I. An invocation was read by John Makowski

II. Minutes of the November meeting were approved (22/0) subject to revision of comments by Gerry McDonald with respect to the composition of the Shared Governance Task Force.

III. Chair’s Report:

Task Force on Shared Governance composition has been announced and it is now at work; UCC met with Linda Heath and Fred Weizman; Peter Schraeder is on the task force on shared task force. Peter Schraeder gave a brief report of the Task Force work thus far in attempting to identify all the UPCs and the affinity groups affected by policies made by the UPCs. They have three broad questions for the University population at large: Knowledge of the Shared Governance System Itself; Effectiveness; Participation.

The Chair’s Report continued with a statement that Father G. will attend the January meeting and that Father G. appears supportive with changing the name of faculty council to faculty senate with the expectation that the name change is accompanied by some changes such as having the top level administrators attending FC meetings.

Gerry turned the floor over to Marta Lundy for a brief presentation on the “Center for Professional Development” She indicated that the center is redeveloping a web page with links to various services (day care), and documents (tenure promotion). The center is concentrating on mentoring initiatives for junior faculty and new chairs. They are beginning to put together a survey to the general faculty to assess faculty needs and desires.

Gerry indicated the co-sponsoring TGIT with staff council has thus far been a success. A brief discussion involving the Sullivan center followed with respect to access to books book storage in the Sullivan basement.

III. New business -

Patricia Jung put forth a motion for FC to co-sponsor an AAUP forum January 24, 2006 on shared governance. The motion passed 21/0/1 (1 abstention). Gerry indicted that FC might be able to cost share some of the refreshments.

IV. Committee Reports

Nick Lash - committee met on dean evaluations - they decided that FC should undertake a dean evaluation but not chair evaluations given the number of chairs. The committee discussed adding two questions to the proposed dean evaluations: does the faculty have an opportunity to reflect their opinion with respect to their chairs; associate chair/dean; - are the associate or assistant dean’s performing satisfactorily- to keep from getting too cumbersome people could write comments specifying which associate Dean. JF indicated that information
compiled in the Dean’s evaluation was taken seriously as one of several pieces of information that would indicate whether the Dean was a person that could meet the future needs of the affected units.

Report of the Education Committee: Bob Bireley  A motion was read from the education committee requesting clarification of the decision by the previous provost Pete Faccione with respect to values component rating of core courses submitted by the classics department. In the discussion that followed acting Provost John Frendreis (JF) presented his understanding of the sequence of events surrounding Faccione’s decision to deny a values component to the affected classes. According to JF the original core committee established requirements and then turned over the process to the University core committee for implementation. Within that second committee there was a discussion about requiring course content to contain some % contemporary relevance in order to satisfy core requirements. There were no minutes taken which could support this discussion. As the process of accepting classes into the core proceeded the committee accepted the classes into the core but without a “values” component. The classes were forwarded to the Provost without a vote and he (Faccione) then reminded the committee of the prior discussion on the need for a % coverage of contemporary issues. The committee then decided not to approve the values component. JF then went on to indicate that, as a policy matter, he did not think it appropriate for the Provost to do more than either accept or reject the committee’s decision. He further indicated that the value of the % of coverage of contemporary issues is something that should be decided by the appropriate university policy committee now that the core has been implemented and intends to send the issue to the academic affairs committee. He further indicated that he would like to have the chair of the FC academic curriculum committee be on the UPC committee. Finally he indicated that he would talk to Paul Moser and Brian Lavell to see if the current problems can be worked out.

David Mirza then suggested that the motion be tabled pending further developments. The motion was seconded by Allen Schoenberger.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a report from William Laird, V. P. Finance (BL) on that status of the university finances. His report began with a question from Allen Schoenberger with respect to a reported $50 million debt increase. Laird indicated this was a form of accounting which now separates out cost of housing and pricing controls (later he mentioned that prior to three years ago the financial accounting system did not allow us to price housing in such a way that it paid for itself, we lost money). The new building at WT was initiated after a market housing survey of students.

Highlights of the last fiscal year: 3 years ago the U lost $200 million in operating revenues in an 8 year period. Money was lost on real estate (Wilmette Campus), inaccurate setting of fringe benefits, refinancing decisions, decisions to place all of the endowment in the stock market, with associated fees in excess of $1 million for investment managers, lack of control on costs and fees of parking ($200k shortfall), hidden deficits in purchasing (withholding of invoices to the tune of $700k), and $100 million in deferred maintenance. Each of the issues mentioned have been addressed and the credit rating of the U has gone up to an A-. We now have a formal plan to pay down the debt. The financial report has a line item to increase the
faculty lines.

There was a question from about the surplus item in the budget. This line was affected by a $5.3 million gift from Mr. Cuomo. Another question was with respect to the recently announced tuition increases. This is based on the fact that our pricing is low in comparison to the market (e.g. Marquette). The new tuition has a split rate in order to avoid affecting current students. The increase in tuition for incoming students should allow us to add new faculty lines. It is offset by the fact that 89% of the students get some form of financial aid. Bob Bireley expressed concern that higher tuition might scare some lower income students from applying to the university. (The remainder of these minutes are compiled from the notes of Gordon Ramsey, as the secretary had to leave.) BL indicated that the average discount for freshmen is 40% of tuition. As more students apply (20,000 this year) and tuition increases there will be a gradual shift toward more need-based scholarships. He answered a question about the area designated as “TIF” in Rogers Park. Part of this area is across Sheridan from the Granada Center and includes the present Fine Arts building. It is an area to possibly be developed with housing.

The chair called for a motion to adjourn: motion, G. Ramsey, second D. Mirza. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.