I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Let me call the meeting of the University Council to order.

Before we conduct business, I think it is appropriate if we pause to reflect on the passing of Dean Fred Kitterle who was a very constructive and active member of the Council for so many years and who led our largest college well through some difficult times. He was an intellectually alive individual who cared about research and teaching and students and ideas. He was an imminently fair person who always listened to all sides before acting and who fought cancer with dignity and courage and not many people knew that. It speaks well for him. Let me call for a moment of silence and reflection.

He will truly be missed. I have some details that have just become known to us and they’re out on the e-mail. There will be a memorial service for Frederick Kitterle on Saturday, May 7 at 11:00 a.m. at Christ the Teacher Parish, that’s the Newman Center on Normal Road in DeKalb. A reception will follow the service at the church and there will be time available to visit with the family beginning at 10:00 a.m.; one service. The family greeting at 10:00; service at 11:00, followed by a reception. In lieu of flowers, the family has established an NIU memorial fund in Fred’s name and contributions may be sent to the Dean Frederick L. Kitterle Memorial Fund, c/o Anderson Funeral Home. This is an all campus e-mail if you want the details. Right before our meeting, I had a chance to express my condolences and sympathy to Janet who is doing well, on behalf of the entire NIU community and so with that, I think we should proceed with today’s business.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.
II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: The first order is the adoption of the agenda including this walk-in report that contains minutes and a report from Pat Henry. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? All those in favor say aye. We have an agenda.

The agenda passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2005 MEETING
(will be a walk-in)

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Report from the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council (Gregory Barrett, Kent Gallagher, Jack Marchewka, Nick Pappanduros, David Wade)

President Peters: I would now call for a motion to go into Executive Session for the purpose of hearing the report on the evaluation of the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary. So moved? Is there a second? Oh, we have to approve the minutes. Is there a motion to approve the minutes as they appear in the walk-in? Is there a second? Those in favor say aye. Opposed? Now, I will entertain a motion to go into Executive Session. We have that motion? A second? All those in favor say aye. All right, therefore voting members, official voting members of the University Council, please stay. All others remove yourselves for a short period of time. We’ll call you back in.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Recognition of University Council Members whose terms are:

Let me say a few words about the legislature and the budget. There is no news on the budget. My guess is we’re going to be way into summer. There are two things that I just want to pause on for a moment. One is – we now – there has now surfaced a proposal for pension reform along the lines that I communicated to you. It has not moved to an adoption or a bill stage; it is out there on the SURS website and we have carefully watched that on a daily basis. I think I saw Steve Cunningham come in. If there are any questions, this will be a moving target now that we are monitoring it along with the other university employee groups so it would be very difficult for something to move without us having input and a chance to have our say and shape the most favorable pension reform bill that we can come up with although we’re hoping that there is no pension reform bill but, you know, it will get a very good airing so that’s one thing. I don’t have anything to report because it hasn’t moved to a legislative hearing stage. The only thing you’re going to be reading about and again, it’s just a proposal and the presidents and chancellors have been appraised of it and have been involved in discussions and it is – I just want to talk to you a little bit about it – if you read about it and right now it has not surfaced in terms of a bill but it is in the negotiation stages and you may have read a little bit about it in the paper and it’s an attempt on the part of some senators to craft a bill that would be a tax swap bill raising the marginal rates on the income tax – individual, and the corporate income tax and swapping it out for property tax relief to provide funding for several educationally related activities. Now I’m
not going to comment or take a position on any tax measure, but there are principles here that are
positive that I’m pleased about because people are talking about helping education. The guts of
it call for a rate increase in the individual tax rate from 3% to 5% and on the corporate income
tax side from 4.8% to 8%. Now there are certain tradeoffs that happen, 30% property tax relief
and things that I don’t want to get into that are moving targets but the bottom line for us is that
this tax measure – this measure – creates a special fund for higher education outside of the GR.
It’s a special fund earmarked for higher education and currently the numbers vary but it’s
substantial. This would raise somewhere in the neighborhood of 320 million dollars annually for
higher ed with a share of that going to community colleges and then the rest in the present form,
being distributed to universities FTE basis which is better for us than it is base budget. I
calculate that about 23 million dollars in addition to our base budget. Now, this bill may never
surface because, again, let’s face it – this is a long-shot and, you know, I’m certain not one
would publicly endorse tax increases but what is positive is that people are talking about
investing in higher education and we haven’t heard that for four years. That’s a good thing. I
just wanted to let you know we’re monitoring that. The probabilities are long. It may not
emerge; it may emerge. My guess is that, you know, it’s the kind of tax increase that the
Governor has pledged to veto. He’s on record saying he would veto this so if anything ever
came of this, it would have to come with an override, which means he would have to have more
funds. So, I just wanted to let you know that. As far as the – this does not solve, by the way, the
budget problem, the GR problem. There’s still a gap there, a hole there and, you know, there the
proposals before us are pension reform, you know, slots, gambling, you know, this would be
dedicated to education only and it wouldn’t close the GR gap. This would be in addition. If you
read it in the paper, you know, just be aware that that is happening. Yes?

D. Wade: Is this HB750 or is this a different bill you’re speaking of.

President Peters: It’s HB750.

D. Wade: Just to be fair, in addition to the raising of the state income tax, it would also extend
the state sales tax to personal services as well as goods.

President Peters: That’s off the table.

D. Wade: Is it?

President Peters: Right, that’s why I say, these change moment to moment. Sales tax is not
part of the latest and as I speak here, there’s probably a meeting going on and something else
will be --- but I bring it only to your attention because I think its positive news because they’re
talking about investing in higher education. I that’s why I bring it to you. Any other questions
about it? So watch in the papers. We’ll keep you informed.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We’re ready to move to our agenda. We have no consent agenda.
VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in

President Peters: Reports. Pat Henry cannot be here today. She has a walk-in report and Paul I think you have some issues you need to talk about in regard to this particular position.

P. Stoddard: Right. Pat Henry’s term as our representative to the FAC is expiring and so we need to find somebody new to do that. Basically, this is a once a month meeting eleven times a year at various sites across the state. You meet with your counterparts from the other institutions. Pat says she finds this very rewarding. It is obviously somewhat time consuming though but she feels it’s been worth the time and effort. It’s a four year term and, as such, Pat didn’t feel that she could commit to that again so we really are looking for somebody new to step up for her. This need not be a member of the Council or Faculty Senate. It can be any faculty member but that person would be expected to come to both meetings and present reports of what went on at the FAC meetings. So, from the time standpoint, it seems to make some sense that the person actually be a member of one of those two bodies. Anyway, they are looking for a name from us by the end of this month so if you’ve got any inclinations that way and would like to get more information or volunteer straight off the bat, that would be great. Feel free to contact us and let us know what you’re thinking on that. Also, Pat’s not going to be able to make the May 20th meeting in Normal or the June 24th meeting in Springfield so anybody who would be interested in an all expense paid trip to Normal or Springfield, you get to drive a new hybrid car from the university. If you’re thinking of buying one, it’s a good test drive.

President Peters: You could see the museum.

J. Stephen: I could probably take the May 20th and June meeting. Although the reports don’t indicate it when we hear them read, these are actually kind of interesting, lively meetings and if I didn’t always teach on Friday and have 240 students, I’d continue doing it. It’s much more interesting than the written reports indicate.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Buck.

President Peters: All right. I think it’s an important position and it’s going to be an interesting year. So, you know, if you have an inkling, you should do it.

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
President Peters: I think we have a report from John Wolfskill on Academic Policy.

J. Wolfskill: We do indeed. Ladies and gentlemen I’d like to call your attention first to the cover letter on page 4 of the packet. This summarizes in a very brief fashion some of the changes that are being proposed in the “Student Evaluation of Instruction” section of the APPM. On the following three pages, pages 5, 6 and 7, you can see the relevant section of the APPM with the original text and suggested deletions, additions or modifications. So, I assure all of you that my committee had extensive discussions over these issues over several meetings. Some matters were fairly easy to dispose of and others necessitated quite a bit of conversation. The result is the proposal before you and on behalf of my committee I move approval of this revised text to the APPM.

President Peters: Okay, is this a first reading? All right, so the process is, so everyone understands, the process is this then will be sent to the Advisory Committee. Okay.

J. Stephen: Is this a first reading since this is a bylaw change?

J. Wolfskill: This is not a bylaw change.

J. Stephen: Not a bylaw change; a procedure change. I do have a question. Will the summer evaluations be included in the personnel process of evaluations? That’s an extra evaluation instrument for those people who teach in the summer.

J. Wolfskill: True. My motion didn’t address that point but just to clarify it since nobody has seconded the motion yet, I would the motion effective for the Fall 2005 term. In my opinion it wouldn’t be wise to implement changes of this magnitude for the summer on such short notice. Thank you.

President Peters: All right, so we have a motion to act on the report to refer it to ---

P. Stoddard: We do have a second.

President Peters: We do have a second? All right. Now discussion. Yeah?

A. Nelms: I thought this was up for vote tonight but it’s not? Those who don’t know the APPM, it’s what?

P. Stoddard: Okay, the University Council will approve or not this document right now. At that point, it goes to the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee which is chaired by the Provost. No? I’m sorry, it’s chaired by Hal Kafer and it’s up to them to ultimately approve the insertion of the new language into the APPM.
A. Nelms: Would that be acted on then sometime obviously prior to the end of this academic year?

President Peters: Dean Kafer seems to have clarification.

H. Kafer: I’m just clarifying where it would go. The committee does not change the language once UC has approved it. And to answer the question, we will get to the ASAP.

President Peters: All right, so the role of that committee is to determine where it goes in the procedure. They don’t rewrite the text.

J. Wolfskill: If I may, I would submit that in this case I think that since it’s a modification of an existing section, I wouldn’t think that is a really difficult matter to solve.

President Peters: Well, you’ve never seen Dean Kafer operate.

L. Gregory: Just a minor editorial point. On the first paragraph in “Courses to be Evaluation” in “All sections of all regularly offered” do we need both alls?

H. Kafer: Speaking for the committee I think that’s a fair assessment.

J. Wolfskill: Yes.

President Peters: Okay, thank you.

W. Tolhurst: I think probably the most significant change is the clarification of who can have access to the qualitative responses and my understanding is that these will then be available department personnel committees for the personnel process and that is likely to render them unavailable to outside sources because they will then be documents used in the evaluation process and we don’t have to give them to other people through “Freedom of Information Act”. If I understand this correctly, this means that these data will not be transmitted to say college deans. Right? Only the department will see these and this precludes their being disseminated beyond the department without the consent of the instructor.

J. Wolfskill: Yes, that is exactly the language of the proposal.

W. Tolhurst: So they wouldn’t go to the UCPC for example.

J. Wolfskill: Correct. It brings up a potentially awkward issue in the case of an appeal, for example, and we discussed that point in our committee and it was thought that if the factory member is appealing a negative personnel decision and refuses to release them to be used in the appeal, that that would probably color the appeal.

W. Tolhurst: Those on the personnel committee would not be able to refer to those things which they were within their rights to see in making their initial judgment. They couldn’t use them to justify the judgment to UCPC?
J. Wolfskill: Correct.

W. Tolhurst: Okay, I just wanted to make sure I understood it.

P. Stoddard: Actually, a member of the UCPC who is also a member of the department would have to excuse themselves from the deliberation of the appeal so it wouldn’t affect them at all.

President Peters: You need a mike.

D. Swanson: Just to clarify what you were saying about what it is – would mean that departments could use the information from the course evaluations if a faculty member was appealing an evaluation or some other personnel decision? Does that mean in their, whatever document the department creates for this; they can’t quote from the evaluations or can’t paraphrase them or, you know, characterize them in some way? You see the question? Do you understand what I’m – I’m just wondering.

President Peters: One can always make evaluative comments on material that’s in the file. You’re making a judgment on material – and if one were to appropriately, it seems to me – now I’m coming into this way --- but I’m going from my experience and I’ve had lots of experience in this sort of thing. What you do is you read a file and then an appropriate body that’s making a decision can characterize that, make judgments about it.

D. Swanson: Just not quote from it verbatim sounds like.

President Peters: That I don’t know. Certainly if you have twenty comments and they all say that the professor presents the lecture material in a clear and concise manner and making an evaluation, you could say it’s, you know, obvious from the file that the president – not the president. Carole and then ---

C. Minor: I have a question about how this effects what gets published on the websites that evaluate professors. It seemed to me that before it was said in some meeting that I attended maybe this one or maybe the Faculty Senate that because the students’ written responses were not available to anyone but the instructor, that they were not available for publishing on websites and it seems as though this might make a change to that. Is that the case?

J. Wolfskill: Well, it’s true that the proposal would make the comments part of the department personnel procedures and my understanding is that as such, it would be confidential documents and not subject to being called for posting on Rate-A-Prof or such sites.

J. Stephen: That’s covered under point 4, distribution – in point 4 you have no distribution outside the department without the express written consent of the instructor so that’s covered there.

President Peters: But my understanding is and I don’t know – Ken Davidson is here – if it’s a matter of the personnel record, it is not subject to freedom of information whereas if it were not
part of that file, even if the department had to right to give permission, it’s not – you could do a freedom of information. If it’s a personnel record, it’s protected. Is that right Ken?

**K. Davidson:** That’s correct. There’s also some confusion ---

**President Peters:** Use a mike.

**K. Davidson:** I understand the point about not being distributed but it seems to me there would be some uses of the information up the line in the process. Was it intended to restrict the use of the core information on up the line although not specifically recited? It would be helpful I think for application of this policy to have this clear in the record in this proceeding.

**J. Wolfskill:** My best answer to that is our intent in the proposal is that the qualitative information, that is the students’ written comments, is one component of many used to evaluate an instructor’s teaching effectiveness during department personnel deliberations. We did specifically include the sentence that the results from the teaching evaluations would not be distributed beyond the department without the instructor’s explicit written permission. That was our attempt to keep the material protected and they’re not subject to calls, for example, from – as we’ve discussed – the “Freedom of Information Act”.

**President Peters:** Yeah, Lynne?

**W. Tolhurst:** As I understand it, this applies to both the quantitative as well as the qualitative data. It’s not just ---

**J. Wolfskill:** Yes, our language in the proposal refers to both.

**President Peters:** Lynne and then Dean Kafer.

**L. Kamenitsa:** I just want to make sure that this was discussed in the committee – it was brought to my attention last year as part of the Grievance Committee that there are some departments now in which nobody sees the qualitative scores except the faculty member and thus this change imposes upon them an obligation to look at that – for the personnel committee to look at qualitative material and for the faculty member to allow that to be looked at and so you’re aware that that is going to raise some hackles and that was discussed?

**J. Wolfskill:** Correct. If approved this would call for a change of procedure in many departments regarding how the written comments are selected.

**L. Kamenitsa:** If I could just follow up, what was the rationale behind wanting to do that?

**J. Wolfskill:** The rationale is on two counts, one in giving a better picture, more complete information for personnel purposes, that is both quantitative and qualitative data, and the other is quite frankly for the benefit of the student body so they can have assurance that this data applies in the personnel record just as the quantitative survey which has for years.
President Peters: Harold?

H. Kafer: Let me ask a question that may get to Ken Davidson’s recommended clarification. At the end of section 4, was the intent of the language to prohibit the raw quantitative and qualitative data itself from going beyond the department which is a slightly more specific statement than the one that’s written there? If the answer to that is yes, I guess I would recommend that the language actually say that which then I think, this being mute on any summative data, then would allow the kind of use of some of the data beyond the unit should there be an appeal that would make sense in the current faculty governance system.

J. Wolfskill: Well, the relative sentence is the one that says “The explicit written permission of the instructor shall be required for any further distribution of the results beyond the department”. Now the word “results” is referenced in the title of that particular section for distribution of results and in the current text of the text there, the results refer to both quantitative and qualitative, that is he entire evaluation survey.

H. Kafer: Including any summative work that a personnel committee or chair might undertake?

J. Wolfskill: That would not be my opinion. I would interpret results to be the raw data. That’s my understanding of what the word means.

H. Kafer: So I would then recommend a friendly change that the word in the penultimate sentence, that the word “distribution” – the phrase “distribution of the results” actually be changed to say “distribution of raw quantitative and qualitative data” and then I think the rest of the issue that’s been raised would be clarified.

President Peters: Will the committee accept that as a friendly amendment?

J. Wolfskill: I certainly don’t have any problem with that. I don’t recall who seconded the motion.

C. Sorensen: I did.

President Peters: Is that accepted by the seconder?

C. Sorensen: Yes.

President Peters: All right, so the new language will read?

C. Sorensen: “Exclusive written permission of the instructor will be required for any further distribution of the raw quantitative and qualitative data”.

President Peters: Okay. More discussion? Sorry Bill. I didn’t see you.

W. Tolhurst: So, if this amendment is accepted – oh, this is a friendly amendment so we don’t vote on the amendment, that’s correct?
J. Wolfskill: Correct.

W. Tolhurst: So if this is accepted, then the summary or an overall characterization of both the qualitative and quantitative results can be given to anybody whatever because there’s no longer any restrictions on the dissemination of the information as distinct from the raw data?

J. Wolfskill: Well, my interpretation of that is that it would be in the same category as any evaluation made by the department personnel committee which certainly may not be disseminated in just any context.

W. Tolhurst: Well, a summary – a description of the data, qualitative or quantitative, is not itself an evaluation and does not represent the evaluation of the personnel committee so, as I read the current language, it does not place any restriction whatever on a distribution of a summary of the quantitative or qualitative data. If that’s not the intent, then I think that needs to be clarified.

J. Wolfskill: I have to confess I’m confused by that because who would be making such a summary other than a personnel committee as part of the deliberation?

President Peters: Well, I think the point that Tolhurst is trying to make is that is the summary a shorthand way of capturing the raw quantitative and qualitative and as it moves up the line for consideration, then does it become public and my view is no, because it’s part of the personnel file, therefore it’s not for you to see. As a matter of fact, the whole thing is – even if that raw data went all the way up for consideration, one level to the next and that’s what I’m used to from my other universities, as each level makes an independent judgment, what if the judgment not to give someone tenure is based on inadequate teaching based, in part, on student evaluations? Well, the person reviewing that, dean, provost, has to have access to the material to make a judgment. So under this system, if the professor who let’s say is denied tenure on the basis of inadequate teaching in part because of – and they say no, I don’t agree to send my data up – then the next level can’t review that.

W. Tolhurst: I’m perfectly satisfied by that explanation.

W. Baker: Speaking as a member of the committee, there clearly have been so many complicated issues involved that – and contentious issues, but may I suggest that as this is the end of the semester, we go away, think about these issues and the whole thing be raised at the initial meeting of the full, the autumn semester.

President Peters: So, this is a motion to table?

W. Baker: Sorry to interrupt you. Until the opening meeting of the fall semester only for the fact that there are so many complicating issues involved here which require an enormous of thought.

President Peters: That’s a motion to table to a specific time.
A. Nelms: I have a parliamentary inquiry. Does the session end because things don’t carry over? I think the motion would be void if there’s “x” amount of time in between your meetings.

President Peters: All right, there’s a second. So is this a point of information or do we have to vote immediately? Well, we have to vote. That was a little bit beyond a point of information. And it’s a majority. All those in favor say aye. Motion to table. All those opposed. All right, we’re back to the main motion. Yeah, Carole?

The motion failed to pass.

C. Minor: I have a question about what it meant by the raw data. In my department, the whole committee doesn’t necessarily look at raw data. What we look at is what we call summary, which are means and medians, so we don’t really look at the raw data. The committee uses means and medians in its deliberations for each course and, you know, we work with the data so with this amendment, nothing that anybody really looks at in our area is going to be prohibited from going anywhere because we don’t really send the raw data anywhere anyway. So, I’m looking for a clarification of what you mean by raw data and what do you mean by the summary.

J. Wolfskill: My understanding of the raw data in the case of the quantitative portion would be the printouts that come from Testing Services. In the case of the qualitative, it would be the actual physical papers with the students’ comments.

President Peters: So raw data under that would mean a mean or a measure of central tendency of dispersion across everyone who evaluated a professor on a specific question.

J. Wolfskill: Well, no it’s better than that. On each item of the survey, you have a complete listing of how many respondents there were as well as summaries of statistical information provided by Testing Services.

C. Minor: So the question is, does the summary – are the means and medians included in this material that can’t go beyond the department and are the typed – we also type up the student comments. Are the typed versions able to go without the instructors’ permission or only the ones that are hand-written by the students? I think it’s an important question.

J. Wolfskill: Well, this would be my personal interpretation. I can’t speak with any authority on this but this would be my attempt as a reasonable person to give an answer to that, I would say that the information that is given to the department chair to be used in the personnel process is raw data. Now how the chair and the personnel committee slice and dice it as part of their deliberation is their business but what is given the department chair to use in the personnel process, I would interpret as the raw data.

President Peters: So you’re allowing for some local interpretation at the department level?

J. Wolfskill: There has to be.
President Peters: I saw some other hands? All those in favor of the motion say aye. Opposed? Abstain? I know that was a lot of hard work. Thank you John and your committee.

The motion passed.

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

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Carole Minor, Chair – report (Pages 8-11)

President Peters: Carole Minor has her final Rules and Governance Report.

C. Minor: Thank you. Our report begins on page 8 and the committee met on the 13th of April. Unfortunately I was sick and unable to be at that meeting and I really appreciate Paul Stoddard leading that for me and the leadership of also Bill Tolhurst and Ferald Bryan for keeping the record of what people agreed to. The committee met on that day with Executive Vice President Williams and Associate President for Finance and Facilities Albanese to discuss the Campus Parking Committee and what was transmitted to me that was agreed upon at that time was that everyone involved was okay with changing not the Constitution Bylaws but the Committees Book to include on page 4 of the Committees Book under Annual Reports, the following committees of the university are required to submit annual reports to the University Council adding the Computing Facilities Advisory Committee and the Campus Parking Committee. The rationale for that is that that would increase communication within the university community with the committee. Also, it is agreed upon that we could add to the Campus Parking Committee you have on page 9 what is now in the Committees Book about the Campus Parking Committee. At the bottom of the page you see the addition of “Executive secretary of the University Council, or designee, shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the committee”. That purpose was also to increase communication with the committee. With the Computing Services Advisory Committee, the only addition is the same sentence on page 11 with “Executive Secretary of the University Council, or designee, shall serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the committee”. So there are basically two things that we requested in the Committees Book that both of these committees be added to the committees that provide an annual report for the University Council and that each of them include the Executive Secretary of the University Council, or a designee, as a communication conduit with various bodies and the university community. So do you want to take that one at a time or all at once? Let’s try all at once. So, for the committee I move that number 1, the Computing Services Advisory Committee and Campus Parking Committee

President Peters: All right, that’s a motion. There’s a second. Any discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Good work.

C. Minor: Thank you.

President Peters: Thanks for your service. It was a difficult committee.

C. Minor: I’m smiling more.
President Peters: I know you are.

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

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

President Peters: Now Sally Webber, Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee.

S. Webber: As the result of doing such a great job, Paul gets the great benefit of, we hope doing it over again and that’s my job today so I’d like to read the following motion. “Pursuant to Article 3.2 of our Constitution and Article 2.1 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, I am pleased to offer for election to the office of Executive Secretary of the University Council, Professor Paul Stoddard. I ask that we have a motion to accept his nomination, close the nomination and unanimously approve his election to the position”.

W. Tolhurst: So moved.

C. Minor: So moved.

President Peters: All those in favor say aye. You’re sentenced.

P. Stoddard: No good deed goes unpunished.

President Peters: All right, thank you Elections Committee.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Is there any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Any comments or questions for the good of the order? All right, we’re ready to party. If anyone needs directions to the residence, let me know. I think we’re at 5:00? All right, if anyone needs – check your website or I have Dean Kitterle’s service information here.

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. ADJOURNEMENT  

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 P.M.