The meeting began at 3:20 p.m. with a full quorum present.

Approval of Agenda:
The agenda was approved as distributed.

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of August 30, 2005 were amended; page 3, paragraph 3, line 13 after for example, add “staff and specialists”. The minutes were approved as amended.

President’s Remarks:
President Simon thanked members for their participation at the Sesquicentennial Convocations that occurred last week. The major speakers were both web streamed as well as videotaped for those who were not able to hear the speakers. The President noted the presentations were excellent and a good presentation of the academic community. There is a brochure that addresses the President’s comments and a web site on strategic positioning. The Boldness by Design will be discussed at the next Academic Council meeting.

Provost’s Remarks:
Provost Wilcox encouraged members to participate in the discussions under way on the Academic Quality Enhancement Fund. The Board of Trustees has identified $9.7 million to enhance academic quality on campus and the Deans have been asked to assist in developing proposals for deciding how to spend the money in support of enhancing the experience of the students and building on the strengths of the University. The hope is to have the proposals in by the end of this month and begin the review. The President noted that this is an important time for engagement since this is the first time in a long while that we have had the opportunity to solicit this type of proposal.
Executive Committee Chairperson’s Remarks:
Professor Sticklen encouraged members to view the videotapes and or audiotapes from the Sesquicentennial celebration. Professor Sticklen commented on the important task for this meeting to deliberate, discuss and vote on the five proposed Faculty Voice task force groups. A revised timeline will be discussed under other business.

Discussion, Deliberation and Voting on Task Forces:
Professor Weber, ECAC member and member of the Faculty Voice Summer Subcommittee, presented a set of amendments on the composition of each task force.

The following changes were made for Task Force groups 1, 2, 3 and 4:
- The task force will be composed of regular faculty (as opposed to tenure-stream faculty)
- Nominations for task force members will be taken from any member of the regular faculty. Faculty Council will be the voting body for the election to the task force. (This was additional information).

The changes for Task Force 5 included:
- The task force will be composed of regular faculty (as opposed to tenure-stream faculty)
- The task force will be composed of six (as opposed to five) regular faculty from a ballot of eight (as opposed to seven) regular faculty.
- Nominations for task force members will be taken from any member of the regular faculty or any member of the fixed term faculty. Faculty Council will be the voting body for election to the task force. (This was additional information).

A motion passed approving the changes.

An additional amendment was proposed for Task Force 5 under the Task Force Charge # 5, third sentence; strike out “elaborate plans for dissemination of the report” and replace with recommend any needed changes. A motion passed approving the change.

An amendment was proposed for Task Force 1 under Task Force Charges, B #7 inserting the word structure after the word leadership. A motion passed to approve the change.

Professor Peterson raised a question regarding the last sentence under composition for all five task force groups, namely: “The task force will determine its own voting rights.” Professor Peterson suggested this should be determined by Faculty Council. A motion was made to delete this sentence and replace it “faculty will have voting rights and students and administrators will have voice but not vote.” Professor Weber noted that all of the charges are not the same. Some of the charges have more involvement of students than others, some more involvement of fixed term faculty than others. The summer subcommittee thought it was best to leave the flexibility inside the task force groups to
decide. The motion failed, majority voting no. There was discussion related to input by students. Weber noted the work of the task force groups will come to governance.

In relation to the composition of the task force groups, Professor Sticklen commented that the summer subcommittee considered carefully the inclusion of the Board of Trustees liaison. The idea was to keep the link with the Board of Trustees. There were two thoughts on the inclusion in that the Board would get the proposals in the end and on the other side was to include them at this level. Professor Sticklen noted if there was a sense of the body that a change should be made, then it should be done now. A member commented that it was absurd that the Board of Trustees should have a vote on the task force groups. The President noted that it has been typical in governance that students and faculty that participate on committees have voice and vote. If an administrator is chosen as a member of a committee, they have been treated as any member. Historically, individuals who have been liaisons to committees have had voice but not vote. Giving people vote as a liaison of the administrative office is unprecedented. In addition it is unprecedented to include the Board of Trustees at this stage of the discussion. The role of the faculty who are liaisons to the Board of Trustees convey information to the Board in their discussions.

Professor Weber made a motion and it was seconded to accept Task Force 1, pages 3 through 5 including the amendment passed regarding composition. Professor Emmett asked for clarification regarding the ASMSU letter and concerns about Task Force 1. A motion was passed to give students voice. Bob Murphy, Chairperson of Academic Assembly, voiced concern related to the potential outcomes of the exclusion of students that Task Force 1 could lead to if following the charge. The letter urges the rejection of Task Force 1.

A motion was made to amend Task Force 1, page 4 under Task Force Charges, A. #2 to read:
Consult with current standing committees (as opposed to Chairpersons only), former Chairpersons and leaders in academic governance….. The motion passed to approve change.

Professor Sticklen noted that the charge of the Task Force 1 is written broadly so the Task Force Group can report out proposals for change that may not be in the original proposal. A motion passed to approve Task Force 1 as amended.

Professor Weber moved acceptance of Task Force 2, pages 6 through 7 including the amendment passed regarding composition. An amendment was proposed under Composition line 3 to include one Specialist with continuous appointment status to be inserted after one administrator. A sentence should be inserted second to the last sentence in the paragraph that reads: The Specialist Advisory Committee will submit a slate of two candidates to ECAC and Faculty Council will select one. A motion was
made to amend the amendment on the composition to increase the **regular faculty to six from a ballot of eight regular faculty.** The motion to accept the change was passed. The motion to accept the amended proposal for Task Force 2 was passed.

Professor Weber moved to accept the proposal for Task Force 3, including the passed amendment on composition, pages 8 through 10. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

Professor Weber moved acceptance of the proposal for Task Force 4, including the passed amendment on composition, pages 11 through 12. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion and the motion to accept was passed.

Professor Weber moved acceptance of the proposal for Task Force 5, including the passed amendment on composition, pages 14 through 15. The motion was seconded. An editorial change was made under composition, line 1 to insert regular before faculty and correct line 6 changing “on” to “one”. An amendment was proposed under composition to increase regular faculty to 6 elected from a ballot of 8 regular faculty. The amendment passed.

The motion passed to accept the amended proposal for Task Force 5.

**Other Business:**
Professor Sticklen presented a revised timeline for consideration of Faculty Voice issues. A motion was passed to accept the timeline as proposed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\[Signature\]

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

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