FACULTY SENATE TRANSCRIPT
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2004, 3:00 P.M.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKY ROOM


Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

THOSE FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Arriola, Bukonda, Castle, Cumming, Gebo, Ghrayeb, Greene, Hamlet, Hurych, Johnson, Kang, Kolb, L’Allier, Loubere, Marcus, Markowitz, Miller, Munk, Newman-Ryan, Peters, Ridnour, Smith-Shank, S. Song, X. Song, Swanson, Tolhurst, Tollerud, Wade, Walton Wange, Wickman, Wolfskill

I. CALL TO ORDER

P. Stoddard: Okay, let’s call the meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

P. Stoddard: The first order of business as always which should come as a shock to no one is the adoption of the agenda. Could I have a motion to adopt the agenda? She’s loud. With these microphones we need that. Would you like to second? Thank you. Any additions or changes anybody would like to make? Clarifications, etc.? Okay. Then all in favor of adopting the agenda as is, please signify by saying aye. Opposed?

The agenda was adopted as written.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 27, 2004 FS MEETING

P. Stoddard: Next up is approval of the minutes to be found on pages 3 through 6. Any complaints or modifications, additions, amendments? Okay, do we have a motion to approve the minutes then? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Very good.

The minutes were approved as written.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS
**P. Stoddard:** The president’s announcements will be few mercifully. I did meet with the Computer Facilities Advising Committee last week or the week before. A couple of things coming up or that have come up – one, on e-mail you get through the main server here so not everybody is effected by this, but they have a new spam control that they’re implementing. Actually, they’ve been testing it for awhile. That was phase one. You may have heard of phase two, spam control. Everybody now should be one it. What will happen is that they have a filter that identifies a lot of key words, you know, mortgage rate or something like that which I’m sure we’re all familiar with by now. It will tag those. It will say oh look, you’ve got about eight different communicators that tells you this is probably a spam message. Right now, I think they’re delivering all those and you have, I believe, the capability to go into your account and control how much of that you want to get through. So if you want it to filter out a lot of stuff and risk losing something that isn’t really spam, you can set it like that. If you want to accept every – or most of everything – you can do it like that. I believe they’ve already, based on their tests, have figured out anything with a score of 20 or better is spam and they’re just going to block it so if there’s any message that you’re getting that has to do with elevator shafts and mortgage rates and I don’t know what else and you didn’t get it, then it’s probably because it got blocked by the spam filter and you should have them edit that message to you. Otherwise, that’s that. I think you can set some of this yourself as I said. One of the interesting side discussions that came up with that is apparently the software refers to black lists and white lists. Spam messages or places that generally send you span are black listed and places that you definitely want no matter what they’re talking about are white listed and I guess this has raised a few eyebrows in various parts of campus so they’re moving towards a reject and trust list as opposed to a black list and white list. However, since the software itself talks about black lists and white lists, we’re seeing some of that in there as well as the trust and reject. However, they are trying to be sensitive to as many groups on campus as they possibly can.

The other thing that is coming up is blackboard e-mail addresses are going to be locked in and what that means is that you have a class or something that you’re using blackboard for and you want your students to be able to e-mail you, they are going to – by June of 2005, that’s this coming June – lock in your NIU e-mail for your t60 or whatever account you have at cso, wpo, etc. They have to do this really for the students because trying to keep up to date with all the different student accounts and the high variability of the student accounts that change from AOL to Hotmail to whatever is a major headache over there so they’re telling the students by that time, all the mail will go to their NIU account and they can have that forwarded I suppose. However, they’re also doing that to faculty which means if, as in Geology, I know Math is also one – I think Physics, you don’t want to use that particular account, you’re kind of stuck. Now this might be something we want to look into. I don’t know why Registration and Records feel they have to lock our accounts into this. I don’t personally why they feel they have the right to lock our accounts into that. So, if this body would like to do anything about that, I am more than open to suggestions.

**J. Holt:** Does that mean that on blackboard students can now edit their personal information and put in a different e-mail address, they will no longer be able to do that?

**P. Stoddard:** That is correct.
J. Holt: Oh, that will be a real pain. That’s how I communicate with my students between classes all the time.

