
J. Millhorn attended for B. Anderson; W. Minor attended for J. Grush.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Baker, Dowen, Johns, Kamenitsa, King, Kolb, Langguth, Latham, Oreseanin, Pappanduros, Parisot, Pernell, Purnell, Schoenbachler, Sido, S. Song, X. Song, Stephen, Stravers, Thu, Wade, Walton

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I'd like to call the last University Council meeting of the academic year to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: We have no walk-ins. The agenda is before you. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? So moved. Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We have an agenda.

The agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 MEETING (Pages 4-6)

President Peters: On pages 4-6, the minutes of the April 4 meeting. Call for additions or corrections. Is there a motion to approve? So moved. Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

Giles moved; Derscheid seconded. Wolfskill moved; Stephen seconded. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION
President Peters: I’ll for a motion to go into executive session for the purpose of receiving the report from the evaluation committee for the Secretary of the University Council. A positive vote means that voting members stay and everyone else leaves including the secretary general over here to receive our report. So is there a motion to go to executive session? There’s a motion, John Wolfskill. Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? We now will go into executive session.

Wolfskill moved; Stephen seconded. The motion passed.

A. Report for the Committee to Evaluate the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council.

President Peters: ?? evaluation and reappointment recommendation. Thank you Paul for your service. Thank does include Paul your requirement that we all go to Johnny’s Char House on your tab but that’s a minor detail.

P. Stoddard: I’d like to point out the level of cholesterol you can get – anyway.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: All right. Roman V President’s Announcements. Today we recognize those individuals whose terms are completed. If you’re here please stand then we can applaud you all at the end.

A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are:


Those people who have been re-sentenced by their colleagues are Rick Ridnour from Marketing. Thank you Rick. Toni Tollerud from Counseling. Toni, how are you doing? Congratulations. Jody Newman-Ryan, Communicative Disorders and William Baker from English who is on sabbatical.

Then newly elected we have Cliff Mirman from Technology. Cliff? Dan Schneider from the College of Law. Dan, how are you? Barbara Burrell from Political Science. Didn’t you do this before? No, okay. Jeff Chown from Communication. Jeff. Linda Sons from Mathematical Sciences. I’m sure Linda has done this before. Yes, yes. Carol Thompson from Physics. Welcome. Richard Greene from Geography and Doug Boughton from the School of Art. Nice to see you again.

Welcome everyone and thank you for your service, those who have participated. You know how important shared governance is to this university. I’ll try to keep my remarks brief. I want to
report a little bit on Lobby Day last week. I want to thank everybody who participated and Ken Zehnder who helped put that together. My report is that there were about four to five hundred individuals from across the university campuses at all levels from presidents on down. After the rally there were individual visits to legislative members, not only from our district but also from home districts and from all indications that I’ve been able to hear from, we were well-received so that’s a positive. The day following that we had our Senate Appropriations hearing which as you know, I couldn’t attend but our Provost, Ray Alden and Dr. Williams gave testimony on our behalf and I understand that that went well. We made the case for our needs and hopefully some action will come out of that. We’re watching the debate very carefully on the tax issue. It really all does come down to the revenue side and what sort of a revenue package, if any, can be approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor because without that, many of the things that are on our list cannot be funded and this is true – it’s probably less true than general revenue; I think that looks pretty positive – but the capital side, we need to have a pretty good tax measure so that Stevens Hall and some of our other projects can be taken care of. So we’re watching that. I want to let you know that the timing of the end of this session is in doubt. I wouldn’t be surprised if there’s an overtime session. I won’t be surprised at all; I expect an overtime session and I wouldn’t be surprised if that session ran into August which, just to warn you, that we may not have information about critical funding issues, salaries and so forth, until late. We’re as prepared as we can be but until you have a signed state budget, we really have to be a little careful. Now, that can change. It is Springfield you know. All of a sudden, come Labor Day, all of a sudden the clouds clear and everyone gets happy and there’s agreement but – I would advise you to monitor campus e-mails if you’re off campus. We may need you but that is the best way for us to communicate between now and the end of the session. So I’d monitor it every now and then in case we’d like you to write letters or do something. Especially as representatives, you should put yourselves in a position of knowing what’s going on.

A few other things that come out of Springfield and Washington that I know you’re all watching and that is the aftermath of the Virginia Tech situation which has resulted in any number of calls for evaluation and concern and stepped up campus security and so forth and I tried to address as best I could the rather detailed plans that we have in three memos. I very seldom write three memos in a month to you, let alone a year, but I thought it was appropriate that we address all aspects of that and no one I believe can be prepared for that kind of Virginia Tech situation but I’m confident that we are as prepared as we can be and I’ve had a lot of good comments back and good suggestions we’re going to try to follow up on. You know, obviously we would not share our complete and detailed logistical plans. We are going to be sharing some field guides for everyone but we’ve learned from situations like Columbine not to be too specific about what we would do, particularly in terms of security measures in the event of these crisis situations but be assured we’ve had a lot of input. We have some pretty good plans which we will re-evaluating – are re-evaluating – but, that being said, the Governor is putting together a task force on campus security. The Attorney General of the State, Lisa Madigan, is putting together a task force on campus violence and the President of the Senate, Emile Jones, has a campus safety task force going, Senate Resolution 50, and our friend, Senator Durbin – these are all our friends – Senator Durbin has a bill in development on campus security. Needless to say, we will be involved and some of you may be involved in all of these activities. It does take a lot of time to serve on these and to collect the information and we’re going to be doing that. Again, we have
been conducting reviews of our own campus policies and practices and you’ll be hearing more about that during the summer and as we enter the academic year next year.

Just a couple of other things. As close out the year, never lose sight of what we do and we have a wonderful event coming up Saturday – is that the 11th of May? That is the commencement where several thousand students will be marching and receiving their degrees and probably thirty thousand individuals will be going through three ceremonies at the Convocation Center so that will be interesting – it’s always interesting logistically. Hopefully, the weather will be fair and not too stormy or too hot.

The other thing is our Strategic Planning is moving along quite nicely. Tomorrow is sort of an end of the year meeting for all of our various task force reports. You notice that they are on the website. The work now really begins to try and flush out the strategic plan. Very important. I want to commend the Provost for the good work that he has put in and the work of so many on the task force. We’ll be able to move forward and focus on some things and my hope is that the Strategic Plan becomes our guide for the next several years on how we reallocate and allocate resources to these objectives. So that is something you’ll be hearing about more and then this Saturday, May 5, we are going to have our kick-off of the end of our first-ever fund raising campaign and it will be a great event. We’re going to tell a lot of stories about the good people and alumni and faculty and staff at Northern and what they’ve done and then we will be announcing our goal for the end of our capital campaign and much of the target of our private fundraising will be the items that come out of the Strategic Planning Task Force so that’s very, very important and I’m excited about that. Again, I want to commend Ray Alden for his good work on that.

With that I’m going to end my report and we will launch into the Agenda.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: We have no Consent Agenda.

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Jody Newman-Ryan – report (Page 7)

President Peters: All right, we’re going to hear reports from councils, boards, and standing committees. Jody Newman-Ryan, do you have a report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to IBHE?

J. Newman-Ryan: Not much to it. I’ll just point out on page 7, we met on Friday, the 13th at Heartland Community College and if you look at Item 1, b., we met with the student representative in that area. I think he was actually the ISU representative but he was nearby and so we attended the meeting and talked about things that the Student Advisory Committee could work together with the Faculty Advisory Council — just have to get that right — so joint efforts we might take next year and one of them was mental health on campus so you will note that, of
course, now that’s probably quite likely that will be the topic for next year. So I’ll be talking to Paul about working with our student representative here and trying to get some joint efforts on that for next year.

**President Peters:** Thank you Jody. Any questions for Jody? Okay. By the way, I think May 22 the new chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Carrie Hightman will be on campus visiting me and having a tour. I encourage – she seems to be very, very interested in learning about higher education and serving it. She’s a cooperate CEO of a technology company and seems to be very, very accomplished.

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

**President Peters:** Okay, Joseph Stephen do you have a report? By the way if you look at Buck Stephen in the phone book you don’t get you.

**J. Stephen:** I am protected.

**President Peters:** All right, no report.

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

D. BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee – Sara Clayton and Bobbie Cesarek – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

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

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Linda Derscheid, Chair – report (Page 8)

**President Peters:** We have a report from Linda, Resources and Space.

**L. Dershcheid:** Yes, we were able to meet, the Resources, Space and Budgets, with Anne Kaplan - so I’m glad she’s here in case we have any questions, we can have her answer them – who is our Vice President of the Division of Administration and University Outreach. She explained about the ITT Network, the NIU TV and Radio and Outreach and Governmental Studies are now under her unit so we commented and sort of fell over in a bow – that seems pretty impressive to be keeping track of all that. The services of course are combined to help meet the P20 Initiative. She talked a little bit about the Proton Therapy Project that we’re helping to get going and operational by 2011. She explained the unit is heavily entrepreneurial in the sense of 70% of the budget comes from local funds, from sales and services that NIU provides and talking about the goal of communication technology and outreach is to get NIU’s presence out there, a little bit of competition with other kinds of university programs and certainly getting the web’s presence was very important. She talked about some charges for the
off-campus kinds of programs. The College of Education has the largest off-campus program providing tuition weavers for supervising students and contracts with school districts is certainly a possibility. We have some contracts with other businesses. Some different departments participate differently and she mentioned that there is a good market for education, business, health care, and general studies bachelor’s degree from LA&S. She talked a little bit about competition with Phoenix University as far as the web presence and that kind of on-line kinds of course work. She also talked about the high speed link that is necessary for our physics program working with Fermi Lab and Northwestern. She talked a little bit of loss of some revenue that we used to be able to generate from toll fees from phones now that students are markedly using cell phones, we’re not getting quite that revenue source. A little bit about helping her department unit how to help with RIA’s search for students who are downloading music illegally and how that became part of her functioning and also there’s some discussion about how much funding that we have to help support on-line course development.

President Peters: Okay, questions? Good report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – William Tolhurst, Chair – report (Pages 9-10)


1. Faculty Personnel Advisor Bylaw changes – ACTION ITEM (Page 9-10)

W. Tolhurst: At the last University Council meeting we had a first reading of two proposed bylaw changes regarding the process of evaluating the Faculty Personnel Advisor. The details of those two bylaw changes are on page 9 and 10 of the packet for today’s meeting. What we have to do today is to vote on it.

President Peters: All right. Do we need a motion? Right. We need a motion. Should we divide the house or take them together?

W. Tolhurst: The motions? Not up to me. I move we do them together.

President Peters: So we have a second. Discussion? All right, should we vote? All those in favor of the Rules and Governance Committee’s recommendation on these changes say aye. Opposed? Abstentions? All right, that was easy.

Stephen seconded. The motion passed.

I. University Affairs Committee – Jody Newman- Ryan, Chair – report – walk-in

President Peters: Now we move to Jody and University Affairs.

1. Religious Observance Policy

J. Newman-Ryan: This was also presented at our last meeting for first reading and thank you for all of your suggestions about the last paragraph but in attempting to rewrite that I still made a
mistake or perhaps more that you’ll point out to me but if you look at the first sentence of the last paragraph before put a motion to forward this we’d like to change the wording again to “students who believe they’ve been unreasonably denied an educational benefit should contact” so take out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 words so “denied an educational benefit should contact”, etc., etc. We tried to reword that so it was clear but the Ombudsman tract was a different tract then the regular grievance procedure there so ---

President Peters: All right so what you are editorially taking out of is “because of their religious belief”?


President Peters: All right. So now it reads “students who believe they’ve been unreasonably denied an educational benefit should contact the person identified by their department”.

J. Newman-Ryan: Yes and I’m open to any other suggestions. We’ve worked on this ??.

President Peters: Any other changes on this? Does everyone have the right policy change? All right. So this is – do we have a motion?

Stephen made the motion as edited; Lusk seconded.

President Peters: All right. Discussion? All right, John?

J. Wolfskill: I have a question of clarification. About the 4th line down of the whole text, there’s a statement “such policy shall be made known to faculty and students”. My question is who does this and how?

President Peters: Gip Seaver has a ---

G. Seaver: Each semester we – it comes out of my office and we do forward it to all faculty, all departments by way of a memorandum at the beginning of the fall semester.

J. Wolfskill: Gip, just a second thing, how about students being informed?

G. Seaver: At this point it really – it’s in the APPM. We rely on the faculty because we do talk to faculty about, you know, making students aware but we certainly could do an e-mail blast on this set of items if that’s what Council would like to have done.

President Peters: Is it in the student handbook Brian?

B. Hemphill: Yes, it is in the student handbook.

J. Wolfskill: Okay, thank you.

President Peters: Virginia Cassidy?
V. Cassidy: It’s all so in the catalog.

President Peters: It’s also in the catalog. Dean Vohra, you had your hand up?

P. Vohra: One comment. I’m not too sure if academic benefit is the right word to use. What we’re talking about is accommodation, not an academic benefit. I’m saying is that academic benefit should be replaced by accommodation because that’s what we can really provide them in case they have any concerns. We cannot provide them any academic benefit because of their religious beliefs.

J. Stephen: That’s consistent with the second paragraph’s existing policy wording of accommodation.

President Peters: All right, so Buck says that it isn’t consistent with --- is that what you’re suggesting? Reasonable accommodation?

J. Stephen: Yeah, but it is consistent with existing policy.

President Peters: Is that a friendly amendment that’s accepted? Yes, I see a yes from Jody.

J. Stephen: That’s fine. I agree with that.

President Peters: So strike benefit and write in academic accommodation?

J. Wolfskill: Or just an accommodation.

???: Or just educational accommodation.

President Peters: Yeah, John?

J. Wolfskill: May I suggest just accommodation? Replace both words by accommodation?

President Peters: So “denied an educational accommodation” to “denied an accommodation”. Is that acceptable? That’s acceptable; okay. Now questions.

???: President Peters I believe Provost Alden has a question for you.

R. Alden: Since I saw this the first time last time, I thought about it a lot and since I, I guess, am the court of last resolve or whatever, I would like to bring up the issue that if a faculty member chooses not to accommodate anybody simply because they don’t believe it would fit within their academic plans for a semester, I’m not sure what the Provost can do to change that so having an appeal to the Provost’s office, particularly if it happens after the event, I’m not sure what criteria I would use or anybody in my office would use to accommodate somebody within stepping all over somebody’s academic freedom. I can see, as a matter of fact I’ve heard, that some faculty have already said there are so many potential religious holidays that I’m going to put it in my
syllabus I choose not to accommodate anyone. So I know that people want to have an appeal right, but if there are not criteria and there are no actions that I can legitimately take without bumping into someone’s academic freedom, this probably would be more appropriate for some sort of an academic freedom committee, academic standards committee, a group of faculty who could make a judgment whether a grade in a course can be changed over an accommodation due to this particular issue because I don’t believe my office can really do that. So I just thought I’d bring that up as a point. I mean, I don’t mind making hard decisions but if there are no decisions to be made, the language becomes somewhat meaningless, particularly if someone goes through the entire chain of command. By the time they get to my office, it may be long after the holiday is over and then we’re arguing over somebody’s grade in a test or an assignment.

President Peters: Okay, William and then we’ll come back to John.

W. Tolhurst: I’m a bit concerned too because it seems to me that it’s important to have the accommodation be reasonable. I do recognize that under some circumstances, a reasonable accommodation is not available and indeed, those who have certain kinds of conditions in their classrooms may find that they have no reasonable accommodation and other faculty members may find it easier to come up with reasonable accommodations. I’m concerned about giving the impression that the student has an entitlement to an accommodation, which I don’t think we want to say, and so I’m also concerned about the idea of being denied an educational benefit. If a student chooses to be absent from class for religious reasons, it’s not as though someone has denied them a benefit. It would have been a good thing if it had been possible for the faculty member to provide an accommodation so the student wouldn’t have to miss it but it seems to me these are choices made by the students. Yes, we want our faculty to accommodate them to the fullest extent reasonable but I’m concerned about creating the impression of entitlements or an impression of injustice where it’s the student’s choice to absent himself or herself in class, an understandable perhaps justifiable choice on the student’s part, but not one that we are obliged in all cases to remedy.

President Peters: All right, John.

J. Wolfskill: I’d like to respond to Provost Alden’s comments with my personal take on the matter. First of all, in my opinion, if we have a faculty member who persistently and consistently says I will never accommodate any religious belief whatsoever under any circumstances, I believe that is flatly wrong and contrary to the intent of our policy and if we have a faculty member with that position, then I believe it would be appropriate to take sanctions against that faculty member, perhaps ??? to a process or if it were judged to be an extremely severe situation, conceivably even ground for dismissal. That’s my opinion. The other thing about the timing, my reading of this document as far as the chain of command for appeals is that’s intended before the fact. What happens after the fact? The student was stuck. Well, then it would seem to me the natural avenue would be to follow the normal kind of grade appeal process if the student believes he was unjustly treated academically in the class then we’re talking about a potential grade appeal and there are procedures for that. Again, those are my opinions.

President Peters: Thank you Professor Wolfskill. Dean Sorensen then back to Professor
Stephen then Jeff.

C. Sorensen: The words reasonable accommodation occur a couple of places here and reasonable notice as well. In the first paragraph it does say “to reasonably accommodate” the religious observance and I’d suggest in the first sentence in the second paragraph we reiterate that point where it says “students who believe they have been unreasonably denied a reasonable accommodation” because, you know, that’s the point. It’s not any accommodation that they choose. But in the other paragraph it also says that the student shall provide instructor with reasonable notice. I think that’s what John’s point was so the appeal is early when it asks for the accommodation ahead of time and the faculty members ??? that they would appeal and I agree with John that then if it’s a grade issue, it should go through the normal way to appeal procedures that we have already in place in the university. My only other comment or question I have is using the word grievance. Is this a grievance or is this a complaint. I’m not sure whether we really want to use the word grievance which often, you know, ??? other kinds of processes in the university.

President Peters: I want to be clear about the language suggestion and that it wasn’t a motion but since it’s students who believe they’ve been ---

C. Sorensen: Denied a reasonable accommodation.

President Peters: A reasonable accommodation.

C. Sorensen: Right.

President Peters: Jody would you accept as a friendly amendment?


???: Might I suggest substituting issue for grievance where Dean Sorensen has pointed out.

President Peters: Where is that in the text?

???: If the grievance is not resolved at – it’s the next sentence.

President Peters: All right. If the issue ---

???: ???

J. Newman-Ryan: Yeah, we have issue at there at one point in the committee. We had matter in there, we had concern, we had – you know, so yes.

President Peters: So yes to issue.

J. Newman-Ryan: That’s fine.
President Peters: As I have it right now – Buck, do you want to do more word ????? Let me read what we have now so we have the text before us. Students who believe they have been denied a reasonable accommodation should contact their, etc. If the issue is not resolved at the department level --- okay, that’s what we have now.

???: Yes.

President Peters: And I think, all right, now Professor Stephen.

J. Stephen: I understand Provost Alden’s reservations but I’d like to point out that we already make a number of different accommodations which we are somewhat mandated to make. Those for students with disabilities for a variety of different reasons which may include them taking a test at a different time or different place. We make accommodations for students who have been ill and as far as making accommodations for religious observations, I think one of the main problems is what’s considered reasonable. If the student says I can’t make it to class, it’s high holidays; I have to be in temple, I consider that completely reasonable. If one of my students says, there’s a wicken festival in New Mexico and I’ve got a week’s travel and we’re going to be there for a week, I’m going to go well, I’m not sure I consider that reasonable. I don’t have a problem with your religion; I do have a problem with a week of travel time and a week for a festival as opposed to a particular high holiday. So I would suggest we already make accommodations on a lot of basic things and I think maybe it’s an issue of what we consider reasonable.

President Peters: Paul.

P. Stoddard: It seems to me we have a couple of issues. One is the question of reasonable ??? but the Provost did not have a problem ruling on whether the faculty is being reasonable or the students are being reasonable is more appropriate in a specific instance. The issue of a faculty member’s decision not to provide accommodation is a bit thornier I think than it would be for disabilities or illness because of a wide variety of religious beliefs that could be out there and the difficulty a faculty member would have in clarifying some of those. If a faculty member were to take such a position, I would strongly advise that would have to be on the syllabus so that any student taking the course would know ahead of time either they have to take a different section or make their own accommodations around the class. As for the timing, again, we do run into a problem with some holidays that take place of the beginning of the semester and there might not be time to run through the gallant of appeals before the holiday actually shows up.

President Peters: We’ll take Jeff and then Professor Tolhurst. Jeff Meyer.

J. Meyer: Thank you. If I can I’d like to make a couple of points. First ??? specifics of my constituency, while I understand concern about timeliness and about the amount of time it takes, you know, to consider such an appeal, speaking in particular to my constituency, we don’t have department heads in the College of Law, we just have a dean so I think it’s important that we have an opportunity, you know, for an appeal of a decision of the dean, the only entity that, you know, exists really above the dean level then would be the Provost Office so while I understand the idea and appreciate the idea of putting it to a committee above the dean situation, that would
make the whole circumstance even less timely for a student in the College of Law who is trying to get an accommodation for a religious observance if the only appeal we have above the dean was to a committee that may or may not be meeting. So I think it’s important that we take, you know, that into account when determining what we would like to do beyond the dean level. I don’t think it would be inappropriate to consider allowance of discretion at the Provost level to take the appeal from the dean instead of directly to the Provost or the Provost or his designee. Understandably, you know, time could be an issue so I think that’s something that may be worth some consideration. But also I wanted to go back if I can for a moment to the discussion from last week. One of the reasons I think that in the debate that we talked about including the Provost Office in this process was time consideration concerns that there would be something much, you know, that if it was a direct line, if there was some hierarchy to it as opposed to some ambiguous nature, you know, for appeals then that might be something that could be dealt with in a more timely fashion even though there were more levels to the appeal. I think that was a comment made in the debate last week. So those are just a couple of the points I wanted to make and thank you.

**President Peters:** Thank you Jeff. Professor Tolhurst.

**W. Tolhurst:** I wanted to return to the talk about how we do have accommodations for other situations. Some of these accommodations are technically required by law as with people who have disabilities. In addition, there’s a complicating factor here which is essentially the separation of church and state and so there are legal issues there that we have to be mindful of. That said, it seems to me that it would be prudent for faculty to put on their syllabi a deadline for requesting an accommodation of this sort so that students know that faculty are willing to do this. Put on the deadline on the syllabus so that their students are informed ahead of time when they have to talk to the professor to alert him to the need for accommodation if it’s possible.

**President Peters:** Okay, let’s take the Provost.

**R. Alden:** Just to be clear, I have no problem dealing with before the fact issues. I mean we certainly can see what is reasonable and try and negotiate with the chain of command down to the faculty member and make sure that we’ve looked at all the possible accommodations but now that it’s been pointed out that if it’s after the fact, a grade appeal may be more appropriate, that’s at least an action that can be taken rather than just telling a student nothing can be done because it’s a done deal. I certainly don’t mind seeing some sort of negotiation if we can make most of these cases before the fact.

**President Peters:** All right, we’ll take Professor Stephen and then back to Professor Tolhurst unless you’re changing the topic.

**J. Stephen:** I think a good balance between what Professor Tolhurst and Provost Alden has to say is – that the Provost Office direct the departments, colleges or divisions, whichever is appropriate, to prepare a small policy to be included in the syllabus. Just a short paragraph, if you’re going to have a religious conflict with one of the dates of class, it is your responsibility to notify the instructor in advance. I mean, religious holidays are known in advance and that puts it
into the position and then also have an exclusionary phrase that says no exceptions will be made if advance notice is not given.

**President Peters:** All right. Okay, Professor Tolhurst.

**W. Tolhurst:** I’m a little concerned about how it would work to have a grade appeal after the fact since, as I understand it, the criteria for grade appeals would not apply in this kind of case. That is to say that the criteria of the grade appeal would be either a failure to abide by the syllabus that had been passed out or capricious grading and neither of those would be covered by this case so as far as I can see there couldn’t be a grade appeal after the fact unless we change the criteria for grade appeal and I don’t think that would be wise for this kind of situation.

**President Peters:** All right, Dean Sorensen.

**C. Sorensen:** Actually, my comment was about that topic. Capriciousness would rule if they treated one student differently than another in granting an accommodation for one and not another.

???: That’s not capricious grading is it?

**C. Sorensen:** If it effects their grade because somebody got an accommodation and another person did not, yes it would be but my comment was in terms of parallel language in the last paragraph you have office of the dean, I was just going to say you might say office of the provost and they can do what I do and delegate it to someone else.

**President Peters:** Being an old provost, my guess is it’ll get delegated anyway.

**C. Sorensen:** But the language isn’t parallel with the office of the dean.

**President Peters:** All right, yes.

**D. Docking:** Comment to Buck, you said the students have a responsibility to notify the faculty in advance if they’re going to miss a class or whatever because of a religious holiday because they know that. Does that then mean that the faculty have to set the test dates, etc. in advance so the students will know when they are? I mean, some faculty do; some faculty do not so what is the implication then for the faculty? That’s my question on that.

**J. Stephen:** I don’t think there would be – whether you set your tests in advance or not if you agree to make that accommodation. You can either as you’re going along, schedule your test for a different date or schedule a makeup test. For instance, I do make up my test schedules in advance and I look at my calendar and in particular I do avoid major Christian and Jewish holidays and try to avoid other holidays that I know of, the major Islamic holidays that I might know of but I also know that as long as my test finishes before sunset on Friday night, I’m not going to have a conflict with say a Jewish student because it won’t go into Shaves but as far as setting your tests, I would think of it the same way you deal with a student who had a car
accident or an illness, that it really doesn’t effect when you schedule your test, you just may have to give a makeup.

**D. Docking:** Just one other comment then. Well I do the same thing you do so I have no problem. I’d just like a point of clarification then on this language in the second line. It says “it has long been the University’s policy” what do we mean by “has long been”? Do we mean it is or it is not or this just some sort of way of saying it is without really saying it is?

**President Peters:** I think it’s saying it’s a University norm.

**D. Docking:** It’s just a norm, but that doesn’t mean it is? If it is, why don’t we just say it is?

**J. Stephen:** Because it’s not formal.

**President Peters:** It’s been – let’s say, it may be the problem is policy; it’s a tradition. It’s a norm. There is a ---

**J. Wolfskill:** With respect, if this is going into the Policy and Procedures Manual, then it’s either a policy or procedure and I submit policy in this case.

**President Peters:** Well, irrespective of whether we’ve had a policy or not, if this goes in the manual, it becomes policy.

**P. Stoddard:** I think the policies ---

**President Peters:** Is that correct?

**P. Stoddard:** Yeah. The policy is encourage faculty to make accommodations. That’s how it’s actually written.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I didn’t write that line; I wrote the line before it. I thought that was policy – well, I don’t know, we had so much policy that had that and I insisted that we have the first line on here because I think we need to start out by saying exactly what some of you have pointed out that there does need to be separation of church and state, however, we recognize and respect different religions and so that was all I was concerned about, was the order of that. We wanted to have a strong statement first saying that this is not a religious institution and then I don’t remember where ??? came from so this is fine.

**President Peters:** All right, where are we? P. Vohra.

**P. Vohra:** I think the statement where it says “students who expect to miss classes” and so on and so forth is a blank statement but basically implies that the students will just tell the faculty that they’re going to be missing the class, exam or anything else. I think the statement would make more sense if you begin this statement “to request accommodation, students who expect to miss class” and then so on and so forth. What we saying is that students are requesting accommodation, they are not just telling the professor they will be missing the class.
???: Can you repeat that please?

P. Vohra: If you add three words at the beginning of the sentence, to request accommodation, and then ---

???: Say the whole sentence.

P. Vohra: The last line of ???

J. Stephen: I would suggest we leave alone the friendly amendments here and perhaps we should table this and move on.

Professor Tolhurst: I don’t think we should table it. I think we should get it done. I think that with reasonable accommodation has to happen between the individual students and professors and it’s the student’s responsibility to work those out with the professors and it’s the professor’s responsibility to provide reasonable accommodation should that be impossible. With regard to the wording about has been, we could always put it is and has long been university policy if anybody is still worried about that.

President Peters: Okay, all right. Does everyone have the current language.

???: Why doesn’t somebody read the whole thing with the changes.

P. Stoddard: All right, this is what I have. Feel free to correct me if I missed something.

“Northern Illinois University as a public institution of higher education in the State of Illinois does not observe religious holidays. It is the university’s policy, however, to reasonably accommodate the religious observances of individual students in regards to admissions, class attendance, scheduling examinations and work requirements. Such policies shall be made known to faculty and students. Religious observance includes all aspects of religious observance and practice as well as belief. Absence from classes or examinations for religious observance does not relieve students from responsibility for any part of the course work required during the period of absence. To request accommodation, students who expect to miss classes, examinations or other assignments as a consequence of their religious observance shall provide instructors with reasonable notice of the date or dates they will be absent. Students who believe they have been denied a reasonable accommodation should contact the person identified by the department to hear such complaints, usually the department chair. If the issue is not resolved at the department level, students may proceed to the office of the dean of that college and if it is still unresolved, to the Office of the Provost. Additionally students may contact the ombudsman for advice.”

President Peters: All right.

J. Stephen: I suggest in the last sentence, first paragraph “students who expect”, that sentence “shall provide instructors with reasonable advance notice”.
President Peters: All right, Jody, you’re really in the driver’s seat on accepting this kind of language. Just say no.


J. Stephen: That doesn’t always happen like when a ---

J. Newman-Ryan: Well, the problem you get into is exactly why it’s taken us so long to write this. As Diane pointed out, I mean, if you have an instructor that sets the day of the exam the day before the exam, you know, that’s the instructor’s issue as well to have to deal with what the advance notice then that they’re happy with because it’s their fault they set the exam the day before so the student can’t really provide advance notice other than to say at that time I can’t be there. So, I don’t know.

President Peters: All right, any other – I want out of the chair and put my old provost hat on and take up Provost Alden’s concern because I was thinking about okay, if it came to my desk as provost and I had a few of these, how would I handle it. Taking out the word unreasonably denied took away an approach that I would use to handle it which means that it doesn’t put the burden on – the reasonable accommodation that was asked for – but was that request unreasonably denied which then gets a provost or anyone in a situation where they could say did the professor do this arbitrarily, whimsically, with malice? It may have been harsh. It was stated in the syllabus no religious accommodations will be given. I mean I guess that’s an academic freedom issue and it was harsh but it wasn’t unreasonable. So I thought that word unreasonable gave at least the provost or anyone else something to dig in to. But not requesting a change; just my thought. Okay, all right. I suppose you could do that under reasonable accommodation.

J. Newman-Ryan: Actually when I read it the first time I didn’t take that word out.

President Peters: You did not take it out? I know, you read it that way and then I ---

P. Stoddard: It could have been my mistake in the reading then.

President Peters: All right. So, yes?

???: If we’re looking at the second sentence “it has long been” that sentence there, if we change that to say “it is the policy” then the scenario of a professor allowing no accommodation is really at steak here. If it is the policy of the university to have reasonable accommodation, then it’s no longer the professor’s ability to say there will be no accommodation. Is that correct?

???: ???

???: So in other words, if it is the policy to have reasonable accommodation then does that does away with a faculty member’s opportunity to have no accommodation whatsoever. Now we may want to do that and, in fact, I believe that 110 ILCS suggests that we must provide it, although I
don’t have the language of the statute at my fingertips but let’s be very careful about that word “is” in that sentence because I think it changes the context of what’s there.

**President Peters:** Call the question? All right. All those in favor of the policy as amended many, many, many times say aye. Opposed? Abstained? We have a policy. I want to thank everyone for the good work that they’ve done.

The policy passed as amended.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I’ll point out again that I have a lengthy report that I will spare you today but as we worked on this all year, we have found a lot of – we’ve come up with a lot of suggestions I guess for the Provost’s office that he may or may not wish to pursue about how to prevent having people sent to his office for this policy infraction so we have a lot of suggestions but unfortunately, or fortunately depending on your point of view, the committee did not want to make all of those part of this policy. We wanted something short.

**President Peters:** So do you want to formally ---

**J. Newman-Ryan:** No.

**President Peters:** You know you could ask this group to formally transmit to the Provost for consideration.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Okay, so I’m just going to send that to him and let him decide what he would like to do with that and he may bring some of that back next year to this committee or not. I don’t know. So we have come up with a lot of suggestions but we just didn’t want it to be part of policy or it couldn’t be part of the policy. For instance, the syllabi issue. We have essentially nothing saying what has to be in syllabi now so it’s kind of piecemeal to say this would have to be in the syllabus when we don’t have university-wide syllabus policy now. If we want to do that, we’d have to talk about all the things that should be in there so --- so just those kinds of problems. Once he’s done with that Strategic Plan, what else does he have to do right?

**President Peters:** Work on the unified syllabus? All right. So it’s our understanding that as part of this process, the Provost will be given that report.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Brigid Lusk, Chair – report

**President Peters:** Brigid, Elections and Legislative Oversight.


**B. Lusk:** Okay, so this relates to University Council confirmation of the election of the 2007-2008 Executive Secretary of the University Council. This is pursuant to Article 3.2 of our Constitution and Article 2.1 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws. I’m 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 nominations, and unanimously approve his election to this position.

W. Tolhurst: So moved.

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

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Unfinished Business, Sabbatical Leaves Bylaw changes, page 11.

A. Sabbatical Leaves Bylaw changes – ACTION ITEM (Page 11)

R. Alden: This came from the UC/PC. We had the first reading last time. There was a suggestion for a friendly amendment between the meetings and I would like to bring it forward as a potential change for consideration. First of all, what was behind this for those of you who weren’t here last time was that people who take their sabbatical in the fall, if they turn in their report 60 days after they return, that’s too late to be included in the merit evaluation process and therefore part of the bylaws regarding 8.4, it’s really too late to do anything to really implement some of that language and so the UCPC wanted to make it 30 days so that this information could be incorporated in the annual evaluation associated with merit. The other component was with respect to review of new proposals, the UCPC thought it would be useful to have, in addition to a report in a file somewhere, some sort of recognition that that report was reviewed at the departmental level and found to largely achieve the work of the previous proposal for a sabbatical before they decided to award another sabbatical to the same person at some distant time in the future because right now, the reports come to my office. They get put in a file and there’s no guarantee that anybody really looked at for evaluation as to whether the person did a significant amount of work while on sabbatical. The discussion centered around not only is it fair if we have fewer slots than we have proposals for someone to have wasted a sabbatical leave and then turn around and ask for another one sometime in the future and be treated like everybody else and second of all, that we felt that it was important for accountability purposes to protect the sabbatical process to make sure the quality control was there. And so the other component of this other than to change the number of days is the wording that is underlined and that was just to make sure there’s a form from the Personnel Committee Chair and the Department Chair that says this report was reviewed as part of the evaluation process and they found that the work was equivalent to what was suggested in the proposal and therefore they have acknowledged that that review was taking place. The suggestion was to drop the two words “completion of” and that changed our new wording because completion of suggests that you have to do exactly what you said in the proposal and we know that as with all research, your plans change as you go through a project and so the suggestion was there’s adequate documentation of the work outline in the sabbatical proposal or its equivalent so that at least somebody has looked to make sure there was a reasonable amount of work done and that it was, if not the exact same work, it was equivalent to the work that was proposed. So that was the friendly amendment and I’m perfectly fine with it as Chair of the UCPC accepting that language because I think that met with the spirit of what was discussed.
President Peters: All right. Is there a motion to accept these changes on the sabbatical leaves policy? Is there a second? Any discussion or questions? This is action. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right we have those changes.

The motion was made by Stephen; seconded by Tolhurst.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: New Business. We have two issues. The first is research misconduct policy, pages 12-27 and second intellectual property policy, pages 28-35. These are first reading changes? They’re not bylaw changes. They’re just policy changes you want to announce.

A. Research Misconduct Policy (Pages 12-27)

R. Bose: This is the ??? of our existing policy. From time to time we look at all of our policies and make sure that policies stand the time test and in this particular case we are forced by the federal government to look at our policies. Many of you that in 2005 the federal government has new research misconduct policy in place. If you are interested, you can read the entire section, 90 some pages long, 42 sections for federal code regulations, section 42 and section 93. Basically, those changes are how long we have to keep the misconduct data, what we have to do in the event the project was federally funded. What is the specific line of action we have to take. What is the definition of research misconduct, things of that nature. We have not changed our operational procedure, how one reports to our office, the faculty committee that advises the Provost and the steps that we have taken before to resolve those issues, there are no changes on those items. The changes are made just to make sure that we are in compliance with federal regulations. If anyone of you have specific questions, I will be happy to answer them. Let me thank a number of people. This was assigned to a group of five. We had a committee called The Responsible Conduct of Scholarship. Dr. Paul Stoddard is a member of the committee along with all the IRB folks and so forth and so on. The five member sub-committee was assigned including Carol Thompson, Murali Krishnamurthi, Sharon ??? and two from my office, Gail Mitchell and Sandy Arntz. They went through multiple revisions related to the federal policies and then Paul took this matter to the Executive Committee of the University Council – not Executive, Steering Committee. We went to the Deans’ Council and also the President’s Cabinet to make sure that everybody is aware of those changes. With that, I would be happy to answer any particular questions in the best way possible.

President Peters: All right, Professor Stephen.

J. Stephen: Page 18, part E, second paragraph from the bottom there it says “the Provost will make a written determination of whether an investigation is warranted. If an allegation is found to be unsupported, blah, blah, blah”, it will be closed and held confidential, however under F, the beginning sentence says “the University will notify the funding agency at any stage of the inquiry or investigation if it is ascertained that any of the following conditions exist:” and notice it says “at any stage” including the end, even if it’s unsupported. Point 5. “There is a strong likelihood that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly.” I can see 6. “The university believes that the research community or public should be informed.” Of course you’d
notify the funding agency, but if you get an unsupported allegation that hasn’t been submitted in
good faith and you find it’s totally bologna and you throw it in the confidential closed pile and
then you find out they’re going to write a letter to the editor, then are you going to write the
funding agency and say – I don’t understand the reasoning for 5. there.

**R. Bose:** Right. Under Section F, the 7 items are taken from the federal policies. When you
accept certain grants then we accept certain rules and they require us to inform any allegations,
even if this not substantiated. However, when the Provost is going to close the case, we’ll advise
the funding agencies there was no finding against this thing so I don’t think it’s too odd what
you’re referring to here.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, so in essence point 5 is essentially putting the funding agency in a position to
defend your position – to defend it and say oh yes, we heard about this; it wasn’t supported.

**R. Bose:** Funding agencies always allow the institution to do due diligence but they liked to be
informed so they are not blindsided.

**J. Stephen:** Okay, thank you.

**President Peters:** That was a good catch thought. All right, so any other questions? We have
to approve this. Is there a motion to approve this misconduct policy?

**J. Stephen:** So moved.

**President Peters:** Is there a second?

**W. Tolhurst:** Second.

**President Peters:** All right. Any discussion? All right all those in favor of this research

The motion passed.

B. Intellectual Property Policy (Pages 28-35)

**President Peters:** Now Rathindra are you bringing the Intellectual Property Policy?

**R. Bose:** Yes sir. Our Intellectual Property Policy was ??? out long ago. There are many
federal regulations in place since we have our first policy. Many of you know there are major
public policies. One is 108403, that’s called ??? The other one called PL108357, that was a ???
format for intellectual property. There are also rules called CRATA that is Cooperative
Research Center Allotment Agreement. So many things happened during the last ten to fifteen
years so our current policy actually takes care of those federal policies as well as a few other
minor changes. These are minor changes reflect who owns the intellectual property in one case.
The other change the committee composition, the voting membership hasn’t changed. The
faculty still has five voting members. Administrative side we have two voting membership, we
just changed one person to the other. There is a new section added in here that if we would like to accept intellectual property donated by somebody else to the university, what do we have to do and that one is critical partly because the 2004 tax reform law requires that we should do due diligence before any gift of that nature. So those specific changes and again, I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

**President Peters:** Could you tell us just a little bit about the process by which this was reviewed?

**R. Bose:** Sure. Our old policy was a good policy but actually was ??? that I don’t think was policy language so this one mostly is very pointed to what the faculty should be doing from definition of IP to everything else. Again, the five member faculty committee did most of the work and I suppose we have Dr. Tom Sims from that committee sitting in the corner. We went through at least ten revisions, went through our legal office and finally everyone agreed and signed on it. We discussed at the Deans’ Council and also I think the Provost had a chance to talk with President John Peters so I think everyone is agreed on this language at this point.

**President Peters:** Okay, great.

**J. Stephen:** Page 31, part IV, Copyrights a and b. Part A says “All rights in copyright will remain with the author unless the material is – (ii) is supported by a direct allocation of funds through the University for the pursuit of a specific product, unless otherwise agreed” and then under b, it says “The University does not claim ownership to ‘traditional academic copyrightable works’”. Okay, how does this effect getting an instructional improvement grant or even as much as a presidential teaching professorship where you’re supported in part to improve your delivery of courses which may include the production of traditional academic copyrightable works while also being supported by the University?

**R. Bose:** I think section a ??? and I think I’m pretty sure about this part, that if we hire some person to develop some materials for Athletic Department and the University to ??? that, so this person has been hired with a specific intent, was not the intellectual property of the person, was the intellectual property of the University on a defined project. What you are referring is the faculty copyrightable materials. Those are developed during teaching of your intellectual ability to create new materials so they are the traditional copyright and I think the authors own that so I don’t see the way you are seeing in here.

**J. Stephen:** It’s because of the “or” – a(i) say “a work for hire” and then goes “or (ii)” and a work for hire part is not part of ii – ii just says, if we read it straight through – it says “All rights in copyright will remain with the author unless the material is (ii) supported by a direct allocation of funds through the University for the pursuit of a specific product”. If I write an instructional improvement grant to help me write course materials, that is specifically material that is supported by a direct allocation of funds through the University for the pursuit of a specific product.

**President Peters:** But that would be in your role as professor and not work for hire.
S. Stephen: The work for hire is only part of the definition in a(i), not a(ii).

R. Bose: Professor Stephen, if you go a page before that, page 29, section e, you would find that clarification is there. It’s traditional academic copyright. So all faculty are protected in there.

J. Stephen: Again, that doesn’t cover it. “works created independently and at the creator’s initiative”. If I write an instructional improvement grant, that’s not independent. That is under the support of the University and funded by the University.

President Peters: Gail.

G. Mitchell: This was a point that was discussed with our legal counsel and that’s why we have that particular phrase – let me find it again – “unless otherwise agreed”. Now that’s supposed within having the grant in order to develop something so that would be the agreement between the grant that you get from the University so that it still remains your property to develop that curriculum.

J. Stephen: So the agreement under such a grant would be that I’m producing traditional academic copyright.

G. Mitchell: That’s correct.

J. Stephen: Thanks Gail. That clarifies it.

President Peters: Are you ready to vote. Anne?

A. Kaplan: I have two questions related to on-line course development. On that same page, 31, in c, can I assume that the reference to information technology services is a “for instance”? That is there is software development going on elsewhere?

G. Mitchell: ???

A. Kaplan: Is that a “for instance”?

G. Mitchell: Yeah.

A. Kaplan: Okay. And the second one perhaps more important, in the next section, d, “It is the responsibility of developers to identify any materials blah, blah, blah that are owned by others”. This is about the development of instructional material that is collaborative between faculty and developers. Now does that mean that a faculty member working with developers in, for example, e-learning services on a course, does that mean that is the e-learning services people who are responsible for identifying materials and getting permission and so on when, in fact, it’s the faculty member’s course?
G. Mitchell: I think this means if there are third party already copyrighted materials that are being used to develop something in a course, then whoever is in that situation of knowing that must disclose it, whether it be the developer who is helping the faculty member ---

A. Kaplan: It does seem to rather put the onus here on the developer which sort of makes me nervous.

G. Mitchell: Actually, would you look in the old one? I think actually this is taken directly from the old policy.

A. Kaplan: I know, but a lot of the old policy is almost pre-digital.

G. Mitchell: Right, that’s true.

R. Bose: But the copyright actually changed.

A. Kaplan: Well, I know, but if you’re coming as a faculty member to e-learning to get instructional design help and you’re bringing materials, I think the staff in e-learning are going to assume that you are aware of the copyright issues related to the materials in your course and this seems to me to read as if they should be taking on some of that responsibility.

G. Mitchell: You could say that these are outside people too who are working with faculty.

A. Kaplan: You could.

G. Mitchell: It’s more a generic term; it’s who the developer is. It sort of puts it on the onus that if somebody is aiding somebody at the University, then it’s their responsibility to disclose if they are using information that is already copyrighted.

A. Kaplan: So, it would be the faculty member’s responsibility to disclose that?

G. Mitchell: Well, when we talked about this ---

A. Kaplan: I’d be happy to – we don’t have to settle this this minute, but I would like some clarification.

G. Mitchell: If you have suggestions for language, I think we’d be happy to entertain them.

A. Kaplan: Okay.

President Peters: In the next few years, these technologies have become so disruptive and as copyright law changes, my guess is we’ll be fixing this up regularly as these issues come up.

G. Mitchell: Honestly Anne, we didn’t really make any changes.
A. Kaplan: I think there are a couple of technology related issues that I think maybe we could clean up over the summer or something.

President Peters: All right. Great, great.

R. Alden: I think this policy as with many of our policies has to be considered a living document. That is, since the IP committee has among its’ responsibilities to regularly review and update it, I think if we do have some issues still out there in the original language, we could start this whole process over again next year and polish it up even further without doing any damage to the existing changes. So I would recommend that you bring those things to Rathindra and the IP committee to continually try to improve this as the technology evolves and the issues arise.

President Peters: All right. We need a motion to accept this document.

J. Stephen: So moved.

President Peters: Second?

J. Kowalski: Second.

President Peters: All right. There’s a question? A lot of people came to his defense there. All right. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right we have a new Intellectual Property Policy.

The motion passed.

X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Any comments or questions from the floor?

P. Stoddard: I have one.

President Peters: Yes, Paul?

P. Stoddard: I would like to note that Bobbie Cesarek has been re-elected as Chair of the SPS for three years so we can look forward to seeing her again. Congratulations Bobbie.

President Peters: We’ll take Dean Vohra and then Professor Stephen.

P. Vohra: I’d just like to say this is Dean Sorensen’s last University Council meeting and I want to thank her for a wonderful job and her good work in partnership with all the deans and everybody else here.

President Peters: All right, Professor Stephen?
**J. Stephen:** We talked about mental health before. I think that we’re in somewhat of a bind because of privacy laws that we are obligated to get involved with and perhaps position students in the public who may have mental health problems but because of privacy issues, we may not be aware of it at the time and without a mechanism for disclosure, if we’re going to put our students into a public setting, we may be opening ourselves up to some big problems and we might think about this and the things I can think about where this might effect our reputation with employers and collaborators is internships, student teaching, things like that and if we place a student into a situation where one office on campus knows that they are, let’s say have an undisclosed mental difficulty which may interfere with their progress or ability to do the work but we as the placing agents are totally unaware of that, we’re not making informed decisions and I think that maybe there should be some kind of mechanism to address this if we’re going to send students into the community. But I don’t know if there can be such a one with the ----

**President Peters:** I can tell you that this is all under review and you will see at the state level and the federal level, you will see some changes in the information sharing parts of family privacy. I know that for a fact and for some that is not a – it could be views as a chilling sort of outcome. For others it gives us a tool that seems reasonable to protect people. So we are – I know there are discussions like that going on and whether or not we get to a good place, I hope we do, but I’m not sure. Gip? Brian? But it has been discussion and will continue to be. All right? Jody?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** I have an unrelated question. Sorry, I just have a quick question. I’d like to thank my committee for work this year. Last week in Senate we talked about wanting a centralized location for faculty handbook types of materials so I guess I’d like to know where – ask Dr. Bose – where these two policies might be posted whenever they’re official? Where might people find these?

**R. Bose:** Currently, exactly the place we have, APPM, Section I. I think I have it – Part I and Part 6. Section I, General Policies and Procedures, Item 2 and IP Policy would be Section I, Item 6.

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** All right. Any other questions? Remember immediately following as soon as you can get over there, we have a reception and dinner for the University Council at new Barsema Alumni Visitor Center. Don’t go to the President’s residence. The mayor has lifted our liquor license. No, but we’re going to try Barsema this year.

**XI. INFORMATION ITEMS**

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

XII. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Shall we stand adjourned? We’re adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.