ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
APRIL 3, 2006
CNS 209


Regrets: AVP O. Grossman, I. Haug, R. DeWitt (Executive Secretary)

Guests: R. Crabtree; J. Garvey.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. Presidential Courtesy
   No items.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
   No items.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of meeting of March 6, 2006.
      Changes (page numbers refer to the numbering in packet) as follows:
      Page 8 line 10 from bottom: K. Nasser should be C. Naser.
      Page 8 line 15: faculty should be faculty
      Page 7 line 4: rational should be rationale
      Page 6 Motion (at top) should read Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for a Senior Summer Fellowship for either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical.
      A vote to approve the minutes was called. Vote on the

      MOTION: to approve the minutes. MOTION PASSED 14-0-0

   b. Correspondence. Secretary Irene Mulvey discussed the March 28, 2006 memo from AVP approving some and not approving one AC motion. She said that this memo is under correspondence, but not on the AC agenda today because it came in too late. She explained that the motion was re-affirming current policy, but the AVP stated that the
motion’s language would not be helpful in the Journal of Record. I. Mulvey asked for input from the Council on this matter. B. Abbott asked if the Council can refer this to the General Faculty; I. Mulvey responded that anything can be referred to the General Faculty. P. Lakeland asked if there was any reference to teaching evaluations and privacy in the Journal of Record; I. Mulvey responded that there is nothing about privacy in the JR. There is certainly historical precedent, but nothing that she can find in the general faculty meeting archives yet. G. Lang asked if there was anything referring to the idea that teaching evaluations had to be turned over to administrative parties? I. Mulvey said not that she was aware of. D. Keenan asked if the Executive Committee should meet with Orin to discuss the issue; I. Mulvey stated that she thought that was a good idea.

4. **Council Committee Reports.**

There were none to be presented.

5. **Petitions for immediate hearing.**

There were none to be presented.

6. **Old Business.**

a. **Follow-up Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees**

P. Lakeland distributed a summary report (attached) of the Conference Committee Meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Thursday, March 23. P. Lakeland noted that P. Huston, Chair of the Board of Trustees read a prepared statement in which he argued key points of view by the Trustees. P. Lakeland noted that it became apparent in the ensuing discussion that the BOT and the faculty are somewhat at cross-purposes; the Board’s stated goal is to “lower the overall cost of providing medical coverage” so that a greater proportion of compensation can be devoted to salary. The faculty referred to the “Guiding Principles” which state that “in a year when overall funds cannot meet cost of living, attention should be given to satisfying sustained merit.” P. Lakeland noted that progress had been made in terms of clarifying the faculty’s views but that problems remained in the sense that the Board did not agree to the statement in the Guiding Principles that funds be directed to cost of living first, since they divided the funds into 2.5% sustained merit and 0.5% additional merit. The Trustees also continue to insist that total compensation (including health care costs) be compared to any cost of living increase.

P. Lakeland asked if G. Lang, who was also at the meeting, had anything to add. G. Lang added that President Von Arx was at the meeting. He congratulated P. Lakeland on the last two sentences of the report, pointing out the cultural gap between the Trustees and faculty, especially the notion that “The Trustees failed to see the argument on principle that ‘some should not receive more if all do not receive enough.’” The faculty have a difference in philosophy; some voices on the Board assert, “if you’re healthy, you should
take out more money.” They don’t understand that the faculty view is that we are willing to sacrifice some of our own pay for someone else.

D. Keenan asked what the Board’s rationale is for splitting the compensation as they did. P. Lakeland responded that the Board believes that if we go to cost sharing, we would reduce the overall level of health care costs to the University. Experience shows that institutions in which faculty take a portion of health care costs on themselves actually spend less overall. We’re not in a good place when 49% of our increase goes to health care; that affects the University’s competitiveness.

G. Lang commented that the faculty will have to address the health care issue, just as all corporations are dealing with it. D. Greenberg asked if the survey the Board referred to found that the quality of health got better among faculty at these institutions. P. Lakeland responded that these were assertions, not a statistical survey. D. Greenberg asked if it was certain if the money saved from health care would go to the salary portion of compensation. P. Lakeland stated that the Board did not use the term “automatically,” but that their philosophy is that salary will increase if the Board is actually committed to the 95\textsuperscript{th} percentile. D. Greenberg asked if it is possible that some faculty would get the bulk of the extra money, and P. Lakeland responded affirmatively.

S. Rakowitz asked what had happened last year, with the money from increased co-pays. G. Lang responded that half of the money went to salary, the other half to endowment. W. Abbott argued that health benefit costs might decrease with no corresponding increase in salary. P. Lakeland reiterated that that shouldn’t happen, if the Trustees and AVP are committed to the 95\textsuperscript{th} percentile. J. Lange asked if the Board did not agree with the Guiding Principles. P. Lakeland responded that it was good that we had the Principles, but that only one Board member indicated agreement with it. G. Lang argued that since in three of the last four years the CPI had not been met, in the short run that means the death of the merit program. T. Snyder asked if there was clarity around which figure should be used to measure “cost of living.” He suggested that economists address this issue. G. Lang stated that an attempt was made to explain CPI-U, which typically does not include benefits. T. Snyder suggested that a position paper be presented to the Board as a basis for further discussion. P. Lakeland argued that economists were present at the meeting (W. Hlawitschka, M. LeClair), but that it wasn’t really the correct forum, that it should go to the salary committee. E. Hadjimichael asked what would happen if the Guiding Principles were actually used? P. Lakeland responded that it would help determine the relative portion of salary versus health care benefit increases.

7. New Business

a. Three proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

i. Guidelines for UCC advisory committees reviewing courses

J. Garvey, Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee presented a document, “Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees” that would provide direction to the Core
Science Review Committee and the two advisory subcommittees on diversity in proposing new courses. J. Garvey asked that the AC approve the proposed Guidelines.

