UNIVERSITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT
Wednesday, November 7, 2012, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room


VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Bond, Duerkes, Gupta, Harris, Houze, Latham, Rosato, Schoenbachler, Walker, Ward

OTHERS PRESENT: Blakemore, Bryan, Klaper, Theodore, Wesener, Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Armstrong, Cunningham, Freedman, Freeman, Kaplan, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Sunderlin, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Peters: Let me call the November 7, 2012 meeting of the University Council to order.

Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

J. Peters: We have to adopt the agenda today, and there are three walk-in items at your desk, seat, whatever you call that, table. We have under VI.G., a Resource, Space, and Budget written report, VI. K., Operating Staff report, and then under Unfinished Business, I believe that’s right, item VII. A., a response from the UCC on the grade appeals policy sent back that we dealt with. So, with that, also, let me say this, that at Alan’s and my request and students’ request, we would like to be able to adjourn by 3:45 today because at 4:00 in the Sandburg, we are going to have a memorial service to celebrate the life of David Bogenberger, the student who tragically died last week. And so we beg your indulgence on that. Hopefully, we can get through with our business. I just want to remind you of that. We really have to break at 3:45. Now, it’s possible that we could turn the chair over to someone else, but my suggestion is let’s try to get done at 3:45 and see where we are at that time. Just to give you a heads-up on that. So, with that, let me call for the adoption of the agenda as amended with the three walk-ins.

A. Quick: So moved, Quick.

J. Peters: Second?

R. Lopez: Lopez, second.
J. Peters: Lopez, second. All those in favor, say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.

J. Peters: Opposed?

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2012 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

J. Peters: All right, you have, distributed electronically, the Minutes of October 10, 2012 are now for your approval. Any additions or corrections? Hearing none, I’ll call for a motion of approval.

D. Munroe: Move for approval, Munroe.

J. Peters: Second?

C. Prock: Second.

J. Peters: All right, all those in favor of approving the minutes of October 10, please say, “aye.”

Members: Aye.


IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

J. Peters: Let me, President’s Announcements. Since we met last time, you know that I have indicated that this will be my last year as president, and I announced that in the State of the University. Immediately upon that, and obviously I had informed the trustees, they have begun the process of presidential selection. I have no role in that selection process except keep the university moving and to sell the university and to help with the transition, but I’m not part of the process.

But I recommended to Alan that we use this forum every meeting that we have between now and the selection of a new president, for Alan to have the opportunity to update you on the status of the search as best he can. He has not officially been named yet, but tomorrow at a special meeting of the Board of Trustees after committee meetings to deal with this issue specifically, Alan will be, if he behaves, will be named, or not, co-chair of the search committee along with trustee Robert Boey who actually co-chaired it last time when I was selected. So he has some knowledge of the process and so forth. The constitutional process of committee selection has moved forward, I understand. So, I want to do two things today, to let you know that that was my selection, and it has been adopted by Alan, and today what we’re going to do, we’re going to have Jerry Blakemore right there, our general counsel, who is the chief liaison, whatever, to the search committee and the trustees on the presidential search. He is the guardian of the process and then Alan will offer whatever comments he wants to offer, even if he’s not official yet. So,
I’m going to yield my presidential time on that because this is the most important thing that the campus will do this year and the trustees. So, my role is to make sure it’s done in a proper way. So, I’m launching it and then you’ll never hear from me again. Jerry Blakemore.

**J. Blakemore:** Mr. President, members of the council, I appreciate the opportunity to provide a very, very brief update on the Board of Trustee presidential search process. The president, in effect, has given you that, so I don’t have much more to add to it, but I will say the following: (1) Tomorrow the Board of Trustees will meet. They will meet in special session. The primary purpose of that session will be for the Board to: (1) select an executive search firm that will be utilized to assist the search committee and ultimately the Board of Trustees in the recruitment, vetting, and recommendations to the Board for the next president of Northern Illinois University. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has already vetted four different national search firms, and they will make a recommendation for full board consideration tomorrow.

In addition, the board will, pursuant to the NIU law, which provides the authority for the board to coordinate the search and the board has the ultimate authority to make a selection or appointment of the next president. They will announce the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. It is the committee that is being developed in two different ways: (1) The NIU Constitution has specific provisions related to the membership of such a committee. Many of you are more than familiar with, and some of you are part of that process because your colleges have selected you, or the Faculty Senate has selected you for that committee. Persons were notified today and earlier of the finality of that selection process and the board will take that up tomorrow. In addition, the board will have appointments to the Presidential Search Committee and their appointments include Bob Boey who is the vice chair of the Board of Trustees. He will serve as the chair of the Presidental Search Advisory Committee. And Dr. Rosenbaum will serve as the co-chair. There will be other members appointed by the board that will join those from the faculty for a 28-member committee. Unless something happens between now and tomorrow, it will be 28. That committee will meet for the first time tomorrow at 3:00. Once that meeting is formally adopted by the board and it has its first meeting, then quite frankly, the operations of that committee will be turned over to the chair and co-chair. They will then be responsible for the agenda. They will establish a time schedule for the search. The Board of Trustees has indicated they would like to have a new president in place by July 1, 2013. We’re on a pretty tight time span and, for that reason, I will offer my apologies even beforehand for persons who receive very little notice about this process. People were notified, the entities were notified of the intent of having a meeting on November 8, but obviously really getting down to the nitty gritty, specifically the names who would be serving, takes a little bit of time. I don’t have very much more to add to that. The Board of Trustees will adopt a charge which will be presented to the committee, and it will basically outline the sort of responsibilities of the committee, and quite frankly some of the obligations particularly related to confidentiality and process of the committee as well.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, first, I’d like to say that the biggest challenge to the search committee is to find someone who can follow up the fine act of President Peters. So, that’s going to be a real challenge. The other main challenge is getting 28 people together at any given time at NIU. I don’t think it’s ever been done. So, that will be exciting as well. Regarding the search committee, the thing I’d like to point out is that the development of the search committee, although articulated in the constitution, is really up to the Board of Trustees. They were not obligated to follow what is written in the NIU Constitution, but they chose to do that and so I
think that it is very important and it’s a statement of the board’s conviction in the culture of shared governance that we have at NIU that they have supported a search committee that is really very heavily represented by faculty members. So, I think we recognize the weightiness of this task. This committee is going to have to come up with someone to lead the university for the foreseeable future and as we’ve already learned, there are many financial and other challenges that are facing the university. So, we feel the weight of this. We think it’s the most important thing we will do, as President Peters said, and we’ll do our best to come up with something. I’m hoping that we can all work together to sort of identify what the university needs and to try and come together and fill that need for the university. We’re enthusiastic and we’re a little bit, I’m a little bit worried about it. I think it’s going to be a very difficult task, but we will do our best to come up with a successor to President Peters.

J. Peters: I open the floor to questions for Jerry or Alan. So, we will try to, I presume you can update us, let’s see we’ll have a December meeting, February, hopefully.

A. Rosenbaum: Whatever Jerry will let me say.

J. Peters: Yeah, right, okay, you’re done, Jerry? Everything all right?

J. Blakemore: In more ways than one.

J. Peters: Okay, there is no Consent Agenda.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Page 3
   MAP 102 (distributed electronically)

J. Peters: Reports. We have a written report from Sonya. It is written only.

A. Rosenbaum: She’s not here.

J. Peters: She’s not here. Any questions on that? Maybe somebody could, I could probably answer some of those. No?

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 – Sean Farrell, Chair – no report

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Paul Carpenter, Chair – report – 
   October 12, 2012 and October 18, 2012 – walk-ins

   **J. Peters:** Let’s move down to G. We have a written report only from Paul Carpenter but he is here, I saw him, Resources, Space, and Budgets Committee. Questions? This is too easy. Something’s wrong.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Melissa Lenczewski, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Kathleen Coles, Chair – no report

J. Student Association – Delonte LeFlore, President, and Austin Quick, Speaker – report

   **J. Peters:** Okay, so we have a Student Association report, verbal only, correct?

   **A. Quick:** Yes, sir.

   **J. Peters:** And someone will be giving that.

   **A. Quick:** Yes, sir.

   **J. Peters:** And it sounds like it’s Austin Quick.

   **A. Quick:** Yes, sir.

   **J. Peters:** Alright, give your report.

   **A. Quick:** Thank you, Mr. President. Just a few short things. Just to reiterate what President Peters said, we would like to welcome and request everyone be in attendance, if you can make it, today at 4 p.m. in the Carl Sandburg Auditorium for a very moving memorial to the life of David Bogenberger, a fellow student who passed away tragically last Friday. Of course, any time there is a loss of life here on our campus, especially for the students, fellow students, it’s very tragic and we take it to heart. A lot of people have worked very hard over the last few days to bring this fitting memorial for him, and we request your presence at this event to come together as a community. So, that is the first thing I would like to talk about. Then, the last thing I wanted to mention…

   **J. Peters:** Austin, just let me interrupt you. So, it’s at 4:00 in the Sandburg.

   **A. Quick:** 4:00 p.m. in the Carl Sandburg.

   **J. Peters:** Then I believe the students are holding a candlelight vigil.

   **A. Quick:** Correct, it will be, all together it will be about an hour, but the memorial service in the
Carl Sandburg and then everyone is going to move out into the MLK Commons for a candlelight vigil and his pastor from his home church is here as well to help.

**J. Peters:** Thank you, sorry, to interrupt.

**A. Quick:** Yes, Mr. President. Then the other thing I wanted to introduce to this body is the Student Association enrolled Senate Resolution #25 which was passed actually two weeks ago regarding the plus/minus system. I will read to you, just because I didn’t get it out to everyone. Just so you can see it’s pretty brief. The legislation is as follows:

> Whereas students have repeatedly voiced opposition to the changing of our NIU grading system;

> Whereas the plus/minus grading policy would create further boundaries preventing student success;

> Whereas the freedom of professors to either use the plus/minus or use the current system disrupts the grading conformity of the university;

> Whereas this policy would adversely affect students seeking financial aid or postgraduate education by making it more difficult to maintain a high GPA;

> Whereas the university seeks to increase the academic success of students in Vision 2020 but a plus/minus policy would most likely reduce the numbers of 4.0 students and the overall GPA;

> Therefore, the students of Northern Illinois University representing the senate, urge the university to discontinue efforts to implement a plus/minus grading system.

I just wanted to introduce that for the body. I know that’s going to be coming up again but just to hear a formal statement from the student body, but that is all I have today.

**J. Peters:** Okay, thank you. Any questions for Mr. Quick? Okay, thank you, Austin, and thanks to the students for taking the initiative to put this memorial on today. We appreciate it, on behalf of the university community.

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

**J. Peters:** Andy Small, we have an Operating Staff Council report.

**A. Small:** Thank you, Mr. President. In respect to the Student Association and their request, I will be just taking questions on the written report that I provided. If there are any questions, I would be glad to try to answer. Otherwise, you have seen my report.

**J. Peters:** Okay, thank you. Questions? Hearing none.

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – report – Page 4
J. Peters: We have a written report only from SPS, I think Donna is here for Todd. This is an upgrade, Donna.

D. Smith: That’s correct. I will also just take questions on the written report you’ve received, if there are any.

J. Peters: Okay, hearing none.

M. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Abhijit Gupta, Chair – no report

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Response from Undergraduate Coordinating Council – walk-in

J. Peters: Under Unfinished Business, I guess that’s the appropriate spot, we have a walk-in response from the UCC on the action that the council took sending back for review, the grade appeal process.

A. Rosenbaum: You said grade appeals.

J. Peters: Grade appeals, what did I say?

A. Rosenbaum: Grade appeals.

J. Peters: Oh, right, it’s a grading scale process. Got it. Okay, I’m going to turn it over to Alan who has monitored this and knows more about it and knows what your options are. Alan.

A. Rosenbaum: The UCC met, I think last Thursday, and we informed them as to what the actions of the University Council were. The UCC was informed that they had three options. The three options are articulated in the bylaws. The option they chose was to send this back to the council with explanation. The reason given by the University Council for sending it back to the UCC was that they had not adequately taken student input into account in coming to their policy decision. The UCC felt that this was inaccurate, that they had taken student input into account throughout the process. They were particularly concerned that students did not avail themselves of the representative positions that they have, both on APASC and the UCC. They felt that given the amount of effort that they have put into this and the fact that they have considered student input and also the fact that they felt that this was really a faculty prerogative, they voted 14 to nothing, 14 to zero, to send this back to us. The council has to do nothing if it wants this to become policy. So, this is not called for a vote. The University Council can, if it chooses, veto this policy. In other words, approval is not required, a vote is not required, but the council has the option of vetoing this policy. If the council chooses to veto this policy, it will take a vote of two-thirds of all voting members of the University Council in order to do that. So, that is where this stands. If we do nothing, this becomes policy.

J. Peters: The item is on the floor.
M. Theodore: I make a motion for the veto.

J. Peters: There is a motion to hold a veto vote.

K. Bak: Second.

J. Peters: Okay, so we have a motion and a second and that would be to have a vote.

A. Rosenbaum: That would be the veto vote.

J. Peters: The veto vote, okay, so let’s have discussion.

M. Theodore: Am I able to talk on this one?

F. Bryan: Mr. President, the person who asked to be recognized is not a voting member of this body but you, as chair, have the right to recognize him to speak.

J. Peters: All right, so we cannot recognize you, correct?

F. Bryan: You can if you want to.

J. Peters: I recognize you.

M. Theodore: Thank you, Mr. President.

J. Peters: I mean, I know who are, and I recognize you. We want to hear what you have to say.

M. Theodore: Thank you, Mr. President. I will try to keep this brief, even though this is an issue that, as everyone knows, it’s been a very broad issue that has constantly come up in University Council and Faculty Senate, it’s always been an issue. Dr. Rosenbaum and I did speak to UCC, we did argue this to them and, as you can see with the report, they did disagree with the student input argument. Although he is correct in saying that when it comes to curriculum, and I have reviewed the bylaws, I’ve reviewed the constitution, when it comes to that, grading is something that is a faculty prerogative.

At the same time though, the S.A. continues to stand firm in its position that a policy that does affect students should involve student input and should involve constant student opinions. That might not be written in stone but that’s something that we firmly believe. Students do have positions on these committees. Yes, most of them do not report back to Student Association. We have not been aware of many of the negotiations that have been occurring. Two years ago, we had been involved with the process. We put a referendum on our ballot to get general student input on this. I don’t know if everyone remembers two years ago, it was a big issue around campus being debated. That was the system that is different than the one now with the A+ and C- which has since been removed. And we have been hearing amongst many of our constituents, differing opinions on what the policy is now without the A+ or C-. So, this is, in my opinion, a different policy than what we were debating two years ago, although student input was involved two years ago, this is a different policy that we think should be brought back to the student body. We
do have processes in place that we’re looking at in order to gain, in order to survey as many students as possible in order to hear what the students think and in order to view the positives and negatives of this policy, but we do request more time on that. We do not see a need to be making this an immediate policy. We do not see a need for moving fast on this when we can be getting more input and can be getting more information on it. That’s the most of it so with that, I yield.

**J. Peters:** Thank you, okay.

**M. Henning:** I have a comment.

**J. Peters:** All right then, yes.

**M. Henning:** My name is Mary Beth Henning, I’m in the College of Education, and I’m going to speak in favor of the veto because I do believe that this policy is not going to help our students. I do recognize that is the purview of the faculty to make decisions regarding curriculum, but in this case, I don’t think it’s in the best interest of our students to have the plus/minus system. I also think that there’s going to be confusion because if I remember correctly from our last discussion, we are not going to have parity with our graduate school grading scale and our undergraduate grading scale. It sounds like it’s going to be a mess in our classes where we have undergrads and grads together. So, I guess I’m going to urge my fellow council members to vote in favor of the veto.

**J. Peters:** Alan.

**A. Rosenbaum:** With regards to that, the Graduate Council has already passed a plus/minus system, so you already have a situation where you have a difference in grading. It should not be that difficult for faculty members to keep track of the fact that they can give a C- to a graduate student but not to an undergraduate student. Furthermore, the characterization of this is something that has happened quickly is incorrect. The data that this disadvantages students in any way is lacking. The senate committee that looked into this in great detail as well as the Undergraduate Coordinating Council which also looked at this in great detail, was not able to find any evidence that there is a disadvantage to students from a plus/minus system. The plus/minus system is by far the predominant system in universities throughout the United States. This came back to us from the UCC. They have carefully vetted this. This committee does not act abruptly or arbitrarily I should say. There was a student member on the UCC that was present. They have six student members. There was one present. That student member also voted in favor of the plus/minus grading system. As you can see, the vote is 14 to zero. I would argue that to veto this would be to disregard, not only the advice of the Faculty Senate, the faculty at large, but also a group of UCC members and APASC members who have been laboring at this for about 2-1/2 years.

**J. Peters:** Delonte.

**D. LeFlore:** Hello everyone. I see your point, but I really think that we need to keep in mind of how this system is going to get in place. The UCC said they vetted this over and over again, but it hasn’t been presented to the students who actually sit here and vote in the UC to make the item consent. I think that if they’re going to present it, how is it going to affect our students now?
How is the GPA, is it going to back and forth? We’re trying to figure out how is it going to work and if they’re going to want us to support this, they have to be able to let us know how this is going to affect the students. I agree that you guys have been putting a lot of work in it. Our students have been putting a lot of work in trying to come up with ways to figure out how this particular plus/minus system is going to affect the students. I said last time, I think that if they’re saying that they want this plus/minus system implemented and we’ve been trying to reach out to figure out is there a way that you can inform us about this plus/minus system and how is it going to benefit us because everything that we look at is going down on the negative form, that it doesn’t benefit as much of the students. I don’t know if we’re looking at this because other schools are moving in this direction. So, we’re just trying to figure out, from a student standpoint, how is this really going to affect the students, how this is going to be implemented and maybe if they can work with the Student Association on it, I know that they also pick various students to sit on those committees but again, those committee don’t report back to us and they’re not obligated to report back to us. So, we’re trying to figure out ways that the Student Association can work with them to maybe get more understanding and come up with a way that we can work together on this effort. So, I ask that it still go to veto.

J. Peters: Thank you, Delonte.

D. Plonczynski: Plonczynski, from the College of Health and Sciences. I have a question for our student members here. From a process improvement perspective, it seems like a major concern is that communication between your members on these smaller councils to the bigger group. Let me ask you how you’re going to address that.

D. LeFlore: To answer that question is, we have no idea of those students who are appointed to those various committees because those are done by the particular colleges and things like that, so we have no say in those appointments, and we have no knowledge of who are on those committee and what’s going on in those committees besides the information that comes through UC and consent agendas.

A. Rosenbaum: To clarify, the members of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council are selected by each college and the students within each college select those members. So, they are not supposed to be selected by the Student Association. The Student Association, if they wanted to have that changed, would have to make a proposal to change that, either in the constitution or wherever it’s articulated. So, that is, by design, supposed to represent the students in each of the individual colleges and that’s how those are selected. It’s not supposed to be selected by the Student Association.

D. Plonczynski: But, if I may comment, Alan, it sounds like there may be a gap in communication on this part.

A. Rosenbaum: Yea, I don’t know. We know that we have a great deal of trouble getting students to attend many of the committees. So, almost every committee that has student positions on it has the same problem, which is getting students to attend the meetings. So, when students don’t attend meetings, whether they are, do you know how many student members we have of the University Council? 16. How many are here?
D. LeFlore: The ones that are appointed by the Student Association?

A. Rosenbaum: So, how many do we have here?

N. Bender: Nine at the moment, Austin left.

A. Rosenbaum: So, the fact of the matter is that we don’t get the representation from these committees, whether it is because students are not interested or because they are appointed in different ways, I have no idea, but that is an ongoing problem. We would like students to be involved, which is why we have those slots for them on the various committees, but we can’t force them to come to those meetings.

J. Peters: I guess having 12 years ago, really dug into the shared governance process here, the logic of student representation on these policy-making committees was imbedded in the fact that it cuts across the academic colleges where the students are studying so that their knowledge that they bring to the committees is imbedded in those disciplines and not representatives from a student government perspective. At least that was my understanding of it, if that’s helpful without taking a position on this. So, two kinds of representation that are aimed at two different issues.

D. Cho: My name is Daihee Cho, and I’m one of the representatives from Student Association. Last time when we talked about the plus/minus policy, I recall that it was my understanding that we would like to have more student representation in this policy and then I am not quite sure why it came back to us without having more student representation in deciding the policy. I believe that the Student Association this year, we have much more outreaching to different student organizations or other students. We believe that we can have better communication with those students where colleges. We have more time where if we have opportunity to talk with our students. So, this is my hope that we do not make the decision like right now and I urge you, like everyone, to give us more time so that we can talk to the other student representatives from these colleges so that we can have better communication with the faculty members or the staff members in the university.

J. Peters: Okay, explain to us, what are we voting on now? We’re voting, a “yes” means we are vetoing the recommendation of the UCC on this grading policy.

A. Rosenbaum: We are vetoing the policy.

J. Peters: So, a “yes” vote means we’re vetoing their action, all right.

A. Rosenbaum: A “no” vote means that this will become policy.

J. Peters: Become policy.

A. Rosenbaum: So, the plus/minus grading, if you want, if you believe that this should not be vetoed, you vote, “no.”

Unidentified: One more time? If we vote, “1” what are we voting for?
A. Rosenbaum: If you vote, “1” you are voting “yes” that you want to veto this policy. If you vote, “2” you are voting that you do not want to veto this policy.

J. Peters: What’s the decision rule?

A. Rosenbaum: They must get 39 “yes” votes to veto the policy. This represents two-thirds of the voting members of the University Council, whether or not they’re present.

J. Peters: Okay, are we ready?

A. Rosenbaum: So, “1” is “yes,” “2” is “no.”

N. Bender: I would like to speak if I may.

A. Rosenbaum: The question has been called.

N. Bender: Very well.

A. Rosenbaum: “1-yes,” “2-no.” If you want to veto this policy, you vote, “1.” If you don’t want to veto this policy, you vote, “2.”

J. Peters: All right, voting is open now. All right, voting is closed.

1 – YES 24
2 – NO 22
3 – ABSTAIN 2

J. Peters: So, the veto fails.

A. Rosenbaum: It doesn’t carry.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Revision to NIU Bylaws Article 14.9.3(2) – biennial Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute – FIRST READING – Page 5

J. Peters: We are running out of time. New Business. We have a, what I understand is a non-controversial proposal to change a bylaw with regard to the Multicultural Transformation Curriculum Institute, and I know that Alan can explain this to you. It’s on page 5.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, essentially the Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute has been taking place on a yearly basis. What happens is that they get a large number of people taking it in one year and then in the next year, they don’t really get too many people. So, they will get 15 or 16 in the first year and the second year, they will get 3 or 4. So, for economic reasons, the proposal is that they are going to only offer this every other year and it’s purely an economic reason for doing that. It’s a lot of effort for not a lot of people on the off years. So, it’s
fairly non-controversial.

**J. Peters:** All right, so it’s on the floor or do we need a motion?

**A. Rosenbaum:** Well, we need a motion.

**J. Peters:** We need a motion to change this bylaw.

**M Smith:** So moved.

**J. Peters:** Is there a second.

**Cho:** Second.

**J. Peters:** Any other discussion on this? All right, all those in favor say, “aye.”

**Members:** Aye.

**J. Peters:** Opposed? Since it’s non-controversial and there’s some need to get this in the catalogue, is there a motion to waive second reading?

**D. Haliczer:** So moved.

**J. Peters:** Haliczer.

**Unidentified:** Second.

**J. Peters:** Discussion? All right, so this is to waive second reading. All those in favor say, “aye.”

**Members:** Aye.

**J. Peters:** Opposed?

**A. Rosenbaum:** We didn’t have to take a vote?

**F. Bryan:** If you think it’s three-fourths, it sounded like.

**IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**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
XI. ADJOURNMENT

**J. Peters:** So, we’re done. All right, anything for the good of the order? Don’t forget about the memorial if you have time. We’re adjourned.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.**