I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

J.Peters: Let me call the April 7th meeting of the University Council to order.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J.Peters: Our first item is to adopt the agenda. There are two walk-in items. Roman VI G and H under Rules and Governance and Resource Space there are two items in front of you. So is there a motion with those two walk-ins noted. Is there a motion to adopt. Earl. There is a second. All of those in favor say Aye. Okay.

The motion to accept the agenda was made by Earl Hansen and seconded by Pat Henry.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2010, MEETING MINUTES (to be sent electronically)

J.Peters: Now I know that all of you have electronically viewed, oh, no, you have viewed the electronic version of the minutes of March 17. I will call for additions or corrections. If not, a motion to approve. So moved. Is there a second.? All of those in favor of approval of the minutes of March 17 say “Aye.” Opposed?

The motion to pass the minutes was made by Pat Henry and seconded by Bobbie Cesarek. Motion passed.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
J.Peters: We have a really full agenda today, so my announcements will be pretty brief. I would like to announce Nancy Castle who asked for time to talk to us at the last meeting but was unavoidably doing something important I am sure. She sent me a nice note thinking I was mad at her. I wasn’t mad at her. Nancy, I am going to give you the floor while they are all in a good, happy mood.

A. Nancy Castle, True North

N. Castle: Great, thank you very much. Actually the reason I did not come last time was because I needed to start my comments to you all by saying, “by now, you should have received the letter…” and you wouldn’t have by the last meeting. By now you should have received the letter from Dan Gebo and Dave Changnon about the faculty fund. In their letter, they talk a little bit about the True North Campaign, and I am here to talk to you just a little bit more about it. The True North Campaign is the first really endowment comprehensive endowment campaign that NIU has undertaken in its history. We are in its final months, and in its final months it has turned its focus to two things. The scholarships and endowments on campus and, two, the campus community as people who could really contribute to these endowments and scholarships.

Your letter from Dan and Dave talked about the faulty fund. It also talked about the faculty and staff campaign. The slogan for this is a little kindness which is what really we are asking the campus community to exhibit is just little acts of kindness. The faculty and staff campaign is not about how much we give it is about how many of us give. We are asking for all of the full time faculty and staff make a contribution to the foundation to this effort.

There are a couple of points to keep in mind about this. One that is very important is that 100% of what you give will go to whatever it is that you designate along as it is not something that you have signature authority over. Then 0% will go to that. But if you have got …there are over 400 scholarships that are administered by the foundation if you have a topic you are interested in or a major or a topic, ask the dean of that college if there are specific scholarships you can contribute to that. You can contribute $10.

And that would be very helpful. The 931 full time faculty and staff who have contributed to date, we thank you. That gives us a 25% participation rate. We would really like for that to be a lot higher. I realize times are tough. I asked the president before if he was going to say things that would make you mad or sad and then turn it over to me. And so thank you for letting me go first. But even as you talk to the people in your department, your secretaries. The cost of a couple of Starbucks over a month is all really we are asking for. If you can do more, we love it. If you are looking for ways to give, if you go to the NIUI home page click on True North and when you get to the True North Home page, there is a little icon that says Faculty and Staff Campaign. If you click on that, there are stories of students who have succeeded due to various sources that come through the foundation. You can click there. There is a form you can download. You can make a one-time contribution and send it in. You can click there and make a contribution with a credit card. You can click there to allow payroll deduction that takes something out of one paycheck, every paycheck. Even $10.00 a month makes a big difference.
And I talk here coming from both sides. I came here as a junior and I received an NIU Alumni Scholarship, had I not received that scholarship, I could not have afforded to come to NIU. Back when Linda Sons was still here, I was a co-chair of the faculty fund campaign. I contributed in that way. I continue to contribute because we are what makes NIU good and continues to make NIU good.

So, please, if you would think of making a contribution, a one-time contribution, a many time contribution, but please participate in the faculty staff campaign so we can end up a True North Campaign worth well over $153,000,000.

J.Peters: Yes, Bobbie.

B.Cesarek: Nancy, I wonder if that letter went out to the entire community or faculty only. I don’t know that we have received it from SPS or Operating Staff.

N.Castle: That’s a good question. It is the faculty fund letter so I am guessing that it went to just the faculty. Is there any staff in here who did not get it? So, many of you have not received the letter from Dan And Dave, but if you go to the NIU home page, go to True North, go to Faculty and Staff, it would be appreciated by everybody.

B.Cesarek: We have an SPS Council Meeting tomorrow. I will be sure to mention it.

N.Castle: And SPS, you all have really organized some efforts on your own part to contribute to True North. You are doing great. Thanks.

J.Peters: Okay, any other questions? I thank Nancy for doing that this year. We are ending the True North Campaign, our first ever capital campaign. Actually, we are at about $159,000,000 today.

What is amazing about that is that the first time we started this, we were going to announce. I went down Sycamore Road to a bank building, I think Eddie, I think you were there. You were not with us yet, Ray. But we were going to planning to announce, I don’t know if it was True North, it was some campaign, we were going to launch it and of course it was 9/11, the morning of 9/11. We turned on the TV screens and the twin towers were going down. So, we immediately cancelled the meeting and cancelled the capital campaign and put it off for a couple of years. But it is really amazing that we have had such tremendous success and support, donors from the family campaign I think given the times has been a tremendous effort and we are going to be ending it in June and then we will have some celebrations, appropriate small celebrations next year for that money is working on scholarships and other activities. And of course we will take a break, catch a breath and we will run another capital campaign. Because that is the nature for higher education. We need private funding. And we have a good base now and know what we are doing. Thank you, Nancy, for doing that.

My remarks are going to be brief. Let’s just say that I have not much to add to what I said last week. It is pretty detailed and up to date. The legislature is not in session this last week or this week so we are safe. And it is a kind of a quiet before the final legislative push and there is no
feeling out there is that there is going to be an early adjournment, May 7, with whatever budget they pass. Last year, remember, they passed half a budget, six-month budget, we don’t know, but we have taken the kind of decisions that are prudent decisions and best evidence that we have on what we think the fiscal ’11 budget is going to be. We made some decisions last week that we will put into effect that will be depending on what we hear from the state, and I am comfortable that we have done all we can do to prepare and that we continue to do that. And that is the best thing we can do right now. And the fact of the matter is as we sit here that we do not have a budget problem. We have a payment problem. It is a cash flow problem. Our budget has not been ridiculously slashed. It is just that they have not paid us anything.

What are we at 38-35%? What is our percent? It is about 55%, and we are owed about $55,000,000 and whether or not we get any more payments, we just don’t know. We have communicated everything to you that we have done. You may be interested to know by the way, I got some website statistics this morning on our budget website. That website, I’ve just got a little button, not the home page of NIU, as of two days ago, that website since it went up has had over 5,000 hits. It is kind of interesting. And of the subsections, guess which link got the highest number of hits? No. We have no rumors around here, we only have truth. Pension reform. 1718 hits. There are probably more today. This was through last Friday. Rumors and Questions, 1551. However, Responses to rumors and questions, only 637.

I thought yup, it’s the university, okay. I have to say that the questions are profound and sensible, nothing goofy, nothing like you would read in a blog which we don’t need. But real sensible, practical NIU questions and also some profound ones. And if you look at it, you can see some of the answers we are producing. We are cutting, grouping questions and so you know that is something you should continually monitor.

Of course, I had wanted to read to you the ten questions that I won’t and rumors that we won’t have answers to. There is nothing that has been outlandish.

Okay, let me see. My budget message of March 10 got over 1,000 hits and I had about 1,000 hits about my presidential email. So that is something, when you think about that, there must be a core of about 1000 people out there who are poised at their computer to read this stuff, or maybe it is the local journalists. We are trying to communicate in every way we can and do rumor busting. It really does help us to get those questions because there are some things that we really did not quite anticipate. We can get out there and get the right information. I appreciate that and we are going to continue to do that. It is a good place to go to get up-to-date accurate information.

