UNIVERSITY SENATE

Meeting #4

Thursday, January 19th, 2023
4:00PM
Letterman Building, Room LB 125

AGENDA

Approval of the University Senate Minutes of December 1st, 2022

I. Announcements

A. Next Scheduled Meetings
   University Senate – Thursday, February 23rd, 2023, 4:00 p.m., LB125
   Senate Agenda Committee – Monday, February 13th, 2023, 2:00 p.m., BC200

II. Recognition of Deaths

Frank J. Puzzullo
Associate Professor Emeritus of Music Performance
Retired 2011
28 Years of Service

Dr. Horst (Fred) Siewert
Professor Emeritus of Natural Resources and Environmental Management
Retired 2003
28 Years of Service

Dr. Betty J. Beeson
Professor Emerita of Elementary Education
Retired 1990
16 Years of Service

Dr. Conrad C. Lane
Professor Emeritus of Elementary Education
Retired 1992
27 Years of Service

III. Questions Directed to President Mearns

IV. Committee Reports

A. Governance and Elections Committee – Linda Taylor, Chairperson
B. Faculty Council – Chris Van Hof, Chairperson
C. Professional Personnel Council – Mike Gillilan, Chairperson
D. Student Government Association- Tina Nguyen/Monet Lindstrand

V. Report by Chairperson of Senate – Nathan Bogert– GANTT chart (Enclosure #2 - Issues in the Senate System)

VI. Question and Answer Period

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. New Business
    A. The Student in the University Freedom of Expression policy (Enclosure 1)

IX. Other Items

X. Adjournment
MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE 2022-2023 UNIVERSITY SENATE
December 1st, 2022

Members Present: 31
Members Absent: 10

1. The meeting was called to order by the 2022-2023 Chair of the University Senate, Nathan Bogert, at 4:03 p.m.

Substitutions were noted.


Substitutes: E. Zurzolo for S. Fulton, T. McKenzie for B. Large, L. Gerstein for M. Tschopp, S. Hji-Avgoustis for C. Webster


Guests: Kristen McCauliff, Robert Crouch, Melissa Rubrecht

A motion was made (Gillilan) and seconded (Haynes) to approve the minutes of September 29th, 2022. No nays noted. No abstentions noted.

Motion carried.

I. Announcements

Next Scheduled Meetings

University Senate – Thursday, January 19th, 2023 4:00 p.m., LB125

Senate Agenda Committee – Monday, January 9th, 2023 2:00 p.m., BC200

Non-Tenure Line Changes- Voted on and approved by Faculty Council on November 3rd, 2022- (Enclosure #1)

Joint Appointment Statement- Voted on and approved by Faculty Council on November 3rd, 2022- (Enclosure #2)
Chair directed the Senate’s attention to the final two items, passed by Faculty Council. Having now been announced, they will move up the governance process.

II. Questions Directed to President Mearns

Provost is present to take questions. Wishes everyone a relatively peaceful close of the semester. No questions were asked.

III. Committee Reports

a) Governance and Elections Committee – Linda Taylor, Chairperson
   No report, will meet next on 1/19
b) Faculty Council – Chris Van Hof, Chairperson
   Two resolutions passed and were just presented. The Core Curriculum Revision process has been temporarily paused, as a compliance issue must be addressed. Once UCC addresses these issues, they will be brought back before Faculty Council. Next Meeting: 2/9

c) Professional Personnel Council – Mike Gillilan, Chairperson
   Dr. Rashida Willard addressed PPC at last meeting, and was generous enough to take questions. Additionally, PPC is now engaged in a process to re-evaluate the work it does to find ways to create more value for members.

d) Student Government Association- Tina Nguyen, President
   Working on community garden, with the hope to get it up and running by the end of next semester. Also met with Parking/Transportation office to improve Charlie’s Charter, primarily with reminding students it is a safe option to get somewhere at night. An elections commissioner has been appointed to start the process of elections that are rapidly approaching. Finally, the process for appointing a student trustee has started, with that appointment expected to come in March

IV. Report by Chairperson of Senate – Nathan Bogert– GANTT chart (Enclosure #3 - Issues in the Senate System)

Chair gives an overview of the issues working through the Governance system.

V. Question and Answer Period
Members were given the opportunity to ask some questions. None were asked, and the body moved onto the new business.

VI. Unfinished Business

VII. New Business

HR Language regarding Dual Employment- Enclosure #4

Dr. Turner asks a clarifying question, whether small things like working at a soup kitchen and being paid would need to be reported. Response from HR is that the intention is not to include things like this, and the language
could perhaps be re-written to be clear. Provost adds that this is an attempt to combine multiple policies already in the books into one cohesive and clearly stated policy.

Coggeshall asks whether faculty that run personal architectural practices will need to report those to the dean. HR response is that yes, this work would be covered under the policy. The goal is to make sure that Ball State employment is the priority, not to stifle other work for faculty. If a situation arose where the stated policy would allow some outside employment, but the dean denied it, that could be escalated up the management ladder as normal situations are handled.

Prater asks whether a commission or “gig” for artists or musicians or other employees would qualify. The answer is yes, that would fall within the scope of this policy. Provost adds that one-time things like being a paid speaker at a conference is a similar scenario which has already been addressed with policy. Prater notes that some facilities are used for outside professional work because of practicality, for example glass blowing facilities, and they could be affected. Provost says that will be up to supervisors.

Chipman asks about arts being legitimate scholarship for certain roles, how would that be handled? HR response is that this will need to be solved at a department level, given the complexities involved.

Davis speaks to the conflict-of-interest policy. All outside work must be disclosed anyway, and there is a system in place for analyzing conflicts. This policy is not new necessarily, just wants to make sure that language is appropriate for liability purposes. Prater wishes to clarify that he is sure all members of his department are following these rules, he just wanted to provide an example to further the discussion.

Chair Bogert wishes to clarify that this is not about stopping people from doing work, it’s just about making sure that all work is disclosed appropriately. Goal is to renew the emphasis on disclosure and put the disparate conflict policies regulating this issue into one place. Open to input to improve it, but it is a compliance issue and it is required that this take place. Office of Research integrity is doing outreach on this issue and it’s expected that will continue this academic year.

VIII. Other Items

IX. Adjournment

Motion made by Gillilan, Dickin seconded
Motion carried unanimously


Respectfully Submitted,

Kourtland Koch, Secretary
Hello Bethany,

After the Freedom of Expression Statement (Section 1 of the FPPH) was adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 30, 2020, the university has engaged in a review of current policies to ensure they are consistent with the university statement. Last year, we successfully introduced revisions to four policies for approval through the governance process.

The attached are two versions of Section 115 – The Student in the University of the FPPH. The redline version highlights the proposed changes and the clean version would be the final version. Based on the FPPH notes, this section of the handbook came from the Student Activities Committee, then Student Senate and University Senate. Should these revisions be sent to the SAC for approval to follow the same approval process? If so, I will work with our PPC representatives on the SAC to begin the process.

39 Approved by Student Activities Committee, November 17, 1969;
   Student Senate, December 3, 1969;
   University Senate, May 14, 1970.

Thank you,
Ro-Anne

CLEAN COPY

115. THE STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

1. The University is a special kind of community – a community marked by a high degree of diversity and mobility, but at the same time, by a constancy and shared purposes among its members. This community's constituency includes students, faculty, and staff in a broad range of age groups and from diverse backgrounds, fulfilling a variety of converging functions, and holding membership in the community for varying periods of time, in most cases for four years or less. Commitment to the pursuit of common goals in an atmosphere of free inquiry and expression is jointly exercised by all members of the University community, the members of the University community having varying functions reflecting their particular competencies. Residents of the state, alumni, parents, and other benefactors also have a stake in the future of the University.

2. Although it is a part of the larger society and as such is subject to many operative forces therein, the University community is and must be dedicated to: the definition and transmission of our cultural heritage; the discovery,
application, and advancement of knowledge; service to the best interests of society; and, above all, the development of its students.

3. As a citizen in the University community, the student is both subject and object of community life. The student, while a member of the community, shares with others responsibility for progress toward the attainment of cooperatively developed University goals, and the impact of the student culture is that of a dominant factor in effecting a potent educational environment. Concurrently, the student is the beneficiary of the content as well as the process of higher education. The role of the student is, then, contributor and recipient; and the relationship between the student and other members of the University community singly and collectively is basically an educational one, with education broadly conceived. Mutual respect and reciprocal fairness should characterize the relationships among members of the University community.

4. In the academic sphere of University life, the student is entitled to expect the following: competent teaching; courses which are adequately described and relevant, so choices may be made; fair, well defined, and equitable evaluation practices; an effective voice in the evaluation of class content, structure, and instruction; adequate facilities; respect from teachers and other students; protection from exploitation and capricious actions by faculty and other students; and opportunity for appeal of decisions made regarding the student's academic achievement and/or progress, which are deemed unfair or unreasonable. Also, every desirable and practical measure should be taken to humanize educational programs and procedures, as well as to facilitate personalized student faculty relationships. The student is expected to take full advantage of available opportunities and to be an active participant in the teaching-learning process. The student should keep in mind that the professors have previously demonstrated a degree of competency in a field of specialty. While not official University policy, legitimate academic-related expectations by particular professors are well within the professor's academic freedom and must be respected as such. The professor, on the other hand, should clearly delineate to students the criteria by which they will be evaluated.

5. In the extra class sphere of University life, as in the classroom and laboratory, the University operates on the basis of its own responsibility and authority derived from various sources, not as a parent surrogate.

6. The University community has responsibility for determining and enunciating its own standards, and students, as full members of the community, should participate in all levels of policy formulation relevant to them. Policies and procedures of the University applicable to student life are based on their justification for, and contribution to, the education of students and the well-being of the University community as a whole, with respect to genuine and legitimate educational concerns. In order to effect consistency in the formation and implementation of policies affecting students, communication should be facilitated among and within policy making bodies, as well as between policy making bodies and those who implement the policies. Policies and procedures must be applied in ways consistent with the principle of due process, the hallmark of which is fair play for all students regardless of race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, national origin, ancestry, age, or other legally protected characteristic.

7. The student is both a member of the University community and a citizen. The student retains basic rights as a citizen when entering the University, while recognizing the assumption of certain additional obligations as a
member of that special community. Thus, basic rights as a citizen - freedom of expression, freedom of 
association, freedom of inquiry, peaceful assembly, and right to petition - will be protected on the campus, 
with any limitations clearly substantiated as necessary for upholding applicable laws and/or valid educational 
considerations and consistent with the Statement on Rights and Responsibilities. The student is responsible to 
civil authorities for obeying the laws of the community, just as to the University for adherence to University 
regulations. The University will not accept remand of a student charged or convicted of violations of local or 
state laws for the purpose of imposing discipline. Only when a genuine university educational concern or 
purpose is contravened will the University take action against a student's behavior. And, a student has the right 
and should have the means to appeal any University action which seems unjustified or capricious.

8. It is expected that all members of the University community will respect the rights of others – including their 
right to hold differing or even unpopular opinions. Therefore, it is essential for the student, as well as for other 
members of the community, to be fully aware of his or her rights and responsibilities.
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application, and advancement of knowledge; service to the best interests of society; and, above all, the 
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attainment of cooperatively developed University goals, and the impact of the student culture is that of a 
dominant factor in effecting a potent educational environment. Concurrently, the student is the beneficiary of 
the content as well as the process of higher education. The role of the student is, then, contributor and 
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evaluation practices; an effective voice in the evaluation of class content, structure, and instruction; adequate facilities; respect from teachers and other students; protection from exploitation and capricious actions by faculty and other students; and opportunity for appeal of decisions made regarding the student's academic achievement and/or progress, which are deemed unfair or unreasonable. Also, every desirable and practical measure should be taken to humanize educational programs and procedures, as well as to facilitate personalized student faculty relationships. The student is expected to take full advantage of available opportunities and to be an active participant in the teaching-learning process. The student should keep in mind that the professors have previously demonstrated a degree of competency in a field of specialty. Respect for this position must at all times be in evidence if the student wishes to command similar consideration for the student's academic rights. While not official University policy, legitimate academic-related expectations by particular professors are well within the professor's academic freedom and must be respected as such. The professor, on the other hand, should clearly delineate to students the criteria by which they will be evaluated.

5. In the extra class sphere of University life, as in the classroom and laboratory, the University operates on the basis of its own responsibility and authority derived from various sources, not as a parent surrogate.

6. The University community has responsibility for determining and enunciating its own standards, and students, as full members of the community, should participate in all levels of policy formulation relevant to them. Policies and procedures of the University applicable to student life are based on their justification for, and contribution to, the education of students and the well-being of the University community as a whole, with respect to genuine and legitimate educational concerns. In order to effect consistency in the formation and implementation of policies affecting students, communication should be facilitated among and within policy making bodies, as well as between policy making bodies and those who implement the policies. Policies and procedures must be applied in ways consistent with the principle of due process, the hallmark of which is fair play for all students regardless of race, sex, religion, or creed, race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, national origin, ancestry, age, or other legally protected characteristic.

7. The student is both a member of the University community and a citizen. The student retains basic rights as a citizen when entering the University, while recognizing the assumption of certain additional obligations as a member of that special community. Thus, basic rights as a citizen - freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of inquiry, peaceful assembly, and right to petition - will be protected on the campus, with any limitations clearly substantiated as being necessary for upholding applicable laws and/or valid educational considerations and consistent with the Statement on Rights and Responsibilities. The student is responsible to civil authorities for obeying the laws of the community, just as to the University for adherence to University regulations. The University will not accept remand of a student charged or convicted of violations of local or state laws for the purpose of imposing discipline. Only when a genuine university educational concern or purpose is contravened will the University take action against a student's behavior. And, a student has the right and should have the means to appeal any University action which seems unjustified or capricious.

8. It is expected that all members of the University community will have tolerance for the opinions and respect for the rights of others – including their right to hold differing or even unpopular opinions. Therefore, it is
essential for the student, as well as for other members of the community, to be fully aware of his or her rights and responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY COUNCIL</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEC revisions proposals</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>04.14.22</td>
<td>08.15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC- Reduction of Core Curriculum Hours-Reversal</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>10.07.21</td>
<td>06.20.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>04.21.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to Admin.</td>
<td>08.15.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>09.01.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To FC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL COUNCIL</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk Safety</td>
<td>To Public Safety</td>
<td>02.17.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll/benefits Questions</td>
<td>To PPS&amp;B</td>
<td>02.17.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOE: The Student in the University revisions</td>
<td>To Student Activities</td>
<td>8.3122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE AGENDA</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF&amp;E Ombudsperson Proposal</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>04.12.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>04.15.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPPH Section 113 &amp;114 Revisions</td>
<td>To SAC</td>
<td>02.14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To FC</td>
<td>03.17.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To PPC</td>
<td>03.03.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To SAC</td>
<td>04.11.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Senate- Annec.</td>
<td>04.21.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP&amp;T Revisions</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>03.14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To FC</td>
<td>04.14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To SAC</td>
<td>08.15.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCGA</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>04.11.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To FC</td>
<td>04.14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To SAC</td>
<td>08.15.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL- FPPH Sec: 16 &amp;21 Revisions</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>04.11.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To FC</td>
<td>04.14.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substitutes: S. Anderson for M. Lorsung


Guests: K. Denker, J. Gassensmith, L. Kuykendall, K. McCauliff, R. Wert, K. Zenisek

The Chairperson of the 2022-23 Faculty Council, Chris Van Hof, called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Roll call was taken by signing the roster.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 6th, 2022.
No nays noted. No abstentions noted.
The motion carried.

I. Announcements

A. Next scheduled meetings
   - Faculty Council January 26th, 2023, 4:00 p.m., Letterman Building, Rm. LB125
   - Items for next agenda to be received by Senate Office no later than Friday, January 13th, 2023, for electronic review by Faculty Council agenda committee

   Chair introduces himself and gives the order of the day. We will hear from the chairs of the relevant committees to introduce the business coming from their committees. Members are also asked to submit any potential business to Chair Van Hof.

B. Items currently in committees- GANTT Chart (Enclosure #1)

C. Chairman’s Report
   a. Progress of the UCC subcommittee
   b. Joint Appointment Statement
   c. Ombudsperson Proposal Ad Hoc Committee Update
      i. Ad hoc committee has been meeting. The Provost provided guidance on where the committee should focus. Have been referencing the work of peer institutions to see how others handle an ombudsperson role.

II. Unfinished Business

A. Joint Appointment Statement (Enclosure #2)
   a. Henry Wang gives a brief background of the joint appointment statement. Joint appointment has been in the works for several years, looking at how to perform proper evaluations when tenure decisions are up for joint appointees. Committee produced a report to discover how this was handled nationwide. The UPT believes that the scope of this problem is primarily within the committee’s charge, but can see where other people would be affected by the lack of joint appointment procedures being written down. This proposal allows for joint appointments, gives the procedures for how that will be handled, and other necessary tweaks.

   Huff makes a motion to approve that language and received a second. Unanimous vote in favor of the motion.

B. Non-Tenure Line Language Change (Enclosure #3)
   a. Chair of the NTL committee Truitt gives an overview. The goal is to fine-tune the language to improve clarity. Another goal is to make sure that the handbook language matches the practices that have been in place.
Motion made and seconded to move to a discussion on this issue. Discussion ensues over how this will affect those departments who rely very heavily on NTL faculty. This change allows the service requirements on NTL faculty to be negotiated rather than assigned. It also acknowledges that those who are NTL faculty will be able to negotiate because they are covering responsibilities that would traditionally be the responsibility of tenured faculty. Specifically, the discussion is about whether the final line of these changes will require departments to negotiate compensation they don’t have and can’t provide.

Vote to call the question. Vote was 25-16. Needing 66% to pass the motion, the vote fails.

Motion to table the motion. Vote was 18-19. The vote fails.

Vote to call the question. Vote was passed by unanimous consent.

Vote on the question. Vote was 29-5. The motion carries and the language will be placed in the handbook.

C. UCC Recommendations Discussion
Chair gives a brief overview. Over the last few years, there has been a conclusion reached that the core must be reduced to align with ICHE and to help transfer students when they arrive on campus. There is an accreditation deadline in 2023, so the goal is to have this problem settled before that time. This proposal will not restructure the core, although that can be handled later if this body decides to do so.

Chair of UCC Denker gives a report. This will try to maintain the integrity of the core, without touching the structure of the core. Individual classes will not be discussed this is a more general discussion. Option 1. Remove 3 credits from Tier 1, and 3 from Tier 2. Also, this will remove the option to double count classes in the core, which will allow students to take core classes outside their major.
Option 2, this will remove 3 hours from Tiers 1 and 2. Must be outside of the domain of the student.

Option 3, Remove 3 hours from Tier 1 and Tier 2

Discussion
Huff is in favor of the first two options, saying that removing double counting will help to solve the problem of people staying within their major.

Domain is one of the four domains within tier 1 and tier 2.

Question is asked whether this affects writing course requirements. It does not.

In Option 1, the double counting would apply through the whole core, while in 2 the change would only affect tiers 1 and 2.
Vitale says that for smaller departments, removing double counting would not be beneficial because it prevents easy completion of a degree. Many students pick up these smaller department’s majors in Tier 1 and 2.

Question is asked whether introductory arts classes will be removed for students. There isn’t any specific removal, but because the structure is being changed there will likely be associated changes.

Mayer asks what the downside is to Option 3. Says it looks like it has a lot of flexibility, but not sure what the downside is. The downside is that students will not have much diversity of classes in Tiers 1 and 2.

Guest from UCC says a lot of research was done for these proposals, 85-90% of departments have classes that are in tiers 1 or 2 of the core. The goal is to emphasize the split between the core and majors, rather than the overlap between the two.

Clarification: Double counting is possible under option 2.

III. New Business
IV. Question and Answer Period
V. Other Items
VI. Adjournment
   A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.
   No nays noted. No abstentions noted.
   The motion carried.
The Chairperson of the 2022-2023 Council, Mike Gillilan, called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. Roll call was taken by signing the roster. Quorum was met.

Approval of the minutes from October 13th, 2022 was entertained. A motion was made (Fulton) and seconded (Haynes) to approve the minutes. **Motion Approved Unanimously**

1. Announcements
   A. Next meeting: Professional Personnel Council: February 9th 2023, 4:00 p.m., Rm. LB125

Chair announces some upcoming dates, as well as informing everyone that the committee letters that were sent out are not spam, and to keep them for your records.

Chair introduces Rashida Willard from the office of Inclusive Excellence. Recently joined Ball State after spending years working in equity at institutions in Oregon. Office is located in the Applied Technology building. In the process of listening sessions around campus, beginning to take that info and putting it into practice. One core responsibility of the office is intentional diversity outreach in the community, and Dr. Willard is making sure to connect with the community herself. Another key part of the office is consultation, trying to become equity experts that can be resources for the campus community. Third major goal of the office is training and professional development; will be taking the existing system and expanding on it. Final goal is Resources and partnerships, which will give tools to the campus community that they can use to inform decision making, as well as integrating with inclusive excellence programs around campus.

Chair opens it up to questions for Dr. Willard, asks about the Climate Survey. The data is being analyzed, and will be put into a presentation that will be presented to the President and other officials. After that is done, the presentation will be disseminated to the community at large, and recommendations will be made.

Question is asked whether the listening tours will be going to colleges, and whether Dr. Willard is willing to attend meetings with smaller units. Dr. Willard responds, says she is willing to go wherever and meet with anyone.

Question is asked that whether the resources tool is available now. Dr. Willard responds that it was done previously at her last institution, and all the information is publicly available, but Ball State specific information is coming soon.

Question is asked whether the resources are in place to make the most out of the climate survey data. Dr. Willard responds that there are some limits on how the information can be shared, but she will be trying to take advantage of access to data experts on campus.
2. Committee Reports
   a. Admissions and Credits
      i. No report
   b. Global Engagement
      i. No report
   c. Master Planning & Facilities
      i. No report
   d. Professional Personnel Technology
      i. Cindy Cash gave report. Met on 10/19, and had a discussion about keeping the committee. Will meet after Thanksgiving to continue discussion and figure out how to move forward.
   e. Professional Personnel Salary and Benefits
      i. Met again today, discussing salary plans and how those will be disseminated.
   f. Research
      i. No report
3. Unfinished Business-
4. New Business
   A. Opening on Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee
5. Items in Committees- Gantt Chart (Enclosure #1)

   UCC committee met, and presented 3 proposals to the members of Faculty Council. Members of the Council will go back to their units and get input, to vote on what will be presented at the next meeting.
6. Question and Answer Period
7. Other items
   A. The Future of PPC

   Prior to five years ago, this group was called University Council, but the makeup of the committee was mostly the same. The structure and name changed, but questions still linger on what the committee does exactly and its composition.
The main question is to figure out what the value of this group is, and the Chair would like to solidify that in his remaining time as Chair. One idea is to have one member of the President’s Cabinet available to answer questions like in University Senate and Faculty Council. The leadership of this council will be meeting to organize a survey about the value of this organization, and how to improve the value it provides to this institution. This could lead to some edits to the purpose of the organization in the handbook if that is the sentiment expressed by the body. The goal is to make the meeting of this body valuable and worthwhile for members and the campus at large.

8. Adjournment
   A motion was made (Haynes) and seconded (Grigoletti) to adjourn Professional Personnel Council at 4:38 p.m.
   **Motion Approved Unanimously**