

Approved
UIS Campus Senate Meeting
May 7, 2010

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
APRIL 23, 2010
10:01 AM – 11:45 AM
PAC Conference Room “H”**

Senators Present: L. Bogle, S. Borland, K. Burton, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, D. Felix, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam, L. Giordano, J. Hall, N. Headman, W. Kline, J. Martin, C. Olivier, P. Salela, B. Siddiquee, E. Smith, T. Sullivan-Stewart, H. Thompson, Ryan Melchin (alternate for M. Van Vossen), T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: None.

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: T. Barnett, D. Barrows, S. Chrans, M. Clark, L. DeFrates, E. Dorsey, F. Eslahi, R. Garmil, T. Helton, K. Jamison, K. Kemayo, S. LaFollette, D. Larson, K. Moranski, K. Rutherford, C. Samson, K. Sheridan, A. Sisneros, E. Stanley

The Senate was called to order at 10:05 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Martin to approve the agenda and was seconded by Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of April 9, 2010

A motion to approve the minutes of April 9, 2010 was offered by Bogle and seconded by Olivier. The minutes was approved with a correction to line 33, striking the words “as corrected.” The motion was approved.

Announcements

None.

Reports:

Chair – T. Ting

Ting described Wednesday’s Save Our State events at the capitol, which was also the designated University of Illinois Day at the Capitol. Approximately 15,000 people attended the rally. Several UIS students attended, including Felix, Casinova and Anderson. UIS faculty members in attendance included faculty members Winand, Seif, Siddiquee, Longo and Ting. In the afternoon

the group met with state senators and House Representatives, and spent 45 minutes with Senator Bomke emphasizing the need for support of higher education. They were unable to meet with either representative as they had the House session that ran long and then dived into the committee meetings, but Felix reported that he was also able to speak with both representatives at a later reception.

The SEC received faculty nominations for the Chancellor Search Advisory Committee and a slate of 16 faculty members was forwarded to President Ikenberry, from which he will select eight faculty for the committee. Once the entire slate of nominees has been finalized, it will be brought back to the Senate for approval on May 7th. Hall asked if Ting could email the names of the 16 faculty nominees, and she stated that she would do so.

Ting noted that this is the final senate session of the current year, which she and the SEC overall felt has been a very busy year. She observed that four senators are not returning next year, and offered thanks for the service of outgoing senators Headman, Sullivan-Stewart, Hall and Gilliam.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman observed that we are at an in-between moment with regard to the budget. The legislature is intending to wrap up their session by May 7th, and if they do wrap up by that time it is likely that there will not be a final solution for revenue enhancement. Under that scenario it would be likely that they would recommend level funding. Given that a large portion of our revenues from last year came from federal stimulus funds, a level funding recommendation would effectively represent a 6.2% decrease in overall funding. While that is significant, it would be less of a cut than what we had been planning for.

There are also discussions underway on a tuition proposal that is to come before the Board of Trustees at their May meeting. The Campus Tuition and Fee committee will review that proposal soon and Berman will provide the Senate with the proposal at the next Senate meeting.

Berman stated that receivables from the state have gone down somewhat. The state owes the university system \$400 million now, and they may finish the year with that outstanding balance. Many are trying to determine how to cope with the possibility of an outstanding balance and the accounting work that would entail.

Tomorrow is our biggest Preview Day to date, with 150 students and their families registered to attend. The event will be held in the Sangamon Auditorium, which is a nice opportunity to show off that beautiful facility. Berman asked Giordano to share the current enrollment figures for Summer and Fall semesters. Giordano noted that for Fall registrations we are up 206 in headcount and 142 FTE, with credit hours up almost 2,000. Summer registrations are also up. Freshmen will of course need to wait to register until after completion of the summer orientations, but at this point we're running ahead on deposits. She expressed hope that Saturday's Preview Day will produce additional deposits.

Berman reminded everyone of his comments last senate session regarding the vibrant intellectual climate on campus, and described several recent events that have furthered his feeling that we have achieved that element of the UIS vision. He described the recent Natural Sciences

Symposium, the Humanities and Social Sciences Symposium, the Day Under The Dome event, and on Tuesday night we had the John Holtz Memorial Lecture. Last night was also thrilling, as the nationally recognized author Terry Tempest Williams was here to give a keynote address in honor of Earth Day, organized by Ting and Craig from the ECCE Speakers Series. She provided a powerful talk on active citizenship in relationship to the environment. Her visit nicely dovetailed with an exhibit on sustainability in the Visual Arts Gallery.

Fisher asked about graduate enrollments for the fall, and Giordano stated that those admits were slightly down. In terms of registered graduate students we are down just one new graduate enrollment compared to last year and we are up 104 continuing graduate enrollments compared to last year. Hall asked about graduate admittances, and Giordano stated we are down by 12 students but applications are up. Berman reminded everyone how vital it is that departments make prompt graduate admissions decisions, as the admissions office cannot admit graduate students on their own.

Student Government – M. Van Vossen (absent – reported by C. Olivier)

Olivier reported that SGA elections are coming up next week, and asked if faculty could remind their students to vote. The SGA voted unanimously over the weekend to approve the textbook rental program. Felix noted that the sentiment was that it gave the students another desirable option, and that additional options are good.

Student Union Referendum – D. Felix

Felix distributed the Pro Forma for the proposed Student Union. He commented that Student Unions are common on campuses nationwide and serve as the “living room” of the campus. They have also been shown to be useful recruiting tools. He noted that two years ago we had budgetary problems that were a product of student enrollment. He attributed that drop in enrollment to the fact that students do not feel UIS is a fun place to be.

The proposed Union would have space for many desirable services, such as a ballroom, a gameroom, lounges, a convenience store, student space, some student life offices, and rental lockers. The Union is part of building for the future, as it would not be completed for another 3.5 years. Current freshmen would be able to use the Union and it would provide the one-stop shop that we currently do not have. He noted that students do not walk across campus presently to use facilities, and having a centralized location for those facilities would be very desirable.

The fees are proposed to begin in the summer of 2011. The SGA debated whether it should be a flat fee or a per-credit hour fee, and the consensus was that the fee should be flat. The fee would be \$200 for full-time students and \$100 for part-time and graduate students. Those fees would be cut in half for summer sessions. Construction would begin in the 2011-12 school year it would open in the 2012-13 school year. For students who pay the Union fees but will not be able to use it the TRAC is offering a semester’s reciprocity for each semester they pay fees.

The Pro Forma describes the beginning fee for four years, at which point it would increase. There may be other revenue possibilities that could reduce the size of the fees, such as a Brick

program that would allow donors to buy bricks in the patio area with their names engraved on them. The fee may also be reduced if enrollment growth is higher than the 2% per year they planned for.

Olivier noted that the operating expenses are not yet known, so the operating expenses projections that are in the Pro Forma are estimated to be on the higher end. It may not cost that much, but Chris Ryan thought it wise to high-ball that estimate and many other expenses, and Felix endorsed that approach as it is better to come in under budget than to go over. He added that this is a good time to begin construction as material costs are low given the current recession. Felix concluded by commenting that the union would bring a sense of community to the campus, would be a strong point for returning alumni and would help to increase awareness of our campus.

Martin mentioned that the Pro Forma does not reflect the halving of the fee for summer session, and Felix indicated that we may not have the most updated Pro Forma. Martin added that the Pro Forma model for enrollment growth assumes a 2% increase per year, but our experience with building the TRAC is that the additional fees produced a dramatic decrease in part-time enrollment. He expressed the desire to have a similar impact on part-time enrollment reflected in this Pro Forma.

Wassenberg asked about the previous comment that fees for graduate students would be \$100, as the Pro Forma does not distinguish between undergraduate and graduate fees. Felix responded that they should have included that data in the Pro Forma, but the cut point for the differential fees is 12 credit hours of enrollment. Wassenberg clarified that there is no differential fee structure for graduate and undergraduate students, and Felix indicated that was the case.

Hall noted that 40% of our students are graduate students, and 75% of them are part-time. At present, if a graduate student takes 6 credit hours they will end up paying as much in fees as they will in tuition. Part-time fees are about \$100 less than full-time, which are currently about \$850. In 2002 fees were just \$220 for full-time students and \$110 for part-time. They have thus gone up significantly in a short period of time. This is an issue for graduate students, as employers can reimburse for tuition but not for fees. Further, we have numerous graduate and undergraduate students on the Peoria campus, where the fees in 2002 were \$87 for full-time and \$51 for part-time students. Currently the full-time students pay over \$750 for fees, and adding another \$100 would be very unfair to them as they are not going to drive from Peoria to visit the union. He expressed the opinion that fees have already hurt graduate enrollment. He added that we used to differentiate Peoria students and they received different fees, but now we cannot do that. While Hall can see the need for a union, but he would like to see the SGA further investigate how to fund the union. Bogle echoed Hall's comments, and indicated that while he acknowledged the need for a union these fees could hurt his program.

