I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters: Let me call the March 25 meeting of the University Council to order and apologize that we had to move the meeting from last week, and I can’t remember why. I’m going to blame the Provost. Oh yeah, it was the House Appropriations Committee that had canceled on us and then, you know, we didn’t want to say never mind, so that’s the reason why you’re here. And I realize these are – can everybody hear back there? I see the deans are in the back. If the deans are awake, wave your hands. Yes, they are awake; eating my cookies. No, they’re the University Council’s cookies.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

President Peters: Anyway, I’ve got some changes to announce in the agenda to accommodate someone who has to leave to do something important like probably teaching or something like that. So, I want to – first of all indicate there is a walk-in written report of the Legislative, Audit and External Affairs Committee. Slip that under V, D. The back page is a walk-in for I, Rules and Governance. Okay, got that? Then the other thing I want to do is move my remarks to after J, before Unfinished Business so that we can move report V, F, University Affairs. That’s Linda Sons who has a commitment and we will hear her immediately after as we go into reports. So understand those changes? All right. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as amended? We have a motion. Do we have a second? We have a second. All those in favor say aye. Okay, we have an agenda.

Stephen made the motion; Miller was second. The agenda was adopted as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2009 MEETING (will be sent out electronically)
President Peters: All right. There is no consent agenda so Linda? We have to approve the minutes which I know were available electronically. All right, additions or corrections? All right. Call to adopt the minutes motion. Okay. Second? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Okay, we have minutes. There is no consent agenda and now we will entertain Professor Sons.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: Now my comments. I’ll try to be brief. The Governor Quinn introduced his FY2010 budget last week. Many of you probably read about it and as usually the case with these things, almost everyone found something they didn’t like so maybe he’s doing something right. This is a good starting point after not being sure where anyone was on this and there’s a lot of debate. This is the beginning of the process and I’d like to caution everyone that we still don’t know where this is going to end up. I mean, we have a budget proposal and it aims at trying to address what is now calculated as rolling to next year, an 11.4, 11.5, 11.6. Someone has said 12.4 depending on your accounting, deficit – billion dollar deficit. That is huge relative to per capital, whatever way you want to look at it, that’s huge. But nonetheless, the Governor presented a budget that balanced. A budget with budget cuts, with revenue and it covered both operating and capital needs and it included a lot of things in it. I’ll try to boil it down for NIU but nothing takes place in a vacuum. These things all get kind of related. NIU’s share of the general revenue funds and those are the traditional state dollars we get to operate that are recurring dollars and it’s always been up until the last fifteen years or so the base of our budget, increased from 107.4 million in 2009 and, you know, our total budget by the way is approaching between – almost approaching half a billion dollars a year so you can see what’s happened to the relative contributions. But still 107.4 million; that’s a lot of money. It increased to 109.2 projected in 2010. Now, virtually every state agent, university, got about a 1.28 % increase in that GR base. Ours is 1.6% and the reason is they put some things back into our base budget that were historically funded outside the budget and were kind of anomalies. Like we had some money for our CHANCE program that was attached to our budget. Now they’re put it in so they zeroed that out and that popped up our GR to 1.6 but it’s really the same as everybody else got. You’ve got to be always careful when you read state budgets and look at the fine print. So overall, universities got 1.28% adjusted for legislative additions. Let me just say that, you know, that pretty much in itself has to be considered very good news. I don’t know if you follow it the way I do but across this country universities, public universities, are slashing and burning, cutting deep into their programs, furloughs, work load increases, slashing programs, doing whatever they can to make 12, 13, 14% base budget cuts. Here our Governor has I think understood that for several years now higher education in Illinois has not fared well at the hands of the state for reasons we don’t need to go into that are complex. So I’d have to say this is – we need more; we probably deserve a lot more, but this is good if it holds. The other thing about that is – let me also say that the Governor and the governors of a lot of other states effectively used Federal Stimulus Package money to help higher education in their states and education and the governors had some discretion as I reported to you last time on how they allocated this between K-12 and public higher and post-secondary and how they used it between capital, meaning building projects, and operating. What Governor Quinn decided to do was to largely use his stimulus discretion to plug the operating gap versus divert some of that money that could be used in K-12 or post-secondary for buildings. So he plugged the budget gap and this is a decision that will be debated in the Legislature. We have Appropriation Hearings coming up on
April 1 in the Senate and April 2 in the House. That’s all subject to change but, you know, there may be some reshaping because if you follow the commentary, there are some people quite concerned about certain aspects of the tax cut plans and so forth. Here’s a warning in the fine print for us all. In using the stimulus money which lasts two years, a state commits to maintaining higher education funding levels at least at the 2006 fiscal year level which this does. However, in two years, the federal money goes away so there’s two years of money plugged into our base budget that goes away in two years and I believe Dr. Williams told me or maybe you didn’t tell me. Maybe I calculated it that this is a 7 million dollar figure so therefore, what happens in two years. What happens when it goes away, what do you do with that money? So I’ve cautioned everyone to put that money into what I call variable costs rather than fixed costs. In other words, most of our resources are in people but lets be careful about that on how we use this money because if we don’t get it, then we have to cut our budge by 7 million and if we use it wisely for one time things, fixing classrooms, travel, equipment, whatever – we can wait and see what happens and then decide longer term what to do with it. We don’t know whether this will happen or not but I consider that a concern. I’m going to talk about that in the Appropriation Hearings. But we’ll take the money. Right? We’ll take the money because I applaud what the Governor has done. I think what he’s done is courageous. The regular capital budget includes $22,516,600 for Stevens Hall renovation which has consistently been our top capital priority on the official capital list. At least it’s been there for ten years that I know of. That’s there on the capital list and $2,787,000 in planning money for the anticipated and needed technology center which is a – Dr. Williams is that about a 35 to 38 million dollar technology classroom, computer science, all purpose classroom building not configured yet but when you get planning money, that’s a good thing. That’s tantamount to getting the actual appropriation down the line so that’s good. We’ve made additional requests, these are outside the Governor’s budget now, for Cole Hall, for Grant Hall renovation and centralized chiller in the stimulus package money but the Governor chose to use the stimulus package money to plug the operating deficit and not the capital. We continue to argue in the Legislature for the funding for Cole Hall and those things and I remain hopeful that it will emerge in a different part of the budget. What the Governor did is merely took the IBHE capital list that has been around for years and fund that. That’s a good decision I think. Cole Hall was always outside of that but you know my feelings on Cole Hall. So the Governor chose – okay, I covered that. There’ll be a big debate about all of this. We’ll see how it comes out.

