clarification. The position I’m in now has a dual title, Vice President of Research and Dean of the Graduate School. If you are going to involve the Dean of the Graduate School for a single position I would prefer the other aspect of my job or anyboy in my job.

**C. Minor:** Are you asking me? The recommendation that we make is only for the changes that were requested here. Any other changes you might want to make, would have to be requested separately.

**J. Stephen:** I don’t know about your title but under 321b, it does say the process would be similar to that for other deans except that other appropriate faculty and student bodies will be involved, I think perhaps the problem is – maybe there should be inclusionary language for your dual role. I don’t know if there’s an evaluation for the Vice President in Charge of Research right now, is there?

**R. Bose:** Not that I know of.
President Peters: Well, it strikes me that if somebody has a conjunctive kind of job, you know, that we have to make sure when you hire a Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, that we be faithful to the selection criteria for Dean of Graduate Studies and for Vice President. So, what that means is that a position like this has to go through two parallel kinds of processes.

I. Legg: As it stands now, if you do not approved for a second year term, you lose your title as dean and continue to be Vice President with your salary cut in half.

President Peters: Is that a motion?

C. Minor: Is that written down anywhere?

R. Bose: Ivan, thank you so much. I think I do have tenure in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. I’d like to go back.

J. Stephen: I suggest that Rules and Governance visit this question and see if that’s covered under evaluation of Vice Presidents and whether a bylaw change is called for there.

President Peters: I think – what I think is advisable is exactly this, that you take a look at this and bring it – clarify it and bring it back for a first reading. Okay? Is that all right?

C. Minor: Can we go ahead with this? This is a First Reading of this particular change. Now we’ll go back, we’ll have a meeting and look at this other issue.

President Peters: Maybe that could be an amendment on Second Reading.

J. Stephen: There might be a separate set of bylaws for the Vice President.

C. Minor: It might take more than one meeting to revisit this.

President Peters: All right, so what I understand – is there agreement that we move forward with the language as presented as a First Reading and that Rules and Regulations take a look at this question of the Vice President and come back. Okay? All right? Good. What else do you have Carole?

C. Minor: On the next page you’ll find the proposed policy. This is a new policy. We inadvertently also didn’t add what was in your original package, the transmittal memo to the Provost on this but I’m just going to summarize a few things. I know from personal experience that this has been discussed and people have been working on this at the university since 1989 because I was on the original writing committee that made the first proposal to the President’s Commission on the Status of Women. The Writing Committee was established by the Provost and this has also - when the Committee made its report, the policy has been through the Council of Deans, the College Councils and Senates, the Faculty Senate, the Legal Council and now the Rules and Governance Committee. The Committee stated – the original Writing Committee was
composed of the following people: Diane Cearlock, Deobrah Haliczer, Patricia Henry, Fred Kitterle, William Minor, Fredrick Schwantes, Carol Thompson, Brent Wholeben and Stephen Wright. In the memo they state that there were certain assumptions that guided their thinking and I want to read those assumptions to you because this is important policy.

“We favor that a policy that sets forth principles and procedures somewhat broadly over one that would try to anticipate and set forth precise rules for every possible contingency. We assume that this is a process that will be applied by people trying to act reasonably and in good faith and that premature and excessive specificity could lead to constraints that would not be appropriate in specific cases. Faculty should not be required to take leave, paid or unpaid, in order to qualify for postponement of the tenure decision. To the maximum extent possible, the specific elements of the personnel circumstances that justify the postponement of the tenure decision should remain private. Evaluation of the specific circumstances that may justify the postponement of the tenure decision should be conducted by a disinterested party. There should be some involvement by the appropriate personnel committee but only the department level and that there opportunity for appeal.”

So those are things that were kept in mind while writing this policy. If you look at it, you will see that the Rules and Governance Committee made two very small changes. On the second line of the second paragraph, we deleted the word “also” which is a reference to something in the first paragraph which we thought was not necessary and seemed extraneous in the way it read. The second was more substantive and in response to several suggestions that we received – questions and suggestions – we added at the bottom of the next to the last paragraph, this entire paragraph reads:

“If a faculty member’s probationary period is extended under the provisions of this policy, the standards and criteria applied during the tenure review will not be increased as a result of that extension”

We added the words “this will be articulated in a memorandum of understanding approved by the faculty member, the department chair and the dean” thinking some of those people could have left by the time the tenure comes up and if things are specified, then everyone is protected.

There are several reasons why I think it’s important that we enact this policy as soon as possible. Similar policies, I discovered in my internet review of stop-the-clock, exist at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, University of Wisconsin at Madison, the University of Iowa, Kansas University, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, the University of Michigan, the University of Maryland, College Park, the University of Florida, UCLA, UC-Berkley, Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Georgetown, Pennsylvania, Virginia Tech, Northwestern, and the University of Chicago. Those are a few. Also, I discovered as we began talking about this, that this is actually happening on campus. Extension of the probationary period is happening under these conditions in some departments and some colleges but other people don’t know about it or have access to it. I think it needs to be available to all eligible people with uniform parameters and effects so much as is possible. So, the Rules and Governance Committee moves – I move on behalf of the Rules and Governance Committee – that the policy of extension of the tenure probationary period be approved by the University Council as submitted.
President Peters: All right and there’s a set of frequently asked questions and responses that I thought was very helpful.

C. Minor: And we added – the last two of those came up from questions that we received during our review so the last two of those are in bold because we added them. The policy will be written in the Academic Policies and Procedures will not include this grid of questions and responses but that’s just for your information.

President Peters: All right. Yes? All right, we have a motion and a second. This is a first reading? No?

C. Minor: This is just a policy; it’s not a bylaw change.

President Peters: It’s not a bylaw, all right, so it’s up for discussion.

I. Legg: I would just like to take this opportunity to thank the committee and the deans and their constituency for taking care of this very, very important document. It came to our attention at the UCPC about a year and a half ago and the committee was formed to deal with it. The committee worked extremely hard on the first version and that version then went through the deans, colleges and was considered. The questions you see were addressed by the committee’s second round after they got the input from the deans and I can tell you in terms of what I’ve seen through this institution and other ones, this is one of the most hard working committees I’ve ever seen dealing with an issue that we were dealing with anyway, but needed to be more consistent and I was approving these meetings event before we had this when I had a good case made and I want to thank the committee. It was a labor of love and of very great importance to our university.

President Peters: All right, more comments/discussion? All right, so our vote is to adopt this policy. All right? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have a policy. Good work; excellent work.

C. Minor: Two of the members of the Writing Committee are here today, Debbie Haliczer and William Minor.

President Peters: Please stand up and be – we know who you are. Good. More? All right.

The policy was approved.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair – no report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Sally Webber, Chair – report

President Peters: Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Sally has a report.
S. Webber: I don’t actually have a report. The University Council elections are still continuing and I need to see the committee members at the end of this meeting so we can schedule to count the final ballots either the 24th or the 25th.

President Peters: All right, let’s not be outdone by Iraq. Let’s make sure we have 90% participation.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any Unfinished Business? I know we have an item of New Business.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Every year we choose a Faculty Personnel Advisor. The current advisor is eligible for another term and has agreed to do so; has expressed willingness to do so for another year. I think this is actually an election so if anybody else wants to challenge for that position, they’re welcome to do so, but we’re not going to be out twisting arms to try to get anybody since we have someone.

President Peters: So if they’re interested they should contact you?

P. Stoddard: Yes.

President Peters: All right. Any other new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Any Comments or Questions from the Floor?

J. Stephen: I have three comments. One is something we already approved but it jumped out on me. On the minutes on page 6, paragraph 2, it says “part of an ombudsman’s funding bill” I think the word there is omnibus funding bill.

President Peters: That’s Freudian.

J. Stephen: A question for Professor Legg having to do with this survey that came to us was from the University of California. Are you aware of the survey I’m talking about?

I. Legg: Yes I am.

J. Stephen: A faculty member in my college was somewhat disconcerted by the feeling that this should be an anonymous survey yet he was identified as a person who had not participated last year and wondered if this is an anonymous survey, how did they know I didn’t participate?
I. Legg: Just before I came over here I got an e-mail concerning an issue similar to that and I turned it over to Steve Cunningham to look into and he is at this time, looking at it. You’re absolutely correct; it is supposed to be private.

President Peters: What survey is this for the record?

J. Stephen: The survey called Institutional Learning and Higher Research, something like – it’s written by UCLA or Southern Cal.

I. Legg: We’ve participated in it as far as I know for a number of years.

J. Stephen: I’ve seen it for 3 or 4 years.

I. Legg: Steve, is that right?

S. Cunningham: I believe so, but I have yet to ascertain how it was distributed so we’ll look into it.

President Peters: Okay. Yeah, in this day and age you’ve got to be careful about any matter and number of surveys you get inundated with. There are some that are academically legitimate and we should participate, but if they say confidentiality is assured and it’s not, we don’t want to participate do we.

J. Stephen: I also have a third comment and it’s about the university’s interaction with a place called pickaprof.com. Initially we thought that we did not supply them with that information. However, upon a second request, we did supply them with the information concerning grade distributions in particular courses. My understanding is that we don’t have a legal basis for exemption for providing that information under the Freedom of Information Act, however, the same letter asks for student evaluation of instructors and we do have a basis for exemption on that and that information was not supplied.

President Peters: I wondered how that all happened and thank you for investigating all that. My advice is that anytime a faculty member, staff member, student get a request for information like that, you send it to our General Counsel who is the clearing for freedom of information requests and we can then make a judgment whether we should or have to or whether or not we can make sure they go through their proper procedures like pay for the, right – in otherwise, make this justify this. But thanks for looking into that. Any other comments/questions? All right. We stand adjourned.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on the Advanced Programs for Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
F. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
G. Minutes, Graduate Council
H. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
I. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
J. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:58 P.M.