E. O’Neill asked if all the items (1-5) were guidelines, since points 1 and 2 appeared to be contextual. J. Garvey suggested that the motion should be to approve the complete draft, and then points 3-5 could be put into the Journal of Record. S. Rakowitz asked why point 3d was necessary. J. Garvey explained that J. Simon drafted these guidelines, and that the committee wanted to make it clear that proposals include “rules and specifications.” W. Abbott argued that 3d was trying to make criteria specific. J. Lange suggested that more transparency was needed in the course approval process, but she wondered if it was necessary to have the course descriptions included in the minutes. J. Garvey said that the committee does want the course description, because it is helpful for review. T. Snyder argued that more specific descriptions ensure that the committee focuses on the guidelines and prevents discriminatory behavior. K. Steffen affirmed that it was good to have course descriptions. It was asked if there were specific criteria for the committee used in making their determination. J. Garvey responded that the Guidelines under consideration were an umbrella document, then more specific criteria would be presented. K. Steffen suggested that in the sciences, there has been interest in having the process of course approval be more orderly. J. He said that when he had been Chair of the UCC, there were no written documents on courses that the UCC approved. The World diversity subcommittee would approve courses, but they would not seek approval of UCC. UCC asked the subcommittee to at least provide a summary of what they approved.

I. Mulvey suggested that before making a motion, the Council should remove points 1 and 2 and re-number 3, 4 and 5 as 1, 2 and 3, but use the paragraphs 1 and 2 as introductory paragraphs.

**MOTION.** [Lang/Steffen] To approve the Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees for inclusion in the Journal of Record with the proposed modifications (remove points 1 and 2 and re-number 3, 4 and 5 as 1, 2 and 3, but use the paragraphs 1 and 2 as introductory paragraphs).

S. Rakowitz proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Rakowitz/Abbott] To remove the last sentence from the Guidelines in point 3d.

T. Snyder argued against the amendment; W. Abbott argued for, along with I. Mulvey.

**AMENDMENT PASSES:** 8-2-4
Discussion continued on the motion as amended. D. Keenan asked why the Guidelines didn’t tie into language in the Course Catalog, that this might leave open the potential for interpretation by the subcommittees. J. Garvey suggested that these Guidelines applied across subcommittees and thus had to be general.

P. Lakeland proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Lakeland/Keenan] [new wording for Guidelines, point 3d (to be re-labeled 1d), last sentence] “Please frame such a discussion around the criteria approved for your committee.”

J. Garvey argued that this was covered by point 3c. P. Lakeland asked if it was always the case that subcommittees will be asking about core credit? J. Garvey said that the Guidelines referred specifically to core review classes (Core Science Review, and US and World Diversity). I. Mulvey suggested combining points 3c and 3d. J. He argued that some of the US and World Diversity classes are not core classes.

**AMENDMENT PASSES: 11-0-3**

J. Garvey asserted that US and World Diversity classes are core requirements. S. Rakowitz proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Rakowitz/Buss] [new wording for Guidelines, point 3c (to be re-labeled 1c), last sentence] “The committee’s recommendation on whether the course meets the specifications for core credit in the area under the committee’s purview.”

D. Keenan spoke in favor. D. Greenberg argued that this document should be sent back to the UCC to tighten the language. K. Steffen spoke in favor. J. Buss called the question.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION [Buss/Steffen]: 14-0-0**

**AMENDMENT PASSES: 12-2-0**

D. Greenberg moved to table the motion and send back to the UCC.

**MOTION.** [Greenberg/Sapp] Table the motion.

**MOTION FAILS: 4-7-3**

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION [Ligas/Buss]: 13-1-0**

Vote on the main motion.

**MOTION PASSES: 11-2-1**
ii. **Request form and template for US Diversity and World Diversity course submissions**

J. Garvey asked the Council to approve the request form and template for each of the Diversity subcommittees and to have these materials included in the Journal of Record. The templates came to UCC in their December meeting, including the Request Form, Criteria and Guidelines, Chart, and flow chart.

F. Dohm suggested that the Council focus on the US Diversity Designation forms.

**MOTION [Buss/He]: To approve the “Request to Consider Course for US Diversity Designation” form and include in the Journal of Record.**

S. Rakowitz stated that the template asks for more than is often provided on a course syllabus. She suggested that this presents a higher hurdle for a faculty member to offer a Diversity course, even though offering these courses is something the University wants to encourage. T. Snyder stated that, on the other hand, these are guidelines, and they might be helpful to people who haven’t offered these courses before. W. Abbott argued that statements on the template such as “will [students] be moved to advocacy?” is an example of areas where the templates might create uncertainty. G. Lang had questions about emphasizing student learning outcomes. He argued that the role of the University is to provide an environment where learning can take place, but learning outcomes are the responsibility of our adult students. We should focus on content and methods of delivery rather than learning outcomes.

P. Lakeland argued that the courses themselves have already been approved, we don’t need the Diversity Committee to second guess the department’s decision. The committee needs to find out if there is diversity in the substance or content of the course, not the process (how the course is taught). J. Lange explained that, from the UCC’s perspective, the committee needs more information. The syllabi that faculty present represent a wide range, from too much to too little information. G. Lang re-emphasized that the focus should be on content.

Due to the late hour, the Council agreed to recess the meeting at this time and reconvene on Monday, April 10 at 3:30 in CNS 209 to complete the remaining items on today’s agenda.

**MOTION. [Greenberg/Sapp]: To recess.**

**MOTION PASSES: 12-0-0**

Respectfully submitted,
Don Gibson
Secretary pro tem