EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

MINUTES

October 2, 2007

Present: Bice, Caramagno, Chivukula, Hinojosa, Hughes, Morash, Noel, Potchen, Powell, Selke, Sticklen, Tims, Zheng; Others: Curry, Harrison, Wilcox, Wright, Youatt, Anderson (News Bulletin), Thoel (State News), Rosser, Anderson

Absent: Ludy, Morrice

Professor Potchen called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. with a quorum being present.

The Agenda was amended to include Faculty Survey – Task Force 4 and CLEP Issues. The amended agenda was approved.

The minutes for September 11, 2007 were approved as distributed.

Provost’s Remarks:
The Provost reported on the state of the budget. The State is $1.8 billion dollars short with $1.4 billion dollars in new revenue leaving $400 million to find in restructuring. The Board of Trustees passed the budget for this year including the expected 1.8% cut which means there will not be any cuts.

The Provost noted that the University has had opportunities on campus for several speakers to come and talk on some controversial topics. The University is an environment where people are entitled and encouraged to share their ideas and this will continue. At the same time, in order to make those conversations possible requires us to be vigilant about our behavior and respectful.

ECAC Chairperson’s Remarks:
Professor Potchen recalled that the Civility Task Force recently issued a report that there was no specific action needed at this time but to emphasize to each other the need for civility to all people. It is important for the University to continue to encourage free speech. The agenda for ECAC during the few next months will be to draw closure on the remaining Faculty Voice issues. Professor Potchen reported that the at-large members met concerning how to best move forward and this will be discussed at this meeting. Professor Potchen reported a Task Force has been identified to look at the stewardship of a public resource and enhancing the role of the human capital at the University to impact the State. The members of the task force include Professors Ballard, Mock, Weber and Potchen.

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) – Report from Professor Anderson:
Professor Potchen introduced Professor William Anderson, the MSU representative attending the COIA meeting held at Stanford University, May, 2007. Professor Anderson reported that COIA is an attempt by faculty governance to address several concerns that have lingered among faculty, namely that intercollegiate athletics must be in alignment with the educational mission of the institution and that college sports must adhere to the collegiate athletics model, not a professional athletics model. There were 60 of the 110 division 1A representatives at the Stanford meeting and 9 of 11 Big Ten Institutions who sent representatives. The organization is an Ad Hoc group who met to complete the work on a White paper. This document was
distributed to members at the last ECAC meeting. The four areas addressed by the White paper included academic integrity, student athlete welfare, campus governance and fiscal responsibility. There were twenty-eight proposals developed and adopted by the representatives at the meeting. A number of associations were also represented at the conference including the NCAA, the Knight Commission, the AAUP and the National Athletic Academic Advisors Association and they have all supported the proposed proposals in the White paper. It is expected that the proposals will likely be integrated into the accreditation standards. Professor Anderson explained that each Athletic Department goes through an Accreditation process much like Colleges and Departments.

Professor Anderson’s assessment of COIA was positive. He was impressed with the quality and perspectives presented at the meeting. Professor Anderson agrees with Professor Kasavana that MSU could benefit from continued participation with COIA. However, he disagrees with Professor Kasavana regarding his statement that “he supports COIA in principle but not in policy since MSU already exceeds the policies of the group”. Professor Anderson believes there are a number of items in the proposals that places more oversight into the hands of governance than currently exists at MSU. Professor Anderson suggested an Athletic Department review looking at some of the new COIA standards.

Professor Potchen asked ECAC members what they wanted to do at this time. A motion was passed to form a Task Force to review the 28 proposals and the degree to which MSU meets, exceeds, or is challenged by the proposals in the White paper. Professor Potchen appointed Professors Anderson (Chair), Noel, Tims, Powell and Connie Zheng and asked for a minimal report in February and a final report in April.

**Task Force 4 – Faculty Survey:**
One of the recommendations made by the task force was to survey the faculty on the issue of communication and transparency. Professor Sticklen reported that several faculty, Sticklen, Weber and Hughes, have worked with the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) to develop a draft of a faculty survey. Nat Ehrlich from IPPSR described the process used for the web survey. Members offered comments on the draft for suggested changes. The draft will be sent to ECAC members with feedback to be sent to the governance office and then on to IPPSR. Once all of the changes have been made IPPSR will begin the process to send the survey to all faculty.

**University Mission Statement:**
Provost Wilcox reported that during the accreditation review by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, the Commission recommended that the University revise the Mission Statement. It was suggested that the statement be clearer and more focused to better communicate to internal and external audiences. The Provost presented a draft Mission Statement which has been endorsed by the BOT. The Provost is asking for input from Governance. After discussion a motion was passed to seek input from UCAG as the first step and then the campus community.

**Academic Program Review (TF 2):**
The Provost presented an implementation plan for moving the Academic Program Review forward. There were some modifications recommended to make the campus-wide program review both manageable but also inclusive. All Programs will be reviewed including the
Professional Programs which can be scheduled with the Units and the accreditation visits. The process will begin in the fall with the focus on self-study and then may move to the external review. Following some discussion the motion was passed to endorse the implementation plan with an appointment of the University Faculty Program Advisory Committee (UFPAC) by ECAC. ECAC appointed the following members to the new UFPAC, Professors Potchen, Sticklen and Wright. This item will be placed on Faculty Council agenda.

**Faculty Voice Task Force 1- Next Steps:**
Professor Morash began with proposing the following two motions:

1. Present a brief discussion of how amendments and substitute motions work according to *Robert’s Rules of Order* at the beginning of the next Faculty Council meeting.

The motion was passed.

2. Present a motion to accept Part 3: The Steering Committee of the Task Force 1 Recommendations at the next Faculty Council meeting.

Professor Potchen asked for clarification if the motion was being put forward to move discussion. Professor Morash indicated this was a way to move through the recommendations, voting up or down and or proposing amendments. The motion was passed.

Professor Powell cautioned that the rules for discussion need to be set up because of the complexities. Rules for debate need to be set up in order to be focused on the issues. We had much input from non-members last year; we now need a deliberative debate by Council members. Following further discussion a motion was passed to propose limiting discussion on Part 3 of the Task Force 1 recommendations to Faculty Council members for a three minute time period. Following additional discussion a motion was passed to hold a ten minute public comments period at the beginning of the next Faculty Council meeting, with a two minute time period per speaker.

**Setting of Faculty Council Agenda for October 9, 2007:**
The agenda for the Faculty Council meeting scheduled for October 9, 2007 is as follows:
- Public Comments (2 minute time limit per speaker; 10 minutes total for comments)
- Approval of Minutes for September 11, 2007
- Academic Program Review – Information Item
- Motions and Amendments According to *Robert’s Rules of Order* – Information Item
- Executive Committee Proposal for Discussion Process at Faculty Council – Action Item
- Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report: Section 3 Proposed Steering Committee – Action Item
- Other Business
A motion passed to approve the agenda.

**Setting of Academic Council Agenda for October 23, 2007:**
The agenda for the Academic Council meeting scheduled for October 23, 2007 is as follows:
- University Committee on Curriculum Report – Action Item
- Academic Program Review – Information Item
• Other Business

A motion was passed to approve the agenda.

Other Business:
CLEP Test Issues: Professor Potchen reported that UCAP took action in response to a request to allow CLEP examination after matriculation to the University last February, 2007. Professor Estry noted he had responded to the student. There is no further action needed by Governance.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance