I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07.

J.Peters: 2010 last meeting of the year of the University Council to order, and let’s move to the adoption of the agenda.

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. You should have that at your desk. And the second additional walk-in is a copy of a memo from James Erman that goes under Information, Roman XI G. that has to do with on-line evaluation questions. With that, is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Is there a second? All those in favor say “aye,” opposed? Alright, we have an agenda.

The motion to accept the agenda was made by Kowalski and seconded by Bowman.

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

The minutes, were they sent electronically? Yes. You received your minutes electronically. Is there a motion to approve the minutes of April 7, 2010 or additions and corrections? Is there a motion? Second? All those in favor say “aye.”

The motion to accept the minutes was made by Thus and seconded by Sorsby.

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 a report on the President of the Faculty Senate/Executive Secretary of the University Council Evaluation. This requires a 2/3 vote of the university council, and if that 2/3 vote is achieved; we ask the non-voting members and I think you probably know who you are, to be excused and then we will proceed with our business.

So, at this time, I will entertain a motion to move to executive session for that evaluation purpose. Is there a second? All those in favor hold your hands up who are voting members. Opposed? Alright, non-voting members please leave.
The motion to go into executive session was made by Pat Henry and seconded by Bobbie Cesarek.

The meeting reconvened at 3:18 p.m.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J.Peters: Here I am. Welcome back from executive session.

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. So let’s do that. As I understand it, here are those people whose terms have been completed:

Rick Rednour, are you here Rick? Thank you and we will clap for you all together, no don’t do it now. Clarsida Garcia, yes, your term is completed. Dan Schneider from Law, Maryline, where are you? How do you say your last name? (Pronounces name.) Boy I’m, you know, I know Maryline but I don’t, from Foreign Languages and Literatures. Barbara Burrell from Political Science. I know her, She’s here. I saw her. Professor William Baker, I know him without a tie. I’ve only seen him with a tie once, but it was a heck of a tie. Carol Thompson from Physics, and Doug from Art. Where are you, Doug Boughton. Alright, let’s hear it for those people who have completed.

And we have a person who has been re-elected and that is Cliff Mirman from Engineering Technology. Are you hear Cliff. How about that?

Do we have any newly elected people here? I will read your names: Chin-Chen Lee from Accountancy, stand up so people can see. Alright, there you are. William Pitney. Kathy Coles. There’s Kathy. Welcome Kathy. You are from Law. Sue Willis is no stranger to our activities. Actually we needed you during executive session. Carl Von Ende, Carl, welcome. Didn’t you serve before? Well, you are in for a treat. Brad Sagarin from Psychology. J.D. Bowers from History, J.D.? Congratulations on your awards. Jim Corwin from Pshychology and Rebecca Houze from Art. Rebecca? She is not here.

So let’s hear it for those….

This next one is so big it has a category all its own and this is the last council meeting for Bobbie Cesarek who is going on to, being liberated from the University, is that right? And the University Council. And your duties with the council and, I guess your name will go up on a plaque at some point. That is all you get, by the way, your name on a plaque. Thank you, Bobbie, for representing your group so well.
Tomorrow we have committee meetings, 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 we are, here is our negative so far. Some enterprising law student has this up in one of the parking decks-$44,618,341 is owed to us by the State of Illinois. So we are moving any time we get a payment.

I spent the last 36 hours on executive committee of NCAA picking a new president. And ratifying the CBS/Turner contract and a lot of my presidential colleagues were there, and, you know, it is pretty mean out there. The new choice for president is Mark Emert who I know very well from provost days, I’ve known many, many years who is president of the University of Washington, who will be the new NCAA president these past twelve months. He has had to cut 33% of his GR base from his budget in Washington. You talk about that, I mean, obviously we have been cut more than that if you think about it, but he is talking about permanent cut. Hopefully, ours is still in the base somewhat. Whenever we get it. The 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. If there were, you know, and everybody is trying different things and most of the stuff has already been tried. But I’m real…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, knock on, oh-oh, knock on wood, is just a tribute to all of you. To run a University not getting your state appropriations and keeping payroll and not laying any one 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 6th with a patched up budget, barrowing and delaying things to next year. There are still issues we are still, even today the borrowing bill is not yet passed and is some state of becoming not that I am, none of us are excited about a borrowing bill, but if we need it, we need it, and so we are, we should just stop and be thankful that we made it through the year and we are all here, most of us and it has been a struggle. But we keep, faculty keep winning awards, and dong research and doing good teaching and our students, actually a lot of them are getting jobs, how about that, that is the key. You are not going to have a recovery that is jobless. And so, I am very thankful for that and all that you do and remember that as soon as we get through this agenda, we will be able to celebrate.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

J.Peters: There is no consent agenda, we have reports.

VII. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES

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

J.Peters: We have VII A, Faculty Council to IBHE. Earl has a report. I don’t know if Earl is here or not, but he has a report on pages 3-5. You want to take a look at that and see if you have any questions. I was there but I don’t remember anything. Earl’s notes are always so good. Okay. No questions? You can read that.
B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee - Joseph “Buck” Stephen and Ferald Bryan – 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

J.Peters: Moving on down we have a report from Resources, Space and Budgets and that was the walk-in Barbara, correct? Do you want to comment? Or? Okay?

A. Rosenbaum: Take her a mike.

J.Peters: Ya, you can’t do anything without a microphone.

B. Jaffee: I’ll just point out that the committee met with the provost and president on April 15th, which we were very pleased to be able to do, something that the committee is mandated to do constitutionally 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 building, 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 office and sort of scheduling when that will happen most effectively. 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, you can correct me if your sense of this is somewhat different, but the need to serve students well, the need to enhance the university’s impact and reputation, the need to diversify the university’s income streams and 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, well I guess it is true of all three, but for example 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. That’s the gist of the report.

J.Peters: Okay, all right.

B. Jaffee: Are there questions?
J. Peters:  Let’s hope we have a budget to build.

B. Jaffee:  Well, there will be something.


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

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

J. Peters:  Next we have Carol Thompson, report from University Affairs.

C. Thompson:  Hello, so, um, what I am reporting on is the conclusion of some of our work for this year. We were charged with reviewing proposed collegiality policy and also the nepotism policy. Our charge with the collegiality policy sort of accidentally was forgotten since it was brought up at the end of last year, but we started working. 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 did not 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 want to give this verbal report again specifically to assure people that both of these issues are not ones that will be dropped because of the kind of things as things get changed 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 will, received much attention this last year and that it will be part, they won’t be forgotten, they will be part of the UA charge in the next year.


J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee - Abhijit Gupta, Chair

J. Peters:  Alright, moving on we have the report from Elections and Legislative Oversight, Professor Gupta.

A. Rosenbaum:  Jana Brubaker will be….Jana

J. Peters:  Jana, you are ready?

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

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

Pursuant to Article 3.2 of our constitution and Article 2.1, should I continue? 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.

J.Peters: There is a second. Professor Baker. Oh, you second. We have two seconds. All right. All those in favor say “aye.” Opposed? You are sentenced.

Motion to confirm the election of Alan Rosenbaum to the position of Executive Secretary of the University Council was made by Jana Brubaker and seconded by both Pat Henry and William Baker. Don’t you love democracy? Okay, now, thank you much nomination, election committee for our good work.

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: Let’s move to information items. Number one, the distance learning e-course Intellectual Property Ownership Agreement and this come to us from Jim Erman who can explain it if necessary. It is not a policy change. It reflects current policy. Jim, do you want to add anything to that?

Jim Erman: the Intellectual property Committee was asked to generate a simple template for faculty members to understand the copyright issues associated with developing on-line courses. We have 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 sort of the four most likely situations and faculty members that are developing on-line courses should perhaps consult with this and before going to far into the work, so that one can develop ownership rights if you are working with other individuals or other parties there can be the question of shared ownership s 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 we will see if it handles all situations. It is subject to modification if situations arise. We are also thinking of putting in frequently asked question, items associated with the template and also, perhaps example of how it can be used for the various situations. So, I would be happy to refer any questions to Rebecca.

**J.Peters:** So, again, this is an information item, it sort of makes a little more formal what we do, it hopefully is helpful for faculty who get involved in these sorts of things and hopefully we will see a lot of people do this and maybe make a lot of money doing this. All right. 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:** And our final item, I am going to ask Provost Ray Alden to introduce and explain. 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 on-line courses and during that discussion, someone brought up the fact that APPM requires a consistent question, one question about teaching effectiveness or of something of that nature be asked of all courses, both on-line and not on-line. And so, 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 a hierarchical things that built on each other, but I gather that the committee, the joint group met a number of times, discussed this and came up with a single question and 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?” Fairly straight forward and fairly kind of a summary type questions so I don’t see that there should be any type of a problem with that, then since the APPM actually says that it should be about the faculty or the instructor’s effectiveness in the course, this makes sense. 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 since there has to be at least a question on everyone’s student evaluation and of course we will share this back with Dean’s Council to make sure that the next time student evaluations go out, that we include this weather they are on-line or other hybrids somewhere in between or lecture courses whether the student evaluations are on-line 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...surprise, surprise. 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 everyone’s asking that question, 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 assess or evaluation 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 on-line 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: ‘casue 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 on-line that this would be a good question as a final question in their on-line evaluation.

**K.Thu:** So what is the next step with what the Provost is recommending with this or what you are recommending with this.

**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 questionnaire’s as well.

**J.Peters:** I was going to save this one for tonight. But my first assignment in shared governance thirty-six years ago as an assistant professor was to head a college 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. Alright, do you know where we stand on that. Very important. Academic Planning council Meeting Minutes, March 22, 2010.

**J.Peters:** I skipped a bit, Is there any unfinished business to come before the house? Any new business? I know Alan Rosenbaum has an item for you.

**A.Rosenbaum:** Well, first, I want to thank you for your vote and secondly, I want to ask you to look in the mail 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 motion 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 and 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 they would like to work on and don’t all try to figure out which committees do the least amount of work and put that as the number one choice because 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 this is really very important work and I hope you will take it seriously and when those envelopes
come that you will fill them out and send them back to us and we will try to make good assignments for next year. 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. Okay, any other comments? Yes? Announcements from Gip Seaver.

**G.Seaver:** Just two things: 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 every undergraduate research day. We have 108 projects that will be presented tomorrow in the ball room 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. There are posters set up. They are able to exhibit the work they are doing. It is going to start at 9 in the morning and there are three different shifts working through there. 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. I just want to remind faculty and staff about that.

**J.Peters:** Alright. Any other announcements? I look forward to seeing you all tonight. Five o’clock. 901 Woodlawn and if you have a GPS it won’t work because one side of the street is Woodlawn and the other side is Lawnwood. Don’t park on Amy’s lawn.

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

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

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