UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2010, 3 P.M.
CLARA SPERLING SKY ROOM

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council website under University Council under Agendas, Meetings & Transcripts.

Attendance records are unavailable.

I. CALL TO ORDER

J.Peters: called the last University Council meeting of the year to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J.Peters: We have two walk-in items. The first is Roman VII. G. That is a walk-in report from Resource, Space and Budgets. And the second is a copy of a memo from James Erman that goes under Information Roman XI. G. and has to do with online evaluation questions. The motion to accept the agenda with the additions was made by Kowalski, seconded by Bowman and passed without dissent.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2010 University Council meeting (sent electronically)

The motion to accept the minutes was made by K.Thu, seconded by R.Sorsby and passed without corrections or comments.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

J.Peters: We must move into executive session for the purpose of receiving the evaluation report on the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council. This requires a 2/3 vote of the University Council, and if that 2/3 vote is achieved; we ask the non-voting to be excused. The motion to go into executive session was made by P.Henry, seconded by B.Cesarek. It passed without dissent and the Council entered executive session.

The meeting reconvened at 3:18 p.m.

V. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Recognition of University Council members whose terms are completed, re-elected, and newly elected.

**J.Peters:** This is the point of the year and the point in the program where we recognize University Council members whose terms are completed, those who have been re-elected, and those who are newly elected. President Peters thanked those whose terms have been completed: Rick Ridnour, Clarsida Garcia, Dan Schneider Maryline Lukacher, Barbara Burrell, William Baker, Carol Thompson, and Doug Boughton, and asked for a round of applause. Cliff Mirman from Engineering Technology has been re-elected.

**J.Peters:** Read the list of newly elected members: Chih-Chen Lee, William Pitney, Kathy Coles, Sue Willis, Carl Von Ende, Brad Sagarin, J.D. Bowers, Jim Corwin, and Rebecca Houze.

**J.Peters:** Noted that this is the last Council meeting for Bobbie Cesarek who is retiring from the University. Thank you, Bobbie, for representing your constituents so well.

**J.Peters:** Reported that not much has changed with the budget. We will be talking about some issues tomorrow with regard to the budget and some housing issues. So, I am not going to say too much about that except to say that the beat keeps moving on. Today we received a payment of $2,581,042, but, as an enterprising law student has posted on the parking garage, $44,618,341 is owed to us by the State of Illinois. I spent the last 36 hours on executive committee of NCAA picking a new president and ratifying the CBS/Turner. The new choice for president is Mark Emert who I know very well and who is president of the University of Washington. He has had to cut 33% of his general revenue base from his budget in Washington. We have been cut more than that, but he is talking about a permanent cut. Hopefully, our base is still the same. You hear horror stories about that so everyone is shell-shocked and thinking about ways of accommodating this, and there are no easy answers. We have made it through the year; I want to thank everybody. This is a great place we have, with great people, and to be able to make it through the year is just a tribute to all of you. To run a university not getting your state appropriations and keeping payroll and not laying anyone off and come a couple of weeks have 2,000 graduates walk across the stage and get their degree, that is really a great accomplishment and it speaks to our core values. Next year we are going to have a similar challenge. There is no indication that we are going to have a full budget. There is still talk of ending the session on May 6 with a patched-up budget, borrowing and delaying things to next year. There are still issues. The borrowing bill is not yet passed; not that I am excited about a borrowing bill, but if we need it, we need it. But faculty keep winning awards, and doing research and doing good teaching and our students, actually a lot of them, are getting jobs. You are not going to have a recovery that is jobless. And so, I am very thankful for that and all that you do.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE - Earl Hansen – report (pp. 3-5)

**J.Peters:** Earl is not here but he has a report on pages 3-5.
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

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Kendall Thu, Chair – no report

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

**B. Jaffee:** I’ll just point out that the committee met with the provost and president on April 15 which we were very pleased to be able to do; something that the committee is mandated to do constitutionally and which I don’t think has happened in recent memory. It was a very productive meeting. President Peters encouraged the committee to take an active role in the process of building the internal budget which begins in late summer, early fall and which we will be happy to do with the assistance of Dr. Williams. We also discussed, in general terms, the kinds of priorities, I call them imperatives here, that shape the internal budgeting process, and this is how I summarize them: the need to serve students well, the need to enhance the university’s impact and reputation, and the need to diversify the university’s income streams. It seems to me, and in discussion with the committee, there was general agreement that it certainly is possible to agree in principle with these imperatives while differing on how best to implement them. Most obviously to me, the need to serve students well, is something we all want to do, but there are some questions as how best to do this. The committee would like to create some mechanism for soliciting faculty input and gauging faculty priorities that will help us to both communicate to upper administration and to advise in the budget building process as we are required to do. And what we have agreed as a committee is to create some kind of survey or questionnaire to be circulated to members of Faculty Senate, where there is the largest faculty representation, at least once a semester.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Rebecca Butler, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Carol Thompson, Chair – report

**C. Thompson:** I am reporting on the conclusion of some of our work for this year. We were charged with reviewing the proposed collegiality policy and also the nepotism policy. Our charge with the collegiality policy was brought up at the end of last year and was inadvertently forgotten, but we have begun to work on it. Our charge was to review the policy to make sure it was fair and equitable and to decide where it should be placed within university documents and to examine the addendum applied to students. We were also charged with looking at the nepotism policy to compare it with other university’s policies to see if it was okay or could be
improved. As part of this work, the committee collected and reviewed the nepotism policies in all of the Illinois state universities and a variety of other state universities; about 39 universities in all. We commented on each of these, in our internal work we are commenting on each of these policies in comparison to the NIU policies. We had quite a few thoughtful and heated discussions for both of these. While we did not come to a point where we can place any final recommendations in front of the University Council, the summary of these discussions, as well as additional relevant points that are part of the discussions that were expressed within the committee, will be forwarded to the committee for next year. So we wanted to give this verbal report again specifically to assure people that both of these issues will not be dropped as the committee changes for next year. In summary, although we did not bring these issues to a satisfactory conclusion to be brought before here, we do assure you that these issues are important to us and that they received much attention this last year and that they will be part of the UA charge in the next year.

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – A.Gupta, Chair J. Brubaker substituted for A.Gupta.

1. University Council confirmation of election of 2010 – 2011 Executive Secretary of University Council

**J.Brubaker:** I am a member of the Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee. Professor Gupta who is the chair of this committee couldn’t be here today, so he asked me to read this motion:

Pursuant to Article 3.2 of our Constitution and Article 2.1, of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, I am pleased to offer for election to the office of Executive Secretary to the University Council, Professor Alan Rosenbaum. I would like to make a motion to accept his nomination and close the nominations and to unanimously approve his election to this position.

Motion to confirm the election of Alan Rosenbaum to the position of Executive Secretary of the University Council was made by **J.Brubaker** and seconded by both **P.Henry** and **W.Baker**. **A.Rosenbaum** was elected without dissent.

**VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

**X. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**XI. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Distance Learning E-Course Intellectual Property Ownership **Agreement** (p. 6)

**J.Peters:** The distance learning e-course Intellectual Property Ownership Agreement comes to us from Jim Erman who can explain it if necessary. It is not a policy change. It reflects current policy.
J.Erman: The Intellectual Property Committee was asked to generate a simple template for faculty members to understand the copyright issues associated with developing online courses. We had a subcommittee that was chaired by Rebecca Butler who has worked on this for almost the entire year. It has gone through many iterations; she has worked with the e-learning division and Outreach as well as other individuals. It has passed through Legal Services to make sure it complies with all legal requirements and, basically, it is a template which considers four of the most likely situations, and faculty members who are developing online courses should consult with this before going too far into the work. If you are working with other individuals or other parties, there can be the question of shared ownership. They should have that decided up front before you put too much work into your courses. I probably would defer any questions to Rebecca since she can tell you more about the working of the subcommittee that developed this policy. Our current thinking is that this form will be placed on the website of the Technology Transfer Office and it is a living document and we will work with it and see if it handles all situations. It is subject to modification if situations arise. We are also thinking of putting in frequently asked questions associated with the template and perhaps examples of how it can be used for the various situations.

J.Peters: So, again, this is an information item. Hopefully is helpful for faculty who get involved in these sorts of things. Well, thank you, Rebecca and Jim.

B. Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, March 22, 2010
C. Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting minutes, September 3, 2009
D. Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting minutes, October 1, 2009
E. Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting minutes, February 4, 2010
F. Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting minutes, March 4, 2010
G. Student Evaluation of Instruction – Common Question – Memo

J.Peters: I am going to ask Provost Ray Alden to introduce and explain our final item. It’s the universal question to be added to Student Evaluation of Instruction.

R. Alden: This particular issue came up when we had a Dean’s Council meeting talking about evaluation of online courses and, during that discussion, someone brought up the fact that APPM requires a consistent question, one question about teaching effectiveness to be asked in all courses, both online and in person. I asked a committee representing the UCC and the Graduate Council to come up with what that question or series of questions should be. Obviously, it says at least one. It could have been a multiple series or hierarchical things that built on each other, but I gather that the joint group met a number of times, discussed this, and came up with a single question. I will let Jim answer any questions about it since he was working with that group but, basically, the question that needs to be in everybody’s student evaluation form is, “What is your rating of the instructor’s teaching effectiveness?” Since this is required by policy and yet, going around the table, it sounds like many of the colleges were already doing this but at least some had departments that they did not believe that was the case, I wanted to bring it before this group as an information item to make sure that it is on the record. We do need to have this question and, of course, we will share this with Dean’s Council to make sure that the next time student
evaluations go out, that we include this whether the student evaluations are online or written. This is just to try and reinforce the practice of having a common question across the university.

**K.Thu:** Kendall Thu from Anthropology. As you know, Provost Alden, the Academic Policy Committee had taken this up as part of our charge this past year, and we were unaware that there was another committee working on the same thing. And I just wanted to clarify that the APPM section that is being alluded to does, in fact, say that all evaluations should have a general evaluation of instruction question; however, it does not say that it has to be the same question on all of the evaluation forms. So what we did as part of our charge was to solicit those actual evaluation tools that we handed over at the last meeting and we discovered that we are, in fact, doing a good job in terms of asking that general evaluation question. But they do it in different ways, different nuanced ways that I think reflect some of the specifics of departments and colleges. What we concluded was that we needed another committee or a body with more expertise in assessment and evaluation because we weren’t sure which question really captured the essence of teaching effectiveness collectively and I notice in this memo from Jim there was an evaluation of several questionnaires and so I would be curious to know how that was done and what constitutes the evaluation. And I would also like to ask that the data might be shared with the Academic Policy Committee next year so that we can have input into whether this should actually be the question that goes on all of the evaluation forms.

**J.Erman:** The evaluation was, in fact, just looking at the instruments we did receive and try to identify the commonality between the various questions. And I was actually under the impression that there should be a similar question on all of the evaluation forms. And I know that in the Dean’s Council there are a number of colleges that are trying to get a consistent online evaluation form for all of their departments in the college so that all of the departments within a college would have exactly the same evaluation form. So this was an extremely controversial subject; I am sure you are aware of this. We had a number of meetings and, in fact, when we came down to the final decision, we just looked at the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual and that was you need a question on evaluation of teaching effectiveness so that’s the default position. That is why there is a single question, “What is the overall rating of the instructors teaching effectiveness?”

**K.Thu:** So, then is it your interpretation of the APPM that the APPM requires the same question on all evaluation forms?

**J.Erman:** When I read it, that was my interpretation.

**K.Thu:** That is not my interpretation of that particular section. It just says you have to have a general evaluation question, it does not say that it has to be the same evaluation question for all departments.

**J.Erman:** So we need a legal opinion.

**K.Thu:** Dean Rosoto is here.
J.Erman: Again, the faculty developed the questionnaires, the deans of these colleges that are trying to do a common instrument for all of the departments within their college or working with their various departments to develop this. One could consider this as a suggestion to those committees that are developing their online that this would be a good question as a final question in their online evaluation.

K.Thu: So what is the next step?

J.Erman: This would be brought back to the Dean’s Council since it originated at the Dean’s Council and the deans of the various councils can take this back to their colleges and see if it would be a viable question to put on their questionnaires.

K.Thu: So it is still going to be left up to the Dean’s Council and then by extension, departments as well.

J.Erman: Yea, that would be my interpretation.

K.Thu: Okay. But I still would like to see whatever evaluation was done be forwarded to the University Council Academic Policy Committee.

J.Erman: There is nothing written down. I mean, it was in discussion of the various instruments we received. I can send you the questionnaires we got from all of the departments.

K.Thu: That would be helpful. We got questionnaires as well.

J.Peters: My first assignment in shared governance 36 years ago as an assistant professor was to head a university-wide committee to set up a standard set of items to evaluate teaching. I am glad to see that we are still working on it.

A.Rosenbaum: Well, first, I want to thank you for your vote. In the next couple of days, you will be receiving from us the description of the committee assignments for next year and I know you are all excited about that. It has been my experience, at least last year, that a lot of people don’t send that back. It should be clear to us that the committees do a tremendous amount of the work of the Council and that we really depend on them a great deal to vet the various issues and bring reasonable motions to the floor so I really want to encourage people to give this a lot of thought and to select committees that you would like to serve on, rank order them, and please send that form back to us. Everyone gets assigned whether you send it back or not, so if you send it back, we at least have a chance to assign people to the committees on which they would like to work. We really need good people to work on these and also chairs. I know last year, I did not have enough people volunteer to be chairs and I had to draft people, or beg people to get them to do that. So, thanks in advance for your attention to this matter.

J.Peters: I want to support that. The quality of the work we do that is related to the committee work – that is where it gets done and that is where you can really make a difference. And that is where your expertise and wisdom is needed. So, I know executive secretaries, I know Sue Willis
is in the audience, get very frustrated when they cannot get enough people on these committees. So make your contribution.

**G.Seaver:** I want to remind Council that the commencement ceremonies will be Friday and Saturday of next week and that speaking for the students and also as a supporter for the students, they really do appreciate faculty and staff who are there and able to march at commencement. So I would really encourage you to think about doing that. The other thing is tomorrow is our first ever Undergraduate Research Day. We have 108 projects that will be presented tomorrow in the ballroom at Altgeld, which represents more than 150 of our undergraduate students who have been participating in research with our faculty. If you get a chance to walk through Altgeld tomorrow, I really encourage you to do that. It is going to start at 9 in the morning and there are three different shifts. If you get a chance to walk through Altgeld, I really would appreciate it. It is a pretty remarkable that this is our first ever and we have 108 projects that are going to be presented by undergraduate students.

**J.Peters:** I look forward to seeing you all tonight. Five o’clock, 901 Woodlawn.

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

**J.Peters:** We are adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned by President Peters without a motion at 3:48 p.m.