Now, the impact on university employees include not only an increase in the income tax because, you know, there’s a proposal to restructure to raise the marginal rates for some, make it more progressive, plug loopholes, you can read about that. Not only that, but a proposed 2% increase in the employee contribution to the pension system and I know Deb is here and I think right now on our pensions the state pays 8% and we pay 8%. I think what this means that the state would reduce its input to 6% and ours would be increased or that’s being debated and you’ve got to read the fine print. So in other words, you know we had this discussing before about the pension systems merging, but then there’s this largely issue that the Legislature must face of this badly under-funded pension system that many has said needs reform and that will happen in this budget, some kind of reform. So that is out there. Again, our people are working on that and the annuitants labor unions are working on it because it all has an impact on state employees. That’s money that you’re not getting in your pensions that you have to put in yourself. The other thing is that there will be a higher cost for health benefits and a cost differential between the two
available health plans is on the table and details are not available yet. In other words, state employees are going to have to pay more for their health insurance. So reaction from the four legislative caucuses and business and labor and other constituents really – there’s going to be a healthy debate about this and there already is. We’re going to be addressing a number of these issues and keeping on top of it.

Now, the best way I’m going to keep you informed and I didn’t write an e-mail last week because I wasn’t comfortable with this information. I think a lot of people have thought this is the budget and it’s not; it’s just the opening round. We don’t have it up yet; we’re working on it. We’ve got a website and we’re going to have a link on our website that is devoted to the FY2010 budget and we’re going to put up there documents, the actual budget, the Governor’s message and then we will add to it commentary as it becomes available for your information because I don’t know how long this is going to last. You know, is it going to last through our commencement? I don’t know but I thought that’s the best – I think people have grown accustomed to using the websites for their information and so we’re going to be doing that and I thought I’d have it up today but we’re not quite ready. It will be soon thought so keep watching for that.

All right. Tomorrow is Board of Trustees meeting and it’s always a very important meeting because we set student fees, not tuition, but student fees tomorrow and I always try to keep them as low as possible so there’ll be a good debate about that. No decisions have been made at this point about tuition and those things.

So with that, I’m going to end my comments and throw it open for any questions. I wish I had more information for you on that but I’m very pleased. I’m optimistic but it’s time to be prudent and to understand that sacrifices are probably going to be required by us before we’re done with this but I think we’re up to that. I think we all know that. I want to say that down from the academic department on up, this has been – I’m amazed at how well managed this university is. We don’t waste a lot of money. I don’t see a lot of AIG stuff hanging around. This is not the time for that. It’s never the time for that but I’m really proud of the way our people manage, you know. It’s – we wouldn’t be in such good shape if it wasn’t for that. We’re not in the best shape we could be in; we always need more money. God if we had a little more money, the things we could do but we’ll get through this in pretty good form I think.

Okay, I’ll take questions.

D. Wade: Does that mean I have to give back my 23 million dollar bonus?

President Peters: Well, let me put it this way – it was – we’re taxing that at 98% and it’s going into the University Council cookie fund. All right.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – report (Pages 2-3)

J. Stephen: I have a report. I have several corrections and as other mathematicians, I have to leave at 4:00 for a different reason. First of all there are several corrections I’d like to point out right away. Paragraph 3 should be stricken. I used an old report as my template and didn’t erase that part. That has to do with the M.S. Program in Family and Consumer Sciences. Also in Action Item, 2 – the correct last name of the new Dean of the College of Law is Rosato, not Alzado. I don’t know where that came from. Both of these corrections have already been forwarded to Donna and will appear as correct in the minutes. The third paragraph should be stricken. The one that says Action Item without a number. I’m not going to go through this all the way but they met. They had action items; they had information items. First item concerns the 52 sabbatical requests for SPS and faculty members. All 52 were recommended or unanimously endorsed and communicated to the full Board. Remember that this sub-committee only endorses and sends to the full Board. The full Board final decision is at the final BOT meeting which, I believe, tomorrow. Jennifer L. Rosato was supported and recommended for promotion and tenure and assignment as Dean of the College of Law.

There are a number of changes in program covered in 3 and 4. During that period of time, one notes that there’s a change and more of an interest in more specialized cultural studies. I think that’s something we can see more of in a disciplinary culture study coming through the program. There wasn’t anything which was considered justified in the in the Oral English Proficiency Report, only two reports were sent in. Let’s see, I believe this is the third year, two members of the faculty who were on sabbatical last year gave reports on their activities. These were quite lively reports and the Trustees were extremely interested. They’re showing, in my experience, increasing interest in this. These grabbed their attention and they got two good reports for them and the Trustees asked a lot of questions about research methodology, limitations of the information, the impact and the dissemination to other professionals. There’s a correction in both (a with a space there). Very positively received and I think this had a tremendous impact on the BOT in understanding the importance of sabbaticals.

They got a report on the IBHE Public Agenda Update. I’ve given you some links to it. It’s the usual stuff.

NIU was named one of six colleges/universities in the nation to achieve the Community Engagement Classification for Outreach and Partnership. This is an elective category and reflects our commitment to service in northern Illinois. If you want to know more information about that, there’s a link there under information for you.

External Reviews of doctoral programs were discussed. These were initiated in the Spring of 2009 in conjunction with our ongoing program review. We’ve got four external reviews expected this semester, none have been completed. Initial indications are positive.
Then there was an Update on Degree-Completion Initiative for Community Colleges that’s been going on, our coordination with eleven of the community colleges in getting students through. We note that Harper is sort of reluctant to participate because of their own aspirations.

I ask that the Council receive these minutes. Any questions?

**President Peters:** Any questions for Professor Stephen? I’m glad you mentioned the sabbaticals and our Board. In an era when all across this country, severe budget cuts have forced curtailment or elimination of sabbaticals, our Board remains solidly, 100% behind this very important policy that we have to renew faculty and staff. That’s very unique and I just think that when the Board hears reports like the ones we heard, they understand why this is so important; both to the vibrancy, intellectual vibrancy of the university, but also the impact it has on students who by and large get involved in these sabbaticals or are the benefactors of these sabbaticals. So anytime you get a chance to thank the Trustees for supporting this, I’d do it.

**J. Stephen:** I think we both have seen the impact these reports have had on the Board of Trustees and in particular I think it’s probably almost been all who choose the representatives. I think those were two excellent, accessible choices, good speakers, showed depth of research and connected all the things we wanted to highlight. Of course, ??? as our mathematician who was too.

**R. Alden:** Well, I think the selection, I have to give credit to Vice-Provost Cassidy because we wanted to make sure we have a diversity of different disciplines represented over the years but also things that are not, let’s say, so technical that the Board may not appreciate totally how important they are so I have to give her credit. I did want to make one point of clarification - that classification for community engaged is with the Carnegie Foundation. They have redone their ways that they classify universities. It used to be you’re just in one class and one class only. Now they have started developing these elective classes and again, I think it is a competitive thing. The proposal was extensive. I need to acknowledge both Anne Kaplan and Virginia Cassidy for putting together with the deans a very comprehensive proposal showing how engagement is really part of our value system and part of our educational experience here. So having that elective category of classification really reflects what we’ve been talking about largely in our Strategic Planning process.

**President Peters:** All right.

**J. Stephen:** Donna will you add Carnegie in front of Elective? I have it in the www part but it’s not specific.

**C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Clersida Garcia – report**

**President Peters:** Okay. All right. Shall we move on to Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee? Paul?

**P. Stoddard:** Actually, Clersida Garcia. She’s not here today? Guess not.
President Peters: All right.

P. Stoddard: That will be included in the official minutes.

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

President Peters: Excellent. Moving on – and I’ll have something to say about finances in my report so we’ll probably pick it up there. We have D, Legislative Audit and External Affairs Committee, Jay and Bobbie?

J. Monteiro: I’ll report today.

President Peters: Okay, Jay.

J. Monteiro: The report is quite long so I’m just going to go through and highlight a few things of interest.

The first thing will be in Section II about the FMLLA update from the Board of Regulations. These updates were added as a result of the National Defense Authorization Act. The first amendment provides up to 26 weeks for an eligible spouse, son, daughter, parent or next of kin to care for a service member injured in the line of active duty. The second amendment provides for a total of 12 weeks leave for a “qualified exigency” occurring as a result of an employee’s spouse, son, daughter, or parent being called to active duty status. They also are amending the employment period worked to be eligible for the leave. An employee must now be employed for at least 12 months and have worked at least 1250 hours.

The number of House Bills and Senate Bills were discussed that will affect NIU if passed. This is down in Section III. If you look at letter D, I think Buck talked about Harper College. They want to be able to award bachelor degrees in two files of study. It’s a bill for a pilot program. Then down in F, they’re combined the Senate Bill 1883 and 2013, Board of Higher Education – Collaborative Baccalaureate Degree Development Grant. It will require that the IBHE implement and administer the grant program to help deliver upper division courses and bachelor degree programs at a location geographically convenient to student populations currently being served by existing community colleges.

If we move down to Section VI, they talked about the Veterans Educational Assistance Act. This came about post-9/11 veteran benefit changes. The benefits are going to be available to veterans who served from 90 days to 36 months and these benefits include tuition and fees, housing allowing, up to $1,000 of books and supplies, can also be transferred to a family member.

I will move down to Section VII. There was an update given by Walter Czerniak about NIUNet and updates to the different projects, the different phases and how that technology has really
connected us to the Chicago land area and has really sped up our technology and our economic growth.

Then the big thing is number VIII, the Illinois Public Employees Retirement System. This is where the State Treasurer has proposed that we consolidate the five state-funded retirement systems into one system and that they would be all combined into one and all the administrative things would be under one board.

That’s all I have for a report today. Any questions?

**President Peters:** Pretty thorough. Microphone coming around.

**P. Henry:** I’m just a little confused about the III, F where you’re talking about the IBHE implementing and administrating a grant program to deliver upper division courses. I’m not sure what that actually refers to.

**J. Monteiro:** Does anybody else because I’m not really clear on it myself and I’d hate to make a comment and not be correct.

**President Peters:** The only person who would know that would be Anne Kaplan and she’s shaking her head. At least enlighten us on what you think it might be.

**A. Kaplan:** I really don’t know this specific bill but the BHE has been under some pressure ever since the Harper effort to come up with a counter. We can’t just refuse – we can’t just continue to tell them they can do four year degrees if there’s no way for anybody else to do them either and so when – before the budget cuts under the ??? Program, there was some grant money available which we applied for with great regularity and frequently got and then used to offer programs that would help with baccalaureate completion on community college campuses. But of course, the grant funding went away. My own view, and I’d have to read the legislation, but I don’t really think a grant program is the right approach to this because grants come and go and the need for baccalaureate completion programs on community college campuses is not going to go away. What you need is some kind of sustainable approach to getting it done. Otherwise, community colleges are going to keep pushing in their own districts for whatever degree ???.

That seems to me to be not exactly the best solution.

**President Peters:** A light bulb just went off because I’m involved in this. In fact, I’m behind it. It is an attempt to recognize in some small way, there has to be an investment to public universities to participate in filling these educational degree needs and it can’t just be out of our existing resources because we’re strapped and it’s a recognition and a little money to plug that gap and it’s a good thing. As Anne said, it’s not the answer but it is a step in the right direction I think. Sorry about that. It’s been a long, cold winter. All right? Yeah, Al?

**A. Rosenbaum:** I would just like to get some additional clarification on VIII because it seems like we’ve heard of this before and that it is not in our best interest for this bill to go forward so I’m sort of wondering, are we doing something about this? Is some action required? It says it should be handled at council levels. Is this being done or do we have to do something about it?
J. Monteiro: I would say that the biggest group that’s working with this is the Annuitants Association. I know that they’ve been going down and lobbying. We’ve discussed it at Operation Staff Council. We’ve not discussed what we can do to tell them that we don’t agree with it. I don’t know what the other councils are doing. Bobbie, did you have a comment?

B. Cesarek: I think at the Supportive Professional Staff Council we are discussion about this and we have thoughts about proposing a letter that would come from the Council to members of the committee and to members of the Legislature to indeed vote against this particular proposal.

President Peters: Yeah, Deb Haliczer really raised her hand.

D. Haliczer: At the April 23 meeting, the University Benefits Committee will be taking this up as an issue and are likely to be issuing a letter, first to President Peters and then discussing what we can do beyond Northern.

President Peters: It’s clear that this issue is much larger than even the totality of the public university system. It involves the other systems and it will take the concerted efforts of many to carefully consider this legislation because if you talk to any representative and the pension issues loom large and they think this is one way perhaps they can save some money. If you look at the services and the financial viability of our system, SURS system, I think it’s superior to the other and this is of great concern to us but again, this is a more global issue. I’m glad to see the employee groups are on it and so is the Annuitants Association. That’s the strongest – how many annuitants do we have state-wide? 90,000? That’s the way to work this. We will too. Thank you Alan.

P. Henry: Would it be something where it would be useful for individual faculty members to write to our state senator and state representative about this?

President Peters: Can’t hurt, can’t hurt. Deborah?

D. Haliczer: As chair of the University Benefits Committee, we all ask all employees to consider joining the Annuitants Association. Payroll deduction is the easy way to do it but all councils always advocates this and this is my official statement.

President Peters: Okay, paid political announcement there. Isn’t there an age requirement?

D. Haliczer: There is no longer an age requirement; any employee can join the Annuitants Association.

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Sons, Chair – report (Page 4)

G. Academic Policy Committee – William Baker, Chair – report (Pages 5-8)
President Peters: How about that! Okay any other questions on Jay’s report on Legislative Audit? Then let’s move on to William – is it Academic Policy Committee William?

W. Baker: Mr. President and University Council if you would pages 5 to 8 you can see the report which is based upon university-wide meetings. I wish to highlight areas of interest only, the key passages and if motions are required, please advise me regarding that. If you would turn to page 6, at the foot of the page, one the committee agrees that there should be a commonality of questions. However, the key passage is on page 8. We recommend that more time be given to the consideration of the commonality of questions at the university, departmental and college levels. Essentially, there are NO clear answers and such a decision relating especially to opportunities for students to evaluate courses via an online procedure should be left to individual departments and disciplines. Further, it should be noted that Professor Murali Krishnamurthi reports that many departments are still pressing him for an online course evaluation system and that he will, with Provost Alden’s help, see what he can do to assist with this process. Finally, I’d like to thank very much members of the committee and others for their full, most informative and helpful participation in these deliberations. Thank you.

President Peters: So, where do we go from here?

P. Stoddard: If I understand correctly, the recommendation of the group is that online evaluations should be allowable but not mandatory so I think (HAD TO TURN THE TAPE OVER SO MISSED SOME)

Baker made the motion; Miller was second.

President Peters: Online evaluations should be permitted but not mandatory. Discussion. Yes?

P. Henry: Just to clarify, that means evaluations of online questions.

P. Stoddard: No, that is online evaluations of brick and mortar courses.

President Peters: To be able to go online and fill out an evaluation of ---

P. Stoddard: The other is a separate issue we’ll vote on in a minute.

President Peters: This is to use technology to evaluate existing courses. Right? Would be a different way of putting it. Yes, Alan?

A. Rosenbaum: Were they not already allowable? Are there regulations that say we can’t have online evaluations?

P. Stoddard: The regulations are mute on the subject. This will be taking the gag off.

A. Rosenbaum: But why do we need a motion that says they’re allowed if there’s nothing that says they’re not allowed.
**P. Stoddard:** Because there’s nothing that says that they’re allowed so somebody could conceivably raise an objection saying there’s no provision for that.

**President Peters:** And they have I understand. So this is more clarity. Okay, we have the Provost and then Terry Bishop and then ---

**R. Alden:** Just to clarify, we have a – I guess – a prototype being tested in the College of Education of a modular that is offered as a professional piece of software where confidentiality is guaranteed on one hand and redundancy so that students can’t send multiple evaluations for the same course on the other so I think all of the technological things have been worked on. I think what the College of Education is looking at now is does it make sense, does it free up a significant part of a class period that would otherwise be devoted to student evaluations, does it permit students to think more critically about what the issues are when they’re filling out a survey so that they would have some time and really make use of an online survey versus class time. So that was the issue and they wanted to make sure the fact that traditionally it’s been paper in class, paper and pencil sort of survey, that we could make use of this technology which is fully secured and confidential. Can we move forward without that becoming an issue and hopefully eventually all of the colleges would adopt this and then we would have maximized our use of class time.

**President Peters:** All right, Terry?

**T. Bishop:** I did not have a comment.

**President Peters:** Oh, you were passing the mike. You were so demonstrative about the whole thing.

**T. Bishop:** I’m trying to get done quickly!

**President Peters:** All right. There’s other questions.

**Barbara ???:** Well, I guess I don’t quite understand what the – what it means to say that this option is possible but not mandatory. Are you saying that within a college some people can adopt it and some can’t within a department, within a class some people can fill it out on line and some wouldn’t? I mean, it seems vague to me.

**P. Stoddard:** Well I think we like things vague. Yes, a department could decide as a department they want to have online evaluations for their courses or they could leave it up to the individual faculty members whether they would prefer to do it online or traditionally as in class.

**Barbara ???:** So what if a department has a common evaluation? Does that mean that a faculty member who decides to do it online because they can exercise this option doesn’t have to use the form the rest of the department uses?

**P. Stoddard:** It would be the same form – it would just be an online version of the form. Each department would still make its own evaluation forms.
President Peters: Way back there; I can hardly see.

J. Hecht: Jeff Hecht. I’m Associate Dean for the College of Education and in charge of the trial that’s been going on there the last two semesters. Just to respond to your question, in the fall of this past year we did a very limited trial of this particular software that Provost Alden mentioned in one department with volunteer instructors and the consent of the department and their personnel committee. Twenty-odd course sections and a very limited number of students were involved. They did it everywhere from holding it in class, where students were brought to a laboratory, where students could do it on their own time using the pre-existing instrument of the department. The faculty through the system could add additional questions from a pre-existing lists if they so choose but they could not modify down the standard instrument. The response rate was very, very good. There was one question from one student about how it worked and feedback was quite positive. In setting up for this semester, I made presentations to the six departments in the college and solicited voluntary participation up to the departments and the faculty. It was up to each department to decide if they wanted to participate in whole or in part and how they would like to do that. Two of the six departments decided to participate in the entirety with the exception of independent study and dissertation type course that are typically excluded from evaluation anyway. One department decided not to participate for most of their courses but left it open to instructors – part time instructors who might be interested. The other three departments participating to various degrees; again, a faculty decision. They were using the standard instrument that the faculty have adopted from each department or the courses in that department. In this trial coming up this semester, we expect to have approximately 121 instructors, 350 course sections involving 7,362 student enrollments who would participate in the trial in addition to other sections that would be evaluated in the tradition way using whatever methods are already in place. In addition to the standard instruments, the instructors would also be able to add questions from the pool of pre-existing questions that has been established or they could write their own custom questions on the fly that could be administered that could administered to all of the questions individual teach or only to a certain section. It’s a very secure system. It worked flawlessly the first time out. We expect it to give lots of options for faculty to ask the kinds of questions they would like to and to reduce costs and turn around time to faculty in terms of getting responses back.

President Peters: Okay, are you giving training to other interested departments and colleges?

J. Hecht: Absolutely.

President Peters: Okay. Provost?

R. Alden: One thing I should have mentioned – I mentioned freeing up class time, this is a tremendous burden on some staff members to have to take all of the writing evaluations and type up the handwritten comments, do the statistics, all of that is done automatically by the software so I would see this as a cost effectiveness and efficiency and, quite frankly, a stress issue with staff members that have to turn these things around when there are just piles of paper. So I would urge that it not just be optional at the faculty level but the shared governance at the department level perhaps can decide whether it’s effective or desired but I think to still have this
staff’s burden out there, just optional and they won’t even know how many are coming in any given semester, could be problematic. I think we need to have a little bit more of a focused approach at departmental adoption, opt in/opt out rather than each section, each instructor deciding for themselves not recognizing that there is a real human and time cost in having these paper evaluations without a lot of thought about why.

President Peters: All right. Everyone understand the motion on the floor? It’s to permit the online evaluation of courses but not mandatory. All right, all those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right.

The motion passed.

Now the second issue as I understand it is the evaluation of online courses whether it be done online and what is your recommendation there Professor Baker if you have one.

W. Baker: We have not.

President Peters: There’s no recommendation.

W. Baker: There’s no recommendation on that Mr. President.

President Peters: No recommendation. So let’s discuss this issue. Provost?

R. Alden: Just – I brought this forward because a number of the people involved in online courses have approached Murali and others in my office about can they provide some sort of sample questions that would be more appropriate for an online course than for a traditional lecture course and I think we will have to pursue that for those individuals or those departments that want to have templates. We do have a draft and we could have this same ad hoc group really try to look at what’s done at other institutions and try to provide that as a service as here are some sample templates that each department can decide whether they are appropriate for their online course because I think there’s a clear need because what a department may have for a lecture course or a performance course may not be appropriate or entirely appropriate or entirely overlap with what would be expected for an online course. So I think we may have to allow that group to continue for those departments that want to adopt those as a starting point. They can add their own questions. We’re not trying to be prescriptive; we’re just trying to enable those individual instructors that are kind of floundering looking for some help in this area. We need to have a process by which departments adopt these things.

President Peters: All right, Anne Kaplan?

A. Kaplan: It might be worth noting in this discussion that eLearning Services which is part of my operation has developed over the past several years about 60 courses with various faculty and we have evaluated those courses for the past three years. We don’t evaluate instruction, we don’t evaluate the instructor, but we do evaluate instruction modalities and the technology and the ease of using the technology and whether the student got enough technological support and that kind of thing so those surveys and those survey questions are available if anybody, you know, if you
want to incorporate them into a larger evaluation instrument that would evaluate the instructor as well.

**President Peters:** All right. So if I understand, the Provost is suggesting the working group take another crack at it. I mean it would trouble me if we have courses for which we give academic credit and instructors whose merit pay, evaluation, tenure/promotion in part is dependent upon the evaluation of their teaching performance in all the various modes, that this is a big gap. Particularly in what’s happening. Are we that far behind that we are not evaluating these courses?

**R. Alden:** I have a feeling it’s very ad hoc. What we’re hearing back through the grapevine is that some departments have addressed it; some haven’t and a lot of instructors and faculty members are concerned that they don’t have the tools to produce to produce such an evaluation so I feel like we’re kind of leaving the rest of the story untold. So, I just want to have a level playing field for the students, for the faculty, for the assessment process. I believe that if we had an accrediting body come in and find that there’s a big gap here that is left out of the traditional student evaluation system that we may have some problems down the line.

**President Peters:** Jeff? Yeah, and remember, that’s one thing I neglected to tell people. You know we are moving into our reaccreditation cycle with the Higher Learning Commission believe it or not. We’re coming up on that again and this is one of the things we’ll have to attend to. Yeah, Jeff?

**J. Hecht:** To the extent that it’s helpful, the current system that we’re using and the software that has been employed can be used just as easily for online courses as well as face-to-face on campus or off campus. It also allows us to create sections of questions that can applied automatically to courses based on their modality of delivery so should the university or department or college adopt a series of questions that would be added to an instrument if that course would be delivered primarily online or primarily off campus, the software would automatically deliver those questions to appropriate sections when those sections are in fact evaluated.

**President Peters:** Okay. One thing I might be able to do is direct the Provost to do a survey to determine if we have uncovered courses and where are they and then that would be important for me to know. That’s something we’re going to need to report anyway and then we can – it seems like we do have some solutions to this without prescribing things or forcing people to do things.

**R. Alden:** I think the big issue is that we have I believe a number of online courses but we have farm more hybrid courses where any part of the spectrum from occasionally meeting face-to-face, to meeting face-to-face on a regular almost a, you know, course period by course period basis but using the online as a supplementary instructional mode and quite frankly, I think the answer is, at least according to what I’ve seen from Murali’s statistics, about 22,000 students a year are in a course that uses Blackboard so it’s not a bright line sort of situation but clearly those who are only online they don’t, until we voted a little while ago, they may not even have seen a student evaluation. Now the question is what is an appropriate student evaluation and how does it fit with hybrid courses so I really this is a shared governance issue but it has to be
taken into the – either at the university, college or department level. Somebody has to claim ownership of it enough so that we don’t let it fall between the cracks and I don’t mind having our people, our ad hoc committee, continue to participate but if it’s only there for those who care to come and ask for help, I have a feeling there’s going to be a lot of things falling through the cracks.

**President Peters:** Yep. Professor Baker?

**W. Baker:** May I please ask for clarification from Provost Alden. What exactly do you mean by the ad hoc committee please?

**R. Alden:** There has been with Murali and believe some of Anne’s people and some of the people from my office, have assembled that list of sample questions that I sent to your committee originally as kind of a “straw person” document. Here are some things that other universities ask as far as something that might be unique to an online course that would not be applicable to a lecture course and so that group, which doesn’t have an identity – it’s just a group of people that I think Murali has gotten together to talk about this, who have a common interest in this, we may just need to formalize that group and have it make a formal recommendation at what level do we have to have these kinds of courses evaluated. So I’m not trying to promote any given ad hoc committee or any given standing committee but I think it’s going to be a problem that’s going to persist unless we formally approach that topic of what is an appropriate assessment tool and I’m not trying to say that a department can’t add any number of other issues, any other number of questions but we need to have something for those instructors and faculty members who are asking for guidance.

**W. Baker:** May I quickly add Mr. President the comment that everything we were hearing from the university-wide constituencies was a real concern relating to faculty and departmental autonomy. That was the primary concern that one was hearing.

**R. Alden:** And I can’t agree enough that shared governance has to have a degree of autonomy at the department level but it can’t be at the response of doing nothing if it causes us to have a major component of our courses fall between the cracks in terms of appropriate questions. So my concern is the hard part of shared governance is getting some continuity, getting a level playing field and making sure that every student in every course and every faculty member feel that they are on a level playing field. So that’s my concern. I’m just pointing out the issue. I’m not telling departments what to do other than we have to have a common sort of approach at the department level at least so that just because a course is online and not in a lecture form, that we don’t have appropriate student evaluation questions.

**President Peters:** It is an important decision so it sounds to me like we’re going to keep moving on through listening to this, you know in other lives I was heavily involved in these sorts of things over twenty years ago and in the places I was, they resolved this in the following way. Without much debate it was clear that it was a directive that every course that gave academic credit had to be evaluated in some way if there was an instructor. How that happened was a matter of local autonomy. But they had to be evaluated and then there was help on how you do that and what best practices were and you know, the technology changes over time. An issue we
haven’t discussed and I might as well blend in right now is that in most cases, there was some set of very small common questions that were relevant for whatever purposes and I’m just going to suggest that this group also blend that issue in too because again, let me say what’s the reason for this. The reason is we do have a responsibility to evaluate the courses but the other thing, again in my experience, is that the people who benefit the most from this are those people who are instructors and professors who take their teaching very seriously and need a way to demonstrate to all of us that what they do is of value and can be evaluated. It’s difficult as I’ve said many times to evaluate research but there is a methodology associated with it. You can bounce it against the list of referred journals in your field or external funding or, you know, whatever it is. It’s not easy but teaching – quality instruction – that’s harder and you need some good evidence and the people who benefit most from it are the people who pour their energies into instruction. That’s why we should do all this. So, I think we have at least – it sounds like we’re moving forward in terms of let’s give it another iteration and consider those two things. Anybody want to add anything to that? I don’t think we need to vote on anything. And we do thank the committee. These are tough issues and you have to continually work at them and there are always things that we haven’t considered, particularly as the technology changes. The question is who is the instructor on some online courses? You know, you’ve got all of that. All right. Well, thank you Professor Baker.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – report

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

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

F. University Affairs Committee – Linda Sons, Chair – report (Page 4)

L. Sons: Appreciate it. I have a visitor from Finland here and I have to get back for his talk which is scheduled for 4:00 and with a ton of graduate students and the like, somehow it doesn’t look right if the professor is not there.

President Peters: Is it in old Finish?

L. Sons: No, but I think it’s in good new mathematics. So anyway, our University Affairs Committee has a report and a policy on relationships between university employees and students. We were charged with looking at such a policy earlier and that is on page 4 of the packet that was sent to us representing the day’s agenda and report items and we took some considerable time to look at a number of other institutions as to how they have written such policies and tried to extrapolate the best of things from other institutions and then formulate our own policy. We had the expertise also of our university legal people to work with us and feel sure that they were comfortable with what we had drawn up and I understand that that was also passed through the Provost’s Office to have a look at it at that point. I don’t know how much he saw of it or didn’t see of it but the legal guys said you saw it and thought it was okay. So that’s my report from that standpoint so this is the policy we’re proposing and I am moving then adoption of this policy.
President Peters: All right, so just to be clear, this is not a Bylaw change. This is a policy and this is a first reading.

L. Sons: That’s true.

President Peters: You don’t need a first reading on this?

L. Sons: No. This can be adopted straight away.

President Peters: This is for action.

L. Sons: Right, it’s an action item.

President Peters: So there’s a motion. Is there a – there’s a second. All right, now discussion. Deb Haliczer, award winning Deb Haliczer.

D. Haliczer: So you put me to the blush uh? Okay, the question that I have to raise comes on behalf of Steve Cunningham from Human Resources and it has to do with two issues with this policy. As it’s worded, we do not discuss the fact that many student workers report up the line to other vice presidents and so we’re going to ask for a minor edit including the other vice presidents as well as the Provost/Deans. So that’s a request that Steven would make. The other question he has asked me to bring up is we would like to have an opportunity for Human Resources too look at some implementation procedures and some comment on enforcement and what the discipline would be like. So Steve is requesting a little more discussion at this point. I was one of the people who helped write the previous version of this policy and I like what Linda’s committee has done. Steve has a few questions about how we’re going to actually implement and enforce this.

President Peters: So, let me get this straight. Theoretically we can act on this today and you’re asking for an editing change that may or may not be a friendly amendment but then you’re asking for a delay so you can consider implementation?

D. Haliczer: Steve asked whether we could have time to talk about this before the next University Council meeting.

President Peters: That sounds like a delay to me.

D. Haliczer: It’s up to you whether you would like to delay. Even if we pass this policy with a tiny edit, HR would want to work with the rest of the administration on how to follow up on this with some implementation procedures.

President Peters: All right but I’m still not – I want to make sure that everyone is clear as to what Human Resources is asking. I understand the edits which you would have to specify but it sounds as if that if we do pass it, you still want time to study it for implementation.
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D. Haliczer: That’s what Steve is asking.

President Peters: But it sounds like the preference is to wait?

D. Haliczer: I’m only operating on Steve’s e-mail which I got this morning.

President Peters: Oh, well then.

D. Haliczer: Asking for – we need to have the opportunity to detail implementing procedures and to discuss the other implications that may exist and that probably means we won’t have time to complete the task before the next University Council meeting.

President Peters: Well, let’s take that for what it is then and the group will decide what that means. All right. Now we had – I saw some hands up. Yeah. Use the microphone please.

Barbara ???: I was wondering if you’re suggesting that policy on enforcement and implementation should be written into this?

D. Haliczer: I wouldn’t think that it would necessarily need to be written into this. There would need to be an additional document talking about how this interfaces with the Sexual Harassment policy and other existing policies. There is some overlap and I think some of those things would need to be clarified. The only edit that I need is that we mention the other vice presidents as well as the ones who are written in the policy.

President Peters: Let’s see, we have Buck first and then Terry.

J. Stephen: You set up the ladder that I don’t quit understand; the dean and then basically the whole President’s cabinet has to sign off too?

D. Haliczer: No, the people that I’m talking about – when we first talked about this policy, it started out as a policy on consensual relationships between faculty and students and as it is worded and as it was reviewed with other university policies, also included and it’s now called the policy on relationships between employees and students. Not all employees who supervise students and who would be covered by this policy are part of Academic Affairs. For instance, I supervise students and I am in Finance and Facilities and so unless my vice president is included in this, there is no person in position of authority over me who would talk about that.

J. Stephen: So I understand, some of the people covered under these are not people who are regulated by the Provost’s Office.

D. Haliczer: And lots of people who are instructors in UNIV 101 do not report to Academic Affairs in their day jobs so I think it would be a more effective policy if we mentioned all of those other vice presidents.

J. Stephen: Thank you.
President Peters: Okay, Terry?

T. Bishop: To further clarify then, it is really not with the policy per se but it’s the asterisks portion underneath.

D. Haliczer: Yes.

T. Bishop: Because the policy is pretty clear that those individuals would be covered.

D. Haliczer: Yes.

T. Bishop: The committee did talk about the need to hash out issues related to procedures and believed that the policy could be passed in spite of that so I don’t know if we want to hold this up. We could perhaps edit the language, you know, in the asterisks paragraph to include virtually, you know, we could expose, you know, seek approval – who would be the chief officer who would have to approve to capture all of the other supervisory relationships that are excluded currently.

D. Haliczer: If it mentioned all the vice presidents then it would satisfy what I need.

President Peters: Linda?

L. Sons: We could add into it or the vice president in the employees’ division.

President Peters: All right. So repeat that so it sounds like a friendly amendment.

L. Sons: We would add the vice president in the employees division. That would cover whoever else may not yet be covered by what was stated already under the supervising dean definition.

President Peters: All right and that’s an accepted friendly amendment. Okay? Dean McCord?

C. McCord: One other amendment which I trust will be friendly is we have a vice president for research, not a vice provost for research.

President Peters: That’s an edit. No problem with that Linda?

L. Sons: No problem.

President Peters: All right.

P. Stoddard: Also I think in the third paragraph then, where it says “Such exclusions must be approved by the Provost in consultation with the University Ethics Officer” should that be by the Provost or appropriate vice president? Do you think that’s appropriate?

???: ???
P. Stoddard: Yeah, it said the vice president of the person’s division but I was trying to save a few words.

President Peters: Linda is pondering whether that’s friendly or not.

L. Sons: Yeah, that’s right. A little bit of a question about how the Ethics Officer works in conjunction with this all.

P. Stoddard: Well, not to replace the Ethics Officer but if it’s not Academic Affairs then perhaps a different vice president would be the appropriate vice president.

L. Sons: I think we could do that, yeah. I think by the Provost or the appropriate vice president.

President Peters: All right. That’s accepted. Yeah, well Terry wants to say something before that.

T. Bishop: Just to clarify then that language to make sure that either the Provost of the appropriate vice president in consultation with the University Ethics Officer so it should be “must be approved by the Provost or division vice president in consultation with the University Ethics Officer”. I just want to make sure.

President Peters: That’s a clarification. All right. Dr. Williams?

E. Williams: First of all I commend the committee for their work and I also appreciate the friendly amendment and of being friendly accepted regarding the fact acknowledging we do have employees outside of Academic Affairs where we have students. I guess my concern is a little more global. I certainly do not have any hesitation in supporting the concept here but I’m just wondering if there is sort of a rush to get this policy in place. I did not have an opportunity and I apologize and I’m probably the last one to know what’s going on around, but I really didn’t have an opportunity to vet this out with my directors with the Human Resource area. We have a policy on our books. That policy – I’m not in any way saying that is the appropriate policy at all – but I do think that we sort of need a little time to reflect on the wording of this policy in comparison and I need to get some feedback in terms of how this would operationally work within my division. I don’t know if there’s an urgency here but it would really be I think advisable from my perspective and maybe from others to have a little time to vet this out and think through everything that is stated here. I mean there are some pretty harsh penalties that have been included in this statement and appropriately or inappropriately as you my feel, I just wish for an opportunity here for a little more time. That’s all I would be asking of the committee and if there were some additional input that maybe that could be brought to the committee.

President Peters: Professor Stephen:

J. Stephen: Mr. Parliamentarian, how do you suggest one make a motion to table this for reconsideration in a month’s period of time?
F. Bryan:  ???

J. Stephen: Is it acceptable to do it while the motion is on the floor?

President Peters: The inquiry was, and there’s no microphone there, was if we were to delay so that a consultation could take place, what would be the appropriate parliamentary approach and I think what I heard was a postponement to a specific date? It was a parliamentary question. Okay.

P. Henry: Before we do this, I just had one question that I wondered in terms of what kind of thing would require this supervising dean and so forth in the case of people who are already married if the husband and wife took a class from the other one, would this be something that would require the approval of the supervising dean?

L. Sons: Yes.

T. Bishop: That’s precisely the circumstance that we contemplated.

President Peters: All right. Buck?

J. Stephen: This would also cover students taking courses from their relative, things like that?

???: That’s a relationship that has a real potential or a perceived conflict of interest or bias. I’m not suggesting the naughty bits that this covers, I’m suggesting that there might be bias.

???: That is not what the first sentence says. It says relationships.

P. Stoddard: The second sentence is where it refers to romantic or sexual involvement. This document was originally intended to cover those issues; not nepotism issues although one could very appropriately suggest that those issues should be addressed in this policy or in a separate policy.

L. Sons: We do have a University Harassment Policy but that does not cover all of this and that was the discussion that was brought on that we should, in fact, write such a policy.

President Peters: What is your pleasure? We have a motion on the floor with a second.

J. Stephen: Move to postpone discussion until the next meeting of the University Council.

President Peters: There’s a motion to postpone until the next meeting which is April – in two weeks.

P. Stoddard: April 8. There is also a meeting on the 29. There are meetings on April 8 and April 29.
J. Stephen: If I have to specify a date, I’ll go with April 29 that should give the various vice presidents time.

President Peters: The motion is to postpone to the 29th. That gives more than two weeks to discuss. Is there a second? We got a second. Okay. There’s a question from Promod. Get a microphone.

P. Vohra: What is postponing it rather than tabling it because then we are not time bound. We can take it off the table when we are ready to discuss it.

J. Stephen: I think the people involved will have it done by the 29th of next month.

P. Vohra: But some of the other units may not have completed the discussions they want to have by that date.

President Peters: Does our parliamentarian have an opinion.

F. Bryan: Yes, typically to table something is an unspecified time and quite honestly in most of the literature it typically means to kill the measure. Postpone typically means to a specified time which was incorporated into a motion so it is appropriate and tabling requires two separate motions to bring something before; postpone means it goes directly to the agenda on the date specified. It’s just more efficient.

President Peters: That’s my understanding; that this comes back on the 29th. Nothing is required.

P. Vohra: So then what I’m saying is if people are not ready on the 29th to vote on the motion then can it be postponed further?

F. Bryan: It can be postponed again. Yes.

President Peters: Anne Kaplan?

A. Kaplan: ?

President Peters: Did everyone hear that? Is it clear that the people to whom we raise concerns – I understand that one reason for the postponement is that Dr. Williams wants to take it to his vast group for comment which includes HR and if I understand what my colleague was saying, is that you know this started out as student/faculty consensual and pretty soon got employee relations and that brings in HR so that makes some sense but some of these issues, I’m not sure. I don’t know if it’s on or not.

A. Kaplan: I don’t know if this is on or not. I just have two sort of related concerns about it in that I don’t know whether the paragraph that starts about exceptional circumstances is intended to deal with the many employees who become students when they exercise their educational benefits so there’s this kind of flip-flop of status sometimes that gets complicated and then, from
my own perspective, you know we have a lot of students in off-campus programs who are 35 or so and a policy that is as firm about their romantic involvements seems to be to be perhaps over-reaching.

**President Peters:** Terry?

**T. Bishop:** If I could speak to that. We studied more than a dozen – we are an outlier on our campus. We are one of the very few institutions that does not have a clear policy which prohibits faculty from having romantic – admittedly faculty – but employees of any sort should not have sexual or romantic relationships with a student who is reporting to them in an authority relationship. Period. Most corporations do. This is my area. Corporations are very clear in specifying that romantic relationships between supervisors and subordinates are really bad news and are a great opportunity for liabilities to be created. There’s also a huge area in the realm of public relations and that’s why our focus was on students, obviously not because of public relations, but clearly this is an area in which we are behind the times. Now I don’t think it’s necessarily such an urgent issue we have to pass it today but I would urge that this is something that, you know, we are not in sync with the rest of the world on.

**President Peters:** The motion on the floor is to postpone to the 29th and there was an inquiry and I think the answer is we direct all comments and questions to Linda’s committee and HR who is doing an implementation review and legal. Those are the people who finally have to come together to get this right. All right. All those in favor of the motion to postpone to the 29th say aye. Opposed? Abstain? The ayes have it.

The motion to postpone passed.

**President Peters:** Thank you Linda. I hope we didn’t hold you up too long. All right, now we go back to our other reports. We have a report from the BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee. Professor Stephen, you have a written report I think.

G. **Academic Policy Committee** – William Baker, Chair – report (Pages 5-8)

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

I. **Rules and Governance Committee** – David Wade, Chair - report – walk-in

**President Peters:** Now I think our next is I, rules and Governance. David Wade? Where are you David?

**D. Wade:** I’ll be discussing ---

**President Peters:** You’re hiding!

**D. Wade:** Only from you. It’s the item on the back of the walk-in packet. It’s the one paragraph, Bylaw 16.51. It appears as thought he existing Bylaw requires that the FAC rep to the IBHE be a member, an elected member, of the University Council. Apparently, we have not
followed this Bylaw in every case. Therefore, we are offering as a suggestion and I will move to approve this Bylaw change that changes the member of University Council to tenured faculty member which more accurately reflects current practice.

**President Peters:** All right, so that – you’ve moved that. Is there a second? Yup, there’s a second out there. Is this a Bylaw change for a first reading?

**D. Wade:** It is a Bylaw change, correct.

**F. Bryan:** He just said first reading. Is that what we want to do?

**D. Wade:** As Paul explained it to me, we were thinking about accelerating the process and trying to get a final vote on it today since it’s a relative uncontroversial matter.

**President Peters:** So we’d have to wave first reading. We’d have to have a vote on that.

???: And that requires a super majority?

**F. Bryan:** Right. Two-thirds vote to waive.

**D. Wade:** Do we need a motion to waive? So moved.

**President Peters:** All right, so we have a motion to waive first reading. Do we have a second? We have a second and it requires two-thirds? Discuss the motion. Yeah, Promod?

**P. Vohra:** I just have a question in the third to last line. When we say all tenured professors, is it all tenured faculty or the rank of full professor? What does that mean?

**D. Wade:** I would assume all professors who have tenure, associate and full.

**P. Vohra:** So the word should be faculty then and we include all three ranks then.

**D. Wade:** This is current language. We can certainly amend the current language again if you’d like. If you want faculty instead of professors I’ll accept that as a friendly amendment.

**President Peters:** All right and the reason is that its tenured members of the faculty irrespective of rank. Is that your point? Not full professors but it could be an associate professor. Is that what your point is? That has been accepted as a friendly amendment.

**P. Vohra:** Correct.

**President Peters:** All right. Now the motion on the floor is to wave first reading. All right? All those in favor of waiting first reading say aye. Opposed? All right. That sounds like two-thirds to me. All right. Now the main motion. Yeah?
Barbara ???: Another friendly amendment which is I think it is now the Faculty Advisory Council rather than the Faculty Advisory Committee.

President Peters: Correct. It’s not committee; it’s council. Is that accepted?

D. Wade: Absolutely.

President Peters: Okay. Other comments? Yes?

???: I’m wondering about the last line here the ex officio non-voting member if the representative is not otherwise an elected member of Faculty Senate and University Council they’ll serve in this capacity. Does that need any more clarification?

D. Wade: Actually, to be honest with you, I think it was utterly inconsistent and could be arguably inconsistent with the current language. With the amended language, it is now consistent.

???: Well, yeah, because that was already there.

D. Wade: It was a little weird before if you had to be an elected member of the University Council but if they’re not an elected member, you know, it didn’t make any sense. Now it does actually make sense.

President Peters: Where’s Jerry Zar when we need him?

D. Wade: Exactly. Where’s Jerry Zar when we need him?

President Peters: Are we straight now? Hearing no further questions or comments, all those in favor of this Bylaw change say aye. Opposed? We have that. All right.

The motion passed.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Is there any unfinished business?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

President Peters: Is there any new business?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS
XI. ADJOURNMENT

President Peters: We adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.