

3-30-2011

FS Minutes 2011-03-30

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Minutes 2011-03-30" (2011). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 11.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/11>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, March 30, 2011, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

PRESENT: Allori, Arado, Armstrong, Azad, Bennardo, Bisplinghoff, Bonnicksen, Brandt, Bryan, Cappell, Carter, Castle, Coles, Collins, Feurer, Finley, Fisher, Flynn, Goldblum, Griffin, Haliczer, Hansen, B. Henry, P. Henry, Houze, Kostic, Lash, Latham, Lenczewski, Lin, Liu, Lusk, Martin, Mirman, Monteiro, Nissen, Pitney, Rintala, Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Slotsve, Staikidis, Tonks, Valentiner, Wade, Willis, Zahay-Blatz

David Gorman attended for Brian May and Amy Newman.

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Bishop, Blecksmith, Bowers, Brubaker, Butler, Calmeyer, Cripe, Cummings, Elish-Piper, Freedman, Greene, Gupta, Hu, Jeffrey, Kowalski, Marchewka, Mogren, Moraga, Naples, Nicolosi, Novak, Poole, Prawitz, Shortridge, Smith, Snow, Stravers, Thu, Von Ende, Waas, Yamagata-Lynch

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: First order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. One of those is my report on the Board of Trustees meeting; the other is the report on Resources, Space and Budget.

D. Valentiner: Moved the agenda. **G. Bennardo** was second.

The agenda with two walk-in items was approved without dissent or abstention.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2011 FS MEETING
(sent electronically)**

B. Lusk: made the motion to approve the minutes. **C. Cappell** was second.

S. Willis: pointed out a misspelling of “council.”

A. Rosenbaum: agreed to make the change and also pointed out the posting of Steve Cunningham’s slides from his [presentation](#) which were accessible through a link in the minutes.

The minutes were approved with the one spelling correction by a unanimous vote.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: I don't have much in the way of announcements. I don't want to keep beating the pension issues to death, so I won't. That was highlighted in the president's talk to the Board of Trustees. The president, as you all know, is very concerned about what changes may be pending to our pensions and benefits. You have been encouraged enough times to contact your representatives if you feel the need to do that. We are posting what we can on that legislation button on our Blackboard website.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

A. Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

A. Rosenbaum: There are a number of colleges, I think three that are requiring that all evaluations of teaching effectiveness be done online as opposed to the in-class paper and pencil format. In those colleges we've been getting reports from faculty members that the return rate is very low. Somewhere around 25 to 30 percent of students seem to be filling those in. At this point, we don't have data that indicates whether or not those people that are filling them in are representative of the class as a whole, or whether they're the students that are most likely to be disgruntled with the course or the professor. We do know that a number of untenured faculty are concerned that this is something that weighs heavily on their tenure decision and it's being based on a relatively low number of respondents. The question that I am raising is whether or not the Senate wants to send this to one of our committees to examine. This being the next to the last meeting of the year, we have a number of choices. We can give it to a committee now and get it started. We could give this new policy a little bit of time to see if maybe students adjust to it and start giving us a little bit more data. It's completely up to the Senate.

E. Hansen: As the Chair of our Personnel and Technology Department, I found it really absurd that only two people would respond electronically to some professors and there's no way we can draw any conclusions positive or negative about that. I think we got more accurate ratings, whether they were biased or not biased one way or the other, when we did it with pencil and paper.

C. Nissen: I was wondering what the advantages were beyond just time, which is only five minutes or so, and the use of paper. Are these the only advantages of using electronic?

A. Rosenbaum: It's been suggested that since students are more likely to like online and web-related things, we'd be able to get more students involved rather than less and perhaps this would also enable them to include the opinions of the students who never bother to come to class.

G. Bennardo: I have two questions. One is: Is there an attempt to standardize the evaluation tool or any department can still keep their own? And second: Is there any way to link the filling in the questionnaire for the evaluation to receiving their grade?

A. Rosenbaum: Probably not. Then we'd have to know which students had given what kind of evaluation so they might not buy that. The answer to your first question is as of yet, there is no

effort to standardize, the only thing afoot is that the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual requires a single standard question across departments and we now have a question that has been developed by Pat Henry's committee in the University Council, so there will be at least that one question across departments.

P. Henry: I would just say that I think it probably should go to a committee. I'm not sure what committee it should go to but given the weight of the evaluations of faculty in the classroom and the possible limitations to getting such a poor response rate, it would seem to me either we have to think about other mechanisms or other measures in order to be fair.

A. Rosenbaum: The University Council approved that it was okay to do online evaluations but never approved the idea that faculty should be compelled to do online evaluations. So that's something that's been added by some of the deans. We could suggest that this be allowed but not required – that faculty should have a choice as to how they want to be evaluated.

S. Armstrong: With regard to benefits, it's also been suggested that there's a huge cost savings in people hours having to type up the student comments and also the length of time that these get returned to faculty is obviously much quicker. So those are two other possible benefits.

A. Rosenbaum: One of the non-benefits– every department has different ways of doing this – but at least in Psychology, the dean has access to the parts of it that are done on scantron sheets, but the individual comments from students to faculty members do not go to the dean. Once this is all online, deans will have access to everything that's asked unless something is put in place to take that out of the evaluations before they are accessible by the deans. This will be different in different departments and different colleges, but that's something to consider as well – whether this will lead to greater access to the information by administrators.

M. Kostic: Expressed the opinion that this be sent to a committee.

G. Bennardo: made a motion to send this issue to our Academic Affairs committee.

A. Lash: was second.

The motion passed without opposition or abstention.

B. Joint Appointment Policy

A. Rosenbaum: The next item is also one that we want to consider whether to take on. Let me explain the history of this item. This was brought forward to the Steering committee of the University Council by Chris McCord, Dean of Arts and Sciences. Chris is concerned that faculty members on joint appointments may be disadvantaged, especially with regards to promotion and tenure decisions. He's particularly concerned about one paragraph in the APPM that says "If there's a disagreement among appointing units on recommending tenure for a faculty member on joint appointments, the units recommending tenure may petition the relevant college to fully fund the position as either a tenured position within the recommending department or as an appoint within a recommending center. Resources permitting, tenure may be awarded to the recommending

department.” In a split decision on tenure between two tenure granting parties to a joint appointment, the department that says “yes” can then assume the full salary of that professor and award tenure. His suggestion is that if that department doesn’t have the resources, then this faculty member would be lost and would not get tenure. He also expressed some concern that this would preclude the usual tenure appeals processes.. I don’t know if I agree with that because there is a statement a few paragraphs down that says faculty members may obtain a reconsideration of a personnel decision by the department or center making the decision according to the reconsideration provision in the bylaws. At Steering Committee, I argued that this is a faculty matter, that the faculty should have their hand in making decisions about this joint appointment policy and, therefore, this should go to the Senate rather than to the University Council and the Steering Committee supported that. So it’s our choice as to whether we want to look at the joint appointment policy and decide whether or not we want to recommend some changes either in the policy as articulated in both the Bylaws – and for those who are interested, this is Bylaw 5.33 and Bylaw 5.40-, and the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual which has a policy on joint appointments. If we want one of our committees to look into the concerns that Chris has expressed and decide whether or not we think there is something to it and that we need to take some action, we can. I want to also emphasize that in doing this, Chris is apparently showing high regard for faculty rights, so he’s not representing something that would be an administration issue but rather is concerned that faculty on joint appointments may be disadvantaged. Also we are increasing the emphasis on joint appointments either within the University or between the University and places such as Argonne National Laboratory, Fermi Lab, the Proton Therapy Center and the like.

P. Henry: I do think this would be a good thing for us to look at and I would move that it be sent to that Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

N. Castle: was second.

The motion passed without dissent or abstention.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – [report](#) – Page 3

E. Hansen: The meeting was at Kennedy-King College in Chicago. I think it’s extremely important, as does the Faculty Advisory Committee, that the faculty at each institution plays a major role in making the decision as to what is tenure and what is not tenurable. Also, we need to be aware of the fact that John Q. Public basically has no idea what tenure is and why it’s out there and we as faculty have done a very poor job of representing the importance of tenure to the public. We were also trying to invite the IBHE Deputy Director and the Chair of the House Higher Education Committee to our next meeting which is on the eighth of next month. They are not going to be in attendance because the legislature is going to be there. This tends to be an ongoing problem in trying to get legislators in to talk to this particular group.

S. Willis: I had a question. Down in the fifth paragraph on the first page you talk about performance-based funding and the performance funding will be aligned with the public agenda. Performance will be like a contract. Could you give a little context for that? What exactly are they talking about? It says we need to be aware of it and so I am wondering what it is exactly that I should be aware of?

E. Hansen: I'm not really sure that the committee is aware of what they are talking about on that. They are trying to get a feel for what is the legislature trying to do in relation to this particular issue and they don't have an answer. We have difficulty getting legislators to come to our meetings to get responses to questions. So in other words, I can't answer your question.

A. Rosenbaum: I think this is based on a much bigger issue and that is the Department of Education is, I think, pushing funding of all levels of education to be performance based.

E. Hansen: The State has a P-20 program. They're looking at Kentucky and a few other states that have been going ahead with this type of activity. The concern that was voiced at the meeting was maybe we in higher education are at fault when we get students that are juniors and seniors and they still can't write a complete sentence and do a bibliography correctly when we get them in classes. Maybe we need to look at ourselves a little bit on a four year level too.

P. Henry: I wonder what the public agenda is. It looks important but I don't recall hearing exactly what it was. Are there a set of guidelines that the public agenda means X, Y and Z in terms of proficiency in something or other or it should all be geared towards getting jobs? What is the public agenda?

E. Hansen: The public agenda, as I understand it, is brought about by what the legislature is putting forward to the public. The questions that arise in our conversations is: "How do we as faculty members, whether we are at a community college or a private institution or one of the state institutions, get our thoughts out to the public if that public agenda is controlled by a group that won't let us put ours in there?" How you get on the public agenda, I have no idea and I think the Faculty Advisory Council is trying to find the same thing.

P. Henry: I wish them well.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – [report](#) – Page 5

F. Bryan: The report is before you and I'll only just highlight a few things. First thing I'd like to emphasize is that, even in these tough economic times, this particular committee is very supportive and seems to have a good, genuine understanding of, the sabbatical process. This is the time in the year when they always approve that, so even though they approved the sabbatical request, they also a few years ago requested a report from a couple of faculty members on their sabbaticals. So we heard Professor Bowers this time. They also had an extensive summary of the annual report on the outcomes of sabbatical. So those were formally requested by this committee and those were received. So after approving the sabbaticals formally, they also made the changes in the emphases and minors and specializations that you see there. And at the end of the meeting we heard a very

lengthy presentation by Vice President Anne Kaplan on the newly renamed Division of Outreach and Regional Development where they are now emphasizing community engagement

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – [report](#) – Page 6

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, the next report would be mine on the Board of Trustee Subcommittee on Finance, Facilities and Operations. I'm not going to give this report only because I would be repeating the same things in my Board of Trustees report because all of these items became action items for the Board of Trustees. So you can read the report if you want to and then I'll talk about it in my Board of Trustees report.