P. Stoddard: They will be told that all their blackboard e-mail and all their e-mail from NIU, schedule information, everything, is going to go to their NIU account. That if they want any information from NIU, they’re going to have to check that.

J. Holt: I don’t think that works real well for a lot of our non-traditional students that have regular accounts that they use and check.

P. Stoddard: What they have – you can go into your account and forward it to your Hotmail or AOL or whatever other account. So it’s a one-time thing you have to do but they figure it’s a lot easier for all students to do that once than to have to try to keep up with 25,000 students changing their addresses.

J. Stephen: I think that’s reasonable for students because that way we’re sure that we’re corresponding with an actual student but as for faculty, we have several distributed networks and I never use Groupwise and if you send something to jstephen@niu.edu, it just gets forwarded a number of times and eventually I get it but I don’t see why we need to lock this out. We have a number of part-time instructors who use blackboard and I think this would be a tremendous inconvenience.

P. Stoddard: I agree with you.

W. Baker: This seems to be something about which has been raised at the Senate in the past and it seems that we ought to take this much more seriously than perhaps we are doing and there are implications of which this is one more example. To put it very basically and simply, it’s like a dog wagging its tail. Computing are yet again are telling us why, for instance, you what there are going to do. Now either we serve them or they serve us. Some of this is as we’ve seen, extremely inconvenient as it was previously. Now can’t we as a Senate, get together and pass some kind of resolution that we should be controlling this and they should be serving us, not we simply following along, the tail on the dog. Is that clear?

P. Stoddard: Yes, it’s clear. I would just say that in this particular instance, this change is not coming through ITS or computing services at all. It’s being made at the direction of Registration and Records. They have told Wally Czerniak to do this and so he’s going to do this and he says if the faculty don’t like this idea, and he understands that we don’t, that this is something he would prefer we take up with Registration and Records than his fighting it. He doesn’t feel that it’s in his purview to fight that battle for us. Basically, I think I would tend to agree with him on this matter and, you know, one of the things I’m trying to do over there is make sure that he hears our voice all the time so that they don’t wind up telling us what to do. That’s very much what I’m trying to accomplish here. But this one, I don’t think – this is not that battle this time.

W. Baker: To your discretion and wisdom, but perhaps Wally Czerniak could come and address the Senate, could be invited and deal with some of our issues which seem to be reoccurring.
Well he could well be invited. Number one and number 2, perhaps we could have a motion here that we are not terribly happy about this.

**P. Stoddard:** Why don’t we invite Wally? I think that’s a good idea. Maybe we should have a motion to invite him and I would suggest we hold off voicing our displeasure until after we hear what he has to say.

**J. Knapp:** At the same time, why don’t we invite the person who runs Registration and Records as well and simply say what the hell are you doing given all the ramifications it’s going to have and, again, are you working for us or are we working for you.

**A Senator:** Part of the problem with – accounts are easy to say well, simply forward your P account to AOL. I was doing that and then I was warned by the powers that be here that AOL would start excluding NIU as spam and so I had to stop doing that.

**P. Stoddard:** That’s something new. Buck?

**J. Stephen:** I think we have to remember that these people are services as far as ACS, that is service and as far as the warning about spam, I think somebody is having one over on you because if you have forwarded an e-mail from a single addressee to a single addressee in general, service providers do not count that as spam.

**P. Stoddard:** Who told you that?

**A Senator:** ACS – they told me that you’re going to have to stop that.

**J. Stephen:** I have tons of my e-mails forwarded. In fact, almost all university e-mail I get I have forwarded to my private account so I can read it at home.

**P. Stoddard:** John?

**J. Knapp:** Buck, with all due respect, I don’t think that’s the problem. I have 36 people in my Shakespeare class and I typically assign send them the assignment after every class period and, as it is, I get bounces every now and again because AOL or someone decides it’s too big or whatever so – and again, this is such a – how should I say it – a re-forcer of whatever class assignments are that no one has ever had the excuse of well, I don’t hear you, I wasn’t there, whatever because all I have to do is check the e-mail. If that gets blocked, that takes away a very large tool that I use all the time.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, well I think I would be happy to entertain a motion to invite Wally and the Registration and Records representative. Okay, any more discussion on that? All in favor? Opposed?

**W. Baker:** Would you convey back to Registration and Records that the Senate is not happy with this?
**P. Stoddard:** I think I can manage something like that.

John made the motion; Bill seconded. The motion passed.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, something else to make us happy or not is that I was at the University Benefits Committee day before the computer committee as it turns out and two issues that they’re looking at – one is the Caremark prescription drug issue which got a lot of interest over the summer by anyone who was here over the summer to express interest in it. For those of you who missed that whole business, basically the State has signed on with Caremark, a drug provider, who wants to make maintenance drugs – drugs you take as a matter of course – have you get those via mail order. I think it ultimately does work out to be cheaper but a lot of people have problems with mail order for a lot of legitimate reasons. After a bit of a complaint over the summer, CMS and Caremark revisited the issue and basically came out and say well, if local pharmacies can match Caremark’s rates on everything, you can go through the local pharmacy. Caremark, of course, has set their rates such that local pharmacies would lose money if you were to go through them to get these medications. The only people in town who might be able to match Caremark is Walgreen’s just based on the volume they do, but as of yet they haven’t signed up to do so. I’m not sure where we stand with all this. I’ve heard conflicting things from people but – yeah, I thought Deb was back there – and if you have questions, she may be able to explain this a bit more clearly than I can. Carole?

**C. Minor:** I received a letter from Caremark last week saying that I would have to sign a – that I had two prescription refills at the pharmacy and then I would have to get my drugs from mail order. I have not heard anything from benefits from NIU that there has been some change in this so I’m interested in finding out what’s going on.

**D. Haliczer:** Okay, I wrote you all a memo about a month ago and it’s being held at the administrative level to make more revisions before it goes out to the campus and what Paul has said is correct and what Carole has said is correct. Caremark is trying to scare people to get their maintenance medication through the mail order program and it is financially advantageous although not the best method of delivery of a lot of kinds of medications that need to be temperature controlled or whatever. As of yesterday, my staff had polled most of the local pharmacies and probably half of them have said that they will begin participating in this plan which means that they will be able to offer the same advantageous rates as in the mail order plan and you’ll be able to continue getting it at your local pharmacy. Not all of them have given answers yet; they’re waiting for corporate headquarters, for instance, Walgreen’s and some others are waiting for the word and the approval from the corporate level. So I regret how late this memo has gotten out but a lot of things have changed since I wrote the initial version of it and, knock on wood, it should be out any day now and I’ll be able to give you more updated information through the HR website on which pharmacies will participate. There has been a lot of negotiation. We’ve been talking to pharmacies and it’s been really frustrating because I know a lot of pharmacies have actually asked for applications to be participating providers under this special plan and Caremark has not sent them their application forms and so I’ve brought that to the attention of people who have much more power than I do. So I’ll have to let you know the actual state of things any day now. Questions?
J. Stephen: I have a dependent who takes 14 maintenance medications and who is often prescribed 1 or 2 medications a month for various conditions and mail order is, I think, medically an unsound way for us to go through with prescriptions because with that kind of pharmacological soup, you need instant access to a consulting pharmacist. I think no matter what, there can be serious problems with this. I have 2 medications. I don’t have any problem with them with mail order.

D. Haliczer: For some people the mail order medication plan has worked like a charm; people on regular medication who don’t change often and for others, I would not advise you to go with this if possible. So Buck, you’re one of the first people I’ll call as soon as I hear which pharmacies are going to participate in this maintenance medication program where you would have the same advantages of the mail order but would be able to get it at a participating pharmacy. Hopefully, yours does. I’ll ask them.

J. Holt: What about controlled substances because a lot of those prescriptions have to be refilled 2 days or they have a time limit when they have to be refilled and I don’t think mail order would work for those.

D. Haliczer: You’re correct. The regular medications that are not maintenance ones like blood pressure or contraception or different heart medications you fill as usual at your regular pharmacy and those of us who are on maintenance medication will have gotten or will be getting a letter saying which of our medications really are subject to this maintenance medication program but again, certain substances and certain medications I would not want personally to be receiving through the mail in my mailbox while I’m gone all day.

J. Stephen: I talked to Caremark about this and they will also give you a three month of both schedule 2 and schedule 3 narcotics through the mail. I don’t know about you, at Grant Park, that’s thousands of dollars of medication in your mailbox.

D. Haliczer: As usually, we’re the messengers, not the decision makers.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions about this issue?

Okay, I think basically that’s all I had to announce so if there’s nothing else, I’ll move on.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION


P. Stoddard: We have one item to consider. I’ll let Richard Orem take over.

R. Orem: Today I’m wearing my hat as chair of the University Affairs Committee for University Council. According to bylaws, you know, is it the University Bylaws or the University Council Bylaws?

P. Stoddard: University.
R. Orem: University Bylaws – the Office of the Ombudsman must be reviewed every four years and I must stipulate that it’s the Office of the Ombudsman that we’re concerned with here not the ombudsman himself. This is the fourth year and so the committee has started the process of reviewing the office and as part of that, we are requested to get feedback from the major constituent groups so the Student Association, the Faculty Senate is considered one of those groups along with the Professional Staff Council and the Operating Council and so today I come to you to simply say that we are in the progress of reviewing the office and that if any of you have concerns or questions or would like to give me any input, feel free to do so. I know that several members of the University Affairs Committee had already contacted their colleges or groups to start the process but I’m officially now coming to the Faculty Senate as one of those groups that is to provide input and just to invite you to do so within the next month. Hopefully, the University Affairs Committee – we have a plan to reconvene in January at which time we’ll take the information we’ve received and complete our report which we’ll file with the University Council probably in February. That’s our goal. So that’s the – that’s all I wanted to say so again, if you have any input you want to give in this process, please feel free to do so. I’m in Groupwise and you can do so by e-mail or you can give me a call and contact me on campus at 753-1688.

J. Stephen: For written correspondence?

R. Orem: Department of Literacy Education. Thank you.

P. Stoddard: Any questions for Richard? Any other questions?

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

P. Stoddard: All right, moving on we have two items on the Consent Agenda. One is about NIU’s involvement with PickAProf.com, a website for rating professors and how much NIU is officially involved in that. We’re going to refer that to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and we’re also going to refer Outgrowth of the Freedom of Speech/Privacy Policy discussions we’ve had – we’re going to refer those to Rights and Responsibilities to look into what policies actually exist and whether that’s sufficient or if anything new needs to be developed along those lines. Could I have a motion to approve the Consent Agenda? Thank you. Any discussion? All consenting to the Consent Agenda please say aye. All opposed to the Consent Agenda. Okay, very good.

The motion passed.

A. PickAProf.com – see memo from J. Pierce – refer to Rights and Responsibilities (Page 7)

B. Freedom of Speech/Privacy Policy – refer to Rights and Responsibilities

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
P. Stoddard: Moving on to reports. FAC to IBHE – Pat Henry has a walk-in report.

A. FAC to IBHE – Patricia Henry – report – walk-in

P. Henry: Thank you. This is for the meeting that took place November 12 at the College of Lake County and as has been our habit, we had several of the local State legislators, senators and representatives, who came by to sort of share input as far as the state of higher education and budgets and so forth. I won’t go through all this in great detail. There was some concern especially among the Republicans as to whether the Governor’s leadership – there’s a typo in the second column – the State has doubled its bounded indebtedness in one year under the Governor’s leadership through borrowing, not though borrowing. One of the representatives, Beaubien, had an interesting bit of input in terms of suggesting that we in higher education, the FAC, and higher education in general, sort of try to make common cause with chambers of commerce and so forth who’s entities would be supportive of the necessity of a high quality education would help make the case to the legislature as well. I sort of had a question about whether this would perhaps be too much concerned with sort of very business oriented aspects of higher education but, I mean, that’s one possibility but I think that also it would be good to sort of not take the ivory tower approach and be willing to sort of find out how that would – how we could work together with chambers of commerce and, in fact, in the following discussion the FAC chair, Alan Kearns, said he would contact business groups and see what he could do to follow up on that. One interesting bit about sort of our pr that goes on with higher education, one of the members had a member of his department actually ran for the State legislature in – I can’t remember exactly where – Peoria I think, and the nastiest thing that his opponent had to say about this person who was chair of the Political Science Department was that he was the “professor” and there were all these ads that came out saying that the “professor” wants to do this, that and the other thing and they worked very well because he lost. The point being here is that the professor is not always a really highly regarded figure in the public view and we have sort of an uphill battle trying to counteract that.

The third item actually I thought – I guess I didn’t highlight that – at the bottom of the first page, we also had a discussion with John Murphy who’s the Executive Vice President and Legislative Director of UPI and some other stuff. He really was just sort of reporting on how the unions had also sort of joined together to try to make common cause to stop the bleeding as it was called there similar to the way that the college presidents got together and wrote a letter to the legislature and the Governor and he would hope that we would continue to – he suggested that it would be good if the FAC also kept tabs with the faculty unions and shared information with them.

One point back a little further in terms of this sort of pr that we have to do again came up with the conversations with the legislators that there still is, despite all of our kicking and screaming, the notion that one hour of classroom time is an hour of classroom time and we only work, you know, twelve hours a week. Pretty easy gig and the point was made and I keep thinking about this that we have to somehow come up with the calculus that shows that one classroom hour represents “x” number of hours of research, curriculum development, preparation, administration, making sure that there are classrooms and so forth, I mean, there’s a lot behind that one hour of classroom time that the teacher is involved in that some of which involves the
faculty directly and some of which involves the support staff but at any rate, that it’s a very poorly understood and little equation and needs to be flushed out constantly.

That sort of leads in then to number 4 on the second page there or I guess it’s the other side of the first page, where I have a very abbreviated and somewhat cryptic report from Ken Anderson who is the FAC representative on the Priority, Productivity, and Accountability, the PPA Committee that met November 2 in Chicago and I’ll just, you know, you can just sort of glance over that outline. Those are the things that are under discussion. Part of it has to do with the relationship between public/private universities and also the for-profit universities that there is some overlap that needs to be taken into account.

Another question that constantly comes up is the matter of transfer and articulation both between community colleges and four–year institutions and among four-year institutions as well where you do often have a student who goes – starts one place and ends in another place having spent a couple years in yet a third place or something like that and the question comes up in terms of statistics and who gets credit for that student or who gets to count that student as graduating and if the student does come to your place for two years and then goes somewhere else, in the present system I think it’s sort of awash as far as saying whether you’ve actually done anything with that student. I did actually hear – this is sort of off the side – but there’s something I heard on the news recently that mentioned that indeed I think the Department of Education is considering some sort of tracking system to keep track of students as they go through the higher education no matter where they are which, of course, raises privacy issues but this may be just an ongoing thing that we’ll be looking at.

I think then the only other thing is the last page where in addition to the obvious piece that we have talked about in the past, the FAC is now proposing a letter to Illinois State legislators. We’re not exactly sure which ones we’re going to send that to. We’re still sort of working that out but some of the same issues that have been raised in the previous OpEd piece which, by the way, I’m trying to get that out next week. I have to run it past NIU’s public – Kathy Buettner is it – who sort of gave me some ideas about how to phrase some things so hopefully I should be able to get that out next week. This would go to the legislators and if you have any suggestions or questions, please ask me. We’re meeting again – the FAC is meeting this Friday in Springfield and we should have a chance then to talk to some members of the IBHE at that time.

P. Stoddard: Thank you Pat. Any questions? Buck?

J. Stephen: Under the category of what institution guarantees the degree, at NIU we have a residency requirement that requires I think the last 30 hours be taken here. I do know for a fact that’s often waived. I wonder whether all institutions have that and I also wonder whether or not the residency requirement should include a requirement that a certain portion of that be upper division work so that we actually have an ability to guarantee the quality of the degree based on the cumulative effect of the education.

P. Henry: There’s some variation in that and that’s one of the issues that this committee is looking at because if you’re going to judge productivity, that’s one of the things that needs to be sort of taken into account.
J. Holt:  Pat has there been any discussion at IBHE about what is coming down for teachers in the state of Illinois, not to allow early retirement anymore after 25 years of doing that policy? That’s been in the Tribune and the local paper and I’m wondering if that is something that IBHE is also discussing?

P. Henry:  I was looking at that and, I mean, as I read that article, I think that’s not higher ed teachers but whether or not I don’t know. I will find out.

P. Stoddard: Any other questions? Thanks again. Moving on to other committees, the BOT, Board of Trustees, has not met and will a week from tomorrow so there are no reports from any of those committees and I believe we have no reports from Academic Affairs or Economic Status of the Profession. We do have a report from Resource, Space, and Budget. C.T.?

