The meeting began at 3:15 p.m. with a full quorum present.

**Approval of Agenda:**
The agenda was approved as distributed.

**Approval of Minutes:**
The minutes of September 12, 2006 were approved as distributed.

**Provost’s Remarks:**
Provost Wilcox noted that the President was in SE Michigan today. The Provost was not able to attend the last meeting due to travel to China. He reported that MSU is well respected around the globe. Part of the Provost’s responsibilities while in China included the opening of the new MSU office in Beijing. This office is charged with serving as a focus point for admissions and recruitment activities in China and as a central point for partnerships, such as research, outreach, and service in that part of the world. The University has been in China for over twenty five years and has over twenty different partnerships with institutions in China. The dedication ceremony for the new office was attended by over two hundred people from across China. This speaks for the depth of commitment from the partners for MSU and the work of the faculty. The University also co-sponsored a forum on international distance education and quality assurance. Provost Wilcox expressed appreciation for the work of the entire faculty at MSU.

**Executive Committee Chairperson’s Remarks:**
Professor Potchen reported that the Faculty Liaison Group to the Board of Trustees met to prepare for the BOT meeting this week. Part of the discussion with Board members
will be the metrics by which programs and administrators are evaluated which is part of the Faculty Voice recommendations. Professor Potchen invited members to communicate any issues they would liked discussed at some point.

There is some problem with faculty participation in academic governance seen in the difficulty of getting faculty in the Council to submit their names for two vacancies on the University Committee on Academic Governance. If we want a voice in the academic governance, we have to have faculty that are willing to participate. Professor Potchen encouraged members to consider what can be done to enhance participation in academic governance. It is the responsibility of faculty to participate. He also added that there is discussion regarding the metrics by which the contributions are measured, faculty are not rewarded for participation in academic governance. We would like to measure administrators and how well they reward faculty for contributions of citizenship in the university. Professor Potchen also noted the importance of being inclusive in governance and that a group that does not feel they have a voice is the Emeriti faculty and that this will be discussed down the road.

Search and Rating Procedures for the Position of Dean of the Honors College:
Professor Potchen presented the proposed Search and Rating Procedures for the Position of the Dean of the Honors College. This is a Taylor 2 position which means that faculty governance needs to endorse procedures. It was moved and seconded and passed to approve the procedures.

Voice Implementation Committee (VIC)
Professor Hughes, chairperson of VIC, reported that it was the decision of VIC and approved by ECAC that the following two motions come to Faculty Council:

Motion #1: The Faculty Council endorses the following three goals from Faculty Voice Task Force 4 (Communication and Transparency):

1. To increase the information flow between the elected governance representatives and their constituencies, in both directions;
2. To increase the level of participation of faculty and students in the process of governance by removing barriers; and
3. To increase accountability on all levels to ensure a responsible self-government.

Professor Hughes noted the first motion presents the overall goals identified in the Task Force 4 report. The VIC is working on organizing the other issues in the report. The motion was seconded and then approved.
Motion #2: The Faculty Council gives authority to the Voice Implementation Committee (VIC) to develop and integrate coherent recommendations from the Faculty Voice Task Force Groups 1 through 5 by any means necessary.

Professor Hughes noted there has been some confusion regarding the efforts of VIC despite the fact that Faculty Council had endorsed ECAC to form this group. This second motion is in attempt to clarify. The motion was seconded. Professor Hughes explained that as the group discussed Task Force 4 recommendations the issue of a survey raised many concerns such as cost, etc. The VIC needs to be able to determine the best approach to gather information.

Professor Abeles suggested an amendment to delete the words “by any necessary means” from motion 2. The amendment was approved. A Council member suggested that the VIC needs to be confident that the faculty is going to give them the necessary support and resources to be able to manage the five very complex proposals and make some sense of them. Professor Potchen indicated this was proposed because it was questioned what authority VIC had to do anything. Did they have to bring the proposals exactly as stated? Could we integrate them because some of them clearly overlap and some are confusing so there is a need to integrate the proposals? Professor Potchen commented that the amended motion would be adequate. The amended motion was passed.

Other Business:
No items.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

Tapes of complete meetings of the Faculty Council are available for review in the office of the Secretary for Academic Governance, 308 Olds Hall, 355-2337.