The meeting began at 3:22 p.m. with full quorum.

Approval of Agenda:
The agenda was amended to allow Provost Wilcox to make his remarks when he arrives. A motion was passed to approve the amended agenda.

Public Comments (2 minute time limit per speaker; 10 minutes total):
The President introduced the public comments period and noted the time limit for speaking. There were no comments.

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of October 9, 2007 were amended. Professor Keller asked the minutes be corrected as she misspoke by requesting to table the Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report instead of postponing the item. The motion to amend the minutes was approved.

President’s Remarks:
The President reported that the State Higher Education Bill included two separate sections, one for the three Universities, University of Michigan, Wayne State and MSU, which are the highest Carnegie Research Classification. The other section was for the other twelve institutions in the State. The amount of money for operations was essentially the same for both. It was the understanding that accountability measures that reflect the various missions and responsibilities of the two groups will be worked on over the next six months. This will be included in the discussions for the next Higher Education Appropriations Bill. There will be $2.50 per credit that will be returned to the students plus a one time payment of $27.00 per the BOT action. Currently the newspapers are reporting the replacement of the sales tax that affected businesses will be replaced by some other tax. If the projections are correct the University should have enough
revenue to carry through 2008. There will not be enough revenue in the package to take care of the structural deficits for Michigan beyond 2008 unless things change.

The President noted that on the National level, a 474 page Bill to Reauthorize Higher Education was issued by the Chairpersons of the Committee that includes a number of provisions. The most dramatic of the provisions is that institutions that raise tuition above the Higher Education price index would be put on a watch list made nationally available. The provisions do not make allowances for a state like Michigan that has lost 25% of the purchasing power from the State. A system of accountability measures, as recommended by the Spelling Report, is not in the bill at this time.

**Provost’s Remarks:**

Provost Wilcox commented on several of the recommendations from Faculty Voice Task Force groups. The recommendations on Academic Program review are in process for this year. The Administrator Review recommendations were discussed in governance last year and Council agreed upon a methodology on two key parts. One area was the additional clarity regarding the expectations for the criteria for review of Chairpersons and Deans and secondly a notification process. The notification process would be when reviews would be taking place for Chairpersons with feedback to the Faculty Advisory Committee in each College when the reviews were completed. The Administrator Review process is moving forward. The Provost’s Office has received half of the Colleges Chairperson review criteria at this time.

The Provost reported that he has been meeting with Colleges on budgets which are part of the Fall planning process. The budget and planning process too often has been a short term issue of crisis and high anxiety. The Provost is trying to ease some of the tension around the process by having meetings in the Fall discussing College directions, initiatives, opportunities and changes in Colleges.

**Executive Committee Chairperson’s Remarks:**

Professor Potchen reported that a preliminary report was received on the Task Force 4 Faculty Survey. The final report will go to ECAC in January.

**Proposal to Split the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management:**

The proposal to split the Marketing and Supply Chain Management Department from Eli Broad College of Business was referred to UCAP and UGC. Professor Chivukula, Chairperson of UCAP, reported the committee unanimously endorsed the proposal. Professor Klomparens reported that UGC had two comments regarding the proposal: 1) the split into smaller units always has a cost and is the Provost going to cover the costs? 2) Who will review the outcomes? It was suggested that the mandated program review would be just such an opportunity to look back and see if the desired outcomes were reached. A motion passed to endorse.

**University Mission Statement:**

Provost Wilcox reported that two years ago during the North Central Accreditation the University Mission statement was rather lengthy and suggested a revision. The Provost’s staff and University Relations staff drafted a revision of the Mission Statement. The revision was
shared with the BOT in the Fall and then asked for community input. ECAC referred the revision to several committees for input. The Provost presented the current revision for discussion and endorsement. A motion passed to support the current revision as advice to the BOT.

**Report on the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference:**
Professor Hughes, ECAC member, reported on the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference attended by Professors Powell and Hughes. The conference was hosted by the University of Iowa, November 3 & 4, 2007. Professor Hughes summarized the highlights of the meeting and the full report will be on the Governance web site.

**UCFA Response re Faculty Voice Task Force 2 – Administrative Review:**
Professor Davidson, member of UCFA, reported on the committee’s response back to the Provost was presented in the UCFA Memorandum dated November 6, 2007 (Distributed). Professor Davidson summarized the UCFA’s comments and noted the committee agrees with the spirit of the recommendations made. The committee suggests that the University might be better served by enhancing the current processes as suggested by the President and Provost and at the same time highlighted some of the concerns expressed by Task Force 2 and offered suggestions. A Council member commented that UCFA’s response is a dramatic revision from what Task Force 2 intended. A question was asked as to whether Faculty Council will have an opportunity to vote on the revisions? The Provost noted ECAC asked for the UCFA’s response to be taken to Council as an information item today. It was decided to refer to ECAC to review a chronology on the movement of Task Force 2 in governance to see if a motion to endorse was tabled. The President commented that under the current Bylaws for Academic Governance, matters of administrative review are advisory to the Provost and with the exception of having a Bylaw provision that would be specific regarding Presidential review. The Provost has the responsibility for the review of administrators and the report is advisory to the Provost. The Provost had some issues with the Task Force Report and advice and chose to engage in conversation with ECAC last Spring about the concerns and a proposed approach to the advice of Faculty Council. The minutes from the Faculty Council meeting of 4/24/07 were then referred to regarding action taken. At the 4/24/07 meeting a motion was passed to refer the set of commitments made by the Provost to UCFA to sort through the issues and report back to Faculty Council in the Fall. Professor Potchen noted that it was never viewed that ECAC, Faculty and Academic Councils would accept whatever the Task Force groups recommended without deliberation. The Task Force 2 Report has been subject to the deliberations of the bodies that have been charged to do so including UCFA. The provost made a response to what was recommended, UCFA as the designated committee reviewed the Provost comments and issued a report back. ECAC found UCFA’s report consistent with the Provost and the Task Force 2 Report. Professor Potchen concluded that deliberation can continue but he would like to see something accomplished. A chronology of the movement of the Task Force 2 Report through governance will be done.

**Motion to Faculty Council from ECAC re Remaining Parts of Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report:**
Professor Potchen made the following motion: to request the faculty members on ECAC to prepare documents similar to the “yellow pages” introduced by Jon Sticklen for the two remaining parts of the recommendations of Task Force 1, which are the two parts not yet on the floor as motions (Proposed Central Governance Bodies and the Proposed Committees). These documents will be distributed to Faculty Council before any motion is made to accept the remaining two parts of the Task Force 1 recommendations.

The motion was seconded. Following brief discussion the motion was amended to add that the documents also be distributed to Task Force 1 members. The motion was passed.

Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report: Section 111 – Proposed Steering Committee:
Professor Hughes presented the following motion: to suspend the rules governing the effect of adjournment on pending items so as to allow the consideration of the motion on page 1 of the document known colloquially as “the yellow pages”, specifically to enable consideration of the proposal for Faculty Council to endorse the recommendations of Faculty Voice Task Force 1 to replace the current “Executive Committee of Academic Council” with a newly defined executive called “The Steering Committee”, lines 11 to 13 of the “yellow pages”. The motion was seconded. Professor Hughes noted that there was some confusion at the end of the previous meeting. While various interpretations have been put forth and discussed, one of the interpretations was that the motion was on the floor at the time the meeting was adjourned and as such under Robert’s Rules of Order that motion would have been killed by the adjournment and would not be able to be brought back in this term of the Council. Thus the reason for the motion, to suspend the rule, is so Council can consider the motion, for example amend the “yellow pages” and move ahead. Professor Hughes noted the intent was that one motion would be passed to create The Steering Committee (TSC) and then move forward with subsequent motions. This approach would provide the most flexibility in the form of the debate as opposed to dozens of amendments. The President clarified that rather than to introduce a main motion as all encompassing and then do a series of amendments, Professor Hughes is proposing a process to introduce lines in small segments so they would be separate motions. A motion was made to amend the motion to consider lines 11 to 91 with the appropriate suspension of the rules. The motion to amend was seconded. The motion to amend passed. The amended motion then passed.

The President noted that it is likely that the Council will encounter running up to 5 pm with matters pending before the body. It would be helpful if the Rules Committee could develop rules that would be user friendly so items may continue from meeting to meeting. Professor Hughes acknowledged the receipt of the request and indicated the Rules Committee would make a recommendation.

Discussion resumed on the “yellow pages” lines 11 through 91. Professor Sticklen proposed an amendment to the motion to add to the “yellow pages”, lines 92 through 107, a procedure for recall of members of The Steering Committee (TSC). The motion is attached. The motion was seconded. Professor Sticklen explained the Council should have the ability to remove a TSC member given cause. There was some discussion regarding the number of votes needed for the recall. There was a motion to amend line 96 to read by a 2/3 vote of Faculty Council. Some members spoke against the proposed amendment. One member noted that at
times recalls become another election. **The motion to amend was defeated.** A question was asked as to why a TSC member would be recalled. What are the criteria for recall? The President, as Chairperson, interprets the desire for criteria as a motion to add, not amend. Professor Potchen inquired if the Rules Committee could develop modified rules for Council as opposed to following Robert’s Rules so strictly. The question was called on the motion to amend by adding lines 92 through 107 to the “yellow sheets”. The motion to call the question to close debate failed. A motion to amend line 98 to insert the **members of** Academic Senate was passed. Professor Hughes noted the time was close to 5p.m. and suggested that the Rules Committee return with a proposed modification to proceed in an orderly and user friendly manner for the next meeting. Professor Hughes proposed postponing further consideration of the motion on the floor until the next meeting. The motion passed.

**Other Business:**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline A. Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance