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


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Azad, Byrd-Calvo, Chandler, Creamer, Cripe, Daniel, Fang, Farrell, Feurer, Fredericks, Goldblum (on sabbatical), Houze, Kapitan, Lee, Lin, Long, Mohabbat, Munroe, Nissen, Onyuksel, Plonczynski, Poole, Rheineck, Rollman, Siegesmund, Smith, Thu, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Alden, Armstrong, Bryan, Haliczer, Klapar, Latham, Macdonald, Theodore (for Quick), Streb, Sunderlin

OTHERS ABSENT: Freedman, Prawitz, Small, Snow, Quick, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Rosenbaum: Called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: The first order of business is the adoption of the agenda. We have two walk-in items. One is Sonya Armstrong’s report on the FAC to the IBHE under XII. A., and the second one is under X.B. We’re going to try and find a representative to the committee to select the presidential engagement professor. I need a motion to accept the agenda with the two walk-in items.

R. Lopez: So moved. J. Novak: was second.

The agenda was approved with the two walk-in items without dissent or abstention.
III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 31, 2012 FS MEETING
(distributed electronically)

A. Rosenbaum: I need a motion to accept the minutes.

J. Novak: So moved. M.E. Koren: was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: You should be paying close attention to the SUAA reports and messages that you get. Those of you who are not members of SUAA should join. It’s very inexpensive and they do terrific work for us. The concern that apparently has been expressed is that pension reform will probably be dealt with at the lame duck session which is January 2 through 9. SUAA keeps a close eye on the legislature. We should be paying close attention and be ready to contact our representatives if something comes up that is not in our best interests. We’ve managed to successfully defeat the constitutional amendment and also other attempts to push through reform to the pension system.

Next, I want to give you a very brief update on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. The committee was finally charged at the last Board of Trustees meeting. The committee met immediately following the Board of Trustees meetings and began developing the position profile and job description which is used in the advertisements and by the search firm in soliciting applicants for the position. That has to be done first before any ads can even go out. You remember at our last meeting we spoke about that together and it was a good thing that we did because it enabled us to generate a very good list of desirable characteristics. We were able to give that list to the search firm and the search firm is putting together the input from various sources around the university to come up with this description. We are going to meet again on December 6. The search committee will meet at noon to try and put the criteria into some order in terms of priorities. After the search committee meets we will get together with the Board of Trustees. The full Board of Trustees has asked to meet with the search committee and at that meeting we will try to agree on a position description. I should remind you that this is all the prerogative of the Board of Trustees so they can take input and advice from us, but they are not obligated to do so. They, however, seem to be very agreeable to working with the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. When we eventually develop the short list of candidates for the Board of Trustees, it is then out of the hands of the search committee. We will give them the short list which will have five, plus or minus, candidates on it and then it is in the hands of the Board of Trustees. So far the BOT is respecting shared governance and is working with the search committee. I’m confident that that will be a successful collaboration.

Next item, Matt Streb who is our liaison to the Athletic Board has asked to be able to make a brief statement, Matt.

A. Matt Streb, Faculty Athletics Representative
M. Streb: I want to share with you a bit of good news today. Most of you are aware of our national ranking in football. We are currently ranked 21st in the BCS standings. The ranking that we’re most proud of is the most recently released graduation rates and our football team is currently, from a graduation rank standpoint, ranked 16th in the country and that is out of more than 100 FBS schools and it’s the highest graduation rate our football team has ever received. It’s 15 points higher than the national average so we’re very proud of that. The rate that we use is the NCAA rate, it’s called the GSR. The GSR is a little different from the federal graduation rate, which most of you are probably familiar with, because it allows us to get credit for transfer students who graduate. If students leave the institution in good academic standing, we don’t get penalized for that either. So the football team is doing very well on the field and in the classroom. Very briefly, our overall student athletes are doing a wonderful job too. Our overall student athlete graduation rate is 83 percent. In ten of our sports we’re either at or above the national average and our overall athletic program was three percent above the national average. I think, overall, we have a lot to be proud of. Our students are getting it done not only in competition but in the classroom as well. Thanks very much for your time.

A. Rosenbaum: Thanks a lot, Matt. And if anybody has been in a coma for the last few days, the team, of course, is going to play for the MAC Championship on Friday night and that will be very exciting and who knows, if they win that, we might end up in the Orange Bowl I’ve heard. But, at any rate, we will end up in a good bowl game and so that’s a very exciting thing for us.

B. HLC Self-Study Process – presentation
Doris Macdonald, HLC Accreditation Steering Committee Chair

A. Rosenbaum: Our first guest is Doris Macdonald who wants to speak to us. She asked for time to talk to us about the Higher Learning Commission self study process. Doris.

D. Macdonald: Thank you for inviting me. I know it’s a busy schedule, it’s a busy time of year, but we are in the process of preparing for the ten-year reaccreditation of NIU by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central states. I’m going to give you just a little update. This is part of what I’ve been doing. Going around campus to as many units, as many colleges and committees and groups as possible to get the word out. And because faculty are an important part of our whole system, it’s very important that I speak to you particularly. I’m going to tell you a little bit about where we are. I know there are many people in this room who are on these self-study committees, thank you for that. The site team will be here from the third to the fifth of March in 2014.

• Doris Macdonald’s power point slides can be accessed through the link above (presentation). The highlights are as follows:

• The accreditation process provides public assurance, consultation to the university and an opportunity for self-analysis by the university.

• NIU has made a substantive change request meaning we are moving from one tier, HLC identified tier, into another tier for online programming. We have submitted a change request because we are moving into the next tier, which is five to 25 percent of programs offered online.
• We are drafting the self-report report right now, or drafting chapters of the report. We will continue to do that through the spring of 2013.

• We are focusing on the criteria that are dictated by the HLC and these criteria are organized into five groups: mission; integrity (ethical and responsible conduct); the quality of resources and support; evaluation and improvement of teaching and learning; and resources, planning, institutional effectiveness.

• When the HLC gets our self-study report, they are going to look for evidence of continuous improvement throughout the institution for evidence that we plan assessment well for all institutional endeavors, and at how we focus on student learning outcomes. They are going to look throughout on how we reflect back on the institutional mission and they are going to look at strategic planning and priorities especially in time of fiscal unease. It doesn’t mean we have to be successful in all our plans but that we are being proactive in planning, strategic planning and setting priorities.

• There will be ten to 12 consultant evaluators who will come from outside the state.

• If you’d like more information you can go to the HLC website. That’s NCAHLC.org. You can also look at our own NIU website. On that website we have our agendas, our minutes, our meeting schedule, the lists of the steering committees, the lists of who are on the subcommittees and any other information. If you have questions, if you have requests, if you have comments, and you don’t know how to find me, HLC2014@niu.edu. If you have some information that you think is important for us to have, pass that along. Because it is an all-institution endeavor. We are looking for input from as many sources as we can. We are looking for as much solid evidence as we can for institutional effectiveness.

Several senators made comments regarding problems with the allocation of time forms that faculty were asked to complete, especially the amount of time that they were spending outside of the classroom which they felt was not adequately represented on the forms.

D. Macdonald: Remember that that number is pre-populated based on the university’s definition of a credit hour and we have a credit hour policy that’s recently been approved that says that for so many hours in the classroom, this many hours outside the classroom, and it is basically the same policy as the federal government has, so that’s how that’s been pre-populated. You know, and I can take all these comments back. This was something that needed to be implemented and the people who put together the bolt on to MyNIU, so that would be Jeff Reynolds and Nick Choban, were working day and night and getting it up and running and we know there are glitches to it and I am hoping that some of those will be taken care of, but these are all comments that are helpful to take back.