Since I talked to you last, we did have our senate appropriation hearings. I discussed that in my letter. It was pretty frustrating. We went down, was it last Wednesday or two Wednesdays ago, I can’t remember now, two Wednesdays ago. I took three or four people which we need to do because of questions and we were all going to go, all of the presidents were going to go at about 4:00 pm which is the way the senate always does this, you never know, when you get out of there it could be midnight. But we are all ready to go, and they came on and said “never mind. We are cancelling tonight, sorry. Be here at 8:00 am tomorrow morning.” Brian Hemphill is shaking his head, because the president was behaving badly. I was angry and if you have never seen me angry, it is not something you want to see. I was pretty angry and Dr. Williams started
to pray and the provost walked away. But anyway, it was alright because you know the reason, pension bill. And so everyone went home but me. I sent everybody home. I figured they could face me in the morning. And I observed the legislative process, being interested in that sort of stuff professionally, the way that pension bill went through. It was the fastest thing I had ever seen and with a lot of bi-partisan smiles. And so the next morning, we had our hearings and they are all sympathetic about the cash flow, but nothing much was done about it, could be done about it from their perspective, but they are sympathetic.

So anyway, that happened. And then this week we had, yesterday was the IBHE meetings and there wasn’t that much on the agenda. The public presidents and chancellors talked and compared notes about the status of things and we are all in about the same boat.

That is my report. There is not much going on in the budget. We will begin to monitor it again next week, and we will keep you informed.

Saying that, now this is the most productive time of year for us, for all of you. This is the time when we have all of our graduation ceremonies and academic honors and celebrations. I know our calendar is full-up with faculty awardees and staff award receptions and dinners are taking place and annual alumni event where we bring back distinguished scholars. Liberal arts is closing out its fiftieth year anniversary. That is the longest anniversary party I have ever known. It has gone on for months. And so, my thinking is…and then it culminates with our graduation ceremonies – graduate and then the three undergraduate. And, you know, whenever I get down I think about that. I think about all of the good things we do here and the graduates, the good education, all of the good research we do, service to our community, and I get real proud that at least there is one institution. I kind of feel that way about all of the public universities. I think they are institutions that the local community and the state should be proud of us. We are doing what is expected of us despite the tough times.

With that, should we move into what is a pretty busy agenda? Any questions? I don’t want to cut the questions off. Rumors and questions? Alright, very good.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

J.Peters: There is no consent agenda.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES.

J.Peters: Reports? Earl? Six A, the Faculty Advisory Council of the IBHE. I saw you there yesterday.

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – report (pp 3-7)

E. Hansen: I saw you there too. And I am glad to say that our meetings are much more fruitful and exciting than most of the IBHE meetings.

J.Peters: That’s a hard one.
**E. Hanson:** I am being kind. The memo that you have in here is basically taken from the notes of the meeting that I did not attend at the University of Illinois Champaign. I did not go to that particular meeting, and it’s pretty self-explanatory. It is the same old dog that is barking – that we don’t have any money and a play on U of I’s take on this thing in this particular memo.

I regress from that and go back to the meeting. When we met with the IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee, they told us that we are the largest contingency of any advisory group that they have ever had. We had a full house, and the discussions were relevant to us here. One member there was asking about the funding situation and asked if anybody in the audience would raise their hand if they thought they could cure the budget problem without raising the state income tax. Not one hand went up. There is an issue with the legislature, and that is the next topic that was brought up. How do we as faculty and administration and staff of universities get the attention of parents so parents can talk to their representatives? Not us per se, but the parents. It is extremely important that the parents understand that we are going down the dumper in regards to funding in this state if we don’t get some funding done.

Higher education is more than just the professor standing in the classroom. It is research, it’s business, it’s the economy. I think John, in your letter to us you mention a loss of $11,000,000 in revenue to the DeKalb area. That is devastating to communities like DeKalb or Carbondale or McComb, Charleston, any place like that that does not have a base besides the academic.

I raised the question, how are we as academicians to tell our students that they should go back to their parents and talk to the legislators regarding funding. Was this something that would be appropriate to do as faculty members? And that was hashed around a while and no one came to an answer to that. I honestly think that we as a faculty group should give this some strong consideration. I know that the advisory committee is going to put together a point letter of the points. We have to give somebody something if they are going to talk to a legislator. But it is imperative that the citizens of this state talk to their representatives about the funding issue in the state universities and in the private schools. I mean, it affects us too, but it also affects the private institutions.

**J. Peters:** Okay, that is your report.

**E. Hansen:** In a nutshell. That’s it.

**J. Peters:** Okay. Questions?

**P. Henry:** In terms of communicating with students, rather than having faculty communicate with students in our class, is there some way we can organize talking to student groups? The power availed us in a class is not great for that sort of stuff, but if we talk or had some sort of piece in the Northern Star as well, although I think they have been covering this thing quite well.

**E. Hansen:** The question is an excellent question. That’s what we discussed and we did it with maps. We didn’t do it with MAP the students did it with MAP. Simply because they saw that they were not going to get funding. They were being told they were not going to get funding for
six months. We are not telling them anything like that. We are not announcing anything that is going on. And I am with you. I’ve got a student organization that I can talk to and I am sure everyone else here has one also.

**J.Peters:** Let’s try the bigger context here. There is a broad coalition, a higher education coalition that is holding a lobby day, April 21 in Springfield, and that is a broad based group of all of the various sectors of higher ed. And then the day after that on the 22nd and Rob is here they may know more about that than I do, and Brian, that is a collegiate student lobby day. I don’t know if that is a Wednesday or a Thursday, I don’t know which, and I think we are sending a bus down. And, Earl, you are right. That would be very effective. U of I is having a lobby day on the 21st. We already had our lobby day. And so the students will be going down and of course, our students are pretty well organized, they’ve got their messages. You know who you are going to contact, what doors are going to be knocked on. That is extremely effective. They have the messages. But knowing that their faculties are supportive to them is extremely important. And that the quality of their education is directly reflected in your own perceptions about how the university is funded.

Rob do you want to add anything to that or Brian?

**R.Sorsby:** Yes, we have been working with the student organizations and student groups on campus to get more students to come down. We had a pretty good turnout for the MAP Grant and we are looking for an even bigger turnout of students to go down to Springfield with us.

**J.Peters:** Alright. Okay? And Alan, on behalf of the Faculty Senate sent a letter. This is the most important thing. Maybe it is symbolic. But it is extremely important. Often times you hear, and this is not any specific legislative action, this is in general, you will hear this comment, “why we haven’t heard from any presidents” or “we haven’t heard from any faculty.” Or “we haven’t heard from any students.” So it is important that you get on the record just like our faculty senate is on the record Our students are going to be on the record. I’m on the record. I am the record. And so I know in a large part it may be symbolic, but you have to be there, and you have to make your case, and it has to be recorded that you make your case. And keep on making the case, because legislators need constant re-education. It is just in the nature of them. Every issue needs to reeducate them and restate your case, or you are off the table. Yea?

**K. Freeman:** It might not seem appropriate to raise this issue in classes but I would argue against that idea. I think that every subject area in a university, issue of leadership in that discipline and in general should be addressed. And this form my perspective is a question of leadership. And also democratic participation should be an issue in any subject area at any institution and this is about participatory activity. So I don’t really see this as highly problematic if it is couched in the right way.

**J.Peters:** Alright. Alan?

**A. Rosenbaum:** At a couple of the faculty groups that I have spoken to it became apparent that a lot of faculty members aren’t actually contacting their representative either which surprised me a
little. It’s not only getting students to do it but also getting the faculty to call their representatives as citizens and I don’t know how many of us are actually doing this.

E.Hansen: What was discussed at the luncheon was a need for people that are contacting their representatives, make sure that you vote. Because they are going to go back in and check your name to see if you actually are voting before they pay attention to you. That’s what I heard from members that deal with the people in Springfield.

J.Peters: I also see a group that made any campaign contributions.

R.Alden: IBHE made very clear to us which is even more basic than vote, which I am sure is very important, but, do you know who your representative is and when you communicate by email or letter, give your home address so that a staffer, often the first level of screening is – is this truly one of my constituents – if it is not, even if you put your name it goes in the trash can because you are not really considered a constituent until it is confirmed that you are really in that district.

J.Peters: And just remember that you have all taken and passed the state ethics test. And you are all well schooled about this sort of activity and when you can do it and what resources you can use. In other words, use your own.

P.Henry: I have always been a little confused as to whether to identify myself as a faculty member writing on my own stationery with my own stamp, because there are certain things that I know about this because I am a faculty member.

J.Peters: You are a citizen, but you are also a faculty member. Well, this could get us, on gosh, if we start getting into this.

E.Hansen: You are also a state employee. That kind of shuffles us off to the side.

J.Peters: If you have any questions about what you are doing, because everything should be done properly and has become a fine art, call Ken Zender, our state lobbyist and check if you want to do anything like this. At any rate, there is some organized activities going on. Our students are involved on the 22nd. Earl, you really stirred something up there with that report.

E.Hansen: That’s not my nature.

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

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Gregory Waas – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Bobbie Cesarek – no report
K. Thu: The Academic Policy Committee was given the charge of reviewing Section 2, Item 14 of the APPM which is the Student Evaluation of Instruction Section. We are required to review that section every five years. So the committee met and the first thing we did was to insert the language from the resolution that was passed by the University Council last spring. As many of you will remember, last spring we unanimously adopted a resolution which allowed for the voluntary use of electronic or on-line student evaluations of instruction. So we inserted that language, if you turn to page 10 and 11, that actually has that section. We inserted that language into number 3, administering and procedures. It reads, “On-line student evaluation of courses is permitted but not mandatory.” So that is the last sentence in Section 3, Administering Procedures. And then, as we did that, the committee recognized that the rest of the narrative in this section was paper centric. It sounds as though allowing for electronic evaluation, but the other text only refers to paper evaluations. So we went through and we altered the language to make clear that both electronic and paper evaluations are appropriate.

So you can see where those changes have been made on page 10 to 11. So our committee then recommends the adoption of those changes by the UC.

K. Thu: That’s my understanding. So I will move to approve.


The motion was made by Kendall Thu and seconded by Carol Thompson.

K. Thu: The second thing that we examined was the issue of developing a standardized question that would be used across departments, across campus, across divisions; this is something we discussed in the past. In response to that question, we actually sent out a survey to all departments, division and college heads to see what kind of questions they are posing to have at least one general evaluation question. The raw results of that survey are listed on pages 13 to whatever, 13-18. I thought folks would be interested to see how we are doing that.

We got 23 responses out of 44 questionnaires basically. And the results indicate that we are all doing a very good job in terms of actually fulfilling our requirement to have students generally evaluate the course and the teaching. But, as you can see if you sift through he way each department does it, it does vary. And so it was unclear to us, what if any standardized question
we could use. In addition to the fact that it raised a number of questions as to what kind of general question would be valid empirically to capture the range of diversity in courses and topics. We did not have an expertise really, in our committee to figure out what sort of question or questions would be viable.

We are suggesting that next year’s Academic Policy Committee perhaps could take that up or perhaps get better expertise and better data on whether one or more standardized question would serve this propose across campus.

That ends our report and we need to recommend that this report fills the obligation for a five-year review.

A. Rosenbaum: Kendall, are you making, are you going to make a motion that this be sent to academic affairs for further consideration or are you suggesting that if we want to, we should just think about that next year.

K. Thu: Personally, I am just suggesting that if you want to it could be given to next year’s Academic Policy Committee.

J. Peters: All right. So we voted, right? We are done? We’ve approved it. All right.

A. Rosenbaum: You are not moving that we do that.

K. Thu: Unless some of my committee members feel otherwise.

A. Rosenbaum: I just wanted to clarify.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Barbara Chair – report

J. Peters: Shall we move on? Roman 6 G, Resources Space and Budget Committee, Barbara, I know you are here.

B. Jaffee: You have my report as a walk-in. It is brief enough that you can take a look at it now and you can answer any questions you have about it.

J. Peters: The questions about Space, Resource, Budgets to Barbara. Who is on your committee?

B. Jaffee: There are four members from University Council, four members from Faculty Senate. There is an appointed member from the Council of Deans and Dr. Williams is ex-officio.

J. Peters: Thank you for that report.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Rebecca Butler – report

1. Bylaw 8 – Sabbatical Leave Policy changes
**J.Peters**: And now, we are on VI. H. – two related resolutions. This is just a little complicated and Alan is going to help us out. From Rules and Governance, one requires a change in Article 8 of the Bylaws of the Sabbatical Policy. And that is a first reading and a second reading is required on that one.

The other is a parallel recommendation to the Graduate Council regarding research and artistry grants that does not require a second reading. And can be voted on today. So, do you want to add anything to that, Alan?

**A. Rosenbaum**: Only that this comes out of the Faculty Senate motion last year. And the Faculty Senate raised some concerns that the ordering of sabbatical leave requests and also research and artistry grants at the department level was not always respected at higher levels in the university and so the Faculty Senate made the resolution that the department ordering of applications in those areas be maintained and if they are not, that the reasons for changing the order be both to the department and the faculty member. This was approved by the Faculty Senate. It was then sent to the University Council. The Sabbatical Leave Policy is one of the bylaws and so it requires a bylaw change. Only the council can do that. And so Rebecca Butler is the chair of our Rules and Governance and she will talk to us about the issue and what is being recommended.

**R. Butler**: It is your thicker walk-in as you can see and the original Sabbatical Leave Policy for the college and for the university are on page 2. And you can see on page one that we have inserted a statement and it is essentially the same statement for both the college and for the university that any changes in the ranking that do affect the funding of sabbatical leaves should be explained to the affected department applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons. So this would be if the college made a change, they would need to explain why they made a change in ranking and the same would be on the university level. And this is a first reading for these two portions.

Then on page 3, you will see a third piece that we could vote on today which is and this addresses research and artistry grants. It is the same sort of statement. Again this all came up from Faculty Senate last year, last spring. And again, this one is only a recommendation because we cannot tell the Graduate School what to do, basically.

**J.Peters**: So, how do you want, should we, are these three separate votes or should we consider as one the Sabbatical Leave Policy Statement for college and University?

**R. Butler**: I think those could be considered together, but that would be first reading. But we could vote on the recommendation to the Graduate School. We could do that today, but the other is a first reading.

**J.Peters**: So we have a first reading. Now we need to have a motion for the artistry grant change of language. Do we have to vote on a first reading?

**R. Butler**: No, are there any questions I guesss? We don’t need to vote?
A. Rosenbaum: We need a motion.

J. Peters: No, it is a first reading. But we do have time for questions. Barbara.

B. Jaffee: This is for college and university. And this has to do with the phrase, “Changes that affect the funding.” I am just wondering about that a little bit. I seem to remember in earlier discussions that it was just changes in departmental rankings. And my questions about why “changes that affect the funding” was included here has to do with the fact that that is several steps removed. Rankings could be changed at the college but we would not know if it affected funding until it goes through University Council. It would be hard to reconstruct what had happened once it went a couple of steps done the road.

R. Butler: You know, I honestly can’t explain that, that is the way we have been playing around with it and no one has said anything until now. So…

P. Henry: Sometimes we don’t know about funding until conservable time has passed and the timely fashion about informing when the changes were made would kind of be lost I think.

A. Rosenbaum: Change to ranking? Would that be a friend amendment?

R. Butler: I think we could if everyone, you know…so changes in ranking that would affect sabbatical leave.

K. Thu: Something along those lines.

R. Butler: umm… shall I read it off again?

J. Peters: Yea. I am hearing a, is somebody going to make an editorial suggestion that we drop “that affects the funding”?

C. Garcia: The granting of the sabbatical leave.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s the same thing.

J. Peters: What you are really after here, I guess, reading this from being completely ignorant of all of these discussions that took place is if someone in the higher review changes departmental rankings irrespective of funding or anything else, an explanation is needed. That’s what you meant?

R. Butler: How about this…”Any changes in department ranking that affect sabbatical leaves shall be explained in writing” and then go on the same way?

J. Peters: You’re not going to affect it. It is just changes in the ranking. Ray? Provost step up here.

R. Alden: Could I make a friendly amendment and just drop, “that affects the funding?”
R. Butler: But you want the ranking of the sabbatical leave in there, correct?

R. Alden: Yes.

R. Butler: Okay, that’s what I thought.

J. Peters: Does everyone understand? Is that a friendly amendment accepted.

R. Butler: Amy changes in departmental ranking that affect, no wait, in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave shall be explained in writing to the affected department. Go on now.

A. Rosenbaum: Just one more question. Do you want to say sabbatical leaves or sabbatical leave applications?

J. Peters: Yes.

A. Rosenbaum: Applications?

R. Butler: That’s true, so applications. Okay, let me try it again. “any changes in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave applications shall be explained in writing to the affected department and applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons given for the ranking changes.” Is that okay?

J. Peters: And the same would be true of the university statement. And this is a first reading.

R. Butler: Yes.

J. Peters: and this is a first reading so that will go back to your committee for brushing up.

R. Butler: And then the third, we don’t have to do anything else on that.

J. Peters: Are there any more questions about this particular…

P. Vohra: I just have a clarification. Does it only apply to college council in terms of providing the feedback or does it also apply to UCPC if they change the ranking?

R. Butler: Right, there is one for the college and the one for the university, so yes, it would apply to both.

J. Peters: Does that answer your question, Promod?

R. Butler: Okay, so the second part would be on page 3 and again we will get this, the committee will look at this again and we will bring it back next month for the next meeting. But would be the Research and Artistry Grant statement and again we have got “effects the funding.”
J.Peters: We do not need a second reading on this piece.

R.Butler: We do not. This is a recommendation only.

J.Peters: So we could fix up the language and vote on it and send it.

R.Butler: Yes.

J.Peters: So why don’t we do that?

B.Jaffee: There is a word in here where it doesn’t belong.

R. Butler: Oh, there is. “Departments and applicants in a timely manner given the specific reasons given for the ranking changes.

J.Peters: Alright, so is there a motion to approve, which means it is sent to the Graduate Council. We don’t need a second reading? A second. All right. Discussion. Terry.

The motion was made by Jeff Kowalski, the second was by Carol Thompson.

T.Bishop: I am wondering of the appropriateness that if we don’t approve of this out our next meeting, asking them to change it. I guess I would suggest that we make it contingent upon, take action next meeting and then if we approve it in our own language that we have some authority over it. Then we could ask for consistency. I just offer that as a thought.

J.Peters: Well, it’s awfully rash.

T.Bishop: Wow, there’s a first.

R.Butler: So you are saying…

J.Peters: I have a thought, Mr. Parliamentarian, can we wave on the first set, can we wave second reading on the first set of changes and this is just a parliamentary question. You vote. I don’t. We can waive the waiting period by ¾ vote. But now we would also have to reconsider. No? We wouldn’t have to reconsider. So being rational we could waive second reading. Move to approve, and if that is approved then Terry Bishop is happy.

P.Henry: The thing with the Graduate Council on the floor, have we voted on page 3?

J.Peters: Right now, we have that on the floor. You could go ahead and vote.

J.Kowalski: I move we waive the first reading for this item.

J.Peters: Second reading.

J.Kowalski: Second reading.
J. Peters: We waived the second. Now we are back to the… wait a minute, we have a motion on the floor for the Graduate School, right?

R. Butler: I think we do. Could we do one and then do the other? That would be great.

J. Peters: Well, I am saying, there is a parliamentary… We have a motion on the floor and a second on sending this to the Graduate Council.

R. Butler: Right.

C. Thompson: I guess…

J. Peters: Point of order.

C. Thompson: The comment that sort of we wanted to make all of these parallel, although I think is logical, they are dealing with different things. One is dealing with research and artistry grants and one is the sabbatical, so let’s say in the worst case for some reason the first one on the sabbatical we ended up not deciding to do but we decided that we would like to recommend to UCPC, I don’t see the problem that we treat them separately, they are on different items.

J. Peters: We have a motion on the floor to second. Further discussion.

Motion made by Rebecca Butler and seconded by Pat Henry.

J. Peters: Do we know what we are voting on now? We are voting on the research and artistry send to the first reading.

R. Butler: No, it would just be sent to them.

J. Peters: No, first reading, it goes.

R. Butler: There is no first reading for research and artistry. It is just a recommendation, so it would just go to the Graduate School.

J. Peters: There is no second reading.

R. Butler: Yea.

J. Peters: Are we clear about what we are doing? Alright. All of those in favor say, “aye.” Opposed? Okay. Now a motion to waive second reading on the first set has been made. Is there a second? 

The motion was made by Jeff Kowalski and seconded by Barbara Burrell.

R. Butler: So I could make.
J.Peters: We waived it, so that means.

R. Butler: So now we can vote.

A.Rosenbaum: Now we need a motion.

R. Butler: That’s what I thought. So one of us can make a motion. I move then that we accept this as we reworded it.

J. Peters: As you edited it.

R. Butler: As it was edited.

J. Peters: Alright. And you should probably read it again.

R. Butler: Okay. And I will, okay, it is,”any changes in departmental ranking of sabbatical leave application shall be explained shall be explained in writing to the effected department and applicants in a timely manner with specific reasons given for the ranking changes.” That would be both for the college, Article 8, Sabbatical Leave Policy, and also for the university which is also Article 8.


Motion made by Rebecca Butler and seconded by Barbara Burrell.

J. Peters: All those in favor say, “aye.” Opposed? Abstentions? We did it. Alright. Good work. Let me see where we are.

I. University Affairs committee – Carol Thompson, Chair – report (p 19)

J. Peters: Is there, Carol Thompson. University Affairs Committee and something extremely important. We have to set the calendar for 2019-and 2020. For all of those who will be here…where is Carol. Go ahead.

C. Thompson: The University Affairs Subcommittee, we shall advise University Council on questions involving internal matters, blah, blah, blah, such as the university calendar. It came to us, you have already approved the University Council, up though 2019, and you have before you the calendar for 2019-2020. Our committee met and looked at this and we said yes to the calendar and it follows pretty much what we have been doing recently and we recommend that we approve the calendar for 2019-2020 as shown.

J. Peters: So I take that as a motion to approve the academic calendar for 2020. Is there a second? Alright discussion. All those in favor say, “aye.” Opposed? All right.
Motion to accept the calendar made by C. Thompson, seconded by P. Henry.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

J. Peters: Is there any unfinished business to come before the house?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

J. Peters: Any new business you would like to bring up?

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

J. Peters: Before comments I would like to draw your attention to the Academic Planning Council Committee Minutes of February 22. These are posted on the website. Anything for the good of the order?

A. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, February 22, 2010

XI. ADJOURNMENT

J. Peters: Motion to adjourn? Second? We are adjourned.

The motion to adjourn was made by Khan Mohabbat seconded by Pat Herny.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.