UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Wednesday, April 11, 2012, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Abdel-Motaleb (for Vohra), Alden, Barth, Bender, Bozikis, Brandt, Coles, Dawson, Downing, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Foss, Gaebler (for Rosato), Gupta, Haliczer, Heller, Holt, Houze, Kapitan, Latham, Lee, LeFlore, Lenczewski, Lin, Long, Lopez, McCord, Mohabat, Munroe, Novak (for Kowalski), Peters, Pitney (for Johnston-Rodriguez), Pritchard, Quick, Robertson (for Holly), Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Shortridge, Small, Smith, Sunderlin (for Bond), Theodore, Thu, VandeCreek, Von Ende, Willis


OTHERS PRESENT: Blakemore, Bryan, Cunningham (for Williams), Griffin, Hemphill

OTHERS ABSENT: Finley, Freedman, Freeman, Hansen, Kaplan, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas, Williams

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: There are two walk-in items, VI.G and VI.K. That is noted on the agenda, but they are walk-ins. So, let me call for a motion to adopt the agenda.

J. Holt: made the motion. A. Quick: was second.

The agenda (with the two walk-in items) was approved without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 21, 2012 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

S. Farrell: made the motion. S. Willis: was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.
IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

**J. Peters:** noted that the traditional reception following the last UC meeting of the semester would be held in the Holmes Student Center and not at the president’s house as in the past.

**J. Peters:** In his announcements, the president noted:

- The state budget remains a work in progress and it is unclear what the final outcome will be for NIU’s budget. We are still owed $47.3 million from this year’s state appropriation but there is consensus among the presidents that every indication we get from the state is that they will pay the full amount but, like last year, it may lapse over to as long as December 31, 2012.
- We have not received our spring payment for MAP money, which is in the neighborhood of $11 million, but we are supposed to be receiving that money very soon.
- The house passed a budget number that called for a 5.29 percent reduction in our GR budget beyond that which the governor recommended in February and sent it over to the senate. Yesterday, the governor sent a message to the presidents indicating that he does not support this 5.29 percent cut, and he is doing everything he can to make the case that higher education is important. That being said, we always have our contingency plans on how we would approach such a reduction which remember, it’s a reduction on that $100 million base.
- There’s a rally coming up on the April 19, and I think we’re sending a bus load of students to rally for MAP funding. MAP funding is very important, and it is something that the legislature and the governor really do want to support.
- One of the issues that has caught the attention of the legislature has been the General Assembly scholarships and also the waivers that are given by the university but particularly those that are given to our employees for dependents. This year, we had about 111 dependency waivers totaling about $382,000, whereas we have about 80 people here on General Assembly scholarships. By the rules of the IBHE, public universities are allowed to grant up to three percent of their tuition base in waivers. Our tuition base is $138 million times three percent, about $5 million plus. We can give those in waivers, and those waivers go for academic scholarships, they go for athletic scholarships, and we’re allowed to go one percent over that to meet Title IX requirements, the Department of Education Title IX requirements for women athletes. There was a bill in the house that would have eliminated or severely capped the employee benefit tuition waiver program. That failed, but they did pass a bill that would remove the General Assembly scholarships. Now, it’s over in the senate, and the senate is taking a broader look at all of these waivers. We are monitoring it very, very carefully, and I made the point that these dependency waivers are very important to us, to our employees. 75 percent of the people who take them earn less than $50,000. I think it’s good for the university, and it’s almost universal in American higher education.
- He supported the sabbatical program which he feels is really a merit-based professional development program. You have to meet certain conditions and it is a rigorous evaluation progress and reporting process.
Regarding pensions, we’re not sure whether there will be any action in this session. The governor has a task force on pension reform. I say we need pension stabilization and not reform. By April 17, the governor’s task force has to come out with a report, I think that’s going to begin the discussions. The state has two issues it has to deal with in a timely way. One is pensions and the other is Medicaid and they’re both huge and they have to be solved before the state moves forward. I just get darned mad thinking about the years that the staff and professors have put into an institution, and then you count on things for your retirement and then somebody wants to come and pull the rug out from underneath them because of decisions that policymakers made to divert their payments to other state priorities rather than paying their share of our pensions. It really gets me very angry.

Commencement is May 12, and so I just wanted to take a moment to thank everybody again for the efforts that they’ve put into getting our students ready for graduation and all the good research and everything that we’ve done this year.

There sounds like a lot of negative in my report today, but there are also a lot of positives. I’m very encouraged about the status of our new residence hall and the additions that are going up. It’s made a difference; our recruitment efforts are paying off. It looks like we have a strong enrollment period. I know we’ve done a lot of advertising, but a key component has been the quality of our new residence halls. We’re going to continue to renovate and replace our existing housing stock to make a much better learning/living environment for our students.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – no report

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – no report

F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper, Chair – report – walk-in

L. Elish-Piper: Much of my report has already been shared, so I’m just going to highlight a few items that weren’t specifically discussed. Our last Resources, Space, and Budgets meeting included having President Peters and Provost Alden with us, so if I misspeak on anything that I say they said, they can correct me.
Item 1. I just want to draw your attention to something that President Peters shared; item C, that a lot of proposals are being floated around regarding how to address the pension crisis and one that has been talked about is having the employer make the contribution rather than having the money come from the state. We may not necessarily know what that would boil down to, but it was shared with us that if it were to occur, NIU would be required to pay over $24 million annually, which is more than one-quarter of our base budget. So, that particular solution is one that obviously is not particularly viable.

Item D, we’ve talked a lot about this particular proposal from the Institute for Government and Public Affairs as being a relatively complex, but more acceptable, approach to dealing with the pension crisis. You may want to look at that because it really teases apart a lot of the issues and offers perhaps more nuanced solutions rather than some of the draconian measures that are being discussed.

Another point that President Peters made that I think is important for all of us to be aware of is item 1. E. A lot of legislative types seem unaware that many people who are employed at the university are not eligible for Social Security. So, he pointed out that, because the state doesn’t have to make that 6.2 percent contribution to Social Security, it seems as if part of the solution should be right there, that if they’re making that contribution for other employees in the state, that at least that portion should easily be made toward our pensions. But, the reason I wanted to share that is I was quite dismayed to find out that many legislators seemed shocked by this fact that we assume everyone knows. So, oftentimes, I think there is a misperception that many of us are double dipping – receiving both Social Security and the pensions – when in reality they are two very separate pools and most of us are ineligible for Social Security.

I want to continue to direct people to the state budget and pension update on our website. It is updated on a very regular basis, and it’s the best place to get the most current information. So, we’ve provided that URL there for you as well.

Provost Alden gave us a brief update on the Great Journeys strategic plan and he informed us that 52 proposals were submitted and 32 were selected and that, in this particular phase of the strategic planning process, there will be more accountability for both budget and outcomes for the funded projects to ensure that they are meeting their goals and moving forward appropriately and that that information, in terms of the specific projects that have been funded, their budgets and their outcomes will be available on the strategic planning website. It’s going to be updated, I believe, within the next week.

We also talked about concern regarding what our retirement situation might be, knowing that there’s all these pension issues and concerns and a lot of people who are beginning to look at retirement. So, we had an interesting conversation, talking about how it seems that approximately two to three times more people are asking questions about retirement than normal. But, just because someone asks questions about retirement, doesn’t mean that they intend to or that they will within a certain timeframe. We also discussed that one might guess that approximately eight to ten percent of employees may choose to retire this year and because only 30 days’ notice is required, it’s difficult to know how that may affect us in terms of staffing for the fall. Because of all of those unknowns, we need to just continue to monitor the situation and deal with it as it unfolds.
Item 6 is the next one I’ll direct you to that we didn’t talk about in President Peters’ remarks. We talked about House Bill 4996, which has passed out of the house and has been sent to the senate, and it deals with limiting reemployment of retirees. It does include exemptions for those who would be paid through grants and contracts, but this is an issue that will be of interest to all of us because many faculty and a handful of administrators are employed at NIU as retirees, and it has a potential to affect our staffing in some departments and some programs around campus. This particular bill could go into effect as early as January 1, 2013, but President Peters is hopeful that perhaps, if it does get passed, that they would allow us to delay the implementation to provide more time to deal with these issues.

**S. Cunningham:** There is a great appetite for limiting reemployment opportunities for university retirees, mainly because there are substantially more limiting policies in effect for the other retirement systems compared to the SURS. So there’s a great public focus on this topic generally. So, the sponsor of this bill has worked with us and listened to us as a background in higher education, and it’s probably the best possible outcome that we’re going to be able to negotiate through this.

**J. Holt:** This doesn’t cover retirees from one state system to another, like schoolteachers and administrators to university employees because at the College of Ed., we hire a lot of our adjuncts as retired K-12 teachers and administrators. It’s just within the system to not be reemployed within that system or across systems?

**S. Cunningham:** That is correct. The bill, as written, is only specific to the State Universities Retirement System. So, it would affect community colleges and universities, but not employment between systems at this time.

**J. Peters:** Because I would imagine we have some retired teachers.

**J. Holt:** Yes, we have quite a few.

**S. Cunningham:** If the bill passes, we will have a great deal of communication with the campus about this, and I believe we will have, as the president indicated, enough time to implement it in a systematic way.

**J. Peters:** This thing had such push behind it that one legislator wanted, without much of an understanding of federalism, wanted to ban people coming in who were retired from another state. They never had my American politics class, they were absent that day.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Greene, Chair – no report

J. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – report – Pages 3-4

**A. Quick:** I want to start out by congratulating, Delonte LeFlore, our president elect for the Student Association next year. The current president, Elliott Echols, was also elected to the Board of Trustees. One of the things we have been bringing to the forefront that we really want
to keep in everyone’s mind is the revitalization of campus facilities that are important to students when they’re looking at universities. One of the things we hear a lot about is our campus rec center and the Holmes Student Center, the building we’re in currently. I’ve heard a lot of great things, even the people that won’t live in the residence halls, but it’s exciting to see something new being built on campus. But we want to make sure that we also pay attention to these other buildings that are very important. As I’ve made mention many times, our rec center is a third of the size it needs to be for the amount of students on this campus, and that is definitely an area we want to make sure is given the attention as needed. I know things are being worked on, and I’ve met with Dr. Hemphill and Dr. Williams regarding that, but I wanted to make sure people are aware of that and keeping abreast of making sure that that happens and that improvements are there.

Speaking on the Springfield trip, we are looking at planning a trip for next week to send students down there. We were working with Dr. Hemphill’s office today to send a number of students down there. The MAP is obviously a very important thing for a number of our students get cut. I think in the fall, we sent two busloads of students down there and made a huge impact, so that was exciting.

The student grievance policy is something we’ve been working on. I was at the University Affairs Committee the other day. I think we’re getting close. I don’t know if you’ve heard anything regarding that. I guess it’s not on the report today, but we’re getting close, I think, to coming up with a solution and then coming up with a grievance policy that students can agree upon that will be fair to all parties involved.

The last thing that I wanted to discuss is the issue that we had talked about at the last University Council meeting with HB43. That’s the crosswalk issue that was brought up last meeting and obviously, that is an area that needs a lot more discussion. We are not going to continue with a resolution from this body, but I would ask for people to support the implementation of signs across campus.

I know we passed a resolution last week, I don’t know if you have an update of where that has went regarding the driving and parking on sidewalks. I literally got four pictures on my way here of the problem with people parking and driving on the sidewalks. I don’t know if you have an update of where that’s going or how that works when we do a resolution?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, the resolution was taken to Dr. Williams who has, from what I’ve been told, started to call meetings to implement the resolution. When we pass a resolution, I direct it to the person who would be the one to implement it and that has been done.

**J. Peters:** Dr. Williams couldn’t be here today. He did indicate that he is moving on that. We had a discussion, and he is going to be bringing it to the cabinet for discussion.

**K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – report – walk-in.**

**A. Small:** First and foremost, I would like to publically thank Dr. Peters and Dr. Cunningham for your great work for our pensions and our dependent tuition waivers. The staff truly appreciates that work, and I know it’s tough work and I know it needs to be done, but we do appreciate it so thank you.
I would like to just briefly comment on the last comment that Austin made as far as folks driving on the sidewalks and such like that. Probably the vast majority of those people are staff employees – trades, crafts, IT people, mail people. And I know those conversations have started to take place in those workgroups. I have heard from those workgroups, so that is progressing.

With that, I’ll go down quickly through our list here, if you’d like to follow along. It is a walk-in today. Workplace Issues Committee: We’ve been working on revising our employee evaluation form. It is in its final form at this point, and we’re presenting it to Human Resource Services. The main emphasis is to make the form easier to complete so that we have more participation and also when you redo something, it has a tendency to revitalize that program, puts more emphasis on it, and that is our hope to do that. So, you will be seeing a new employee evaluation form for staff employees coming out shortly.

The second thing: We have revised our ethics statement. Our ethics statement is on the back of the walk-in if you care to take a look at it. I am proud to announce that we have been able to put our ethics statement on one page. I think that’s important, to be ethical on one page. I will also refer to the faculty ethics statement that happens to be on two pages and our friends at SPS, it takes three pages for their ethics statement.

The next item is our outstanding service awards. I’m sure you’ve heard the announcements at this point. Kenlyn Bialas, Lincoln Fox, Brenda Jones and Kelly Steward are our four winners this year. If they are in your workgroups, please take time to congratulate them and give them the appropriate news.

We, as you know, have a dependent scholarship program and since its inception, we’ve been able to give two $500 scholarships each year to our dependent students, students of employees here at the university, staff employees. This year, we’ve done so well, we have been able to give four $500 scholarships. So, in conjunction with the Vision 2020 program that has asked us to try and continue to increase the amount of scholarships that we give to students, I’m proud to report that the Operating Staff Council has done just that and has doubled our scholarships this year.

We have completed our operating staff revitalization and revisions of our constitution and are continuing to work on our bylaws.

I have noted here that our special guest for our next meeting (which does happen to be out at the Yordon Center, with a very prestigious football coach). Dr. Cunningham will be our guest and will be talking about the SPS audit as it relates to staff positions on campus. I would also like to take a moment to thank the Lincoln Hall Dining Service. They hosted our last meeting in an effort to get the Operating Staff Council out and around on campus. We went to Lincoln Hall Dining Service which served breakfast. The executive secretary joined us and SPS President Todd Latham joined us. We appreciate you taking the time to come and meet with us there. The dining service, as you may know, in Lincoln Hall, is just down six steps. Our guest speaker was in a motorized wheelchair, unable to attend breakfast with us. There is no way to get to the Lincoln Hall Dining Service in a motorized wheelchair, which I think to tack onto Greg Long’s report last time about continuing to help students that have disabilities or challenges on campus.

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – no report
M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposed revision of NIU Bylaws, Article 4.3, Student Representation – SECOND READING – ACTION ITEM – Pages 5-6

J. Peters: I think that’s the end of reports and now we move into unfinished business, and we have an action item, VII. A. This is a revision on student representation in the bylaws.

A. Rosenbaum: You might recall this is an item that was brought by the Student Association. They have a difficult time getting the representatives to us in a timely fashion because of the timing requirements imposed by the bylaw. The other issue had to do with the fact that the current bylaw limits representation from any one college and so right now, they are out of compliance because they have overrepresentation of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. This motion will change the bylaws in such a way that we eliminate the deadlines and that we allow them to select their representatives from whichever colleges they want without putting quotas on specific colleges. There is already part of the student representation that has to come from each college anyway, so this is really just the at-large members that we’re talking about. Every college will have at least one representative, but this will free them up to get representatives from whichever college they can. This is a second reading, so we have to take a vote. It’s a bylaw change, therefore we need two-thirds of the voting members, which means it has to carry with at least 41 affirmative votes. Before we vote on it, does anyone have any questions, concerns, or comments? There was no further discussion.

J. Peters: called the vote

The motion passed with the required 2/3 vote, as follows:

41 – YES
1 – NO
2 – ABSTAIN

B. Proposed revision of APPM, Section III, Item 7, Academic Misconduct Policy/Grade Appeal Procedure – Pages 7-12

J. Peters: Let’s move on to VII. B., which is revision of APPM Section III, Item 7. That’s the academic misconduct policy grade appeal procedure.

K. Brandt: As you know, in our last meeting, I introduced this policy. It’s a revision of the grade appeal policy, which will allow for students who are appealing academic misconduct to appeal through the grade appeal policy. At the first reading there were three suggestions that our committee took seriously and have incorporated into this policy.

The first was that we place a timeframe on how long a student has to file an appeal. You’ll see that our timeline here is one month post decisions by academic misconduct panel. The reason we thought that one month would be appropriate was that it would give the student enough time
to be able to put things in order to go through the grade appeal process and yet would not be so unwieldy as to interfere with the ongoing processes.

The second suggestion on page 10, was that the academic grade appeal process policy was a bit cumbersome in terms of language. So, the language has been simplified in several areas.

The third point was that, apparently in the current grade appeal process, the language says that in case of non-resolution with the instructor, that the dean would direct the instructor to change the grade, which was incorrect. It should have said was that the dean would then direct the registrar to change the grade. Those were the three suggestions made, and our suggestions to correct those.

**K. Brandt:** as the maker of the motion accepted the revisions made by her committee. The revised motion was seconded.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Under the introduction, at the end of the paragraph it says, “whether the student did or did not violate the standards of academic misconduct.” Would it be more correct to say, “violated the standards of academic honesty or academic conduct,” as opposed to, “violating the standards of academic misconduct.”

**K. Brandt:** Accepted the wording change as a friendly amendment.

**C.C. Lee:** raised concerns about the instructor’s authority over the grading of the students in the course and **K. Brandt** clarified the impact of this revised grade appeal process on the rights of the faculty member. In doing so, she described the appeal process as it will be conducted under the revised grade appeal policy.

**J. Peters:** called the vote.

**A. Rosenbaum:** This only needs a majority.

The motion passed with the following vote:

43 – YES  
0 – NO  
3 – ABSTAIN

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Proposed revision** of APPM, Section II, Item 14, Student Evaluation of Instruction  
– Pages 13-16

**J. Peters:** Okay, new business. Proposed revisions of APPM section 2, item 14, Student Evaluation of Instruction, pages 13-16. I think Chuck Downing is here to talk about that.

**C. Downing:** Thank you President Peters. As mentioned on page 13, you can see what the proposal is. I’m here representing the CUAE, the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment. In short, this proposal is asking to add a second common question to the APPM.
Currently, there is one common question, which you can see on page 15, which says, “My overall rating of the instructor’s effectiveness in meeting the course’s stated goals and objectives is…” This proposal aims to add a second question, which is right above it there, highlighted, which is simply, “The instructor treated students with respect.”

I’ll try and be brief with a little background on this and then take questions as you would like. Each fall, the CUAE hears a report from the Office of the Ombudsman. The ombudsman summarizes data of what the students are talking about, what the complaints are, and follows over a period of years. In the last several years, “We are hearing more concerns related to issues of faculty/staff behavior and professionalism, academic advising and the availability of jobs for students on campus.” It is that first clause, “faculty/staff behavior and professionalism,” which this revision aims to address. I want to be very careful as a committee and me as an individual. No one is claiming this is an epidemic. We are grateful and appreciative of the outstanding faculty that we work with, in general. But both myself and the CUAE would hope that everyone in this body would agree that one instance of disrespect toward a student is too many. Additionally, the CUAE hears reports from a variety of surveys, among them, the Foundations of Excellence Survey, etc., and many of these things point to again, a small number of incidents of faculty showing disrespect to students. Again, we’re not claiming epidemic, nor are we claiming that with the addition of one common question is going to all of a sudden solve this problem. But rather we see this as incremental movement toward doing something about what is maybe a small problem but nonetheless a very serious problem.

**K. Thu:** Not really a question, but a comment as a cultural anthropologist. We have a large contingent of students from different countries around the world and the nature of the relationship between the faculty and student and what respect means culturally is going to differ significantly. So, I’m not saying that to oppose this question but to recognize that respect is a culturally constructed concept that we have to be careful in homogenizing a question like this across the board.

**C. Downing:** Duly noted. My response would be that what your words would satisfy me as the chair of the CUAE, be careful. Be careful with it. If we have one student out of 50 from a particular culture where I don’t understand how respect is conveyed, I might research that. If I were to make a mistake, the numbers are small enough in that case that it probably wouldn’t show up as a giant problem on my evaluation.

**K. Thu:** Not necessarily. If you have classes that are in Southeast Asia, for example, a class on Sub-Saharan African culture, you may have classes where the majority of students are not from American culture predominately. So, to rectify that potential issue, and it may not often occur, if you could give faculty some wiggle room in not just mandating the question as stated, but something like that or comparable to take into account cultural nuances I think might be appropriate.

**J. Novak:** In the School of Music, we have spent a long time trying to find a good group of evaluations, and we chose measures from certain schools and we pay for them. I do not know if these questions are on these particular tests. Are you suggesting that if they’re not, that we add them onto the standardized form, or we just need to find all new forms altogether?

**C. Downing:** I believe, and someone who knows more can correct me if I’m wrong, I believe the
suggestion is that yes, they would be added.

A. Rosenbaum: Chuck, would you be agreeable to sending this to the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration, or do you want to work on this and bring it back to us.

C. Downing: I think, I would say what I said before. If someone were to say, “This is the most appropriate way to handle it,” then I would say, “This doesn’t have to be handled this moment.” Whatever you think is most appropriate.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I would think the safest thing to do is refer it to Academic Policy, and let them bring it back to us and hopefully that doesn’t take very long and perhaps we could even have it by the next meeting.

J. Peters: And then it will be referred to the Academic Policy.

A. Rosenbaum: Will somebody make the motion to refer it to Academic Policy.

C. Downing: moved that the issue of a second common question regarding whether the professor treated the students with respect be referred to the Academic Policy committee of the UC. P. Middleton: was second.

J. Peters: What is the instruction to the committee? To make it more culturally sensitive?

A. Rosenbaum: To consider all of the different ramifications and to bring us a motion.

J. Peters: Called the vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

26 – YES
14 – NO
2 – ABSTAIN

The issue was referred to the Academic Policy Committee.

B. Proposed revision of NIU Bylaws Article 13, University Faculty Senate – Page 17

J. Peters: Okay, the second item of new business, B proposed revision in the Bylaws, Article 13, University Faculty Senate, page 17. Alan Rosenbaum will bring this issue.

A. Rosenbaum: Beginning in the spring of 1998, letters to the departments concerning vacancies on the Faculty Senate included the line, “Please see the attached list of University Council members who, by virtue of their service on the University Council, are ineligible to be elected to the Faculty Senate.”

We have gone back and tried to find some source for that statement. We can find nothing in the constitution, and we can’t find any actions by the University Council with regard to establishing that. It does, however, make a lot of sense that somebody should not be able to simultaneously serve both on the University Council and as their department representative to the Faculty Senate. Two reasons, one because as a University Council rep, they represent their college and
so how could they represent their college and their department at the same time? It sets up a potential conflict of interest. Secondly, it deprives their department of a vote since a Faculty Senate member can only vote once, so if you are there by virtue of being a University Council member, you can’t vote in both your capacities.

So, for those reasons, I would like to make a motion that we send the bylaw change that is on page 17 to our Rules and Governance Committee. The change is in item 13.2.2.1 and what we’re doing is recommending that the following sentence be added: “Members of the University Council may not serve as the elected Faculty Senate representative of an academic department.”

S. Farrell: seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the following vote:

38 – YES
1 – NO
3 – ABSTAIN

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

J. Peters: Any comments or questions from the floor?

D. Haliczer: Todd and I would like to invite all of you to come to Tuesday’s SPS awards event. It’s an annual celebration of people’s accomplishments, and we’ll be giving out about 30 certificates of recognition to people all over the university for excellent service. We will be giving out two service awards to Dana Gautcher and Anne Hardy. We give out a special recognition to Steve Cunningham thanking him for all of his efforts on behalf of pensions and benefits, and our four presidential award winners this year are Jason Rhode of Faculty Development; Michelle Pickett of the Advisement Center; Deb Pierce, International Programs; and our own Todd-Latham. Join me in congratulating them. It’s Tuesday afternoon from 2 to 4:30 in the ballroom.

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Minutes, Academic Planning Council
B. Minutes, Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
C. Minutes, Athletic Board
D. Minutes, Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
E. Minutes, Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
F. Minutes, Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
G. Minutes, Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
H. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
I. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
J. Minutes, General Education Committee
K. Minutes, Honors Committee
L. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
M. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
N. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
O. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
P. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.