UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2006, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


M. Morris attended for L. Pernell; M. Tahernezhade attended for P. Vohra

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.


I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: We call the November 8, 2006 meeting of the University Council to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item of business is the adoption of the agenda. You should have at your place a walk-in committee report from Rules and Governance which goes under VI., H. Are there any other additions to the agenda? Motion to approve the agenda? Second? All those in favor. Opposed? All right, we have an agenda.

The agenda was approved with the walk-in item.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2006 MEETING
(Pages 3-5)

President Peters: Take a look at pages 3-5, the minutes. I will call for any additions or corrections. I saw Jerry Zar at the football game last night and I should have asked him to come and read the minutes for us. It would be a long meeting. Motion to approve the minutes? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

The minutes were approved as written.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: There is no Consent Agenda but I have to give my announcements of course. Now, let’s see – what’s that? Oh yeah, we did adopt the agenda didn’t we? Yeah, we did adopt the agenda. You were reading the minutes when we adopted the agenda.

Okay, let me see. What do I have? I’ve jotted down a few things. Provost Alden is not here today. He’s at a meeting somewhere and I would have asked him to give an update on his Strategic Planning Committee and efforts. It’s my understanding that the committee has been empanelled now, the taskforce or whatever you call it, and it is – I had told Ray when we had first met about this and he said you know, I really would like about six people on this committee and I said, okay, go ahead. So there are forty to forty-five people on the committee. Lesson number one about NIU and there are about eighty-five other people who are upset they’re not on the committee. Well, anyway, I look at the list; it looks like there’s very good people and some good representation and remember the task here and the intent is to get a discussion going to shape up our ??? admission and get a vision for our academic strategic plan. It’s not an all-encompassing university master plan or whatever you want to call it but obviously there are implications about other things, you know, resources, physical facilities, equipment that sort of thing that would make real good academic plan but the core of this is academic planning and I look forward to this and I know Ray is working very, very hard and this committee is going to be working very hard. But, it’s incumbent on all of us and all of you to make sure that you and your department or your unit or where you work that people know about it and get their opinions out. So I’m excited about that.

I just want to let you know too that I’m in the final stages of determining whether we can go ahead with the mid-year salary increment that I mentioned in June when I announced the salary plan and I’m optimistic but I’m looking – that still depends on the current budget situation and whether or not the state’s coffers are solid and revenue estimates that appears to be so but, as you know, - I don’t know how you could avoid it – we’ve been in a kind of a two-month hiatus while the politicians ran for re-election and therefore there wasn’t a lot of policy communication back and forth. That now will come to an end. The veto session is scheduled for next week and then there’s a week off and then there’s a second week and, you know, it’s a lame duck veto session and for those of you who don’t know, a veto session that’s scheduled and it’s supposed to clean up any bills that the Governor either vetoed or left over things and usually the charge is pretty narrow and usually at that point, if there are any budget issues they may get discussed although that’s an executive gubernatorial decision because the budget has already passed. But here’s the point, everything being equal, I think – I’m hopeful to announce that mid-year salary as soon as I can. I’d like to announce it between now and December 1. We’re working on that and it’s not simple because it comes out of our own funds.

With regard to the veto session, it begins next week and I don’t expect too much out of the veto session. There are and there have been and there usually are rumors and rumblings about a capital bill because we haven’t had one in four years and, of course, the major thing is Stevens on that particular capital budget and planning money for the Technology Computer Science, Computation building whatever we call it officially. I made a study of this but my guess now is that you’re not going to see that until the spring, until the new legislature is empanelled because
Senator Emil Jones has a veto-proof Democratic majority on the Senate side so they’ll wait for that. I mean that’s a guess on my part. Okay, that’s coming up.

At the federal level, there’s obviously a big power shift and the impact there is on committees and in terms of higher education, there’ll be a lot of Democratic committee chairs take over that are long-time members that are very skilled and know the education issues. My guess is there’ll be a focus on student aide and still accountability, cost. You know, when the Democrats are in the majority in Congress at least on educational issues, there’s more of a tendency to regulate so we’ll see a little bit of that. I think some of the things from the Spellings Commission might work their way in but I’m not sure about that. At any rate, and I’ve not made a study of this and I only know what I quickly read in the newspaper and that, this is – for higher education and us – this is really the start of the 2008 election cycle and so I don’t expect, I could be surprised, I don’t expect much in terms of higher ed policy coming out of anywhere. Okay. But maybe that’s good. But you know, we don’t still don’t have a – the higher education bill hasn’t been reauthorized and that’s – World War II has gone on longer than this reauthorization so maybe we’ll get a reauthorization. So, we’ll see.

Okay, just a couple of things that I have been doing and I found interesting. Provost Alden and I a week or so ago hosted a dinner at Barsema Alumni Visitor Center for all new tenure-track faculty and their guests and department chairs and deans and I just want to say I was really impressed with the quality of the new people that I met. They join us from all different areas and at different levels of their careers. Most of them, you know, junior level, entry level, but some more senior and I was really impressed with them and I didn’t get a chance to talk to everyone of them but I went on the websites and tried to find their CV’s and I got to see some of your websites and I have to say my department, Political Science, is new and fresh and beautiful but my picture isn’t there so I’m e-mailing my chair. See, higher education is the only place where my boss is the department chair of Political Science and the Dean and the Provost but yet I’m their boss. Figure that out. Then I think it was Monday of this week, I held a reception for our Lincoln Laureate nominees and winners and their faculty advisors and let me tell you, if you had seen that group of people, you would say this is why we’re in this business. They’re impressive and intimidating. You’d better be careful if you raise a subject with them because they really are well-trained and focused. They’re focused and our faculty has done a great job with those kids. They can go anywhere; any law school, any medical school, out into the professions and we’re going to be proud of them. I want to mention one in particular, Samie Chaudhry who is Political Science and Geography, a double-major, who was chosen by the state Lincoln Laureate Committee to be the spokesperson for all the Lincoln Laureates from the universities and if you read his background and you hear him speak with authority and he’s very much interested in international affairs and that sort of thing and defense policy, pretty much an expert on it, you’d be proud. So that was kind of the best thing that happened to me this week. The rest wasn’t so good.

Okay, that’s my comments. All right, so let’s move into – we already did, there is no Consent Agenda.
V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Paul Stoddard – report and P-20 Teaching Standards (Pages 6-9)

President Peters: Paul Stoddard has a very long report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the IBHE.

P. Stoddard: The reports not that long. There is an attachment to the report, however. The FAC to the IBHE met October 20 at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. It’s a pretty campus if you find yourself if Edwardsville with a half-hour to kill, go see it. We started off, we got an introduction, a welcome, from the new Provost, the newly hired Provost down there, Paul Ferguson who they hired from University of Nevada, Las Vegas where he had been Vice Provost for Research and in that capacity worked under one Ray Alden, III, the Provost at UNLV so I think you can see where we are in the pecking order when it comes to hiring new provosts. Anyway, he mentioned a couple of things that they’re trying to do down there. There’s a list of several of them. One of the ones I found interesting was that they are actually considering differential tuition, that is tuition based on course of study driving by market values more than a blanket tuition across the board for all students. I don’t know if that’s something we want to consider or not, I just found it interesting.

The main point of business of the meeting is the subject of the attachment you have which is a three-page document called “Breaking the Teacher Inequality”. This is something that apparently they’ve been working on, the FAC has been working on. It’s a position paper by the FAC to the IBHE. They’ve been working on it for a while. Unfortunately, we haven’t been at those meetings and before going down there, I had a discussion with Associate Provost Seaver about this. He relayed some concerns he had and received specifically regarding elementary ed teachers. This whole document is about the preparation of new teachers and while we are already doing many of the things this document recommends doing, in the field of elementary ed this document suggests that all such teachers be required to complete a major in a content area which essential would add thirty hours to any program which means an extra year and what is a four-year program becomes a five-year program and a de facto five-year program becomes a de facto six-year program. I raised those issues at the meeting. A representative from Urbana, Sharon Pane, also talked about support i.e., the state should probably be looking to provide additional funding because this is going to present more of a challenge for university resources and there was an objection about the major area being in Liberal and Sciences with capital LA&S. It was pointed out that a lot of content that is appropriate for K-12 teaching or in other fields that are not necessarily in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences so those capital letters are being knocked down to lower-case letters. A small statement about support is being snuck in on the last paragraph of the text on page 8. Those changes are not reflected in the document you have in front of you. This did pass; it actually passed unanimously which means I voted for it. I did so not necessarily to endorse all the recommendations they are making but because this serves as a jumping off point for debate. It seemed to me and everybody present that while we’re doing a decent job, a good job, preparing teachers it never hurts to see how we could be doing it better. So all this really is is the opening salvo on what we hope will be a debate on how
to improve teacher preparation in Illinois. This document will get presented to the IBHE who can follow up on it or ignore it as they see fit. They also are not the body that actually certifies new teachers, that’s the ISBE so really there’s a long way to go and a lot of talking that has to go on before any recommendation on this document ever sees the light of day so, again, it has some interesting ideas. I thought it was worth talking about them. That did pass unanimously as I said.

We got a report from Rebecca Wojcik from Governor’s State who sits on the HBHE working group that gives us a feel for some of the things the Board is going to be considering in the future. Right now they’re worried about physical presence and this is both student/teacher interactions, face-to-face versus on-line versus distance learning, etc. but also institutions operating in Illinois have to maintain some sort of physical presence. So an on-line institution that happens to be home-based in Arizona for example and has no physical presence here is going to have a difficult time being accredited to offer a degree to people in Illinois. So they’re worried about this. This worried about what it takes to maintain a physical presence and so forth so that’s a concern that they’re talking about.

Finally we got a report from Eastern Illinois University Trustee Leo Welch who is an interesting individual. He doesn’t get to the trustee position by what I would consider a normal route. He’s a former member of the Board for the Illinois Federation of Teachers so he’s a union man which is unusual but he talked about public relations essentially and how universities can – or how faculty and other people at universities and universities themselves do better – make themselves appear better to the public eye and perhaps even the legislatures’ eyes. He said his fear is that we focus too much on economic paybacks talking about good degrees leading to higher paying jobs and not enough about the other good things that university provides especially in a university community such as cultural opportunities and the availability of experts on a wide-range of topics. You know, we have multiple schools in this area who will call us up and say we need somebody to come talk to our class about, in my case, fossils or global warming or some such issue. So the university provides a valuable resource to the community at large and we need to be stressing that.

With that, we’ve pretty much finished up so it’s the end of the report. I’ll take any questions.

President Peters: Good, questions? Dean Sorensen is itching to say something or eager rather.

C. Sorensen: A question first and then I’ll make a comment. What percentage of the FAC members are actually from college of education?

P. Stoddard: I don’t have an excellent breakdown of that. I wouldn’t be surprised if none of the people there were from a college of education. A couple of other members did relay the concerns that their colleges of education had as well about this. I do believe the document was drawn up by non-college of ed people. I don’t know how much interaction they had with their colleges of ed when they actually drafted this.

C. Sorensen: Yeah, I would guess they had little conversation with their college of education colleagues. Some of the assumptions drawn goes far beyond the data that exists actually about
teacher education but in the states where they have taken this model, for example California went
a number of years ago to requiring a major for elementary education, and we actually have
faculty members in our college who went through that system and, for example, majored in
history and then taught elementary education who would say I did really well at teaching history
but not so well at teaching mathematics and science and so there are some issues related to that.
In other states where they have moved to this model such as Virginia, the elementary education
people now major in things like sociology or psychology and then go about and get – actually,
they’ve not gone to five-year undergraduate degrees – in almost all instances, they’ve gone to
masters of arts and teaching degrees so what you’ve done is then create five-year certification
programs where you do a four-year baccalaureate degree and a fifth year master of arts and
teaching degree and that’s essentially the model that has happened in several states and there are
studies that are coming out that I’m not so sure they do any better actually in the classroom in
elementary education than teachers prepared in the traditional four-year model we have. So yes,
we do have some concerns about some of the implications and some of the underlying
assumptions of some of them as well, even the assumption of grade inflation. I had a
conversation with a reporter here on campus a number of years ago about grade inflation in the
College of Education in the undergraduate programs who didn’t quite understand the fact that we
require a 3.0 GPA coming into the College of Education, into our teacher education, major
elementary education in particular and 3.0 GPA is not acquired in the College of Education. It’s
acquired in your general education course work in Liberal Arts and Sciences so by definition,
they likely will have a higher GPA in the College of Ed once they’re headed there. So just some
of the assumptions here are problematic and we really were not too happy with the language
requiring a Liberal Arts and Sciences major for elementary education and I’m not sure what the
implications are for that and early childhood education or physical education or any of those
areas – or special education – which are not addressed here.

P. Stoddard: Right. I think they’re not addressed here on purpose. I think they didn’t want to
venture into that. I’m trying to think, you know, I’d be happy if the people from the College of
Ed wanted to put together some of the information you are relaying and see if the FAC might not
want to add it – put in an appendix perhaps – from the college of ed or at least pass this along.

President Peters: Gip, you have something to add from the provost position?

G. Seaver: Just a suggestion Paul. I don’t think it’s an issue just in the College of Ed. Northern
is very unique; it’s very different from all the other schools in the state of Illinois and it’s very
unique actually in the United States in that our governance system for teacher education is not
contained within the College of Education. It’s contained in the four colleges that do prepare
educations and I think Dean Sorensen’s point is that, I mean, as I said to you, we’re way ahead of
the curve on a lot of these things and I would suggest whoever the faculty – the FAC rep would
consult with our two governing bodies that we have here and particularly CITCI to be able to try
to develop some type of a response. So we’re used to working with this and our colleagues in
Liberal Arts and Sciences and Visual Performing Arts and Health and Human Sciences and the
College of Ed do work collaboratively in these particular areas. So I would suggest much like
you and I did before, that we sit down so we can have the individuals very well prepared to be
able to address particular issues and maybe we can show some of these other universities how it
can be done by collaboration with the particular colleges.
President Peters: Paul, do you have any context here? Where did this come from and where is it going?

P. Stoddard: This is something, I mean, the FAC I think – this is my first meeting there so I don’t want to speak too much for them – but my feeling is they are trying to make themselves relevant and establish something of an agenda that they can bring to the IBHE rather than just responding to the things the IBHE hands down. They want to take a bit more proactive role. So this again is a paper they put together. It’s not from the IBHE at all and it will be presented to the IBHE at a future meeting and, again, from there if somebody on the Board wants to pick it up and follow up on it they will but they might just ignore it. My understanding is that would not be an unusual course of action for the IBHE to take.

President Peters: William?

W. Tolhurst: Just a quick question about the process. If there are concerns that we might to register to get this document changed in certain ways, is it too late for that to happen? I mean, if they’re going to present something to the IBHE and this one is in our view flawed, it would be good if we could do something to make it better.

P. Stoddard: I think, I mean the document proper, I mean, it really sounds like they’ve been back and forth on this for several months and I suspect that the will is not there to reopen the main part of the document. That’s why I suggest an appendix or an addendum or something tacked on to express some of the issues that have been brought up here today.

President Peters: Okay. Thank you Paul. Lot of strange things about IBHE. Peculiar organizationally peculiar things is that here we are, you know, we’re chartered. We have a process. We have accredited programs, teacher programs, and we grant the degrees and we prepare the curriculum and so forth and we do that here in a shared governance issue, really curriculum issues are solely the problems of the faculties that develop them so that’s where the competency is. Then you have a state coordinating agency whose role sometimes isn’t as clear as it might be but it’s somewhere between cooperation and regulation let’s say and then associated with it is input groups that are made up of the kind of constituents you find in post-secondary education, students, faculty, independent colleges, community colleges, what have you. But those groups as constituted, don’t represent anybody. Here you’ve got a group of loose faculty, no, no he knew exactly. I advised him on what to do on this. You’ve got a group of loose faculty that aren’t bound by you or me who are making these opinions to this group and then this commission, in good faith, they take this and they chew on it and the IBHE staff does something with it and it may come down in some sort of a rule that then we have to make sense out of and it comes back around and then we straighten it out or kill it, you know. It is interesting. Vigilance is important and that’s why I’m glad Paul and our students are involved. Vigilance is important because we have to know if there is anything out there, any craziness that’s going on or something that’s not rational that we’re going to have to spend a lot of time fixing. Now, that being said, every once in awhile they come up with a really good idea so --- all right? That’s the way I kind of see it. That was a good report Paul.
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 – Rachel Turner 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 10)

President Peters: It looks like our next report is Linda, Resources, Space, and Budget.

L. Derscheid: We did meet on September 27 and October 18 and at our September 27 meeting we were able to meet with Dr. Williams and asked him several questions about resources, space, and budgets and his thoughts about various kinds of issues and he pointed out that it seems to him that NIU has entered the fund development age and that a couple of new recent projects are being funded through our development office, the housing for students with dependents which was just started in October and the Academic Athletic Performance Center which is currently being built. We also talked about performance contracting. We talked about the fiscal budget request for maintenance and as President Peters said we have not had any funding for four or five years for any kind of major capital improvements. We talked some about the Spelling Commission and how that might impact resources, space, and budgets and an empty building that some of the faculty were noticing and wondering about, the Carroll Cinema, a theatre space and what was sort of the future for that and Dr. Williams said there’s so many other priorities over that that it’s not on a high priority list right now. We also talked about in October some other possible people on campus we might be able to talk to get a better feel for what’s happening with NIU’s resources, space and budgets.

President Peters: Good report. Some questions?

H. Rules and Governance Committee – William Tolhurst, Chair – report – walk-in

President Peters: Rules and Governance. Bill?

W. Tolhurst: This time around we responding to a request by the Provost’s Office that the Multicultural Curricular Transformation Task Force be renamed and established as a permanent Category III committee of the university. The committee has been in business for a number of years and it seems appropriate that it be a permanent committee rather than an ad hoc committee and since implementing this recommendation will require a change in the By-laws, what you have before you is the change or amendment to the By-laws that will be necessary in order to rename the committee and give it a permanent Category III status. All we’re doing
today is presenting you with the change so that you can read it at your leisure and be informed about it when it comes time to vote on it.

President Peters: All right.

W. Tolhurst: The amendment language goes over on to the second side of the page so you need to turn it over.

President Peters: So this comes as a recommendation from your committee. Does that require a motion or just a second or is this a first reading?

W. Tolhurst: I don’t think it requires anything. It’s just the first reading.

President Peters: That’s right, but it is open for discussion?

W. Tolhurst: Yes it is. I will explain anything I can.

President Peters: Yes, Brian?

B. Hemphill: Just one quick question. Is there a reason why the Asian-American Resource Center was not included or was that ---

W. Tolhurst: My understanding is that, I’m just giving you what I got from the Provost’s Office and so I’m not the person to ask, but I assume that the people listed on this are the people who were listed for the Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Task Force and so this is just transferring over, right, so it doesn’t represent a change in the entity, merely a different name and status and so if you wanted to make a change, you know who to talk to.

President Peters: Okay, ???. That’s a good question, I mean, if we’re going to be acting formally maybe we ought to fix some things if they need fixing. Lynne first. She had her hand up.

L. Kamenitsa: Just briefly. I’m not any part of this, but looking at these three, these three are academic units whereas the resource centers are not academic units? Like the Women’s Resource Center is not an academic unit but Women’s Studies is?

P. Peters: ????

W. Tolhurst: The whole point of this committee is to work for curricular change. However, this committee does not itself have any authority over the curriculum; that is left to the UCC and appropriate committees like that. So this is focused on promoting curricular change and those who participate in the activities are not necessarily listed on this committee list.

President Peters: I have a question? What is a curricular dean versus a non-curricular dean or one who has no curriculum? What is that? Is that an academic dean?
W. Tolhurst: Is the Dean of the Library a curricular dean?

President Peters: It depends on what university you’re at.

W. Tolhurst: Well if it’s not here, then we know whatever the difference is between the Dean of the Library and the other deans is the difference between the curricular dean and non-curricular dean.

President Peters: If you all understand it then I’m okay but I don’t understand it.

G. Seaver: We know.

President Peters: Jeff?

J. Meyer: Is it usual for an academic transformational committee or development committee to be devoid of student representation?

W. Tolhurst: The participants in the annual workshops that are put on every year are all and only faculty because the idea is to get faculty to work to further diversify and multiculturalize their work with students, you know, so as far as I know the committee itself, its main task is to set up the next institute for those who will participate in it.

J. Meyer: My only concern was that if we’re going to transform it from something that’s an ad hoc entity or from something that’s a task force or something of that nature to a permanent standing committee, most university standing committees have student representation on them and I would think that’s something that would be appropriate for the body to consider, understanding that its purpose is limited in its scope.

President Peters: Okay, William?

W. Tolhurst: I just want to point out that the committee is rather like the presidential commissions. Its sole function is to provide advice to the Provost, okay, so the committee does not itself make any decisions at all really; they provide input to the Provost as the Provost sees the need for it.

President Peters: Let me ask a question. What’s the compelling rationale to change what seems to be functioning quite nicely into a more permanent bureaucratic thing? What is that rationale?

W. Tolhurst: To the extent that we got one, it seems to me that the rationale is that this committee has been in existence for over ten years and its not going away and it does represent a serious commitment to diversity and to multiculturalism and that that permanent commitment seems to be better recognized by making it a permanent committee doing what it already does. It’s not going to change the bureaucracy at all. It’s just changing the status of the committee. If you want to change what the committee is doing, you can do that, right, but the idea was that this
is a committee that’s going to be needed for the foreseeable future and that being so, we ought to recognize it with giving it this status. So that’s the best I can do about the rationale.

**President Peters:** So this came from the Provost’s Office?

**W. Tolhurst:** Yes. Provost Legg. It came from Provost Legg via Virginia Cassidy who’s been very helpful.

**President Peters:** Well, okay. This was first reading so it will come back next month for second reading. All right and if you have questions meanwhile, we’ll take the questions. Okay, thank you. Any other things that you have William? You’re done?

**W. Tolhurst:** I’m done

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

**President Peters:** University Affairs, Jody?

**J. Newman-Ryan:** Not at this time.

**President Peters:** Not at this time, all right.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Brigid Lusk, Chair – no report

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** So we’re done to unfinished business.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Receipt of Annual Reports

**President Peters:** I see we have receipt, under new business, any number of annual reports that are all electronic and on websites. Should we entertain questions of those reports? We have a bunch of them. Anybody have any burning questions there?

**P. Stoddard:** I would just encourage anybody to take a look at them. This is – you know, a lot of what goes on at the university is in these annual reports and as the overseeing body at the university, it probably is in our interest to know what’s in these.

1. Academic Planning Council
2. Athletic Board
3. Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
4. Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
5. Faculty Personnel Advisor
6. Graduate Council
7. Undergraduate Coordinating Council
8. University Assessment Panel
9. University Council Personnel Committee
10. University Ombudsman

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Anything for the good of the order? Comments and questions from the floor? You all want to get out and play golf or something this afternoon. All right, you see information items.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Motion to adjourn?

The meeting adjourned at 3:48 P.M.