Gilliam asked about the assumption of a 2% growth in enrollment across all four categories, and what would happen if those growth numbers were not realized. Felix indicated that if that growth does not happen, the fee would have to go up.

Kline stated that he does not see a need for a Student Union, and added that he did not see a room listed on the Union floor plan that is not already available on this campus. He commented on the previously stated reluctance of students to walk across campus to use the facilities we currently have, so why would they walk across campus to use this building? He also noted the contradiction between endorsing a student textbook rental program that might save \$30 on a textbook while at the same time requiring them to pay much more in fees to make a building. He noted that contradiction makes him wonder if students are concerned about costs, or not? He expressed the opinion that you make do with what you have in tough times. He stated that he would encourage his students to vote on this measure, especially his online students whose interests do not appear to be represented here. Further, he observed that the administration has plans to develop land near the campus for convenience stores, and the inclusion of such in a Union would potentially harm that plan. In sum, he does not view the Union as necessary right now, but perhaps if we double or triple in enrollment.

Melchin stated that he and Van Vossen are spearheading the opposition to this proposal. They started a Facebook page and within hours we had over 100 people “friend” them. Sophomores will not benefit from this at all. He agreed with Kline’s comments and acknowledged that while he might like a union he does not see the need at this time.

Martin asked which unit would be responsible for the management of this space. Felix stated that would be the responsibility of Student Life. Martin asked about the addition of ballroom space and if Conference Services would be involved, and Felix indicated they would not. Ting added that whenever we create a new building we need to think about maintenance. If we have a new building then custodial services needs to keep another building clean and there are costs associated with that. Will we be able to hire more building service workers? Is that part of the plan? If we cannot afford more hires, how will that affect current staff? Martin added that we already have an entity that manages such facilities here in the PAC, and it may be worthwhile to replicate that arrangement in a Union. Felix stated that the key priority is to make sure that the students get the building, and Conference Services shouldn’t manage a building that should be under Student Life. Martin stated that just because Conference Services might manage it that would not mean that student use wouldn’t be given priority.

Olivier commented that the fact that many students will be paying this fee who will not necessarily see the building. He noted that this is not the first time that issue has arisen, and observed that it could still be seen by alumni when they return to campus and they could take a sense of pride in their institution. He added that Kline’s comments that we do not need the union were new, as he has never heard any student say that before. He disagrees entirely with Kline, noting that the buildings that have been used for union-type activities are the old temporary buildings that should have been torn down long ago. Those facilities are not in good shape and are ill-equipped. If the students feel it is necessary and are willing to pay for it, that is what matters. He added that this is not simply a consolidation of facilities, but we are adding a ballroom and other facilities that would make for a larger, more inclusive community.

Kline responded that it is important to distinguish between want and need. While students may well want a union, he would argue that it is not needed. Further, just because facilities we build might be better than what we had previously, that will not necessarily translate into additional

use. When he arrived on campus he visited the TRAC and decided to instead join FitClub because it was better. The same may happen with the union as some students, especially those with cars, may find that Wal-Mart has better offerings than the convenience store and would go there instead.

Barnett noted that the fees would not be applied to online students, undergraduate or graduate. He shared that when he was interviewing for this position last year he heard from everyone that a Union was needed and that was listed as the primary desire of students. He commended Olivier and Felix on their excellent work on this project. He added that the operations costs are included in the \$500,000 figure listed in the Pro-Forma. And in response to Martin's question about management of the building, he stated that it is traditional for Student Unions to be operated by Student Activities Office or Student Union Director.

Wassenberg stated that she understood the students' need for a social space, and noted that there are not many spaces for those between the ages of 18 and 21. The parent part of her recognizes that, but the political science part of her worries about the message this would send statewide. We just had a legislator recently comment in the paper that the University of Illinois is not sufficiently complaining about the loss of state funding and wonders what we are doing with the money we have been given. They would likely be baffled that we could erect a new building in this current financial climate, and of course the explanation is that the building would be funded from a different pot of money. Even faculty do not always emotionally connect with the "pot of money" explanation, and so she expects that others would not fully understand or accept that explanation for funding of a union. Consequently she feels it is very important, if this measure is approved, to manage the message that is being sent to the general public and legislators.

Fisher agreed with a number of the comments made today and applauded the students for taking the initiative and addressing the desire to have a social space, a desire that she has heard from her students as well. She asked if there could be additional investigation into the funding models and if there might be a model that does not rely so heavily on student fees. While we might be in the middle of the pack statewide with regard to our fee amounts, all state universities are rapidly increasing their fees, which has the effect of rendering public higher education increasingly difficult to afford. Another model is to "build the program" and see if, out of that growth, one can create the growth that would allow for the improvement of facilities. Taking the convenience store idea, would it be possible to build a co-op type of program in existing space that would help to fund the eventual construction of a union?

Eisenhart stated that she loves the idea of a student union, and she has been advocating for such since the inception of Capital Honors. She stated that this is a great idea, but it is coming at the wrong time. No matter how it is structured, we will get killed in the press. Many people will see what they want to see, and given that we will likely see double-digit tuition increases this becomes a very bad time to move forward with this project.

Martin asked what would be done with the space that would be vacated once the Union is built, and Olivier stated that he did not know of any formal plans but had heard talk of turning it into academic spaces.

Siddiquee observed that enrollment is a big issue, and asked who we compete with for students and what facilities do they have that would put us at a disadvantage? Giordano stated that every other university in the state has a union, and when prospective students come to campus they always ask where the union is. Siddiquee observed that the budget issue is important but it is temporary, and this project would be a permanent addition to the campus that would help to attract more students.

Ting commented that this feasibility study group has taken a lot of time and included students as well as faculty members Winand and Wright. She noted that this is a student initiative and she applauded the students for taking the lead, working with various constituencies, and doing this research. Even if this referendum is passed it is only advisory to the administration, and the administration will have many important things to consider. She added that if this is not approved in time for our 40th anniversary as Felix wishes for the purposes of raising funds for the union, the 50th anniversary is right around the corner. She thanked the students for their work.

SEC Liaison to IAC Update - L. Fisher

The IAC met a week ago Monday and had a very productive meeting. The topics of discussion included a review of the bylaws and what the committee should be spending its time on. The specific issues identified as important included the SGA student representative, the reliance of the athletics budget on student fees and how that compares to other schools, establishing a regular schedule of budget updating, and the issues of student privacy as they relate to the athletic committee's role in assessing student welfare. Finally, the IAC opted to meet once more this semester with the old committee members before meeting with the new to put together a priority list of issues that need to be resolved this summer, especially those needed before student athlete orientation begins. A particular concern in that domain is the athletic department's concern about who signs off on athletic eligibility based on a doctors' report. An update will be provided at the next Senate meeting.

University Information Security Policy – D. Larson & F. Eslahi

Eslahi stated that this is the first revision to a policy that was put in place in 2003 and that was developed by the University Technology Management Team. Eslahi described composition of that team and indicated that the purpose of the policy is to protect the information assets of the university and aid the university in its compliance with legal requirements. He reviewed the policy with the Academic Technology Committee section by section and addressed questions. He noted that this policy provides a framework and implementation is up to each campus, which is the next thing he will need to work on with ATC. Ting reiterated that this is an overarching policy for the entire university system with implementation left to the campus level, which will be the primary charge for the ATC for the next year or two. This policy was forwarded by the University Senates Conference, soliciting campus input. The ATC provided a written response which indicates their agreement with the policy.

Fisher noted that the policy is written very broadly and includes information that has value to the institution. She asked about differentiation between things like her course syllabus, which

presumably has some value to the institution, and things like student records. Would she need to change her laptop security to protect her course materials? Eslahi indicated that the first step in implementation would be data classification. Ting stated that if there are no concerns she will write a memo to USC indicating endorsement of this policy statement.

Campus Planning and Budget Committee Report – B. Siddiquee

Siddiquee described the composition of the CPBC and noted that their work this year has had to take into account the ongoing budget crisis. The committee recognizes as well the change in the demographics in Illinois college students and its implications for recruitment, and recognizes the primary of instruction as the core mission of the institution. The first activity of the committee was to conduct a survey to learn of views on campus priorities, the results of which are available on the Senate website. The committee also consulted with unit heads and reviewed budget documents and past recommendations. Based on this work the committee recommended three top priorities that are unranked: strengthening student recruitment, retention and services; enhancing educational quality; and enhancing salary competitiveness. They also recommended that the campus look at a number of studies that might support those priorities. One such study is to examine the composition and growth in salaries and expenditures in upper administration versus instruction and other areas of campus. There are questions about the growth in those salaries, and it will be important to establish whether or not they are growing at different rates. It may also be helpful to examine budget practices, and to examine budget reporting changes that would allow for easily understandable metrics.

Provost Berman stated that he appreciated the work of the committee and Siddiquee's seeing this plan through. As context, this committee has existed for about 10 years and when it was created we had the notion that there would be an annual report, but the shape of that report has changed over the years. The initial intention was to have a report just like this one that is a few pages long that highlights a handful of key issues for the campus. He applauded the committee for doing that.

Martin asked if the committee had gotten feedback on the metrics they wish to see to determine the feasibility and timeframe for compiling those metrics. Siddiquee stated that those measures have already been discussed in the Instructional Resources Management Task Force. However, as this is their recommendation they have not yet received feedback on the calculation and reporting of such metrics. Berman added that this recommendation was framed at the very end of the process, and the next step will be to have a dialogue between the administrators who know about such metrics and the committee over the next year. As an update to the IRMT measures, there is currently a crack team of data people working on refining those measures.

Ting noted that work on those measures is underway, but she asked about the feasibility and status of creating metrics that would allow for the comparison of salary growth and budgeting practices. Berman stated that there are ways in which these additional studies would be simple and ways in which they are not. There are already established ways of reporting administrative and instructional costs, but as we move away from that standard reporting the studies would get

more complicated and would require more dialogue. He appreciated that the committee wants to look at the data before jumping to conclusions. He added that the first recommendation to allocate resources for additional recruitment and retention would increase administrative costs, which would affect subsequent metrics of administrative cost growth. Ting stated that her understanding is that the CPBC will follow-up with those three studies next year.

Headman added that with regard to the third bullet point they decided not to mince words and made the statement as strongly as possible. The decisions to not offer salary adjustments that at least meet the cost of living increases are unacceptable. Each year we end up begging to just stay even, and without that our buying power goes down. This is a real problem.

Wassenberg stated that this dialogue needs to include reality, as the pie is not growing any larger. Everyone is suffering; she did not get a raise and had to take 10 furlough days. These things affect faculty recruitment. She stated that the faculty need to make some decisions about whether they want to have raises at the expense of losing positions. This is not a false dichotomy. She added that there is a commonly held perception that somewhere out there somebody has a big hidden pot of money, and Deans are particularly guilty of thinking that the Provost's office is an ATM. She appreciated the committee's position that it is vital to establish a shared understanding of the financial status of the institution, but she encouraged everyone to be disappointed that there is no money that will magically appear. We all need to understand that there are tradeoffs. Headman responded that he agreed with the need to face reality, but reiterated that this is a major systemic problem. It is especially problematic to bring in a new faculty member who is making as much as a veteran faculty member. This is a cry to begin this discussion.

Siddiquee thanked Headman for his comments, and he wanted to make it clear that this is not a concern just for faculty but also for AP and CS employees. He agreed that there needs to be education that allows everyone to create informed opinions, and that is why these studies were being recommended. He commented that at the Rally Day yesterday a legislator spent several minutes chastising them about the top administrator salaries. Siddiquee stated that those perceptions need to be informed by facts, further emphasizing the need for these studies. It may be that the growth is comparable. The proportion of budget going to instruction also needs to be closely examined.

Fisher stated that she appreciated the three bullet points and commended the committee for their work. She was also pleased to see the listing of previous year priorities, and noted that dating back to 2005 the salary issues have been top priorities.

Berman stated that he and the Chancellor take these seriously as recommendations. As a psychologist he would characterize these as perceptions of the committee and the constituents out there and feels those are hugely significant. Martin also expressed his appreciation for the committee's hard work and encouraged them to continue.

Textbook Rental Program - T. Barnett & S. Chrans

Ting reported that the SGA unanimously approved their endorsement of the textbook rental program that was presented at the last Senate meeting. Ting asked for comments or feedback.

Fisher stated that she heard from several of her colleagues about the concern that students need to have a credit card to do this and that the fines for late returns appear to be quite significant in comparison to the price of the textbook. At the last senate meeting we had asked if there was a requirement for reminders or a grace period, and she expressed the desire to keep default rates well below the 10% that was evident in their pilot program. She would like to ensure that this is addressed at the campus level and not just leave it to Follett, as their relationship with students is different than ours. Ting stated that it was clear from the presentation at the last Senate meeting that there will be no grace period and that it is limited to those who are 18 or older, and the presumption is that they will be responsible adults. She expressed the hope that SGA leadership has emphasized those things to their constituents.

Ting asked Chrans about the reminder implementation and whether such reminders can be implemented. Chrans stated that currently Follett channels communication to students through his office. He would like to see Follett have direct email access to students, but in the meantime he has been sending those notices out for the last 25 years.

Garmil asked about the standard for damaged books, and Chrans stated that the standard for rental returns would be the same as that is currently used for book buyback.

Fisher stated that endorsement of such a program might be good if the students want it to go forward, but she expressed the desire for the next senate to track this to ensure that the default rate stays well below the unacceptable 10% rate. Olivier stated that SGA would educate students about the policies and consequences in question.

Kline thought the program looked good, but indicated that it would warm his heart if the SGA might also do something to encourage the desire to own and keep their books. Some segment of the population might like that idea, rather than focusing on selling the books back.

Kline offered a motion to endorse the program and Olivier seconded. The motion passed with one abstention.

Old Business

Resolution 39-19 Clarification of the Use of 400-level Undergraduate Courses for Graduate Credit [2nd reading]

Fisher offered a motion to begin discussion on the resolution and Martin seconded. Ting noted that Graduate Council chair LaFollette is present for discussion, and that the document before us has the track changes highlighted for ease of comprehension. No discussion was requested. The resolution was approved with one no vote.

Resolution 39-21 Proposal to Create Advanced Teaching Assistantships in the English M.A. Program [2nd reading]

Eisenhart offered a motion to begin discussion and Salela seconded. No discussion requested. The resolution was approved with three abstentions.

Resolution 39-22 Proposal to Create a Graduate Certificate in Teaching English [1st reading]

Eisenhart offered a motion to begin discussion and Hall seconded. No discussion was requested. The resolution was approved unanimously.

New Business

Resolution 39-23 Awarding of Degrees and Recognition of 2010 Graduating Class

Martin moved to suspend the rules and approve this resolution on first reading, seconded by Felix. The motion was approved unanimously. Fisher offered her congratulations to all graduates. Martin moved to approve the resolution, seconded by Felix. Ting offered congratulations to the graduating seniors and specifically to SGA senator Felix.

Resolution 39-24 Tenure Eligibility [1st reading]

Salela offered a motion to begin discussion, seconded by Hall. Ting stated that this resolution does not reflect a change in policy, but rather is an effort to clarify the language and eliminate ambiguity. Because we have an increasing number of faculty members on a short track, the current language is creating some confusion with regard to the precise year they need to apply for tenure. Berman added that the ambiguity is created by the “considered” for tenure language. Martin asked if this language has created problems, and Berman stated that there has been at least one instance of confusion. Hall moved to suspend the rules to approve on first reading, and Bogle seconded. The motion carried with one abstention. The motion to approve the resolution was unanimous.

Resolution 39-25 Proposed Revisions to the Statutes, Article VIII, Changes in Academic Organization [ST-66] [1st reading]

Olivier offered a motion to begin discussion, seconded by Siddiquee. Ting stated that this resolution is to address minor changes being recommended by the UIUC senate, which are noted in bold. The language that is underlined was approved by all three senates last year. This resolution has been with USC since 2006 and she expressed the desire to get this approved and sent on as soon as possible. Martin expressed the opinion that this should be passed as it clarifies the role for faculty in the creation of academic units, and Ting added that the effect on tenure homes is also important. Fisher asked about the thinking behind these final small changes, and what the problems were. Ting stated that the language specifies that these changes pertain to Article VIII. The other change is changing the word “may” to “will” with regard to faculty consultation in unit changes; this helps ensure the necessity of faculty consultation. Martin added that narrowing the definitions of these terms to just Article VIII was done because these terms are defined elsewhere in other elements of the statutes. Eisenhart offered a motion to suspend the rules and approve the resolution on first reading and Hall seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Olivier offered his congratulations to chair Ting for a job well done. And Martin asked for a motion to express their appreciation of the Senate for the work of the Senate officers this year,

especially to Gilliam who is leaving the Senate. Eisenhart seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was offered by Eisenhart. The Senate adjourned at 11:46 am.