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – [report](#) – Page 8

J. Monteiro: Only the good news so that will make it a short report. Trustee Murer started out the meeting by congratulating Lisa Freeman, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, on her recent appointment by Governor Quinn to the newly created Illinois Innovation Council. She also introduced the new general counsel, Jerry Blakemore. She also announced that NIU's Accountancy Department had been ranked in the top ten in the Public Accounting Report's 29th Annual Professors Survey. She also made an interesting comment that NIU's Blackboard system is now used more than Facebook. During the 97th General Assembly report, Kathy Buettner, she pointed out some House Bills. One of note is HB180 and this was relating to conduct at funerals and memorial services and the thing that was special about that is it was originated from one of our own NIU sociology students. The congressional report was pretty dim so I won't read you that. During the Intercollegiate Athletics report, it was reported that our athletics program was re-accredited with no conditions and, from what I understand, that's very unusual. So we congratulate them on that. A PowerPoint presentation was given and it was highlighting the academic achievements of our athletic program. They pointed out that we have gone 11 straight semesters with a 3.0 GPA average. We had 89 athletic grads in 2010 and NIU's graduate success rate in athletics is above the national average and NIU had two academic all-Americans. Our football team ranked 9th in academic progress towards graduation and then it was also mentioned that the football and volleyball teams both went to the MAC championships this year. Another important thing was that our NIU athletes have done over 5000 hours of community service and you can see listed there some of their charity partners. Kathy Buettner gave out some information on the NIU branding initiative. They are studying why people are choosing NIU. She also announced that a logo redesign is in the process and they've narrowed it to three logos and they are hoping to send these out for voting for the campus to look at sometime in April and the official brand rollout will be at the football game at Soldier Field this fall against Wisconsin.

P. Henry: Again, in Part III, I see performance-based funding and was there any other information given by Kathy Buettner as to what this is going to mean?

J. Monteiro: It relates to graduation rates.

A. Rosenbaum: I was speaking to somebody who's on the search committee for our new basketball coach who you all know has been hired and is coming from Michigan State. And what I was told is that the thing that was the highest priority and was made very explicit to the candidates was that NIU has a zero tolerance policy for any kind of recruitment irregularities or any types of these violations that we hear going on at other universities. It was good to hear the emphasis that we place on playing fair.

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – [report](#) – walk-in

A. Rosenbaum: The Board of Trustees meeting was held this past Thursday. At the beginning of the meeting, Chair Strauss emphasized his and the Board's intention to support the President and to fight for money and support for NIU at the legislative level. The President's report began with President Peters talking about the financial situation. We are owed a lot of money by the State. We haven't gotten most of that. We spend a ton of money on un-funded mandates. The financial situation is grim. It's been suggested during the appropriations hearings that the University prepare for another round of belt tightening. Our administration is very worried about the funding streams. This is one of the reasons why we have such an emphasis on the Vision 2020 initiative. By the way, the vision 2020 initiative is going forward pretty well. We had a meeting of the Steering Committee the other day and the committees are doing a good job of identifying needs and goals and setting bench marks and so that seems to be coming together nicely.

The Board considered and approved 26 action items. The ones that might be of interest to us are the student fee recommendations. Student fees will increase approximately 2.73 percent. The room and board rates will increase somewhat – 5.2 percent. All of these fees that are passed on to students are processed through the student representatives and they are on board with that. They approved the NIU Foundation professional services contract. This is the money that is used to support the office that is raising funds for the University such as in the True North Campaign which just ended. They approved the FY12 student health insurance contract. As I think I mentioned once before, the electrical infrastructure of the university is crumbling as we speak, so we have to try and fix it. There is no appropriation from the state to do that. The university has to somehow come up with the money. They approved Phase I of the campus-wide electrical infrastructure improvement plan. As Ferald mentioned, they approved all of the sabbatical leaves that were requested. They approved several new emphases, Sustainable Energy, Environment and Health, and Health Promotion; and two minors, International Marketing and Deafness Rehabilitation. Jerry Blakemore has now been appointed by the Board as the new Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel replacing Ken Davidson who retired in December. He's a prominent attorney and he has a very strong reputation in education law so we are considering ourselves lucky to have recruited him.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
- B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report
- C. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – report – Page 10

1. Guests in Class Policy [Proposal](#)

G. Slotsve: Unfortunately, Brad couldn't be here today. The issue basically was pointed out that it should be up to the instructor, the instructor should have the right to control who's in the classroom. The Committee has met and in the boldface is the statement the committee would like to put forth.

A. Rosenbaum: This is on page 10.

G. Slotsve: So only instructors have the right to allow guests in their classroom. When deciding whether a guest is appropriate, the instructor should take into consideration the effect the guest will have on the learning environment. The individuals present in the classroom should be limited to the instructor of record, students registered for the class and individuals invited by the instructor.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay and would you like to move that we approve this and forward it to the University Council for consideration for the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.

G. Slotsve: Yes.

C. Cappell: was second.

A. Rosenbaum: Discussion. Nobody has any problems with the guests in class policy? I have one question. I'm wondering, do we want to define "guests in class"? Did the committee consider whether we want to specify that any further?

G. Slotsve: As I recall we did discuss potentially defining it in a little more detail, but felt it was best to leave it a little broader.

T. Fisher: This, well I just want to highlight, what was the basic difference between what was in policy already from your new policy?

G. Slotsve: As I recall there was no policy, was there?

A. Rosenbaum: There was no formal statement of that I believe.

T. Fisher: Okay, it was just in practice.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think it was just an assumption more than anything else. But I think part of the reason we took it on was because it's really not stated anywhere so an instructor could say, "no you can't bring that person in" and I guess someone could say "well where does it say that?" We decided to be proactive and have a statement on the record or a policy on the record that says "it's up to the instructor."

C. Cappell: I just wanted to make a comment that emerged in the Executive Committee discussions about this policy that this is a pretty strong policy and allows total control of the classroom in the hands of the faculty. One particular issue that came up was what about external evaluations of

teaching or senior faculty visiting the classrooms of junior faculty and we felt that, even in that situation, the faculty should be in a position to grant permission or not to those people to observe the classroom. Of course, realizing what the real world consequences would be if they exercised that right, but nevertheless respecting it that faculty member control the classroom environment.

N. Castle: I'm kind of a little concerned that, in an instance where a professor allows a guest into class, what happens if that guest falls and hurts himself and the instructor has said "yes, it's fine. Is there a legal liability issue that we need to consider?"

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I think we raised that issue before we gave it to the committee. Did the committee consider the issue that Nancy just raised?

G. Slotsve: No.

A. Rosenbaum: If we send this along to the University Council they can raise this issue with the new General Counsel.

N. Castle: That would be great.

A. Rosenbaum: When we originally introduced this "guests" word, we also considered human and non-human and one of the things we don't want to leave up to an instructor is whether to allow, for example, a helping dog or a working dog into the classroom. So that's why I was wondering if we wanted to define "guests" to not include working animals. Okay, I can see I'm getting nowhere with this. Alright, the motion on the table is to send the bolded section on page 10 to the University Council and asked that it be placed into the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.

The motion was approved without opposition or abstention.

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – David Goldblum and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs – [report](#)
– walk-in

D. Goldblum: Fortunately, my thunder has been stolen by the other depressing reports so this won't take long. We met right after we all received that e-mail from the President on the 25th so some of the discussion revolved around some of the comments in that e-mail. We had Dr. Williams with us as always and got the latest update which we've already heard about. He did mention that, from his perspective, there were three ways that the Governor's budget plan is proceeding as far as rectifying some of the deficit issues. He said that some that the tax increase, there are three prongs, the tax increase was effective as of January. The Governor wanted \$6 to \$8 billion in loans, which according to Dr. Williams, the Republican Caucus will not look too kindly on. So we're left with a third option since the first option's not going to cover too much of the deficit to reduce operating costs across the state which leaves us to most items below. We know that we are owed a lot of money as was said. NIU representatives have been testifying at the state level about the University budget. We all know there are changes ahead, likely to be ahead, for not just new faculty but now current faculty and annuitants as well. The President has become a bit more active. He's working with some other institutions across the state looking for ways to develop proposals to reduce the problem with some of the pension funding at the state level to try and present some alternatives.

There's also an Ad Hoc Pension Advisory Committee being developed on campus here and Dr. Williams is gonna ask that one of the members of our committee is on that Ad Hoc Pension Committee. There are two areas that were of concern to our committee, the proposed cuts in tuition waivers for staff and faculty and also the mention of sabbatical funding was also in that e-mail. We didn't really discuss that too much. We also talked about the electrical problems on campus. I guess about almost \$3 million has been requested and I asked Dr. Williams where that money is coming from and he has no idea but he said it has to happen fairly soon. And then lastly the committee, our Resources, Space and Budget Committee, would like to prepare a memo from the faculty and staff about what the budget priorities are for the campus and we'd like to present that to this body and the University Council final meetings. So if you have any input that you'd like to have us include in that memo, it would go through these two bodies and ultimately to the President, can you either email Laurie or myself, email addresses are there. We want to have a statement of what faculty think are the core concerns, economic budgetary concerns. Thank you.

A. Rosenbaum: And personally I want to applaud the committee for really asserting themselves into this process and trying to have a voice. And I particularly like the idea of us coming up with what are our ideas about what priorities ought to be, not telling the university how to spend its money, but just giving them the faculty's position on spending priorities such that when there is money available that will be taken into consideration. Good job by the committee. Well thank you David and your committee as well.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle, Chair – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A. Rosenbaum: I have been asked by Pat to call your attention to the fact that my letter of acceptance of your nomination is located in the informational items.

T. Fisher: I was in a faculty meeting today, and we have a new dean in the College of Education and one of the practices is being followed that the previous dean had and I just didn't know if it was a campus-wide type of thing that when there's a search committee that the dean prefers the pros and cons for candidates versus the search committee giving the dean a specific recommendation for a hire. I just want to know if that's pretty common practice for departments?

A. Rosenbaum: I think it's more of a common practice in terms of a Chair position than it is for a faculty position.

R. Feurer: It was something that caused a hullabaloo at SIU Carbondale and it was really the reason for unionization of that campus when deans started to do that sort of thing. It's a big issue. I think it's something that we all ought to fight back against. It's a main issue of faculty rights and

governance if we don't object to this. So I encourage you to object to it fiercely and I think we ought to pay attention to such things across campus if they are occurring.

A. Rosenbaum: Now is that in the college's policies and procedures manual?

T. Fisher: From what I just heard, I will double check because I didn't know it was just reserved as a common practice just for chairs.

A. Rosenbaum: Again, I don't know. What I said I've heard of that being done with chair positions; I haven't heard it being done here with faculty positions was all I was saying.

S. Willis: I don't have time to sort of thoroughly read the University Bylaws but I would be surprised if this were not addressed in there. There's probably something, I would be surprised if the University Bylaws didn't have something to say about that. That's a sort of thing that the University Council Rules and Governance Committee is supposed to interpret (the University Bylaws) and so perhaps my committee or me or somebody should take a look at them and see if that's addressed.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, we can certainly take a look and see if there's something there to be interpreted.

N. Castle: Do you want Rules and Governance to look at it? That I could do?

S. Willis: The University Council's Rules and Governance. I meant that the University Council's Rules and Governances.

A. Rosenbaum: We'll take a look at that and maybe we can also take a look at the College of Education Policy and Procedures Manual and see if there's something articulated there and we can keep an eye on it.

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Letter](#) of Acceptance of Nomination from Alan Rosenbaum – Page 11
- B. Academic Policy Council [minutes](#) – November 8, 2010
- C. Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education [minutes](#) – February 7, 2011
- D. Graduate Council [minutes](#) – October 4, 2010
- E. Graduate Council [minutes](#) – November 1, 2010
- F. Graduate Council [minutes](#) – December 6, 2010

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

S. Willis: Made the motion to adjourn.

P. Henry: was second.

The motion carried without dissent. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.