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

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Paul Stoddard and Xueshu Song – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Donna Smith and Shey Lowman – no report

E. BOT – Paul Stoddard – no report

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – John V. Knapp, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Radha Balamuralikrishna, Chair – no report

C. Resource, Space, and Budget – C.T. Lin, Chair – report (Page 8)

C.T. Lin:  Well, let me see. Our report is on page 8 and we have a meeting on November 10 with Provost Legg and this report is written by the Chair of the University Council, Bill Goldenberg and I’ll just simply read the report here.

The Provost says that this year we don’t have any like mid-year rescission like what we had last year so it’s a good thing and the second thing he said that due to the budget resource limitation, NIU had kept the maximum enrollment. The total number is given as 25,000 and the entering freshmen will be kept at about 3,000 student maximum and it looks like this year we only have about 2,800 or something like that so in a way, we also lose some additional income.

He said a new initiative program and that program is giving a one-time stipend to certain departments that have a certain critical course with excess student demand and every year the are
given to 5 or 6 departments for the purpose of hiring part-time faculty or some other thing like that.

He mentioned that salaries remain the top priority of NIU and also the library is also a high priority and so intentionally has been cut less than other areas. He also mentioned, you know during the meeting we have a question, for those people like you and me, you know, working at NIU for a long time and working really very hard, and getting results, etc., but does our salary compare who are new hires or those people who simply go out to look for a new position and get some sort of matched salary, etc. For those people who’ve been here a long time, we have a certain inequality when those people who have been here a long time are compared to the new hire. So I said yes, perhaps we should have some kind of seniority put into the salary adjustment but he didn’t like that. He wanted to have some sort of compression study. Human resources is conducting a faculty salary compression study and by using this is based on regression analysis and he says no guarantee but, you know, they may come up with a sensible, you know, one time increment.

Then our Vice President Eddie Williams talked about the capital budget and he said that this year during the regular session in May or June our budget was not considered but will be under consideration during the veto session.

The Provost was proud of all the exceptionally fine work and the attitudes of faculty, staff, and administration. So he’s very happy. That’s all he said.

P. Stoddard: Great. Any questions for C.T.? All right, well thank you very much.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Ngoyi Bukonda, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Continuing on, I think Faculty Rights and Responsibilities doesn’t have anything to report yet but they will soon.

E. Rules and Governance – Augden Windelborn, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: Rules and Governance, nothing at the moment.

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Gretchen Bisplinghoff, Chair – no report

P. Stoddard: No Elections recently so we’re done with those.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Any unfinished business that anyone can think of? Yes, Pat?

X. NEW BUSINESS

P. Stoddard: Okay, let’s do new business.
**P. Henry:** This may not be appropriate for this body, but I’ve been sort of concerned to see the signs around talking about the NIU dispute with the kitchen staff union and I wondered if anybody had input on that in terms of whether given that there are tough times, some people are having a tougher time than others or what’s going on?

**D. Smith:** I’m not real familiar with it. I think they’re just in negotiations. From what I understand, the problem is there are some kitchen staff who are in unions and some who aren’t and the pay is not equal. I don’t know if Deb Haliczer can address it better than I can.

**D. Haliczer:** Actually you’re right Donna, I don’t know a lot more than you other than when I inquired last week I was told that after some lengthy negotiations that a resolution had been reached and had been agreed on by both parties and that’s all I know.

**P. Stoddard:** Okay, thanks both of you.

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

**P. Stoddard:** Any comments or questions from the floor? Buck?

**J. Stephen:** We have all committee members for this task force on student grievance procedures except for those who are to be appointed by the Graduate Student Council so I’m going to send them a screening letter and tell them we’ll proceed without them at the end of January if they don’t have any appointments by then.

**P. Stoddard:** Sounds reasonable. The Council is meeting Monday so maybe. Any other comments or questions? If not, the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. I knew I could count on you. Second? Approved? We’re adjourned. Have a good break.

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Athletic Board minutes
C. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality
D. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
E. Minutes, Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum
F. Minutes, Graduate Council
G. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council minutes
H. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
I. Minutes, University Benefits Committee minutes

**XIII. ADOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned.