I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: I’ll call the University Council, March 19, 2008 meeting to order.

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

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Our first item is to adopt the agenda but there are some walk-ins. So if you take your agenda, VI, C - there will be a walk-in report under BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee. VI, D - BOT Legislation, Audit and External Affairs Committee, there’ll be a walk-in report. VI, F - Paul Stoddard will report and that will be a walk-in. Moving down to New Business, VIII A - the Ad Hoc group, there’s a walk-in and B, the Academic Calendar, there’s a new version that’s a walk-in and all those are contained in the stapled handout. Okay, with those changes is there a motion to adopt the agenda? All right, is there a second? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

Morris made the motion; Kowalski seconded. The agenda was approved as amended.

III. APROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 30, 2008 MEETING

(Pages 2-5)

President Peters: The minutes of our last official meeting, January 30 meeting, are on pages 2 through 5. I’ll call for additions or corrections. Hearing none, is there a motion to adopt the minutes? Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, we have minutes.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Well welcome everyone. This is the last day of winter. Do you believe that? Tomorrow the sun will shine. Well, you know, so much has happened since we have met and we’re here and we’re moving on and we’re healing but it has been a very turbulent time for all of us but we’re doing all right. I want to talk a little bit about that but, you know, we are moving on so we do have the business of the university to attend to.

There are so many people who have to be thanked and I can’t tell you the thousands of e-mails I’ve received that I’m writing notes to people that I’ve never heard of. I know you probably have received contact from friends that you hadn’t heard from in years. It’s really quite amazing isn’t it? We got calls from the principal of Columbine and from the president of Virginia Tech, the Amish community. We will be receiving and be the depositors of the 911 flag or a – it’s a
quilt. Virginia Tech will be transferring that to us and we will be holding that. I hope we hold it forever if you know what I mean. So, we have a lot of people to thank. Of course you, the faculty and students, the community have been tremendous in the aftermath of that tragedy and so a lot of other people. It’s hard to single people out. You have to say that right from the start, and I’ve said this before, the Virginia Tech people have been outstanding and they reached out this way – where Virginia Tech, you know the Vice President for Student Affairs called our Vice President for Student Affairs. I’m sure of you got calls from faculty from Virginia Tech. Student leaders, offering support and wise council and it puts us in a mode that we have to prepare ourselves if we’re called upon if someone has a situation like this, to share our expertise – our support – it’s hard to call it expertise. We have to thank those Virginia Tech people, I don’t know, the 300, 400, 500 counselors that we had on campus who – and many are still helping us – really was very important for everyone. The comfort dogs – I suppose we should send tons of Alpo to Oregon to the comfort dogs although one of those comfort dogs took a little nip at me at the basketball game. It probably had too much comfort that day. It’s hard to laugh but we need to get back – our community and I know our Board of Trustees will be adopting a formal resolution thanking our DeKalb community and our Sycamore community and all the first responders - Kishwaukee Hospital. You know, you’ve read about; you know what I’m talking about. It was overwhelming and then I personally sampled some of the 50,000 cookies that were baked and I think I got the best ones but a small act like that that isn’t small at all, it’s really important and, you know, I don’t know how you feel about it but I know how I feel and that is we’re going to repay that. You know, our community, when they have issues we’re going to be there. I would hope that this good feeling extends beyond just a crisis period into the future and I think it will. I know that on April 19 Student Affairs does their NIU Cares Day and, you know, that’s when students go out and they help in the community. You know, they fix things up. I hope we have a great outpouring. I’m going to look down in the basement and find my hammer and hammer some nails. I mean, I really think we need to say thank you and not just one time. We have to continue that.

There are other things that are happening as we move forward for us to remember. With the publication of the latest issue of Northern Now that will go out, a special commemorative issue or supplement has also been produced that basically is a photo montage of the memorial that we held at the Convocation Center and other places and it’s – I’ve seen it and it’s really quite moving when you look at that so we’re going to print extra copies of that so that everyone could get a copy who wants one. I’m not particularly a White Sox fan but the White Sox have been great. Their opening day is going to be NIU day and they’re inviting the families of those who were impacted by this tragedy – it will be a nice thing and it goes on and on and on. There’s also been a lot of silliness and people saying gee, we’re so sorry – would you like to buy our security alert system, you know. It’s un --- the weight of that is hard to believe. Also, if you go on E-Bay, people taking photographs and marketing commemoratives in our name and we tried our best to protect our trademarks and actually we more than tried our best; we’re just downright tough about it, you know, that’s our trademark. So anyway, we’ve got a lot of those things going.

There is a delegation; we’re planning to send a small delegation to the Virginia Tech memorial which I believe is April 15 or 16, that period of time – a small delegation and I would hope that our various shared governance groups could prepare resolutions of support and we’ll take them
to Virginia Tech on that day. So, you know, we’re getting back to our routines but we’re not going to forget and we’re going to remember in a proper way.

Now, there’s real – as I said in one of my many e-mails – there’s real work/business that needs to be attended to and family business and people have been doing – actually it’s like people have been doing two jobs. I mean we’re doing our normal thing plus we’re also taking care of the issues that have resulted from this tragedy and they’re deep. Some are long-term and they’ll be with us and there are costs associated with them in terms of time and resources and we have to work our way through that and we are doing that. I’ve kind of laid those out in some of my memos. One immediate need that is being attended to by the Provost and his group is the short-term which means, you know, next year. The problem that we’re going to have in the fall when the fall semester starts and there are more students enrolled than spring semester and trying to find classes for everyone assuming that Cole Hall will still be out of commission and I think that under any scenario that’s probably true. That’s about 12,000 students, 150 to 175 ---

**R. Alden:** 12,000 in total in terms of the ones that were scheduled in Cole Hall and then the domino effect.

**President Peters:** Then the domino effect. Yeah. You know, some of you are probably teaching or taking classes in some of some of those new venues and you know they’re not optimal and so they’re working on that. That’s the short-term thing we’re working on. So that’s one thing. Then I want to separate two things because in the minds of a lot of people, they’re not separating. I’ve named a Memorial Committee and that is a committee that is going to vet ideas to develop a fitting memorial to the students and that’s not a building; that’s not Cole Hall, that’s not that issue. This is a memorial. Let me tell you what Virginia Tech did and you may know this but it happened immediately and the students almost organically designed it. What they did was they put 31 – I think it’s 31 killed at Virginia Tech – Hookie stones. Now a Hookie stone I guess is a limestone and 40% of all of Virginia Tech buildings have to be made with Hookie stone and the closest thing I could – Altgeld Hall, all right, and they put 31 Hookie stones in a semicircle facing the Administration Building. They had a committee and that, dressed up a little bit, became their memorial. It was a physical space where people could, you know – poignant and simple. So we’ve got a committee that’s being formed that’s very broad-based and it’s being co-chaired by Mike Malone, our Vice President for Development and by our former provost, Lynne Walderland who’s retired. Many of you know her. She knows probably more about this campus than anybody I can think of and it’s going to be a broad-based committed that is going to vet all the ideas and they’re going to have a survey and then those ideas will be presented and that’s kind of short-term. We’d like that sort of wrap that up as we move toward commencement and then get that done and we want to hear every idea and I’ve already received a lot. And sending me an e-mail is almost a futile thing because it gets lost in all these filters that I have because I get so many. So don’t assume that if you send me an e-mail that I get it and there have been a lot of very interesting suggestions; some sublime, some not so sublime. Anyway, we’re going to come up with something very fitting and we’ve had a lot of good ideas but it’s not some big edifice or – this is the memorial. Then what we’re working on very, very hard is the long-term solution to the Cole Hall issue. You’ve probably read more about that than you care to read but we’re in a process now and I laid it out I think in an e-mail Monday to our shared governance groups. We want to collect ideas and then we’re going to – I’m appointing
and you’ll be getting an e-mail on this – an ad hoc advisory committee to me and the trustees on this issue that basically is composed of our shared governance people – operating staff, students, Faculty Senate and then all these ideas we want to get and see if we can’t categorize them and then have Dr. Williams and his group cost out these various alternatives. Then take them back to the various constituents for one more look-see then bring them back so that we have time, if funding is involved, for me to mount an attempt to get some state funding or not, depending on what we come up with. So it’s time sensitive. So by around – right around April 10 through the 15th we would like to hold a meeting of this ad hoc long-term group to talk about the suggestions that they’ve received so then we can put them in some kind of option form then get them back and then by May 1 have some decisions because then I miss my window in the legislature. I don’t think we need to belabor it too much. We’re categorizing now while maintaining confidentiality all of the stuff we’ve received in the Cole Hall confidential – strip the names out and kind of categorize but I think I kind of detailed what it was and, you know, what the frequencies were in my e-mail. There are some that say, you know, get rid of Cole Hall; there are some that say keep Cole Hall but reposition it or change it. There are some that say throw paint on it but you know 90% of them are thoughtful, really thoughtful. The reason I wanted to go back for more process is there wasn’t enough there for me to have a real good feel. I wanted to make sure everybody could have their say if they wanted to in their own way where they’re comfortable. It’s a true shared governance thing – probably rushed that thing a little too much but, you know, I think the people in the state have to cut us a little slack based on what we were dealing with in a moment of crisis and trauma. Anyway, we got a real issue and that real issue has a space issue. This has cost us. There are real costs involved in what happened to us and those costs will continue for several years. You know, we’re going to be accounting for that but we need to get to it; we need to do some planning.

So that’s where we are on that. Now, getting back to business a little bit – and so what I’m saying is this is your chance. Encourage the people you represent, if they have something to say, say it, but also take a broad view. I’ve read some things that are a little parochial; should that surprise us? No, but we’ve got to take the broader view and what’s best for NIU. That’s what’s going to drive me. The other thing is, I want something that I know I have consensus. I want something that I can stand up in front of people and say “NIU stands behind this set of recommendations”. That’s what I really need because then, we’re going to have to in good fashion – NIU fashion – we’re going to have to make the case. We’ll have to fight for this and I know we’ll win if we’re together.

Okay, the budget goes on. Our budget hearings are around April 2 or 3rd. We’re trying to get them together both in the House and the Senate. The Governor’s budget message or budget bill for higher education called for basically a flat budget for 2009 but it really wasn’t a flat budget because there are certain things that have been passed through. IBHE formulated its budget in steps, you know, 0%, 2%, 3%, 5% and we intend to argue before the House Higher Ed Appropriation Committee and the Senate Appropriation Committee – I intend to argue for what we need and wherever that takes us. You know, I’d like to be optimistic but last night after I read Senator Obama’s speech, I read the latest economic forecast for the state and one of those documents was very uplifting and historic. I’ll let you vote in shared governance fashion – but, you know, the revenue estimates are a little soft in almost every category so we’ll just have to wait and see. We’re going to make the case for that.
In addition to that, this year we have to cover our own share of workmen’s composition. So that’s like a rescission. It’s not a rescission but the state has asked us this year to pay for that and that number is, at a minimum, one million. Could be double that. Whether this is a feature for the future, luckily – you know how prudent we are – but that million dollars – that’s money for roofs being fixed, for the roads being patched. You know, one time things. I had some student recently write me about the state of one of his lecture halls and things like that we would use that one time money that we had collected from various auxiliary operations to take care of that – our little reserve. Well, we’re going to have to pass that through so – but we’re going to be all right because, quite frankly, facing those problems is a lot easier than facing what we faced. We can deal with those issues; we’ll be all right. We’ll come out all right.

All right so that’s the budget. Capital bill, you know, Stevens and so forth. This is my eighth year, ninth year without a capital bill in the state. I have committed, made a commitment, to a group, a task force, that is chaired by former Speaker of the House, Denny Hastert, our representative and Glenn Poshard President of Southern Illinois University who was a member of Congress and was a public official in his previous life and they put together a bipartisan ad hoc group to try to build support for a capital bill, not limited to higher education, but a broad capital bill because of the need in the state for a capital bill and I don’t need to go into that. So on behalf of NIU, I’m committed to help them in anyway I can; we need a capital bill. Matter of fact, that’s the key to some of our issues that we’re facing; we need a capital bill. So we may be calling upon you in your own way to help; write letters and so forth. We’ll have to wait and see how that unfolds but we’re going to need everybody. As we move toward the end of this session, we’re going to need people to have parents call and students write letters.

I’m going to turn the program over to our Provost who’s going to give us an update on Strategic Planning. Remember Strategic Planning? I haven’t forgotten about it and some personnel issues.

**R. Alden:** Thank you. I sent an e-mail last week that hopefully most of you have gotten – have received that sometime in the last week about extending the deadline for Strategic Planning proposals. There are actually two deadlines, one for the research cluster (RFP) which Vice President Boles is running and that has a deadline of mid-April; I believe it’s April 14. That’s in order to give the review committee, which will be largely faculty members, time to review all those proposals and come up with recommendations. The second deadline is April 25. This is for the proposals coming from the colleges as well as from the task forces and hopefully that will the Deans Council a little time to go through those and help prioritize them before summer gets started after commencement. So we’re looking to having a retreat with the Deans Council to go through all of those proposals that come in. As I said in my e-mail, I see Strategic Planning as a living process; a process that evolves over time so those groups that felt like they could not continue on with their planning after the February 14 event, we will have opportunities in the future to refine those plans and evolve them into new areas. So hopefully we’ll get some good solid initiatives to get started with and then we’ll work from there.

In terms of personnel, we have two dean searches under way. The one has been completed and I’m happy to say that the Dean of Libraries – the candidate of choice – has signed as of yesterday
morning and it’s Patrick Dawson who is the equivalent of an associate dean, the Associate University Librarian for University of California, Santa Barbra. He’s had about twenty years of experience in the libraries in the UC and other systems and so he knows how research libraries work and he was by far the candidate of choice I think for almost every constituency group so I’m happy to say that that search worked out quite well. The second search is the Dean of Law search and the second candidate left yesterday. I believe the faculty is going to get together in the next day or two to kind of get their heads together on the degree of acceptability of the two candidates. We had a third one who had to drop out because of a death in the family and other obligations and so we hope that the faculty and the various other groups that are sending in evaluation surveys will be able to determine whether one or both of these individuals are acceptable for that position and we’d be able to start negotiating in the near future. So I’m looking forward to that.

One final note – I’d like to give my gratitude and thanks to Anne Kaplan who helped with the Dean of Library search and made it really possible to have a search that, without a search firm, was much like the searches provided by search firms. She did a lot of the leg work and organized the whole recruitment campaign and I think that that’s why this year we had a far larger group of candidates available to us who were potentially acceptable. I’d also like to extend my congratulations and thanks to Vice President and Dean Rathindra Bose who will be moving on in July and we appreciate his five years of commitment to the university and we wish him the best in the future.

President Peters: Very good. Ray you know that Vice President Kaplan runs an auxiliary operation. Didn’t you hear about the bill you’re get for services rendered? Also, in the midst of our last month or so, our Athletic Director, Jim Phillips, accepted a position at some little school in the northwest of Chicago – I can’t think of the name of it right now and what a great job he’s done for us and we have a national search that’s commenced with no time frame. Gip Seaver is chairing that and I think we’re getting an announcement out about the committee and so forth in the next day or two. So virtually all of these searches, by the way, and decisions really kind of happened before our tragedy so – at any rate, Rathindra we wish you well and of course Jim Phillips.

All right. Do you want me to stop here for questions if they have any before we launch? Don’t want to cut off questions; we can come back to them at the end if you have questions. All right, very good, let’s launch then.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: There is no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

President Peters: Let’s hear reports. Academic Affairs, VI. B? There is a report on page 5 and 6?

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report
F. Bryan: Thank you. The report is before you and I would like to highlight a few items from the March 6 meeting of the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee meeting. This is – it was a solemn and elegant opening that Vice Chair Bob Boey gave the meeting and the Chair was participating via speaker phone but they all gave us great support under the circumstances. This was a special meeting to hear two sabbatical leave reports that several years ago the chair of this committee requested so we heard two sabbatical reports from Laurel Jeris and the other from Donald Richgels, both from the College of Education. The Board of Trustees Committee was fascinated and asked many good questions and it was a well-received opportunity. In fact, Trustee Boey always has been very supportive of sabbaticals and we should be very thankful for that.

The University Action Items first dealt with the approval of the fifty Faculty and SPS sabbatical leaves. There was a request for a new minor in Mechanical Engineering approved. A new emphasis in Mechatronics which, of course, I have no idea what that is and a new specialization in Nanoscience (within the Ph.D. in Chemistry) and they received the official Oral English Proficiency Annual Report.

Under Information Items there was one item that, because of a lack of Academic Planning Council approval, will be received at the Board of Trustees’ meeting on March 27. There will be a request for a new Master of Arts in Teaching and a Master of Science in Teaching both on and off campus locations. So we’ll look for that on the 27th.

New fees for the program in the Master of Accounting Science and Accounting and we heard reports on the 2009 Programmatic Budget Requests and Increment Summary Report and the annual on Underrepresented Groups for the previous year.

That concludes my report but I would be happy to answer any questions if you have them.

President Peters: Okay, that was the Academic Affairs Committee. You know, the interesting thing in my eight years, I’ve never heard one trustee ever criticize the sabbatical program and that has not been my experience at other universities and we extend that to SPS staff. That’s really quite amazing and I’m always impressed that the trustees want to hear about these activities and the outcomes of them and I think that’s very good because it gives them confidence in that program. You know, they’re kind of disappearing on American college campuses. Anyway, I’m glad that you made that report.

P. Stoddard: Dr. Castle is not here so – she’s actually the one who filled out the report here. Finance and Facilities met right after Academic Affairs. The first thing they did was to swear in
our newest Board of Trustee member, John Butler. I think we all know his bio by now. I would just add to what’s been published about him that after February 14, he was on campus quite a bit and was really one of the more engaged people in terms of helping with our coping with that situation. So I think his commitment to this university is long-standing but also, I think it’s safe to say, runs very deep.

Of the things that the committee voted to recommend, the most significant I think is probably the student fee structure. Again, as in past years, the primary source of increase in student fees is in the health insurance aspect which is something the university has very little control over. This price is fairly well dictated by the insurance companies. Some of the – well, a summary of the increases is in the report and I will point out that the student representation on the various committees that approve all these increases was there and so the students have had an essential voice in the money they will end up paying for fees.

Room and board is also increasing. Those numbers look a bit high. They are a bit high but the main reason for that is that we have to put sprinklers in the buildings to bring them up to code and, more importantly, for the safety of the students in those buildings and that money was not appropriated by Springfield of course so that will come out of room and board.

There are several routine items that are listed and then finally, reconstruction of parking lot #24 (in front of the HR building) is going to start moving forward. The Proton Therapy Treatment Center has been authorized – NIU received Illinois Health Facility Planning Board approval for this which was a key step and so that’s a very good piece of news for the university. Finally, Master of Accounting Science program fees in the College of Business, in order to maintain a competitive program that keeps us among the top programs in the country, an addition per credit hour fee is going to have to be charged to make sure that we can continue to offer a top quality education to those students. My understanding is that those students come out and make very good money and so this actually just a good investment on their part to make sure that they get the best education we can possibly give them.

Very briefly, that was my report on Finance, Facilities and Operations.

President Peters: Okay, questions?

P. Stoddard: Yes?

Student: For the room and board after this year which, as you said, went up quite a bit, do we expect it to go down in the following years.

P. Stoddard: I believe that there’s actually several years that we have to finance the sprinkler system renovations. By that time I’m pretty sure inflation is going to be catching up with us but I’d have to defer that to Dr. Williams.

E. Williams: Yeah, I can comment very quickly. The overall cost of the improvements that have to be made to the residence housing is in the neighborhood of 15 million dollars. For us to build up sufficient funds to cover these expenses will require multi-years look at room and board
rates unfortunately. But as the Secretary has indicated, because the state was willing to mandate without funding, it put us in the position of trying to find a source to make it happen and that’s the reason.

**Student:** Thank you.

**President Peters:** All right. Okay, let’s move on then if there are no other questions, to Legislation, Audit. Jay and Bobbie? Jay’s giving it? Okay.

D. **BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – report** – walk-in

**J. Monteiro:** Okay. We did not have enough have enough people to have an official meeting; there was no quorum but we did discuss the informational items that were on the agenda. I’ll give a brief highlight here. On the 9th General Assembly Report Kathy Buettner discussed some of the bills that affect higher education. House Bill 1434 which is out there to allow community colleges to offer 4 year degrees. It’s passed through the House and now it’s gone to the Senate Rules Committee. The main community college that is bringing this up is Harper College. There’s a couple of different degreeed areas that they want to work with. House Bill 4621 requires universities to admit students from approved high schools if their grade point average is in the top 10% of the student’s high school graduating class. House Bill 4625 is for veterans and it’s going to require reimbursement for 50% of the cost of textbooks that they have to purchase for universities and community colleges.

We moved on to Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Update. The Governor has suggested a 4% across the board reduction in budgets for FY09 but that did not include higher education. As you can see there, it listed a cut for the CHANCE Program but they expect that to be reinstated when the budget is approved. A little note there – K-12 may actually get an increase this year.

Congressional Report – Kathy talked about the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which has passed both Houses and is now in Conference Committee.

Fiscal Year 2009 for the Bush Administration – Kathy mentioned an increase of $69 which will bring the PELL Grants back up to FY07 levels and there was a cut. The LEAP and Perkins Loan programs were cut but those will be expected to be included in the budget later that Congress will approve.

That was it.

**President Peters:** Okay. Any questions about State or Federal policy? All right. I think Paul is giving a report under Academic Policy Committee that’s a walk in. Is that correct Professor Baker?

E. **BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report.**

F. **Academic Policy Committee – William Baker, Chair – no report.**
**P. Stoddard:** Right. Professor Baker is absent due a defense that he had to attend. I was asked to chair that committee so I’m presenting the report.

Basically, we were asked to consider the matter of retaining materials used in grading and how long is an appropriate period. We met; we discussed this and we quickly reached a consensus that materials should be retained for 13 months. This gets us past any possible grade appeal periods and also gets us past any period where a student might end up retaking a course in which case having some of the original grading materials might still prove beneficial. It also gets issues that arise from summer semester ambiguities. So 13 months – we decided that the grading material should include, but not necessarily be limited to, exams and assignments that are not returned to the students. We don’t expect people to go back and harass students to get that material back. The syllabus that explains the grading procedure is an essential part of this. Any grade books, Excel spread sheets or whatever was used in order to derive the grade should also be retained for that 13 month period and that these materials need to be accessible to the department chair or any other appropriate person. There have been instances apparently where a faculty member goes on sabbatical, the material is with them in some remote part of the world and grade appeals become very problematic. So this material needs to be accessible to the department chair and that also holds for people who leave the university on a more permanent basis. Anyway, that is our recommendation. The official language is on page something of the walk-in packet and I think the appropriate place to end up putting this would be in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual so I would move that we suggest or move this policy – approve this policy and move it to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual Advisory Committee to determine the appropriate place in that document for this policy.

**President Peters:** That’s a motion. All right, so second. Now is this a first reading or this is it?

**P. Stoddard:** Going into the APPM it does not need to – this is it.

**President Peters:** All right so everybody understands. Is there any discussion of this or questions?

???: Would that include attendance also?

**P. Stoddard:** If attendance is used in grading, as part of the grade, then yes it would include attendance.

**President Peters:** So any factors involved in the grading decision. Okay. Yeah, William? Professor Tolhurst?

**W. Tolhurst:** Does this mean that the faculty and the department have to retain these and so they cannot give these materials back to the students?

**P. Stoddard:** No, the materials they would normally give back to the students, give them back to the students.
W. Tolhurst: Okay, so anything that goes back to the students you don’t have to worry about?

P. Stoddard: Right. Presumably if the student wants to appeal the grade it is now on them to bring that material to the grade appeal.


The motion passed.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Linda Dersheid, Chair – no report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – William Tolhurst, Chair

President Peters: Rules and Governance next?

W. Tolhurst: No report. We’ll have a motion next meeting.

I. University Affairs Committee – David Wade, Chair – report FIRST READING (Pages 7-9)

President Peters: University Affairs, David Wade.

D. Wade: This is being offered since there are numerous bylaws recommendations for changes. It’s being all offered as a first reading. If you recall at the beginning of the fall semester, you assigned the University Affairs Committee to look at the various funding mechanisms for various offices – Executive Secretary of the University Council Office, the Ombudsman/Faculty Personnel Advisor and Faculty Rep to the IBHE. As we began our efforts, you’ll see our recommendations there, but we were as surprised as anybody to find in the Constitution and Bylaws that apparently the University Council creates and submits a budget for the University Council on an annual basis, certainly by Bylaws and Constitution if not by practice. That then slowly became the mechanism through which we fund most of the other offices here. I can go through it briefly for you.

The first one just simply takes the existing Bylaw language and adds the additional funding of the additional offices. Faculty Representative to the IBHE is currently an unfunded position. After speaking with the current, ???, we tried to estimate approximately what the time commitment was for that member and we basically got information that ranged between two and three days each month for 11 months. Timing that out we sort of rough ??? to be approximately a 1 month salary or a 1 month period of time and the recommendation then is to make this a paid position through the budget of the University Council at the rate of a 1 month salary stipend for whoever faculty member serves that purpose or serves that function. The Ombudsman’s Office – currently the Ombudsman deals with – it’s clear what they do in the university. They assist all members of the university community in their various concerns. It’s hired by, reported by, seems to be directly associated with the University Council and therefore we’re recommending
that that office be funded as a line item in the University Council budget. We are also recommending that the Ombudsman be an active participant in that budgeting process so as to provide them with some sort of proposed budget that can then be discussed and included in some form. Currently, it’s funded through the Office of Administration and University Outreach. While we can find nothing particularly wrong with that function, through talking to people – Tim most notably and Tim can comment on this a little better – felt that it might be better to have a budget for the office rather than be funded on sort of an ad hoc request basis through the Division of Administration and University Outreach. It helps in the planning function for that office. Most notably it allows them to allocate funds internally in a manner that they find to be appropriate and I think it puts upon that office recognition of its importance and central role in grievance processing and resolution at the university.

Last but not least we’ve got the Faculty Personnel Advisor. Currently the way this has been compensated in the bylaws is by a one half time reduction in academic assignments. Talking to current, Alan Rosenbaum, past, Malcom Morris and Kurt Baren – the last ten years basically the Faculty Personnel Advisors, we discovered that that half time reduction has resulted in inconsistent treatment ranging from, and I list it here, some get no release from their class time, some get some release, some get total release. The one consistent item seems to be that the Provost Office has supported this position with a one month stipend in the summertime even thought that’s paid over a two month period. But that seems to be consistent across Faculty Personnel Advisors. Faculty Personnel Advisors are not distributed equally over all colleges and departments. Over the last four Faculty Personnel Advisors, two have been from the College of Law to give you an example. Therefore, since this cost is absorbed to a greater or lesser extent during the current view, by the college or department from which the Faculty Personnel Advisor is drawn, those demands fall unequally on certain colleges and departments. Third, and what we consider to be the most important concern about this, is that there has been a practice in some colleges or departments that instead of finding an adjunct or instructor or another teacher to teach the class that’s now not being taught by the Faculty Personnel Advisor, they simply cancel the section, thereby offering less sections to the students and I think negatively – and the committee believes – negatively impacting the provision of student services. Toward that end, and at the suggestion of the current Faculty Personnel Advisor I must say, we considered whether that reduction is an unworkable problem, determined it was and opted instead to recommend that we – instead of reducing their assignment let the Faculty Personnel Advisor, and realize that personnel matters tend to be feast or famine – they don’t evenly distribute themselves across a calendar year. They tend to gravitate around promotion and tenure periods of time when a lot of controversy arises which is usually in the fall. Therefore, the faculty personnel we felt would be in a better position to take on the regular academic responsibilities with no change and if they seek to take on the additional responsibilities of the FPA should be compensated for that additional time and effort. The recommendation therefore since there’s a one month stipend in the summer for the summer session, we simply took that principle and applied it to the fall and spring semesters and said there should be a one month stipend for the fall semester, one month stipend for the spring semester and one month stipend for the summer semester. If the person offered the position or recruited for the position does not feel that that person will be able to handle their ordinary academic responsibilities and the additional duties of FPA, they should decline the position. If they do feel that they’ll be able to work the extra time when those times arise, they’ll be compensated accordingly. All the various bylaw changes and the language
changes have been contained within the document before you. Again, this is a first reading. We’re open to any form of discussion or questions you may have. Thank you.

**President Peters:** All right. That’s a lot. Are we voting on these when we get to or *en masse*? Are we going to divide the house? That’s a parliamentary question.

**F. Bryan:** I think I’m hearing they’re recommending it as a whole.

**President Peters:** Oh, all right.

**F. Bryan:** They could divide it though.

**President Peters:** We don’t have a preference.

**D. Wade:** It really is completely up to this body how they want to chose to deal with it.

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

**D. Wade:** Professor Sons?

**L. Sons:** In looking at the Office of the Executive Secretary, the statement that’s being added or changed, whatever you want to say, put in “the budget shall provide salaries for” – blah, blah, blah, the editor of the Faculty Bulletin, to my knowledge, the Faculty Bulletin is defunct. Is there a reason to put this in to the bylaws?

**D. Wade:** It’s only there because the original bylaw contained it. I simply carried forward the language that existed. We can certainly delete it.

**President Peters:** That’s a bylaw cleanup.

**L. Sons:** As long as we’re doing what we’re doing, let’s get it out of there now.

**President Peters:** That may change the voting. Does that change the voting? We’ll take that under advisement but clean that up is what you’re saying.

**L. Sons:** Yes.

**D. Wade:** We do not vote today. This is a first reading. Again, it will have to be at the next meeting at the earliest.

**L. Sons:** This is a time that one can offer potential changes and this still viewed as part of the first reading since everyone is here to see the first reading as I understand the first readings from past history. I have some question about this thing about the Faculty Personnel Advisor. I am not sure that I think it’s bad or good quite frankly when I say it. I just have some doubt as to how it’s put in here in terms of the reading of things. The advisor shall receive a half time reduction on the other hand we’re compensating him a certain amount each semester. I’m
wondering if it isn’t cleaner to think in terms of there just actually being “buy out” a course or whatever you want to call it because that’s what we often do with other faculty who have certain heavy obligations which are likely to take a certain amount of time so rather than laying it as a reduction in course plus some kind of a salary there would it not be cleaner to simply talk in terms of it as a buy out of a course?

D. Wade: The recommendation is that we delete the one half reduction in academic assignments and replace it with the stipend.

L. Sons: That’s not how it’s reading.

D. Wade: I believe it is but we have to agree to disagree on that.

L. Sons: It’s still up here though – the – oh, I’m sorry. I’m misreading it. Thank you.

President Peters: All right. Are we clear on that?

L. Sons: Yeah, that’s fine. I misread it.

F. Bryan: I think it would be best to vote on each section of the bylaws that we change since each heading or subheading seems to deal with a particular office.

D. Wade: I think you’re probably right. It would be appropriate to vote on that for next time. So that’s another heads up for those next time that we’ll vote on each section separately.

President Peters: I think one thing we want to do administratively is we want to – we need to do a fiscal impact on this and find out exactly where the funds are coming from and whether there is a budget. I think there are some assumptions here that may not be true.

D. Wade: We didn’t look at ????. We looked at the mechanism.

President Peters: Yeah, right. We’re going to have to look at that and then we’ll get ---

R. Alden: One other thing that we discussed when we met with Paul was since this kind of service, particularly with the Faculty Advisor, is not dependent on someone’s discipline, that it may be more of a level playing field. Offer a set stipend rather than make it based on salary because then people in higher paid disciplines are getting paid for their discipline but they’re not using their discipline; they’re using their knowledge of the university which should be the same regardless of the discipline so perhaps leveling of the playing field by making it a set dollar stipend would be more equitable across the board.

President Peters: For what it’s worth in my experience dealing with these in other universities and having to develop these, there’s always two rules about these kinds of things whether they were administrative or academic. First up is that a job that required or called for an appropriate reduction in instructional load, had to calibrated in terms of teaching an undergraduate course and lecture discussion format of size 30. That would be, you know, whatever you were doing,
that was the equivalent and so if you had a half time reduction for Faculty Advisor that related to – well, I don’t know what half time would mean – but so many undergrads. The other thing is that the stipend is geared toward the actual work and probably would best be, if we went this way, an administrative overload stipend that was paid on a monthly basis that was equal to the task. Something like that. That’s the way we usually do that kind of stuff administratively.

D. Wade: The only concern I would have about setting a fixed sum stipend rather than having it shipped with monthly salary is that we would need language in the bylaws that would be generic enough that every time you changed that stipend as inflation or time passes, we would have to go back and amend the bylaws which again would require first reading and second reading. I’m not offering that as something that kills this but it is a logistical concern when we’re going through this.

President Peters: Maybe someone can figure some language that would be generic enough.

D. Wade: Right. The reason we picked one month is because currently the Provost offers that stipend as the summer stipend so we just borrowed that notion from that.

President Peters: Okay. A lot to consider. All right. Any other questions? First reading. Jeff?

J. Kowalski: My comment was basically going to be comparable to Provost Alden’s and that is since different departments and different colleges have different salary levels that we could consider a stipend as an alternative to a month’s salary to keep things more equal for what might be equal work.

D. Wade: And the same might be true of the Faculty Rep for the IBHE. I mean the same argument would probably hold for both positions.

President Peters: The other thing to please pay attention to and we’re going to – needs to be clarified – and I’m not taking a position in any of this – for instance, in the Ombudsman person, who does the routine annual evaluation, salary setting and so forth – that’s a regular position and I think I do that right now don’t I? Yes, that’s a good salary. So somebody has to be administratively responsible for the evaluation. It’s not like, you know, let’s say the Faculty Advisor where that’s kind of a function and it rotates but here we have an employee that has a contract that we have to subscribe to all the human resource rules and they have to be evaluated on an annual basis according to, you know – and then salary set within a pool so just – those are things that we should consider. I’m not saying we shouldn’t do this but ---

D. Wade: My understanding is that the University Council reviews the performance of the Ombudsman. I may be wrong about that.

President Peters: They review on that --- not for the routine annual basis. William? Professor Tolhurst?
**W. Tolhurst:** As far as writing this in the way that doesn’t require a change in bylaws every time we change the stipend, I would suggest that we change the language to require that the Faculty Personnel Advisor gets three equal stipends whose amount is to be determined depending on the money available.

**President Peters:** Okay, got that. All right, any other comments? This is – we don’t really need to vote on first reading. This is the time when you have any ideas. Who should we get these ideas to?

**P. Stoddard:** Professor Wade I think. He’s chair of the committee.

**President Peters:** Thank you and we’ll try to do a fiscal note on these things so everyone knows what we’re not dealing with.

**D. Wade:** Please.

**President Peters:** All right? Okay. Where are we?

**J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Toni Tollerud, Chair**

**President Peters:** Elections?

**???:** No report.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**President Peters:** Unfinished Business? We have a lot of that.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Form an Ad Hoc group to set policy for finals week disruption.**

**President Peters:** New Business? We have a walk-in. The ad hoc group for finals week disruption.

**P. Stoddard:** This seems like ancient news and relatively minor but nevertheless it is still important. You may recall that last semester’s finals week was disrupted and that required some scrambling as to how to best address the loss of a day during finals week. We hope that that particular event is not repeated. Certainly weather days, especially during winter’s semester, are quite possible and have occurred from time to time. So we thought it would be a good idea to put together an ad hoc committee to set the policy for what happens during a finals week disruption. Obviously, whether the day lost is at the beginning, the end of the week so forth could make a big difference. Is it two or three days that are lost? So the Steering Committee came up with a suggested set of representatives. An advising dean, I’ve already spoken to Dean Doederline about this who is has expressed willingness to serve in this capacity. Somebody from Student Affairs. A student. A faculty representing each college since colleges might have
different ways of dealing with exams or different things they deal with in exams. At least one representative from a course with mass exams, such as Accountancy 207 or Math 101. Those people could in fact be – we could double dip so that the business representative could be someone who teaches Accountancy 207. A LA&S representative could be somebody who teaches Math 101. We are trying to keep this group as small as possible but still maintain adequate representation. So I guess what we’re asking for here is sort of nod of approval on the representation of this and then a call to the deans of the colleges, college councils, the SA, to name some people so we can actually get this policy in place. I imagine it probably won’t take too terribly long. I am told that we actually do have some form of policy way back when ---

**A. Kaplan:** ---with additional representatives but it would be helpful if one of the college representatives, probably Education, could be somebody with some experience in off-campus environments because it is not a simple matter to rearrange exams in space that isn’t – doesn’t belong to the university. I mean, it’s bad enough from a scheduling perspective on campus but that’s our space. When have rented space off campus and cancel it, there’s no guarantee it’s going to be available when we get around to going back to work.

**President Peters:** All right, we accept that idea.

**G. Seaver:** I certainly am not looking for another meeting but, as you said, we do have some background material that has been developed in response to – we have been asked in the past to do different scenarios and we also have been doing some analysis based on what happened in December. So certainly if you would consider having somebody either as a resource, ex officio, whatever it might be from the Provost’s Office, we could certainly some of the work that’s already been done but also would have some others that were there to talk about what some of the ramifications are about – it may not be just closing for a day; it may be losing a building as compared to losing a whole day – so some of that thinking we’d be happy to share with the group as we come up with a policy.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, very good.

**President Peters:** Well I think this is really the right thing to do because we’ve learned about weather in December but then disruptions that if shared governance is going to mean anything, you need to be ready to act quickly and make some decisions because you don’t have any time. So I think this is a good step forward and we do have a body of knowledge and people who understand these things. You have to make sure you get all the right – you know, Outreach – that’s always – oh yeah, we forgot about Naperville. We don’t want to forget about Naperville. Rockford? Who said that? All right.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, so if the appropriate people could forward names I guess I’ll collect them and take charge of --- okay – I’ll submit this as a motion for the committee structure. I’ll just – Advising Dean, Student Affairs Representative, student representative, faculty member from each college, at least one representative form a course with mass exams, at least one representative familiar with off campus teaching, and somebody from the Provost Office.
President Peters: All right, that’s the motion. Is there a second? Any more discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstain? All right.

P. Stoddard: Just forward me the names and I’ll put together the committee and call the first meeting.

The motion passed.

B. 2007 – 2008 Academic Calendar (Page 10) updated version – walk-in

President Peters: VIII, B – We have a new version walk-in of the Academic Calendar.

P. Stoddard: Usually we would give this to University Affairs but since we’d like to get this done as quickly as possible and I hope we can do this today. As we all know, the Academic Calendar had to be modified due to the events of February 14. The net effect was to push the remainder of the semester back a week, including final exams and commencement. That officially has to be approved by this body. The only wrinkle to this is the issue of reading day and the suggestion has been made not to have reading day this semester. The rational is that due to Martin Luther King Day, due to a snow day, due to an extra Friday lost during the February 14 aftermath, Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes are down a full week. To loss that reading day really will make it difficult in many classes for content, the necessary content, to be taught. We know that this creates an imposition on students as they will have classes right up until the time of final exams. We have talked – the Faculty Senate talked about this. One of the issues that came up during that discussion was academic integrity. I personally feel that content is an essential part of the academic integrity of these courses; that we need to teach a certain amount in order for these courses to be meaningful. But that’s my opinion. Just by way of help I guess, the Senate was kind of equally divided as to whether or not to have reading day. I would say that under this policy, if did not have reading day, a faculty member would be free to not hold class on Friday. If we do have reading day, then theoretically a faculty member is not allowed to have class on Friday. That’s the essential difference. So that’s – I guess I would move the Academic Calendar as included in the walk-in without a reading day.

President Peters: All right. There’s a motion moved and seconded to adopt the new calendar. Brigid?

B. Lusk: I have a concern that certainly in my school we have an annually planned off campus faculty review of our curriculum every reading day and I’ve now managed to get the off campus site to relocate from one week to the next. The agenda’s out. So, is it okay if Nursing and Health Studies faculty do not have classes on that Friday or ---

President Peters: Can you convince all your faculty?

B. Lusk: I might be able to do that yes.

President Peters: Write me an e-mail when you get that done. Jeff?
J. Kowalski: Would it be appropriate simply to put in par emphases after classes end, optional – I don’t know if we want to use the word reading day – but no?

Pl. Stoddard: Let’s hear from the students.

Student: Well, just speaking as one student and working on behalf of all others as I try to, this does cause some concern. Obviously we understand that all classes need to be pushed back for one week. Obviously we lost a week as a result of this tragedy. However, continually changing this does lead some – it’s a little undesirable to us. Another thing – I personally have used the reading day every single year in order to study, in order to take a break from classes and get ready for my upcoming exams. I have an exam every day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week and I know there are others who will as well. Friday has oftentimes been areas where you can study. My language class will be having one during that time instead. I mean, obviously I’m going to assume they will do the same, but I know that won’t be true for others. I don’t know how receptive the students will be and I personally would be opposed to it.

President Peters: Did anybody every do an analysis of just how many classes there are on Friday and, you know, the people who are impacted are the people who have a Friday class because then you’ve got to turn it around and they may have a test on Saturday. How many people who classes scheduled for Friday, on this reading day, would have a final? Maybe we’re not talking about very many; I don’t know.

M. Morris: I would suggest that this student is one of the few who actually uses reading day for studying and I would stand up and say that I think we should include classes on that Friday. I know the revised schedule has already said that that’s going to be reading day but I respectfully submit that there are very few students that actually reading day for reading.

President Peters: Is there an accreditation issue here? Do we have to get an exemption if we have the reading day because we won’t meet the requisite number of class periods?

G. Seavers: That’s a Virginia question. I do believe ---

V. Cassidy: It’s not an accreditation question at all. It has to do with really financial aid and how a semester is defined. Which is an academic year is 30 weeks of instruction.

President Peters: Okay, got you. Professor Tolhurst?

W. Tolhurst: I’m a little concerned about this. For one thing I’m not sure how we would know how many of our students use reading day to study. I certainly don’t track down mine to see what they’re doing on reading day and it seems to me that the schedule has been jerked around a good deal, not only this year but last year and although I agree with Paul that academic integrity is important and this is an important part of it, we are not going to make a significant improvement by eliminating this one day. Suppose we’d had one more snow day. Would we have decided for that reason to skip reading day or would we have just said, well, that’s how it is and this is what we do. But if an additional snow day wouldn’t have justified eliminating reading day, why should this tragedy?
President Peters: Okay.

Student: Well in my case, I have three Friday classes and one of them goes from 10:00 to 4:00 which is a class that would meet Tuesday and Thursdays so as of now we’ve missed two weeks for that class which now we’re trying to make up in every single class which means that we’re working three times as hard to get caught up with the other classes because of this lab. So I guess that not having the reading day would be beneficial for us and considering the fact that I do have two other classes that meet on that Friday. So ---

Student: Well, it’s a tough thing to look at trying to assume that students have similar plans or different plans depending on their academic arrangements. The main concern I have is that a lot of the TAs in courses use that day or use that weekend to help prep some students. I know with the language course I have, the TAs try to make themselves available just prior to the final and that’s probably one of the days that they would’ve used and so I’m not sure exactly what would happen with that type of an arrangement without the reading day. Secondly, I see a scenario where we’re teaching towards assuming that that day is an additional academic day, I would hope that we’re still teaching with material that is being presented with the assumption that you do not have that day because students just might not show up and they might just take a day off even if they have it. That’s one problem I see.

President Peters: Linda?

L. Sons: I’d like to speak to this in two ways. One is it is definitely the case that those of us who have Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes have not only lost the initial Monday that we expected to go with Martin Luther King Day. We’ve lost a Wednesday. We’ve lost a Friday. It makes it that much harder for the students to have the instruction that represents a standard syllabus. Those of us who teach in courses which have a very thick national syllabus are being put in a pressure to have to try to do the kind of thing that this student is talking about which is bunch up, bunch up, bunch up, in order to cover that syllabus which really needs to be covered for the students because they have to have the comparable kinds of courses. If they’re going to finish a certain calculus thing that they’re going to need to have for the next semester to go on and be successful in that semester, they have to finish certain kinds of topics. So everyday becomes crucial as you start looking at the overall syllabus. Now when you start backing off in the sense of oh, okay, let’s not have that extra class in there, what you may do then is put the student in not only a bind relative to what they can possibly get from instruction this semester, but put in a place where they’re not going to be able to know as much when they go on for that next course because there’s that extra pressure in there. Right? Everyday that you have, that’s a good possibility here is going to help you in those kinds of courses. Now we’re talking about the prospect that a faculty member could say, okay, let’s not meet that day if they don’t find it as essential in courses like we’re talking about or they might say, let’s really use that day for a good review day which is often the kind of thing that people want to do at the end of a course. They want to take and give an overview of that course; they want to put it in review. They want to help students direct themselves best toward the final exams, right? Without the extra day, what one does is push that back with the notion that it’s going to be at an earlier time and that means less done again, if you know what I’m saying. So what could happen now is under the idea that
a faculty member could call that day off if they really wanted to. Right? You’ve got the prospect that this day might be just a genuine review day where you’ve got the facility available, you’ve got the staff there and the students know that they’re going to have the time there that’s not locked in by other things.

**President Peters:** Okay, yeah?

**Student:** One last thing to address is the fact that many students don’t use it for study. First of all, I would say that a good portion do but for those who don’t, we do like the time to rest. I think that it’s been easily tracked that finals is probably the most stressful time for students in which we do get overloaded. If we keep pressuring more things into an individual week, then we are putting more strain on students. Giving the students an ability to relax for just one more day can make a difference in final scores. We do have the ability then to go in as refreshed as possible. We’re getting rushed, we’ve had so much happen to use this semester. The idea of giving us like this little bit of a break I think could be very beneficial. Maybe we’ll use it for study; I know I will. Maybe we’ll use it for taking a little time off. Maybe we’ll use it to spend time with friends or family or anything else. I do believe that we do look forward to it and taking it away, I don’t think is the best idea. Thank you.

**Student:** I just want to add that some students will have to, you know, try to cram as much with that extra day would enable students to at least pace themselves. Academically, I think they could probably absorb more material if they had that extra day and try to study everything over maybe three days than if they had two days or one day or maybe the next day.

**President Peters:** Let’s clarify where we are. What is before us now is the proposed 2007-2008 Academic Modifications. Right? The bottom half. Right? If you vote affirmatively on that, what that says is that there is a reading day.

**P. Stoddard:** No, no reading day.

**President Peters:** I’ve got the wrong one. That’s why I was confused see. Now all the arguments make sense. Well, you know, there’s no optimal solution here. If you have a reading day, you take the option away from the professor. Are we ready for the question? Do you know what we’re voting for? Everybody have their say? All right. All those in favor of the motion, you know, you’re voting for classes end May 9 – that’s the no reading day option. That’s what’s before you just so we’re all sure. The President is now sure. All right. All those in favor of that say aye. Opposed? Okay, the ayes have it. You want a show of hands? All right, show of hands. All those in favor say aye. Okay. Now we have to make sure everybody is legitimate. You have a number? All right. Opposed? Raise your hands high. What’s the total? 21 aye; 9 no. Any abstentions? High on the abstentions and hold them. 3 abstentions. All right, the motion passes. Anything else?

The motion passed.

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**
President Peters: Any comments or questions from the floor for the good of the order. It’s been a good long meeting. All right?

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: Move to adjourn? Second?

The meeting adjourned at ???.
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