UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2005, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


D. Lonergan attended for J. Hurych; W. Minor attended for F. Kitterle; M. Morris attended for L. Pernell; M. Pritchard attended for S. Richmond.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’d like to call the March 9, 2005 University Council to order. It is spring isn’t it? Spring break. I remember years ago when I spent twenty years at Lincoln, Nebraska, spring break was always anticipated but whenever it was time to come back, there always was a blizzard and a whiteout. Remember that? I don’t know how many times we canceled university because students were on the road. Yeah, you could count three snow days a year in Lincoln, Nebraska. Then, when I went that next year, 1993, to the University of Tennessee, I was in charge of making the call whether you call off school so I got a call at 4:00 in the morning and they said, “Mr. Provost, it’s snowing outside; are you going to call off the university?” I said “what – wait a minute”. So I walked out on the patio and there are like 6 or 7 flakes coming down, you know, my dog wouldn’t even go outside and I said “somebody else is going to have to make this call because I just spent twenty years in Lincoln, Nebraska and I have no idea.” But you know the south whenever it snows.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item of business is the adoption of today’s agenda. There is a walk-in item that goes under VI. B. That’s a walk-in report from the subcommittee of the BOT. All right, with that, is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The agenda passed as amended.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 16, 2005 MEETING
(Pages 3-7)

President Peters: III, Approval of the minutes of February 16. They’re on pages 3-7. Are there any additions or corrections first? Motion to approve the minutes? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have minutes.

The minutes passed as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well, this is the week before spring break and it’s also the time of year that I do a lot of traveling between Washington and Springfield and last week I spent most of the week in Washington. I’ll talk a little bit about that and then last night I came back from Springfield for our meeting today and I’m leaving right after the meeting today to go back to Springfield because our budget hearing before the House Appropriations Committee is tomorrow so I’ll say a bit about that. Needless to say, this is a time unfortunately I don’t get to spend a lot of time on campus. I kind of observe what’s happening from afar, literally at 30,000 feet, and sometimes it’s very interesting. Sometimes safer too.

Washington – this is the time of year when we meet with members of the Illinois Congressional delegation to talk about next year’s federal agenda for NIU and we’re always well received and we were this year and every year we ask for more money. Also that was noted, by the way, but you know Washington is pretty much taken with the debate over the cost of the war, social security, debt. It hasn’t received an awfully lot of play yet. It received some play but the beltway talk is the need to rebuild the military which is not in a very good state as the result of Iraq and other pressures on the military and so there will be budget pressures. That puts budget pressures on the domestic budget and also in the discretionary dollars and we have seen that in President Bush’s budget as it came down, particularly with regard to many Department of Education programs as it relates to higher education and I’ll say a little bit about that and there’s been a slowing of investment on the R&D side for many of the competitive programs that our faculty rely on, NSF funding, NIH funding and so forth. There have been some rather significant cuts at the Fermilab that – the cuts were deep operationally and programmatically they were deep. For one program, which fortunately was one of the programs that we don’t participate in, we participate in a different experimental program, but none-the-less that is of great concern and I had several discussions about that. I’ll keep very close tabs on that. Some of things that are of concern to us in general – normally, I don’t get heavily involved in national lobbying except letter writing and that sort of thing – for major programs like PAL Grants, Perkins Loans – but this year I am. I’m involved for all of us and all of our students across the country in trying to certainly get more money into the PAL Grants and there is money increases in PAL Grants in the president’s budget and that’s a very expensive program and yet it hasn’t kept up with the costs that students have to pay as we have had to increase tuition as a result of state appropriations across the country declining as a percent of our base budgets. So I’ll be working on that, going back to Washington two or three more times for both the NASULGC, the Land-Grant Institution and the Association of State Colleges and Universities. There was a, I think it was either a week ago or two weeks ago – yeah, it was two weeks ago – Congresswoman Judy Biggert, whose
district encompasses Naperville and the Fermilab and who is a member of the House Education Committee, held a higher education roundtable where there must have been twenty or thirty presidents, higher education people and others, admission counselors in both public and private and four-year and two-year institutions, who were there giving input on the re-authorization of the Higher Education Act which is – the sun will set on it – and you might remember if you follow these things that last year this has been carried over. There were attempts on the parts of some in the Congress to inject more accountability into federal aid for students and basically it went something like this. If your tuition was at a rate that was outside of certain indices, you would be dinged on your federal dollars that would come in so this is very serious. It took an awful lot of effort to try and get some rational discussion around that yet that issue hasn’t totally gone away. I don’t think we will see that, but accountability and costs are still an issue for the Congress because it’s an issue for the American people. Poll after poll has shown that parents are very, very concerned and students are concerned about the raising costs of post-secondary education. That’s an issue and it cuts across partisanship and region so we’re working on that.

I’m also getting involved with the Department of Education budget lobbying; particularly there are some programs that are important to us. Under the President’s proposal, and speaking broadly, the Upward Bound and Gear Up Programs are zeroed out and those, of course, are long-standing programs that help minority students get a helping hand to get in to university so I think we’ll be able to put those back, but it is a question of if you put something back, what do you take away because there are, you know, budget limits. Also, within the Department of Education budget, the teacher quality, the TQE Grants – I don’t know if that’s the right language, I see Dean Sorenson is here, and those have been drastically – well, I think they’ve been zeroed out and so we’ve already entered into discussions to try and put those back. You know, lobbying takes an awfully lot of time and effort and coordination so I’m going to be doing a lot more of that in Washington outside of our own specific NIU ear-marked agenda, which is in really good shape, and we’re doing very well there I’m pleased to say.

Turning to Springfield, I just got back from Springfield as I said. Tomorrow is the House Higher Ed Appropriations Hearing and on the Committee, fortunately, is our good friend, Bob Pritchard, who’s been extremely helpful to us and yesterday, there are many new members of the Committee including the Chair, and so I always make it a practice, before the Hearings, you go in and visit these people and make sure they know who we are and let them have a chance to, if they’ve got a problem or a question, to answer it there rather than having it flare in open committee, you know, and trying to get a little preview of what our issues are. Of course, they know what our issues are, you know, we walk in and it’s usually about one thing; it’s more support form the state. So I’ve done that yesterday, and I’m leaving right after to go back for our meeting tomorrow and most of the folks up here are going as well and we are the – save the University of Illinois which is going in April, middle of April, for some reason – timing – we were the last university to go in this round before the Senate hearings and we’re sandwiched in between the College Board and the Student Assistance Cooperation, you know, the MAP Awards, and so we know a good bit about the questions that have been asked and the focus of the questions, it’s pretty friendly and that’s good. There are a lot of questions about recruitment of minority faculty and students on the Committee. That Committee – that’s always an interest to that Committee and appropriately so. There will be questions about the impact on the budget cuts on how we’re accommodating student access. There will be a lot of questions on that and
then, of course, individual members of the Committee have their specific questions from their districts that they care about and we try to prepare very well for that. I’m going, you know, and I get a few minutes to read a statement and I’m going to once again present the case that we’ve really by rocked by 40 million dollars of cuts to our base budget; that we’ve had to limit student enrollment. I will talk about the fact that if we did nothing, if we did not have enrollment controls, basically given high school graduation rates – although this year is a slightly down turned year, and that’s why you see reports from other universities that their application rates are down. It’s because this year’s high school class – in part, there are other reasons – but in part – but after that, given our region, given our region – we can expect normally, changing nothing for about four years, 500 more students seeking admission each year. So, you know, give us some help. We need money for salaries; that’s always my top priority and we need money to add faculty to provide students with the programs so they can graduate on time and with the kind of quality program that we deliver. But we have to limit numbers, because we will not deliver a less than quality product and, you know, our situation is a little different than some of the other universities because of where we’re located and our reputation and so we’ll see how that goes. I might mention in this regard, the Speaker of the Illinois House, Michael Madigan, several weeks ago called for field hearings to be held on the budget, a series of them – I don’t know how many – several across the state. We know one was held in Rockford because we went up and we didn’t testify but we participated. This coming Monday, that is the 14th at Kishwaukee Community College from 6:30 to 9:30 such a budget hearing will be held and Bob Pritchard will be putting it together and serving as the representative from this district and I’ve been asked to testify. I have three minutes and we’re asking for Paul to testify; three minutes and Shey Lowman, you’ve been asked to testify for three minutes and Donna Smith, you’ve been asked to testify for three minutes and our student government president has been asked to testify for five minutes. So, I’m going to basically say what I’m going to say tomorrow. We need money in our base to serve these students and we need some salary money. I’m going to say the same thing so, you know, they will give their perspective on this. Who knows where this will go, but I think it’s good that locally we get a chance to let our representative know how we’ve gone the extra mile but, you know, I always say we’re hanging on and we’re smiling and sometimes I don’t know if that’s a grin or a grimace but we’re hanging on and we’re doing our job like professionals.

There is, by the way, I think April 14th there is a Higher Education Coalition rally that’s being put on by any number of groups in the state capitol.

All right, let me just check my notes to see if I’ve covered all the important stuff about budgets. We’ve still heard nothing about capital from last year. That’s a discussion that if you bring it up, you get no engagement so it’s not in their minds and the issue of pensions – I will give our position on pensions to the people I’ve met and I will tomorrow if asked but they’re not tracking on it because there’s no proposal yet. There’s no proposal from the Governor yet. They have nothing to deal with so it’s not on the table for discussion but we’re all ready and we’re vigilant. I sent an e-mail out and tried to stick to the facts because there are a lot of rumors out there but we – I know Steve Cunningham monitors that daily. He’s here – hourly. We watch the pensions hourly – not just for us but for our future employees.
The other thing – unfortunately, I have been traveling an awful lot but I’ve been following the commencement thing. Of course, I know about the issue; that is the merging of the three commencements periods into two and I just want to give a little perspective on that from someone who hasn’t been on the campus following it on a daily basis, but somebody who care deeply about commencement as an academic tradition and exercise and someone who, when I came, saw the great benefit that we had in taking our wonderful exercises that we had and try to combine them so that we’d have more of a university feel to it and also we have the wonderful venue of the Convocation Center and when my good friend Ivan Legg joined us, one of the first things we talked about was to take a look at commencement and let’s go on a continual improvement journey and make that fantastic and I have to say it’s my favorite times of the year, even though I have to put my hand in ice water at the end of the day. For a major university for each individual to go across the stage and get to shake hands with the president or whoever, it’s a very good thing plus the pomp and circumstance. If you’ve not attended one lately, it’s pretty amazing. We’d like to move toward – obviously, your May commencement is the big commencement. That’s the one that if you’re going to have honorary degrees or get a C-Span type speaker, we would like to move toward that. So, this has been a process. The other thing I’d like to do is sort of publicly thank the scores of people who work on this continually, I mean, on top of what they do normally. The registration people, the student advisors, faculty who help out, the marshals; this is a huge logistical operation and so for at least four or five years, I was aware that there were serious ongoing discussions in our Commencement Committee and elsewhere about merging into two major commencements that we could handle because this is not cost free. There are many indirect costs and so I certainly think that the decision that was made was the correct one. I do feel for those students who were planning to graduate this summer but I’ve also been assured and I had a good report today, that our college people who work in the offices have been very accommodating to get these students who want to graduate in May. The other thing, flying a 30,000 feet, we certainly always consult with a lot of people and we certainly did on this, people on the Commencement Committee and deans and others and, you know, when we make a decision – I guess there’s sort of a lesson in this – that, perhaps, we could have done a better job of letting students know. I think we did the right thing. The final thing I want to say on this is that almost everything we do at the university, we’re so complex, there’s a conflict with something. Everything we do at the Convocation Center has a conflict and I can assure you, as your president, that scheduling events at the Convocation Center had nothing to do with this decision because we have all sorts of ways of accommodating that and when there is a conflict, let me tell you what my position is, academics comes first. So I hope that – you know, we’re working real hard and I hope people can understand that and again, I just want to thank the – really, there’s scores of people who help with commencement.

The last thing I want to talk about because it happened again while I was gone, is how I at the national level, since I’ve been involved in athletics at the national level and with the NCAA and with the New Academic Reform Standards, I can’t tell you how much I embrace what the NCAA and Myles Brand and the presidents have fallen together in line on this to inject some real difficult, tough academic standards into our programs and this is a bit of an experiment because there are things that are wrong with the methodology that had to be cleared up, but I want to say it’s a great academic management tool for us. I’ve called together sort of an ad hoc group of people including people like Gip Seaver who is now – what is your title over there? You have all of the academic advising for student athletes, whatever that is, and Jan Rintala, a faculty
representative who really should – I’m getting a little bit ahead of myself – I think she should be an *ex officio* member of this group so if there are questions about athletics, we have somebody there who has real time answers, and our compliance officers. Terry Bishop, head of the Athletic Board, registration people, they all are advising Jim Phillips and I as we go through this period. This is very important and significant. The other thing is it blends into what we’re doing with all students. Bryan and Gip I want to congratulate them. They are working together as we try to work on seamless advisement for undecided students, undeclared students and increase what we do in our very good first year experience. You know, for the 1997 cohort, we increased our six-year graduation rates from 47 to 53 and our retention rate is 77. We’d like to get it around 83 to 85. It’s real tough after that given our student population.

So, that’s the end of my report. We’ll do our business today and then I’ll get back in my car and do battle in Springfield.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: Consent Agenda, is there a motion to accept the Consent Agenda? We have none. Then I don’t want a motion.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Joseph “Buck” Stephen – report (Pages 8-10)

President Peters: Let’s move to our reports. Buck, do you have a report?

J. Stephen: Yes, this is the FAC report from February 25. I attended the meeting for Pat Henry. I’d like to express my thanks to her for doing this job. I found out just how much it entails once I got there. I just want to point out a couple of things here. The HB750 Bill, the Property and Income Tax Reform Bill that was aimed at K-12 and we’ve been trying to get it K-16, it’s probably not going to pass because it will involve a new tax rate because of an amendment friendly to the university added by Senator Meeks, that would take a super-majority to pass because of the Governor’s “no taxes” stance.

Under Miscellaneous points, I think the first three are of great interest to us. A recent AAUP report places the salaries at our public universities in the lowest 20% nationwide. Harper College has hired their own lobbyist to represent their interests at the legislature. This will cost them about $60,000 a year.

Of great interest to students is what has happened to the MAP grants. Last academic year, 16,000 eligible students didn’t receive funding. This year that number increased to 50,000.

There’s some discussion about what we can do about communicating the impact of the financial crisis at Eastern Illinois University, the students have developed a series of *I Stories*. These are brief discussions of their experiences, their aspirations and their difficulties in meeting their educational goals because of the shortage of resources. Not included in this report are reports from students at other universities that they’d prefer to see tuitions at their universities raised as
opposed to a decline in resources they’re experiencing. That was most common at Northeastern which has a significantly lower tuition rate than we do. The FAC suggests that this type of approach might be taken at each institution and that a similar approach to it might be done by faculty members, perhaps called IA day in the life of a professor.

Under advocacy and public relations, at this committee it was reported that April 13th is Lobby Day. In the next paragraph there, there is a web link to the UPI [www.upilocal4100.org](http://www.upilocal4100.org) and it talks a great deal about issues of interest to those working for the universities. There’s a sample letter under “Our Pensions Under Attack” for people opposed to the pension legislation. In connection to this, we had a discussion at Faculty Senate concerning what an individual’s role could be in communicating their opinions to the legislature. The main point is that if we write a letter to our legislatures, that we identify ourselves individually and we do not purport to be representing any faculty body or the university as a whole. Individual comments identifying your position whatever are fine, as long as you’re speaking for yourself, otherwise it would be considered lobbying if you purport to be arguing for other people.

Let’s see, what else have we got. Under the PPA, Priorities, Productivity and Accountability, the FAC approved a couple of recommendations of interest. One is that they believe the baccalaureate Follow UP Survey should not be discontinued. We feel that that feedback is valuable information. We support an IBHE movement to eliminate the Capital Development Board and the Capital Development Board Construction Administration Fee of 3%. This provides our administration direct appropriation and direct design in building authority of our capital projects. It should streamline the process also.

Finally, under Resources and Legislative Contact, there’s some recent articles the FAC thought many faculty members might find interesting. One concerns the connection between business and higher education in Virginia. That appeared in the Chronicle, February 25 of 2005, not 1005, and the other one is an Academe article called “Insuring the Nation’s Future: Preserving the Promise of Higher Education”.

The letter that we’ve seen at previous meetings has already appeared in several newspapers and new drafts are continually being formed as the budget and pension approach continually gets reformed or whatever they’re doing to it.

That about covers the highlights of the FAC meeting.

**President Peters:** Okay, questions for Buck? You’re filling in? Did you find that an interesting experience?

**J. Stephen:** Yeah, very much so but it’s a very, very busy day.

**President Peters:** Questions? All right.

President Peters: We will move forward to the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. That will be Buck again.

J. Stephen: Okay, Ferald Bryan and I attended this meeting on March 3, 2005. There were five action items. All of these items were approved by the BOT Subcommittee on Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. They’re now subject to full Board approval and then I believe they have to go through the IBHE. There were forty-eight requests for sabbatical leave from faculty members; none from SPS. All of these requests were approved. Trustee Boey took time to express the fact that over the last four or five years, his appreciation for the purpose and the value of sabbatical leaves has developed greatly and he’s vowed to continue to explain and defend these leaves and would like to be informed more about the sabbatical reports so that the Board of Trustees would be better armed when defending them.

They approved a request for an MS and Industrial Management to be offered in the Naperville area. This program is sort of test-driven for awhile but the degree will continue to be offered at NIU. No indication of the cost involved in that.

Requests for new specializations within the Ed D program, both of these are in the C&I, Curriculum and Instruction program in the Department of Teaching and Learning, involve no new costs. Basically, they’re documentation issues, the ideal that the Ed D will then a specialization in Art Education or a specialization in Science, Social Studies, and Environmental Education Integration. The new minor in Computer Sciences are approved. That’s anticipated to be in high demand and they deleted the emphasis in acoustics in Physics because it has a low demand and we don’t have the faculty to support it anymore and the specialization in Elementary Education within the Ed D program was deleted because of the low demand. The Oral Proficiency in English’s Annual Report was received and the Board was satisfied with the handling and resolution of these complaints and the Provost’s Office reported to me, to this Committee, that they’ve complied with the request for an annual report on under-represented groups. This year the focus was on programs and services to enhance academic achievement for under-represented groups and specific mention was made of the CHANCE Program in this discussion.

Then we had a wonderful dinner.

President Peters: Okay, comments and questions? Yeah?

B. Lusk: Just a typographical error. Under sabbatical leaves, it should be the “College of Health and Human Sciences” not “Services”.

J. Stephen: Oh, that would be my mistake. Sorry.

B. Lusk: No problem.

President Peters: Okay. It appears we have no reports from – we have a report from Finance and Facilities? Paul?
C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report

**P. Stoddard:** We don’t have a written report yet but that will be included in your packet for next time but I’ll give you an oral report.

This was the meeting that met just before the Student Affairs/Personnel Committee meeting that Buck just reported on so that was last Thursday. The main order of business for the Finance and Operations Committee was the approval of the new student fee schedule for next year. The university was trying to keep the total increase in student fees to no more than 3% and with the exception of the student health insurance contract, the university was successful. The average fee package was an increase of 2.83%. Student health insurance, however, did jump up quite a bit by 23.6%. This is based on the contract that the university was able to sign with a health provider and, in fact, the university had to sign a new contract because the old health provider actually wanted to raise the cost by something in excess of 50%. So, this represents a savings; an increase of 23% is better than an increase of 50%. Again, other than that, the average of he fees was kept to less than 3%. The fees do include things such as student activities, athletics, the bus, health insurance, various financial aid and so forth and some of those are beyond the control of the university as we discussed last time. The bus went up 7% and so on but everything else we were able to keep down where it belongs.

The next order of business was the approval of some equipment purchases for the Department of Geology and Environmental Geosciences, you’d think I could say that right by now. We got several earmarked, what’s the appropriate term, funds for purchasing some very important equipment. Massspectrometers and what got the Board particularly excited was a ?? or submarine remote controlled vehicle. This is an unmanned vehicle so we’re no taking applications for pilots yet but video games would be useful. This was equipment that totaled about 1.5 million give or take a few thousand. That will prove very useful for the study of environmental change and climate change through time for the earth and should go a long ways for helping the Geology Program in that endeavor.

There’s approval for fixtures and equipment for the Barsema Alumni and Visitor Center and this is money that is going to come from existing bond revenue funds and gifts so there’s no real cost to the university in that regard.

There was approval for money for internet conduits for Lincoln, Douglas, Neptune, and university apartments. This represented an increase in the budget which will be paid for out of bond revenue, resident hall funds and telecommunication funds.

They approved a new collective bargaining agreement with the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 150 and I believe that means that we now have agreements with all of our unions so that’s a nice state to be in and finally, they approved the purchase of 196 computer systems complete with flat panel monitors to be used as replacements in existing student computer labs across campus.
So that was all of their action items. There was a report on the budget which was pretty much what we’ve heard here before. The IBHE in their proposal included a 1.5% salary increase. The Governor recommended an absolute flat budget, i.e., no salary increase and so far the legislative bills are at the Governor’s level, not at the IBHE’s but the President will be in Springfield to see what he can do about all of that.

Those were the highlights of the meeting. Like I said, I’ll have a full report included in the next package.

**President Peters:** All right. I forgot to add that I will – we filed our budget bill at the level of the IBHE, not the Governor’s level and so tomorrow when I testify, I will be supporting the IBHE budget which is about a percent more than the Governor’s flat budget. All the universities will do the same. I’m not sure about Uof I because they’re – but I’m sure they will and I hope our history in a hundred years reads that in the year 2005, NIU convinced the Congress to fund a submarine for it. Quite an accomplishment I would think.

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 – report**

**President Peters:** All right. Let’s see, who’s next? Looks like Academic Affairs. John?

**J. Wolfskill:** In last months Council meeting, the matter of student evaluation of instruction was referred to the Academic Policy Committee. In the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, usually called APPM, there is a short section which lays out in very broad terms policies and procedures governing student evaluation of instruction. Now many colleges and departments have more specific policies and procedures in place, but at the level of the whole university, that’s what we have. These policies specify that they will be reviewed by the Council every five years and that is the matter that is before the Committee. We began to discuss these issues on Monday and we made some progress there, however, there are some weighty issues that remain to be resolved and I am hopeful that we can bring a final recommendation to the Council before the end of the academic year but I have to admit the timing is tight on that. Our next meeting will take place March 28 at 3:30 and I encourage any here who have strong feelings or opinions about some issue connected with this, to contact me before that meeting.

**President Peters:** Okay, questions? All right, it looks as if Buck, you’re back up on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities unless there is a report from Economic Status or Resource and Space. I’m sorry, I’ve got the wrong --- now I see it, Rules and Governance. I’ll bet Carole wishes I had my other ---

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

H. **Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report** (Pages 11-14)
1. Bylaws Change for 18.32 – ACTION ITEM

**C. Minor:** The Rules and Governance Committee report is found on pages 11 through 14. If you’ll look at page 11. This is the second reading for this bylaw change. It involves changing the language of bylaw 18.32. It was suggested by former Dean Zar that we delete the “and the Dean of the University Libraries” from the deans’ section of the administrative personnel document. That would be in the two places that you see, in the title of 18.32 and in the statement of what 18.32 means. There was a suggestion or a request of the Committee at the last University Council meeting that we review the recruitment, let’s see, what did we – we reviewed 18.32 recruitment, appointment, and performance review of academic administrators and vice presidents. We reviewed that very carefully. We found – we were requested to look and see if there was anything that was inconsistent about one person being recruited or reviewed as a vice president and as a dean. We found no inconsistency there. We had to do a little gerrymandering to put together the committee and look into two different or three different places in the bylaws, but we determined that would be clearly possible for someone as intelligent as a provost whose responsibility that is.

**President Peters:** That reminds me of a joke that I’ll tell you after the meeting.

**C. Minor:** Clearly within the responsibility. In the process of that we got new learning and so we can tell you we learned a lot about recruitment, appointment, and performance review of academic administrators and vice presidents and we can tell you that our new business today comes under the purview of bylaw 18.522. Useless information for you. I request and I move that the bylaw change for 18.32 be approved.

**President Peters:** All right. So that’s a motion that has a second. Now we need a discussion. Hearing nothing – yes?

**S. Webber:** It’s a really minor point but under B, “the dean of the Graduate School, and the Dean of the University Libraries”, the capitalization is inconsistent there.

**President Peters:** Oh yeah, you capitalized the Libraries’ Dean but you didn’t capitalize the Graduate School Dean.

**C. Minor:** Technically, that was not use but we’ll see that it gets fixed.

**President Peters:** That’s an editorial change, accepted.

**C. Minor:** Just another comment, the specification down there, I thought that was brought up last time too, is about specific recommendations or restrictions for just those two deans having additional requirements so that is appropriate that say Dean of the University Libraries.

**President Peters:** All right, any other comments or questions? Are we ready? All right, all those in favor of the action say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right, that passes. All right, the second item?
The motion passed.

2. **Bylaws Change for 19.1 – ACTION ITEM**

**C. Minor:** The second item is on page 13 and it refers to the University Ombudsman recommendations that were made by University Affairs Committee in January I believe. Two changes to the bylaw 19.1 The Ombudsman. The recommendation was that the ombudsman provide an oral summary annually at a University Council meeting so that language was added to 19.1. You see that down at the bottom “report annually to the University Council regarding the operation of the Ombudsman’s Office and provide an oral summary at a University Council meeting.” That was added at the request of the University Affairs Committee. If you’ll turn the page to 14, you’ll see there is another change in 19.41. It was suggested that an evaluation every four years of the Office of the Ombudsman was not necessary and that it be reviewed every eight years or at the time of a vacancy in the office. So we’ve deleted “quadrennial” and “four years” and added “eight years or at the time of the next vacancy in the office whichever comes first, but not during a review/search year) during the fall semester”. And we’ve deleted the other references “those years in multiples of four”. So, what we’ve really done is change it from a quadrennial to an every eight year evaluation which I don’t know the proper word for. Those are the two changes that were requested by the University Affairs Committee.

**President Peters:** All right, I’ll take that as a motion. Is there a second? Discussion? Hearing or seeing no questions/comments, all those in favor of this action say aye. Opposed? Abstained? Thank you.

**C. Minor:** I would like to remind the Committee that we will meet on the 21s of March at 3:00 to review the last items that were referred to us by the University Council.

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

**President Peters:** All right. Next item, Richard Orem, we have a report? No report

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

1. **Results of University Council Elections**

**President Peters:** Sally? Elections and Legislative Oversight.

**S. Webber:** What I’d like to do today is announce the newly elected members of the University Council.

For the College of Business, it’s Diane Docking, from the Department of Finance; from the College of Education, Rebecca Butler, Educational Technology, Research and Assessment; ??? Smith, Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundation; from the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, Shin-Min Song from Mechanical Engineering who’s been re-elected; from the College of Health and Human Sciences, Bridgit Lusk from the School of
Nursing; from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Lynn Kamenitsa from the Department of Political Science has been re-elected; Amy Newman from the Department of English; Jay Stravers from the Department of Geology and Environmental Geo-Sciences and William Tolhurst from the Department of Philosophy has been re-elected; from the College of Visual and Performing Arts, Deborah Grall from the School of Art and Jeff Kowalski from the School of Art; and from the University Library, Byron Anderson

President Peters: Let’s give them all a round of applause and to all those who contributed to their political campaigns. Anything else Sally?

S. Webber: No.

President Peters: Good work.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Any Unfinished Business before the house?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Extension of Acting Associate Dean’s for Graduate School Appointment – see memo from Rathindra Bose to Paul Stoddard (Page 15)

President Peters: New Business. I turn that over to Paul.

P. Stoddard: As per bylaw 18.522, anytime there is to be the extension of an appointment of an acting, in this instance, associate dean, that extension needs to be approved by the University Council. You have a memo on page 15 of your packet from Vice President and Graduate School Dean Bose requesting the extension of the Acting Associate Dean of the Graduate School for one additional year. He mentions in that memo that this has been approved by the Graduate Council unanimously and then he also offers justification of the extension basically saying that given the current circumstances, he feels it will be easily to attract the next the next candidate in a year’s time. So, we need to approve that extension in this body.

President Peters: All right, we have a motion to approve. There’s a second. Discussion.

J. Stephen: This is – we talked about actually the extension of the position not the assignment of the person in the position.

President Peters: Yeah, this is about the position. Other questions/comments? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstained? All right.

The motion passed.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR
President Peters: Comments or Questions From the Floor. Carole?

C. Minor: When I come in the door for these meetings, the west door of this building, there’s a huge handicapped signs on one of those doors. Above that, there’s a regular sized handicapped sign. There is no button to open the door so it’s very frustrating for me and I’m for sure others trying to use the handicapped door, that there is no way to open that handicapped door and there really either should be some way to open that or the signs should be taken down. So that’s my request of this body here where we might be able to do that.

President Peters: I’ll go look at that. If I see it, I’ll understand what you were saying.

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 4:05 p.m.