A. Rosenbaum: Thank you, Doris and thanks for the work you do in putting this all together for us.

C. Raymond Alden III, Executive Vice President and Provost – presentation
**A. Rosenbaum:** Our next speaker is Provost Alden. I’ll remind you that there are a number of reasons why we wanted to invite Provost Alden to speak with us. Originally we had some questions about standards for admission that we thought the provost might be able to answer and also we wanted to hear a little bit about the provost’s view of distributed learning and where the university needs to go. So it’s my pleasure to introduce Provost Raymond Alden.

**R. Alden:** Before I get started, I did want to mention that I usually give an introduction to Doris thanking, not only her, but the hundreds of faculty that are involved in the steering committee. I shouldn’t say this, but this is my fourth re-accreditation in three institutions. And generally it’s something done by a small staff that is all they do for ten years. I’ve seen the university come together and really make this a viable process and it is particularly critical because we are the first and probably the largest institution having to deal with these particular criteria that they were still developing while we were starting to write the self-study and that credit-hour issues did not even come up until after the faculty left in the spring and then they didn’t finalize the template for it until September. I would like to thank all of you for bearing with us on a federally-mandated but very last-minute requirement. It just shows how the university can come together on some of these issues.

I wanted to get everything in the context of the challenges that we all hear in higher education and then talk about some of the future directions. Things are changing – changing in higher education, particularly public higher education, dramatically. Not the least of which is the public and political view of higher education no longer being the public good that allowed our country to be what it is in the world as the only remaining super power and having the technological edges and so forth. It’s being viewed much more as a private good; people ought to pay for their own education because they benefit from it. So, this is a very unfortunate fact of life and it didn’t just happen with the economic crisis in 2008. This public disinvestment is not going to get any better. Right now, 44 states have shortfalls in their budgets. Unfortunately, the little red asterisk at the bottom represents Illinois, we’re 43 of those 44, the only one that’s worse is Nevada. We are kind of at the bottom of this and the National Governors Association says it’s probably not going to get better for a while.

Unfortunately at the same time expectations of the public and political bodies both at the state and federal level have gone up. There have set very aggressive goals for attainment both in terms for the Race For The Top as well as the Illinois public agenda which both pretty much say that by 2025 either we need 20 million more Americans with post-secondary education on the federal level, or 60 percent of our population between 24 and 34 to have some sort of post-secondary certificate or degree associated with their education.

Provost Alden’s power point presentation can be accessed by clicking the link (presentation) under C. The text of the presentation has been omitted from the minutes because in many sections, the comments were in reference to graphs and tables that were on the screen and therefore make no sense out of context (i.e., without the slides to which he is referring).

**R. Alden:** Well you originally said there was something else that you wanted me to answer and I don’t remember what it was now.
A. Rosenbaum: I think the question that had been raised originally had to do with the problem of trying to maintain the university’s financial situation via tuition, while at the same time maintaining academic standards. I think faculty have expressed some concern that the academic standards not be lowered in order fill the positions that are necessary to fill in order to support the university.

R. Alden: First of all, we have stopped directors admit. So the directors of admissions do not unilaterally admit students who do not meet our admissions standards. The colleges can, and do, look at the records of students and make some of those decisions, so it’s the advising deans that are really making those decisions. That’s something that basically I implemented a couple of years ago.

The other thing, and we had a discussion in Dean’s Council this morning. The best place we can effect change on enrollment is not going out and have everybody do recruitment, it’s in yield. Our yield of students who’ve already been admitted but have not enrolled or who have enrolled. Our yield is quite low compared to our sister institutions. I think university-wide it may be 28 percent. That’s low hanging fruit. If we can get students on campus or communicating with their home departments early on, I think that’s been proven to be the most effective way to build enrollment. It builds enrollment on students who have already been admitted and, quite frankly, I think it could be used, if we just came up to – close to what our sister institutions like ISU and UIC have as their yield rates, we’d probably have a waiting list again. So this is a way for colleges to shape their enrollment without having to feel like they have to go out and beat the bushes in the high schools or in the community colleges. It’s just sealing the deal, and quite frankly the Stamat Study that was done a couple years ago amongst top students in this region indicated that it’s not the prestige of the university they are looking for. It’s whether they can have an academic home and work with their faculty, and get a meaningful career path going early on. That’s what they’re looking for. So if those kinds of conversations and that kind of interaction can be done from the time they’re admitted until the time they make their final decision, that’s where we can have really some impact at the academic side of the enrollment process.

M. Kostic: I think we wanted to discuss with the provost the newest online learning. The last time we talked about it and we were debating and then we heard that provost is all for it and I would add before the provost commented that the most important thing in real estate is location, location, location and there are many other business particular in education is quality and quality and quality.

R. Alden: Right. We had a task force on distributed learning that met for almost two years and one of the critical things the group wanted to emphasize because they reported the recommendations to my office even though I participated in a lot of the discussions, is that we want to make sure that we don’t just consider online just someplace to post our lecture notes and then give an exam at the end. This is something that really requires a lot of focus on quality. Quite frankly, the reason that the Ivy League institutions are jumping into this is they realize that it’s the future and they realize that it can be done with quality.

Now we don’t want to go only online. I think we have a lot to offer on campus here and that’s the value added we need to reaffirm and focus on and quantify. But we do have a huge
population in Chicagoland that are geographically bound. These are working professionals, they are people with family obligations that are only able to take one course at a time.

A lot of the students that we see as traditional students, perform better with high-touch, high-tech combination, hybrid courses, faculty interacting with them both in and outside the classroom. Because I am in favor of online, it doesn’t mean one size fits all. It means that certain populations and certain academic programs can serve better online. But we also need to look at how we can serve as well as we can those students who come on campus and show what that valued added is. It is a complex matter. The competition out there is fierce.

What I see as a positive sign is that the for-profits who got in early and did a lot of the cherry-picking online, they’re starting to lose enrollment. Kaplan has almost gone down the tubes. University of Phoenix went from 500,000 two years ago down to 300,000 students. So that is a positive sign. But it means the publics and the not-for-profit privates are getting quality and edging them out. We need to be a least having a portion of our population served there.

Another aspect of online, which is counter intuitive, regional name appeal is huge in the online world. If you know the institution and you are able to relate with the institution, even though you never set foot on the campus, you often have a competitive edge to maybe even a more prestigious university coming from across the country. And that’s been shown over and over again. I think having a foothold and a lot of partners in the Chicagoland area, a lot of constituencies, a lot of alums, we can make the difference here for those populations who never come to campus.

G. Slotsve: On transcripts, will we distinguish what’s on-campus versus online course work as far as the credits that are produced?

R. Alden: No. As far as transcripts go, no. Now I say in the future, I would like to have e-portfolio and credentialing of those students that do come on campus and do get heavily engaged in learning experiences in faculty both in and out of the classroom to have some credential in the competencies they require because of those kinds of things. That’s beyond the transcript. That’s something that is added to the transcript, but, in terms of whether you get a grade in an online course or an off-campus course or an on-campus course, those are all the same. Another thing is that geographically bound working adults want to take one course at a time but want to take it in a more compressed year-round format rather than just the traditional two semesters. So that’s one of the challenges, but it’s also one of the opportunities because, if you look at some of those courses, faculty don’t have to teach them quite as often. They have a lot more time off.

G. Slotsve: No, granted, but then I would just suggest at this stage because it’s at the earliest stages of the planning in a sense, that you think of keeping records to see what are success rates for what’s on-campus versus online, at least internally, so we can find out if there is a difference and know if there is a quality difference going on.

R. Alden: And those universities have done side-by-side studies of online, face-to-face and hybrid. Different sections offered in different venues tend to find out as long as the quality is there that the online and face-to-face tend to be fairly comparable, but the hybrids are much better in terms of student retention and information retention than either of the other two venues.
I’m not saying online just to go online, I’m saying hybrid is probably the best way to transform the course.

**G. Slotsve:** By hybrid you mean a combination of online and in class?

**R. Alden:** Well, instead of assigning students a text book, having them use some of this courseware to do the content mastery outside of the classroom and have the faculty focus on what does it all mean. Problem based learning basically.

**A. Rosenbaum:** I think we are running out of time so thank you, Ray. We appreciate your coming to talk with us.

**V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION**

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. **FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – walk-in**

**S. Armstrong:** Alan Phillips, the IBHE deputy director of planning and budget gave us a very lengthy PowerPoint, 72 pages I think, that paralleled what Provost Alden just gave to us. So if you’d like more information on that, I just got that in my mailbox today and I can get that to Alan to post to the Blackboard site. It’s very detailed. The last thing is that the public caucus is taking on the probably impossible task of looking at the value of higher education in general and trying to find ways to communicate with the public to dispel the misconceptions about the value of higher education especially with regard to the increasing costs. If any of you have any sources that you would like me to take back with me, we are actually writing a white paper which we hope to turn into editorials to send to newspapers and also to alumni. If you have any sources that you’d like me to include, please let me know. I’ll entertain questions too.

**A. Rosenbaum:** We’ll put Sonya’s materials on the Blackboard as soon as we get them.

B. **Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report**

**M. Theodore:** Things have been moving very quickly lately. As you know, Speaker Quick is going to be graduating at the end of the semester so there’s been a lot that’s been happening with wrapping that up. The new speaker elections will be this Sunday so you will be able to know who will be succeeding Austin.

I would also like to thank all the faculty members that attended the memorial this past week for Steven Agee. It was very moving to remember a great student and it’s very good that faculty members, students, staff and the DeKalb community were able to come together to remember him, so I thank everyone for that.

Relating to that, we have been assisting the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management with their bystander intervention program and their training. The important thing
here is to reduce the bystander affect and encourage students and everyone at the university to be
more educated about what to do in the case of an incident. The reason I’m telling you this is that
I heard today that they do need more facilitators for next semester. This program has been doing
a lot of great work in educating students and it does need faculty facilitators to educate. The
training session for that is going to be January 9. If you want more information you can contact
the director of Health Enhancement.

We have put in money for busses to Detroit for the football game and there’s a few slots left so if
you know students who really want to go, let them know. Also, we will be looking for a new IT
specialist. Our current one is graduating. So if you know someone who is very web savvy, we’re
looking for them.

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and
Andy Small – report – Pages 3-4

D. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas –
report – Pages 5-6

A. Rosenbaum: I’m going to call your attention to only one thing because it relates to what the
provost was talking about and that is the last bullet point on my report which gets at this online
learning and the mechanisms by which NIU is going to try and get into this. Apparently, in
consideration of the fact that it requires a great deal of technology and scaffolding, one of the
ways to do this quickly is to partner with companies that have already begun doing this. This
item, this last bullet point that I was just referring to, refers to putting out RFPs for these
companies that have experience with online education to be able to propose collaborations with
us. And so this involved the mechanisms by which the board is going to approve those RFPs.
The provost’s intention is to have many RFPs going out at various times and so the Board of
Trustees needs a mechanism for approving those without having to wait for the next Board of
Trustees meeting.

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita
Lopez – report – Page 7

T. Latham: All right, there was a report by the internal auditor and it really was 16 audits, one
was canceled or not completed. Out of those 16, you can see item areas, but it really focused on
operational areas, compliance, financial, information systems, fraud detection and prevention.
Kathy Buettner gave a presentation on the recruitment and marketing efforts of the university.
Three main points: high population markets, the use of traditional media, and the use of social
media to attract and recruit students. The fourth paragraph identifies the cost of those types of
initiatives as about $800,000.

And the last paragraph is the legislation piece of the committee in which Lori Clark reported that
the constitution amendment in Illinois did not pass. And a consequence of the election is that
representatives, legislative representatives at NIU, will be changing because of that. You can see
of those names. Adam Kinzinger, of course, is one and Senator Severson from Rockford will be
a new representative as well.
A. Rosenbaum: Last is the BOT report and as I said earlier, the main focus was a special meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Board will meet again on December 6 for its regularly scheduled meeting. This special meeting was called to charge the search committee and to hire the search firm. The search committee now includes 28 people. A number of people were added since we last spoke and that was to make sure that every constituent group in the university was adequately represented. You should be aware that of that 28, we picked up additional faculty members as well. So we started with 12 faculty members, we now have 15, so the faculty, proportionately, have gained representation on the search committee. The Board of Trustees hired the Parker Executive search firm which is a very experienced search firm. We’ve worked with them before and they do a really good job. Their expertise is in the area of presidential searches.

M. Kostic: inquired about whether the BOT is restricted in who they can choose, based on the short list given to them by the PSAC.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, they have a number of choices. They could choose one from the short list. They could continue the search. They could either continue the search with this particular search committee and say, “Send us some more candidates.” Or they could continue the search going forward and appoint an acting president because on June 30 President Peters will retire.

M. Kostic: So then in mind you, we do have a say. It’s not like we are just advisory if we are to recommend a selected group. That’s how it works in college, committee recommends and then dean makes the choice, that’s the same procedure.

A. Rosenbaum: Right, but they are not restricted to hiring from within that pool. They could hire outside of that without our consent. I don’t think they will do that because they seem to be respecting the shared governance culture at NIU. So my feeling is that we will give them five or more strong candidates that we can get behind and that they will be satisfied with one or more of those candidates. But there are other aspects as well. I mean just because you pick a candidate doesn’t mean you can sign them. The BOT will have to engage in a negotiation with whoever those candidates are and so it’s possible even if we give them five great candidates and they choose one or more of those candidates, there’s no guarantee that those candidates will accept the offer and agree to become the next president in which case we have to go back to the drawing board. But the Board of Trustees has the final say and they can hire somebody that is not among the five that are given to them by the search committee. We don’t expect that they’ll do that, we hope they won’t do that, but they have the right to do that.

C. Cappell: I read in the Tribune a few days ago a letter from Barsema and the chair of the BOT in response to an editorial about the need and difficulty of finding an NIU president given the current situations here, and the phrase, entrepreneurship, was a key feature in their letter saying we will have no trouble finding people and here among the attributes that we’re looking for, entrepreneurship was mentioned.
A. Rosenbaum: Well, entrepreneurship I think refers to what we expect the president to do, not who we expect the president to be, so my expectation is the entrepreneurship involves figuring out ways to generate money for the university. That person who’s doing that, whether it’s someone who comes from the academic ranks or someone who doesn’t, is going to have that same task. There might be some very respectable candidates that do come from outside of academia. We can’t just disqualify them outright, but certainly the faculty have made it clear that we want a president from the academic side. But that president will have to be somewhat entrepreneurial in order to keep the university in a stable fiscal state.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report
B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report
D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report
E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Page 9
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Selection of Faculty Senate liaison to Libraries Advisory Committee to replace Jeff Kowalski. The LAC meets from 2 to 3 p.m. on the third Friday of the month.

Both Gleb Sirotkin and Virginia Naples volunteered. There was some discussion and it was decided to flip a coin. The result was that Gleb Sirotkin will serve as the Senate liaison to the LAC.

B. Presidential Engagement Professorship Selection Committee – one volunteer to serve as Faculty Senate representative on this committee which will meet January 14, 2013.

Virginia Naples volunteered and was unopposed. She will represent the senate on the committee.

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Graduate Council
L. Minutes, Honors Committee
M. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
N. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
O. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
P. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
Q. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.