
W. Minor attended for F. Kitterle; D. Jackman attended for C. Sorensen.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT; Castle, Cunningham, Egeston, Gorman, Hemphill, Kazmi, Kolb, Lusk, Miller, C. Minor, Newman, Pernell, B. Peters, J. Peters, Pierce, Seaver, Smith-Shank, X. Song, Strader, Tollerud, Walton, Wang

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 P.M.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 9, 2005 MEETING (Pages 3-7)

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

V. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Review of Articles 10 and 11 – see e-mails from Jerry Zar and Paul Stoddard – refer to Rules and Governance (Pages 8-9)

I. Legg: We need to also vote on passing the agenda. I would welcome a motion on that. Is there a second? Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed?

The Consent Agenda was adopted.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

I. Legg: We will move to Item VI. Boy, we’re moving fast. Reports from Councils, Boards, and Standing Committees.
A. FAC to IBHE – Joseph “Buck” Stephen – report

I. Legg: FAC to IBHE, Buck Stephen. Buck?

J. Stephen: Faculty Advisory Council at the IBHE met on the 25th of March. Not a lot was done; we met with Richard Wilson who Illinois Wesleyan’s new president. It was sort of interesting to notice that he moved to Illinois Wesleyan after a twenty-six year career as an administrator at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, so he moved from University of Illinois to Illinois Wesleyan which has 2,100 students. He talked a lot about the problems that students have; maybe they’re common across a lot of campuses. Then we had several business meetings of the subcommittees but we didn’t have time for the subcommittees to report to the whole so we don’t have anything there. We talked a little bit about the budget and then met with Elliott Regenstein who is the Governor’s representative. He’s the Director of Education Reform for the Office of the Governor although he reports to the Vice-Governor. He’s clearly rather an inexperienced person. His mother and father are both academics but that doesn’t really put him on our side as really understanding of the issues. He says the Governor’s Office is cautiously optimistic that higher education will not suffer cuts and that the Governor is not against higher education but he believes in exercising restraint. The pension plan was addressed and I can only say that Mr. Regenstein was met by a rather hostile crowd. He admits that the pension plan is not our problem but it has to be fixed. Curtis White quoted the democratic legislators at a previous FAC meeting said the Governor was a mission to harm education and they quoted the Governor using the words “assault” and “blow up” and they wanted to know from Regenstein why members of the Governor’s political party are under the impression that he’s out to harm education. Regenstein said that the Governor had been mischaracterized. There’s about five pages here but not much of it is pertinent. We talked to Regenstein about the fact that we’re working at ’97/98 levels and that we’re getting ever increasing students. We pointed out that the cuts in the MAP grants – well, excuse me – the increased funding in the MAP grants are actually a cut compared to the available cohort and part of the drop in the number of people who’ve actually got them compared to those who are eligible. It’s interesting to note that Illinois State right now has 120 faculty searches going on. Fifteen percent of the faculty have departed for institutions that are better financed and have better offers.

We asked him explicitly to explain the meaning of “reform” in his title and he indicated that it mostly has to do with the Governor’s reorganization of the State Board of Education. We asked him to elaborate on the earlier statement about not being from the budget office, “I’m not in charge of how things are characterized”. He really couldn’t. He says his office has no budgetary input. We pointed out that since the Governor has perceived K-12 as the greater need, we’re being penalized because we’re not broken. Regenstein practically admitted this might be true. Many of the FAC warned Regenstein that when the Governor was up for re-election, he would not have the support he earlier enjoyed from Illinois faculty members. Actually, Regenstein was a little nasty about that. He said “well, you know, if you feed at the trough, sometimes, you know, you can expect to resent the Governor for his actions” and I pointed out to him that we’re in the Democratic stronghold and it’s not just those of us at the trough who are unhappy with him. Don’t know whether he’s going to do it. It was frank and forceful; humor abounded throughout the discussion and Regenstein was repeatedly assured that the FAC are not negative
towards the messenger but simply the Governor and his perceived lack of leadership and we asked him to relay to the Governor that he needs to help create a more positive image of higher education and that he needs to publicly affirm the important role higher education plays for the overall good. That’s about it.

**I. Legg:** You’re done Buck?

**J. Stephen:** Not much there – it was a rather hostile meeting but nothing really was accomplished but we had fun getting at the Governor’s rep.

**I. Legg:** Question in the back.

**D. Swanson:** Yeah, I’m just wondering – should we have a written report about this in our materials?

**J. Stephen:** No, you don’t have one.

**D. Swanson:** Oh, okay.

**J. Stephen:** I’m at 6 or 7 pages right now and considering our 21 million drop in funding, you don’t want 90 copies of 6 pages, do you Donna?

**D. Swanson:** Okay, okay.

**J. Stephen:** What I’m striving for is two and a half and I just haven’t had the time since last week.

**I. Legg:** Any other questions?

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

**I. Legg:** Let’s move on then to Item B, BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Personnel Committee. There is no report.

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

**I. Legg:** C, BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee, again, no report.

**D.** BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – report (Pages 10-11)

**I. Legg:** Item D, BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee, Donna Smith and Shey Lowman, report, pages 10-11.
**S. Lowman:** I’m Shey Lowman and I’m going to give the report. So, I’m not going to insult your intelligence by reading all of this to you. I’m just going to point out some of the pertinent information. Kathy Buettner had covered the current state substantive legislation and out of that she talked about HB476 which is an amendment to the State Property Control Act and what this does is transfer name rights from the university to the state which the university is very upset about. Since I wrote this, I believe a letter of concern has already been written to Michael Madigan from Chair Siegel and President Peters. There were no blanket exemptions from this so we couldn’t call Barsema Hall Barsema Hall anymore and any of our endowed chairs could potentially be renamed. They gave us 10 pages of current legislation and you don’t have that in your packets either and like I did at Faculty Senate, if anybody is interested in those 10 pages, let me know. I’ll be glad to e-mail them to you.

Kathy Buettner also talked about how we had a flat budget unless some of the pension reform proposals in the Governor’s budget are passed which any raise in the last four years that exceed 3% would become the financial responsibility of the university. Should that happen, I believe that would impact the university about a million dollars a year so hopefully that won’t happen.

Steven Cunningham had given us an update on pension reform. They’re expecting some legislation to be introduced, I think they were thinking by this week, but I don’t believe we’ve heard anything, because we’re all kind of waiting to see what happens so that we can start writing letters. Chair Siegel very much told us at this committee meeting that lots of letters are going to be needed in order to protect our pension benefits and I know the Operation Staff Council and SPS Council and I believe the Faculty Senate will try to encourage you all to join the NIU Annuitants Association because they can lobby on our behalf legally so please, $2.00 a month, payroll deduction. You can get a membership form on line.

I think the other significant thing everybody ought to be aware of is that during the auditing process, NIU had no material findings and it wasn’t that many years ago when we had lots and lots. That’s the end of my report.

**D. Swanson:** What was that last ---?

**S. Lowman:** The university gets audited each year and there were no material findings and it wasn’t that many years ago when we had lots and lots. That’s the end of my report.

**I. Legg:** Thank you. Are there any questions or comments?

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – report – walk-in

**I. Legg:** We’ll move on to Item E, BOT, Paul Stoddard, report. There is a handout of the report.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, you have the report in front of you presumably. The first two paragraphs just deal with things that the full Board approved that had already been recommended by the two subcommittees, Academic Affairs and Finance and Operations, so there’s nothing new there. We reported on that last time.
Moving down to the third paragraph, Trustee Vella moved and it was approved to automatically extend President Peter’s appointment annually through June 30, 2010. That can be changed I think at either the initiation of the Board or the President. Nobody seems inclined to do so at the moment. The Board also voted to increase the President’s salary by the same 3 and 1, that was the average salary increment for the rest of the campus and that was retroactive to the same time frame as for the rest of campus.

Under information items, we were introduced to the new Women’s Basketball Coach, Carol Owens. She is an NIU CHANCE alumna and has a very impressive record while here, both academically and athletically, so it’s nice. She’ll be a good role model I think for CHANCE people and this is, I think, why we have the CHANCE program is for folks like Carol so that was very uplifting to see her.

Fundraising apparently is going very well. They’ve already raised 5.8 million dollars this year which is a million more than last year. They also announced that Elizabeth Schwantes, who has several family ties to the campus community, has donated almost half a million dollars to fully endow three full scholarships in the areas of computer science, geography, and psychology which are areas that family members are involved with.

Finally, backing up his commitment to increasing the endowment for the university, the President announced that he and his wife were establishing an endowed scholarship in the area of public service.

So those were the main things. One thing I would like to stress again is when the approval of sabbatical leaves came up, the Board was very supportive and Trustee Boey in particular expressed his gratitude and his support of the sabbatical program so I think we have a good friend in the Board of Trustees in regards to the sabbatical program and so that’s my report.

I. Legg: I’d like to underline the sabbatical stability. I made it a priority to make sure that the Board of Trustees understood the importance of sabbatical leaves in a declining budget period and they endorsed it. It is really what keeps the quality and the creativity of the university going. So I’m very pleased we’re still offering that. Are there any questions or comments for Paul?

F. Academic Policy Committee – John Wolfskill, Chair – report

I. Legg: Okay, let us move on again to Item F, academic Policy Committee, John Wolfskill will give a report. John.

J. Wolfskill: Let me first apologize. You know when the question was raised a few minutes ago, my report is not distributed in writing and the reason for this is that some of the content of the report was contingent on our committee’s meeting which was two days ago. Now, I’ll go ahead and give my report.

The Academic Policy Committee has been meeting in order to discuss several possible changes to the APPM Section on Student Evaluation and Instruction. We anticipate presenting a
First, we are preparing many stylistic edits in the current text whose language we believe we can improve considerably in several passages. All these will be included with your material for the May 4th meeting.

Second, there are three specific changes to the rules that we will propose. These changes all have to do with which courses must be evaluated as opposed to those for which the evaluations are optional. I’ll delineate the three rule changes that we will propose. The first of these current policies state that the evaluation of intersession and summer courses is optional. In our opinion, this is not wise. We are recommending that evaluations must be performed for all such classes.

Next, current policies state that when an instruction teaches multiple sections of the same course, only one need be evaluated. We are recommending that all sections be required to be evaluated.

Third, current policies include a minimal enrollment in order for a section to be required to be evaluated. Courses whose enrollment is less than this minimal is optional. We endorse this concept but we believe the minimum is too high, currently 20 undergraduates or 10 graduates. We are recommending that these thresholds be cut in half.

Third, there is one very important issue about which we have not yet been able to reach consensus and, quite honestly, I’m asking for guidance and advice from UC members on this point before our committee’s next meeting on April 13, that is one week from today. For now, I want to explain to you what this issue is and what possible policies might be considered. The issue is that of what is the disposition of the written comments made by students as part of the evaluation instruction. Current practice throughout the university appears to be quite variable and the current text in the APPM which address this issue is rather confusing. In the end, whatever policy is adopted, this section of the APPM will need to be rewritten so that there is a clear understanding by all parties, both faculty and students, as to what the rules are. The APPM text describes two parts to the evaluation; a first section whose results are to be used in the personnel process and a second section of optional, additional questions for the instructor’s personal use. What is controversial is in which section the students’ written comments lie. Some departments have included these in the first and hence used in the personnel process while others included them in the second intended solely for the instructors use and benefits unless that person releases the information. Now in our committee’s discussions, two models have been put forth for consideration. In one model, it is expected that the written comments be included in personnel deliberations. Indeed, I have been told in at least some disciplines, this is presumed by reviewing and accreditation agencies. So the first model would require that student comments be included in the data given to department chairs for use in personnel processes. However, others have advocated a second model in which it would be up to departments or perhaps whole colleges whether or not to require the inclusion of student comments in the personnel process. In either case, department scripts read to students at the time of the evaluation would need to be clear on this point and based on numerous antidotal accounts, that is most certainly not the case at present.

I would be happy to receive recommendations from any of you about this matter. My e-mail address is the first eight letters of my last name; that is, wolfskil@math.niu.edu and again, my
committee will meet one week from today to take up this point and resolve our final text that we will present to you on May 4.

I. Legg: Thank you John. Are there any questions or comments? Yes?

J. Stephen: In the APPM it says the additional questions and additional comments are for the instructors’ personal use? Is that what I understood you to say?

J. Wolfskill: The second section of the evaluation. Yes.

J. Stephen: It seems pretty clear to me that that excludes their use by the department.

J. Wolfskill: Not if they’re in the first section.

J. Stephen: Okay.

J. Wolfskill: But suffice it to say that several people, who I would not describe as stupid, spent quite a bit of time with varying opinions in some cases by the same individuals over a period of time, so I present that as evidence that the current text is confusing and whatever rule is adopted, the current text needs to be revised.

I. Legg: Anything else? Bill?

W. Tolhurst: I know that when this came in, we were clearly informed in our department that those comments were the property of the instructor and we then immediately adopted a policy which has not been changed at all, according to which access to those comments by anyone other than the instructor required written permission from the instructor which the instructor could decline. The practice in our department is that all instructors give permission, but that’s their choice. I have the impression that this was clearly communicated from higher up and is part of whatever might be the original intent and so I’m wondering whether there might be any guidance from minutes of the University Council around the time when this was adopted that might clarify the situation at least from that point of view.

J. Wolfskill: In my opinion, if I can venture a response, whatever communication has been on this point over the years, the matter is not at all clear.

W. Tolhurst: I agree the language is very, very vague.

J. Wolfskill: Both the language and the current practice is quite variable. We heard accounts of departments in which the written comments are used routinely and others in which they are not. I admit Bill, my own departments practice is much as you described. That’s the paradigm with which I’m familiar; however, that is simply not the case in other units. My personal opinion on this point is more productively rather than searching through archived minutes. I believe it would be more appropriate to enter into a discussion in our committee and then for the full UC as to what is the proper rule on that point and then frame the language appropriately.
**W. Baker:** John, speaking as a member of this committee, could you please restate to the UC what you understand the legal opinion of Ken Davidson to be because we had to seek this out. Thank you.

**J. Wolfskill:** Perhaps, since Ken is here, so maybe it would be better for him to speak since I’ve heard it only filtered through someone else so I think I’d like to defer that to Ken.

**K. Davidson:** This has been a recurring question that’s come into the office and I think that I’ve consistently taken the view that this was information that was reasonably to be owned by the subject of the evaluation, the faculty member, but as soon as I got that opinion out and felt the matter was resolved, it was brought to my attention that there were departments that were doing it quite differently without the advice of counsel and so I have relayed this information on to Paul and we have gone about trying to locate the intent of the Council in the records and it continues to be my belief that it was the intent of the Council that this information be the property of the subject of the evaluation but it’s right to bring this up again since it’s at that evaluation point.

**W. Baker:** For clarification for the chair, could you please clarify what you understand to mean by the subject of the evaluation.

**K. Davidson:** The faculty member would be the subject of the evaluation.

**W. Baker:** So in other words, can this be used as part of the evaluation process or not?

**K. Davidson:** With consent, yes.

**W. Baker:** Consent of the faculty member?

**K. Davidson:** Yes, that’s my understanding of the written standards.

**W. Baker:** Well, that is in variance, because we understand it, perceive it to be the practice of many departments in this university.

**I. Legg:** We have a question in the front row here.

**A. Nelms:** I don’t want to draw out the debate here any longer than we ought to but to Mr. Davidson, your opinion that it’s the property of the subject is based on the current system so if we were to amend it to say explicitly that the student comments could and would be used in personnel evaluations, that would remove it as the personal property of the subject and make it then acceptable, legally speaking, to use in that manner. Correct?

**K. Davidson:** That’s correct.

**A. Nelms:** So, it’s my position, I believe that was the Student Association, that the committee ought to take that step.
J. Wolfskill: So noted.

A. Nelms: I’ll see you on the 13th.

I. Legg: Any other questions or observations?

L. Kamenitsa: I just want to possibly tie this to another issue we’ve had before recently about the public release of evaluation materials. In particular, we’ve been told by – if I understand you correctly Ken, that things that are used for personnel evaluation cannot be used publicly but ones that are not used as part of personnel evaluations could theoretically be released publically? I’m just thinking about that’s something we should keep in mind as we decide what we’re going to do with this. If we’re going to remove them from ---

J. Stephen: Oh, I see the distinction.

L. Kamenitsa: We don’t want to leave them in limbo in between is what I’m saying, because then they could be used as well. Students – you should read the kinds of things people write on evaluations before you are sure that you really want this to be used.

A. Nelms: Also I think though with the limited parameters of the “yes/no”, 1-5 questions, that they ought to be taken into consideration even with an appreciation for the fact that in some cases there are interesting comments.

L. Kamenitsa: You have no idea.

P. Henry: This is actually on the third point about setting a minimum on numbers of people in the classroom. I think that varies a lot from department to department about what is a big class and in my department, where we have some pretty small classes, one of the things that we have instituted that might be useful to consider is a waiver such that the students have to get together just as they would for an evaluation in a group meeting to waive their right to evaluate an instructor given the fact that they’re a small class and their anonymity is somewhat compromised. If they decide they want to evaluate the instructor, they can go ahead and do it if they don’t sign that waiver. It’s still in play, but it’s up to the students to determine how much, you know, if there’s two students in the class, for example, then it becomes a little tricky if they really wanted to make a negative evaluation and they can decide to waive their rights so just as input for something to consider.

J. Wolfskill: Well Pat, two students would still be below the threshold even under our proposed numbers.

P. Henry: I understand but in some cases, you might not want – a department might not want them if all of their students follow their – several of their classes are below that threshold because they are small language classes then you would end up with no evaluations of that particular teacher. So ---
I. Legg: Anything else? I would just comment that this is clearly an extremely issue. The primary function of our faculty is the education of our students and the evaluation we give to the faculty is important in terms of how we determine merit and I think we should look at the parameters and I’m glad John that you doing that and the issues that have raised here are also I think very important. Anything else?

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

I. Legg: Let us then move on then to Item IV, G, Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee, no report. Right, Bill?

W. Goldenberg: That’s right.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report (Pages 12-14)

I. Legg: H, Rules and Governance Committee. The report will be given by Bill Tolhurst.

W. Tolhurst: You do have a report. I will not read it. We have three recommendations. We recommend that two very important committees be added to the Committees Book. Those are the Computing Services Advisory Committee and Campus Parking. Those are important in the functioning of the university and we feel they should be there. My understanding is that since this does not involve a change to the bylaws, we can vote on it today. We also recommend the addition to the bylaws, a section describing each of these committees. Okay, and also some additional revisions in connection with one of these committees. As far as amending the bylaws, this would be a first reading and so I would encourage you to read it for next time and at this time we can perhaps vote on the two recommendations that came forward.

I. Legg: We need a motion on that.

W. Tolhurst: Can I move it? Okay, I so move.

I. Legg: Okay, open for discussion, elaboration or otherwise.

E. Williams: Could you clarify – I understood the first recommendation. Clarify the second for me please.

W. Tolhurst: Okay, the second one just advocates putting a description of the standing committees just explaining what the committees do. That’s my understanding of that. I don’t have Carole here to correct me so if I’m wrong about that, that will have to be dealt with. The substantive bylaw changes have to do with the Computer Facilities Advisory Committee. It did not have any bearing on the Parking Committee as I understand it.

P. Stoddard: Just to clarify again, there’s no bylaw recommendation regarding the Parking Committee. Is that correct?
W. Tolhurst: Well, I’ll read you recommendation two verbatim since that seems to be an issue. “The committee recommends the addition to the bylaws of sections describing each of these very important standing committees. Bylaw 14.9 would be added to describe the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee.” I guess that’s the only one then. Okay. I was confused by the language of the recommendation which suggested that they would both be in but, in fact, only the Computing Advisory Committee is going to go in with that description.

P. Stoddard: Correct. Okay, that was my understanding as well.

I. Legg: Therefore, the motion stands as made.

W. Tolhurst: Well, that we put in descriptive language about the Computing Advisory Committee and there’s no mention of the other committee in the recommendation for bylaw language. So, I recommend that we implement – yeah, we’ll just have to take the each out of that. So ---

A. Kaplan: What is the substantive impact of turning an advisory committee into a standing committee?

W. Tolhurst: There’s an expectation that we will have an annual report of what the committee has done during the year to improve communication between the committee and the university.

A. Kaplan: Is there no expectation that a non-standing committee would provide an annual report?

W. Tolhurst: I really don’t know. All I know I know is the affect of putting them in the Committee Book and the location noted is that there is an expectation of a report and that’s the only implication that I’m aware of.

A. Kaplan: It seems to me that the description of standing committees of the university as it appears here suggests that there will be reports on actions and so on. It seems to me that in the case of an advisory committee there are no actions; there’s just advice. We just, you know, you just have discussions and people express their views and the person being advised takes account of them but there are no actions. So I, I mean ---

W. Tolhurst: I’m told that a great many of the complaints concerning committees come with regard to these committees and the Rules and Governance Committee felt that the more information people have, the less likely there would be complaints and so ---

A. Kaplan: This is not necessarily true.

W. Tolhurst: I agree that there’s very little that’s necessarily true. This is what one might call a reasonable hope.
**A. Kaplan:** I think that there’s certainly no problem with providing reports on anything that goes on in committee to anybody, although I think you need to recognize that a great many of the complaints that surface regarding computer issues have to do with the decentralization of computing that the university operates under.

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, this was developed I understand in consultation with the person who receives the advice of the committee and that person did not have any problems with it but if others have problems with it they may need to be dealt with.

**A. Kaplan:** Well, I just have a problem about expectations which I am concerned will not be realized.

**W. Tolhurst:** Well, the only expectation I am aware of is that information will be provided.

**A. Kaplan:** Okay.

**W. Tolhurst:** That’s the only expectation I am aware of.

**I. Legg:** Back of the room.

**D. Swanson:** Taking a look at this information here on page 12-13, the standing committees are required to report on actions to the University Council and the second item there at the top of page 13, that “any actions which these committees recognize as involving a substantive change in academic policy should be submitted for University Council approval.”. I’m assuming then that part of the goal of these changes is to require more accountability and transparency in what these committees do and it may be that some of the issues, particularly with computing, can have some academic consequences. So, that’s what I’m getting at.

**A. Kaplan:** My point is this committee doesn’t take that kind of action.

**W. Tolhurst:** As I understand it, the only actions the committee takes is the action of providing advice ---

**A. Kaplan:** Right, exactly.

**W. Tolhurst:** --- and that would be duly reported, perhaps, but that would not result in any change in academic policy.

**A. Kaplan:** Right.

**W. Tolhurst:** It would only be the implementation of said advice that might.

**A. Kaplan:** Right and so I guess I’m wondering, you know, if the implementation of said advice is to be reported, we need a different kind of recommendation.
P. Stoddard: If I may, since I’m kind of the one who instigated these changes, I can let you know what I was hoping for. One of the first things that happened when I took this job was people started complaining to me about – among other things – campus parking and campus computing and since I know a little bit about computers, I managed to get myself invited to sit in on the Computing Facilities Advising Committee and I found that that was actually very useful in being able to explain to this body and to the Faculty Senate why certain decisions were made that seemed to be adversely effecting the community’s ability to compute. Yeah, robots and other guys aside, anyway, what we were trying to do really was formalize a bit more than already exists, the lines of communication between these advisory bodies and the rest of the university community as represented by the Council and the Senate and so I know there have been some concerns about the Council trying to grab power or do something like that and none of that was what we’re going for. We really just wanted to make sure there was always an open line of communication so that what seemed to be unpopular decisions can at least be explained and then we can worry about them, whether or not they make sense but the thought was the more people understood, the more they’d understand.

A. Kaplan: I can live with that. That sounds fine. I just don’t want anybody to imagine this committee is making decisions or taking action that somebody should be reviewing because it isn’t.

W. Tolhurst: My hope was that it might shorten some University Council meetings.

P. Stoddard: After this one of course.

C. Booth: I had a question Bill about an item on page 14 here under the duties of the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee. It says “to review and make recommendations about major changes, deletions, and new technologies that have a broad effect on campus information technology practices.” That seems to me that it sort of straddles the ground between significantly getting involved in decision making and just sort of advising and I was wondering whether that was something that you were proposing or whether that was already part of the responsibilities of the committee.

W. Tolhurst: I’d like to pass this one off to Paul.

P. Stoddard: That’s what is in the book already; that’s already part of the committee’s duties. The only change to the duties is that we’re asking that they us the minutes and since the minutes are already posted on line, it’s not a problem for them.

A. Nelms: So it will remain advisory but it will be standing now? Because the duties as outlined in 14.921 still read to act as an advisory body.

P. Stoddard: Correct. Yes, I mean they don’t set policy; they advise on the policy that should be. But the thought is the computers aren’t going away anytime soon so this committee is not going to be going away any time soon.
A. Nelms: I guess I still don’t quite understand the merit – the gain from making it a standing committee.

P. Stoddard: Really, it’s just to formalize and make sure that there’s always a University Council presence on that committee and that they always are reporting back to us what they’ve been doing. It’s really – the only advantage is to formalize that relationship.

A. Nelms: Under the current composition there’s no guarantee of a University Council representative?

P. Stoddard: Correct.

P. Henry: Just sort of looking at the other end of it, is there a way in which people who are not on this committee can get their concerns to this committee and would that happen through the University Council or ---

P. Stoddard: Well, I mean, yes – actually, the on the Computing Committee each college has a representative.

P. Henry: Okay, so they need to know who their college representative is.

P. Stoddard: It was my experience that most people did not know, well, most people don’t know that this committee exists much less than who their representative on it is.

W. Baker: I might have missed the input of the discussion, but putting it basically is there any way in which this committee, however you’d like to refer to it, can be given some teeth.

P. Stoddard: My understanding is that these committees were formed specifically by the people they report to to help them make these decisions and so, I mean, I think it would be out of order for us to say you formed this committee; we want it to do the following things. I think these committees should exist in the format that the vice presidents have created them so if we want our own committee to look in to this, we might consider that but I don’t think we should be messing with the committee, that part of the committee structure and their duties.

I. Legg: I see a hand way in the back.

D. Graf: I serve on the Computing Committee now and I’m a little confused because first of all, the process is that the representatives do bring concerns to the people in academic computing but it sounds like this report at the end of the year is much like the ombudsman provides where you sort of summarize all the complaints that the organization has. The committee doesn’t really act this way. We bring concerns; they’re usually larger concerns, more macro types of things but we never get into the like Help Desk sort of things where we’re talking about little things and it almost suggests that the report at the end of the year needs to be this way and I don’t know if this would benefit anyone to do that.
P. Stoddard: Well I think, I mean, the committee discusses various changes to Blackboard and to e-mail accounts and so forth and I think what we’re looking for is a summary of the changes that the committee has discussed. Yes, the committee doesn’t vote on those but, you know, what were some of the big decisions that were made, what were some of the ideas or what the rationale was for making those decisions.

D. Graf: Well, he already has a report that he prepares for us on the committee.

P. Stoddard: If he wants to get it out to the University Council?

D. Graf: I don’t think that would be a problem because he already does an annual one. I was just kind of curious about whether he had to be real specific about phone calls ---

P. Stoddard: No, I don’t envision that at all.

I. Legg: As a parliamentarian, correct me on this if I can’t do this. It sounds as if there’s enough explanation needed, confusion that would be in error to vote at this time on this proposal although the proposal basically is a good idea. I would recommend that the motion be withdrawn. Can I do that? Well, I can’t myself vote.

J. Stephen: I move that the motion be withdrawn. It duplicates what we’re the ITS guy do in his annual report.

P. Stoddard: This would be the ITS guy.

A Council Member: Second.

I. Legg: Any further discussion? All those in favor of withdrawing the motion? Opposed? The motion passes. It still needs attention.

The motion passed.

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

I. Legg: Let us move on then to University Affairs Committee. No report

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Sally Webber, Chair – no report

I. Legg: Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. No report.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

I. Legg: Unfinished Business. I’ll turn this over to Paul.

A. Letters from Joseph “Buck” Stephen, Shey Lowman, Donna Smith to Michael Madigan, Tom Cross, and Robert W. Pritchard (Pages 15-19)
**P. Stoddard:** In your packet you’ve go testimony from Buck and then also Shey and Donna. The three of them met in a town hall type meeting sort of, with Representative Pritchard regarding budget issues for the state of Illinois. They were invited along with other members of the local community to this meeting. These are a series of meetings that are being held across the state at the behest of Michael Madigan. So these are here mostly for informational items although if you have any questions, I’m sure Buck, Donna, and Shey would be more than happy to answer them for you.

B. **Letter** from the Faculty Senate of Eastern Illinois University discussing state pension system (Page 20-21)

**P. Stoddard:** Also in your packet is a letter from the Faculty Senate of Eastern Illinois University to the Governor expressing some of their concerns about the pension proposals that are coming down the line. Again, these are unfinished business because they deal with budgetary matters that we’ve been discussing in here but there’s no specific action required or anticipated at this point.

**I. Legg:** Are there any questions or comments?

**J. Stephen:** I expect that I’ll have a guest column in the *Northern Star* on Monday addressing the different ways that students can approach from their side the current effects of the budget crisis and who to contact and encouraging them to contact the legislators and perhaps get involved with the Lobby Day that’s coming up that’s been discussed. It would be a little different viewpoint than we have here pointing out that essentially, you know, one main point is that compared to 2002, we get about $1,000 less per full time student than we did four years ago and defending our fee increases saying it’s not all going to make Ivan and a number of other people really rich. That’s not what’s it there for.

**I. Legg:** I should remind you of what was mentioned by our President at the last meeting and that is anything that is in the lobbying category cannot be done as a university representative. It has to be done as a citizen of the state of Illinois so that letter from Eastern was probably breaking the rules.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**I. Legg:** Let’s move on then. Is there any New Business?

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

**I. Legg:** Comments and Questions from the Floor?

**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

I. Legg: The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 P.M.