

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
August 27, 2010
10:00 AM – 12: 20 PM
PAC Conference Room “G”**

Senators Present: D. Ballard, L. Bogle, P. Boltuc, S. Borland, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, T. Helton, K. Jamison, W. Kline, J. Martin, R. Melchin, C. Olivier, S. Owusu-Ansah, P. Salela, L. Schoo, D. Schuldt, K. Sheridan, A. Sisneros, C. Switzer, H. Thompson, M. Van Vossen, J. Villegas, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, Y. Zhang and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: L. Schoo

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: D. Anthony, H. Bapat, K. Burton, A. Carlsberg, E. Stanley, L. Johnson, S. LaFollette, K. Moranski, L. Pardie and K. Rutherford.

The Senate was called to order at 10:00 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

Chair Ting welcomed everyone to the 2010/11 academic year. Ting acknowledged that this was going to be a very busy year for the campus senate. Ting stated that thoughtful participation of senators is greatly appreciated. A motion was made by Eisenhart to Approve the Agenda for the August 27 senate meeting. Garmil seconded the motion.

Approval of the minutes from May 7 2010

A motion to approve the minutes from May 7th was made by Sheridan and seconded by Martin. The motion carried without any corrections or changes.

Announcements

Martin presented two announcements. Martin announced (1) that star parties will resume after Labor Day, and (2) that he had submitted the report from the July BOT meeting. The chair confirmed that the report had been circulated. Martin suggested that senators might check with Kathy Rutherford for previous copies. Ting suggested that a new link be created on the Campus Senate website, where the BOT meeting reports could be posted.

Borland announced that the Pre-law Center will be hosting an LSAT preparation course beginning September 11th and continuing on September 18th and 25th. The course is being offered for people planning to take the LSAT. Borland emphasized that the course is more personalized and more cost efficient than commercialized preparation courses.

Reports

Chair – T. Ting

The Chair offered a welcome to new senators, Schuldt representing APAC and Shoo representing Civil Service. Ting acknowledged three returning SGA representatives, SGA president Van Vossen, Olivier, and Casinova. Ballard and Melchin were also welcomed to the Campus Senate by the Chair.

A reminder of senate attendance policy was given by Chair Ting. She stated that the full senate consists of 28 members. In order to have a quorum, 60%, or 17 senators must be present in order to vote. The Chair emphasized the importance of notifying senate chair and copying Rutherford if unable to attend the meeting. Ting continued by referring to senate bylaws which state that if a senator misses more than three meetings in any semester his or her seat shall be declared vacant by the campus senate chair. This policy applies to all senators, not just faculty.

Chair Ting stated that all senate committees had been staffed last semester; however, new vacancies have occurred due to departures, retirements, and assignment changes. The Chair noted that the senate chair, in consultation with senate committee on committees, has the power to make interim appointments. The list of interim appointments was presented to senators by Chair. An apology was made to senator Switzer, Associate Professor of Psychology, for not including her name on the list of interim appointments. Chair Ting stated that previous senate secretary Burton has been appointed as interim associate dean in CLAS and Switzer agreed to serve as senator for AY 2010-11 academic year. Ting thanked Switzer for her willingness to serve. Two other interim appointments were made to replace Li and Siddiquee, who are on sabbatical during the Fall 2010 semester. Associate Professor of Accountancy Stephen Owusu-Ansah from the College of Business and Management, and Assistant Professor of Business Administration, Jorge Villegas were welcomed. Senator Villegas is also from the College of Business and Management. Chair Ting expressed her gratitude for their willingness to serve.

Chair Ting announced the replacements for other campus senate committees. Jenene Case Pease from EHS will serve on the Academic Integrity Committee for the AY 2010-11. Michael Cavanagh from LAS has agreed to serve on the Committee on Diversity, Equal Rights, Opportunity and Access for AY 2010-11. Martin Martsch from EHS will serve on the Committee on Library for one year. Joining the Personnel Policies Committee are Mike Miller from LAS for two years, 2010-12, and Eric Thibodeaux-Thompson from LAS for AY 2010-11. Kim Furumoto will serve on the Undergraduate Council for AY 2010-2011, and joining the Parking Appeals and Advisory Board is Carol Saltgaver from LAS. Saltgaver will serve for AY 2010-2011.

Chair Ting announced that the Provost will discuss proposed revisions to the governance chart for curricular approvals and the pilot study that will be conducted this year.

Ting introduced new senate secretary Thompson and requested that senators and audience participants speak loudly and state names before speaking.

Ting reported that President Hogan has a blog page and his entry for August 27, 2010, was about the 40-year anniversary of UIS.

Provost – H. Berman

The Provost welcomed everyone to a new academic year. Berman began by reporting a 6% appropriations reduction to all state institutions. UIS had anticipated and prepared for a further reduction because of the termination of the stimulus money. Berman stated that of the \$743 million appropriated from the state to the U of I, approximately \$220 million were owed at the end of the last fiscal year. Payments have been received and the amount now owed for fiscal year 2010 is \$150 million. The Provost stated that the UI administration decided to set aside \$120 million in anticipation of a reduction, which is 16% of the FY 2010 appropriation, or \$3.965 million for UIS. The good news, according to Berman, is that not all of the money had to come from the recurring budget; the overall recurring budget reduction for the campus was 3%. Provost Berman reported that a decision was made last spring to take larger reductions from certain units in Academic Affairs. The resultant overall recurring reduction to the colleges and divisions was 2.65%. Berman stated that because of the extensive planning, there was limited impact on instruction. Provost highlighted that all divisions, academic affairs, and colleges, took equal cuts except for the Sangamon Auditorium and The Center for State Policy and Leadership.

Berman stated that all three campuses decided it would be prudent, although painful, not to offer a general salary program for AY 10-11 for faculty or administrators. However, UIUC declared a need for a faculty retention program. July 1st President Hogan determined that a faculty equity and retention program for only UIUC was not a good idea. He directed the other two campuses to also incorporate a compression, equity, retention program. In response to the directive, the Provost met with Deans during the second week of August. The Provost emphasized that this is not a general salary program, but is a special program to address compression and equity problems. Berman further stated there is an intersection between this program and the merit process. Eligibility for consideration requires faculty to have received a meritorious vote during the spring 2010 evaluation process. Adjustments will be included in September payroll.

The Provost announced that UIS has broken the 5,000 students mark. He applauded the way staff, faculty, and administration worked together to attain this goal. Kudos were given to admissions and those who attend to student retention. Berman stated that the increase was largely attributed to the number of students who were retained. He acknowledged that it has been a very difficult decade in terms of budget and goals; however, compared to fall 2000, UIS is at a 30% increase in student enrollments.

Provost highlighted comments made at Convocation. He emphasized the Chancellor's dedication to continue strengthening campus culture. The campus climate survey will assist in this process. Berman reported work being done to improve the use of instructional resources, based on the recommendations of the Instructional Resources Management Task Force in collaboration with Deans and staff. Additionally, Provost reported that the Center for Teaching and Learning, under the leadership of Kandice Pryor, will oversee the administration of the faculty development workshops developed by Associate Vice Chancellors Moranski and Pardie. Further, Berman noted a number of other faculty development opportunities being offered through COLRS and COPE-L.

Provost thanked those involved in outreach initiatives and collaborations with community colleges in surrounding areas. Provost also expressed his excitement relative to the number of international partnerships and collaborations that are occurring.

Berman discussed the text book rental program that had been endorsed by the senate in Spring 2010 semester. Provost reported that program had created approximately \$70,000 in savings for students who participated.

Finally, Provost Berman discussed first-week events, including the Chancellor's picnic, the involvement expo, and the Foot in the Door Event. All activities were very well attended by students, faculty, staff and families. Provost reported significant growth in student organizations from 2000 until now. Additionally, 72 employers seeking part-time employees visited UIS, through the Foot in the Door Event. Kudos were given to Career Services.

Martin asked for clarification about how the budget cuts had been shared equally between divisions. Berman reported first meeting with the Directors for the Center for State Policy and Leadership and the Sangamon Auditorium to discuss the importance of taking a higher percentage of reductions from CSPL and Auditorium in order to minimize effects on instruction. Berman then stated that budget reductions were then divided equally between divisions. Martin clarified that the metric used was created around elements central to student instruction. Berman agreed and referred to the core mission of UIS.

Sheridan asked Berman for further clarification regarding the retention equity program. Provost stated that the minimum requirement for consideration was a meritorious vote during the Spring 2010 evaluative process. Fisher stated that key words "equity" and "compression" were used in talking about the program and wondered if the equity formula was used in the decision making process. Berman said Will Miller is the new chair of the Faculty Salary Equity Committee. Based on the work of the committee, the deans were provided current data regarding faculty who are at or below 95% or predicted salary based on rank, years of rank, and discipline. Faculty who want to know more about this can visit the Academic Affairs website. Provost continued by stating that Deans, in consultation with college faculty (e.g., college executive committees) would be making decisions about who would receive the money.

Fisher supported the idea of raises to address compression, but asked about the status of campus-level decisions and inquired about the process for handling raises. Berman did not think UIS would be shifting expectations to align with UIUC standards.

Garmil asked about the funding of this initiative. Provost stated the amount of money is considerably less than the money that would be required for the general salary program. Furthermore, upsurge in enrollment will assist in the funding of the program.

Sisneros raised a question about the percentage of faculty who would benefit from the program. Provost stated that approximately 40% of faculty would benefit. Ting stated that this is a special program and not the general salary program. She asked if it is reasonable to assume that all faculty should be notified of this initiative beforehand, not simply after the fact. Berman stated that all faculty members would be notified. Additionally, Berman said decisions about how to handle the process were being made at the college level. Sheridan asked if the program would continue next year to assist faculty who do not benefit this year. Berman was unsure as to whether or not the program would continue and emphasized that the campus had been directed by President Hogan to fund the program. He continued by saying that, hopefully, faculty, APs, and Civil Service employees who receive favorable evaluations next year will receive pay increases. Martin stated that notifications of pay increases for meritorious and extra meritorious evaluations are given in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). Not expecting anything this year, Martin said this equity, compression, and retention program was very welcome news. Provost emphasized again that this is not a general salary program and not everyone who received a meritorious evaluation would receive a raise.

Sisneros asked if the pay adjustment would be added to base pay. Berman affirmed that it would be added to the base. Sisneros then asked who was making decisions regarding who would receive the increase. Berman answered decisions were made by the Deans. Fisher reported that in CLAS decisions has been made by the dean in consultation with the CLAS personnel committee. Salela reported that consultation had not occurred with the college personnel or executive committee in the Library.

Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen

Van Vossen announced the first SGA meeting was scheduled for Sunday August, 29th at 7:00 p.m. in the UIS studio theater. He also reported that a Committee of the Whole meeting will be held on Saturday, August 28th to determine who would serve on senate committees. Van Vossen said SGA would have student names by Sunday.

Committee on Committees-Kline

Kline reported that Karen Swan, from EHS, will be serving on the Research Board for AY 10-12; he reported that Elizabeth Kosmetatou from LAS has agreed to serve on the Parking Appeals and Advisory Board for AY 10-11. A motion to accept the slate was called by Eisenhart. Casinova seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Proposed Revised Levels of Governance and Administrative Approval (Pilot Study) – H. Berman

Provost stated that a table had been created in late 1990s to generate clarity and consistency in the handling of curricular changes. The table was very well received. Since then, UIS now has a lower division and the BANNER system. Deficiencies have been identified relative to the absence of administrative processed in the current table. Last year there was a major initiative to review, revise, and update the chart. A task force was created to accomplish this goal. Members of the task force were: Bapat Harshavardhan; Terry Bodenhorn; Len Bogle; Brian Clevenger; Heather Dell; Dyanne Ferik; Sharron Lafollette; Holly McCracken; Karen Moranski; Donald Morris; Lynn Pardie; Bev Rivera; and Missy Thibodeaux-Thompson. Terry Bodenhorn served as the chair. The task force wrestled with fundamental questions regarding the proper balance between having autonomy and quality assurance. The Provost thanked the members of the task force for the work they invested. Once the chart was updated and revised in the spring, the task force received feedback from the Campus Senate Undergraduate and Graduate Councils and college curriculum committees. The Associate Vice Chancellors, in collaboration with Kimberly Craig, integrated feedback and reformatted the chart over the summer. Provost consulted with SEC and suggested that given the level of consultation in the process that UIS adopt the chart for a year, accumulate revisions throughout, and bring forth new document in spring.

Kline asked for clarification about the lack of approval procedure for undergraduate certificates under 18 hours. Berman said that was correct. Kline asked why this has been left out. Provost requested that undergraduate council weigh in on the issue and discuss.

Boltuc commented that the word “inform” on rows 16 and 25 is grossly inadequate. Pardie suggested that this is a language issue. Boltuc requested more clarification regarding the role of the vice chancellor in the review process. Moranski stated that this is happening and is a paperwork issue. The Associate Vice Chancellor’s review ensures that BANNER requirements are met. Moranski stated that all general education courses require her signature. Boltuc asked if the paperwork would still be signed if a negative vote was given by the council. Ting asserted that the administrative review part is oversight for paperwork, not about the substance of the course.

Wassenberg emphasized the importance of a formalized system to inform administration and faculty of new courses. Although unsure of how to do so, Wassenberg suggested formalizing the communication process between colleges and departments. Ting suggested the college curriculum committees should play a key role in the strengthening of the communication process across colleges.

Garmil inquired why information was given about changing from upper to lower division courses, but not information regarding the reverse in line 32. Provost acknowledged the possibility of including a row on the chart for that situation.

Old Business

Resolution 40-1 Approval of Minor in Public Health [2nd reading]

A motion was made by Olivier to discuss Resolution 40-1. Van Vossen seconded the motion. Kline stated that this resolution could have been resolved at the last senate

meeting in the spring; however, due to a lack of quorum, had to be carried over. Ting stated there was a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, but many people left early.

Martin raised questions about the double-dipping nature of this resolution and wondered if this is appropriate. Lafollette explained the broad nature of Public Health at the undergraduate level is in line with best practices. Martin said he appreciates that the minor meets national standards and hopes exceeding standards is encouraged. However, Martin stated that his concerns were not enough to keep him from voting for the resolution. Fisher agreed that Martin is raising important questions and encouraged continued discussion.

A unanimous vote was made in favor of resolution 40-1.

Resolution 40-2 Campus Senate Endorsement on SGA Resolution on the Proposed Follett Book Rental Program

Ting reported that this program is already in place and is saving students a significant amount of money. Van Vossen endorsed the book rental program and reiterated that already 2,000 books have been rented.

A motion was made to vote on the resolution by Eisenhart. Bogle seconded the motion. The vote passed with one abstention.

New Business

Resolution 40-3 Modifications in Workload for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [1st reading]

Deborah Anthony, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee reported that in the pending resolution Article 3, Section 3, of the personnel policy was modified to clarify scholarship and service expectations for non-tenure track faculty. With this change, it became important to address the teaching load of non-tenure track faculty.

A motion to discuss Resolution 40-3 was made by Martin and seconded by Wang.

Kline asked if it was the intention that a 4-4 teaching load be put in place for non-tenure track faculty with no further service and scholarship expectations, or if the 4-4 load was in addition to service and scholarship. Anthony stated that the intention of the resolution is that non-tenure track faculty teaching a 4-4 load would have lowered service and scholarship expectations, although she could not specify how much lower.

Eisenhart expressed a concern about the number of non-tenure track faculty being hired to teach, compared to tenure track personnel. Ting stated that if Eisenhart was referring to lines 27-28 that content had nothing to do with the number of faculty who could be hired into these positions. It merely addresses what percentage of non-tenure track faculty may teach a 4-4 load. Anthony stated that the resolution was intended to limit the number of non-tenure track faculty who could be hired.

Helton asked why 10% had been selected instead of another percentage. Anthony stated that the number came through an investigation of the number already present in each college. Ting asked about the numbers. Anthony reported that data from AY 09-10

suggested that the college of business and management had 18%, education and human services had 21%, LAS had 14%, Library had 50%, and PAA had 10%.

Wassenberg stated that there must be a problem with the numbers because last year PAA had 1 half-time and 1 full time non-tenure track faculty member. She noted a possible issue of having to hire 9 non-tenure track faculty members in order to hire 1 who could teach a 4-4 load. Anthony said that the 10% includes everyone.

Martin asked how labs were counted into workload. He said this is an issue to be looked at later.

Fisher asked if we have a number of non-tenure track faculty who do not do service and scholarship. She highlighted the difference in teaching load at UIS as a major discriminator between UIS and other institutions and questioned whether as an institution we want to move in this direction. Provost suggested that it is not fair to hold non-tenure track faculty to the same standard as tenure-track faculty. Ting stated that there are instructors who teach full time but have no service or scholarship obligations. Kline asked to amend line 26 to read, "when the faculty has no service or scholarship obligations" after the word "agreements." He asserted that future interpretation necessitates accurate language.

Garmil noted that as a non-tenure track faculty member, he does not have service obligations, although the faculty handbook states that he may engage in special duties. Sheridan suggested a clause to indicate a reduced expectation for service and scholarship. Wassenberg proposed adding a separate sentence to reduce confusion. Martin raised a point of order. Bogle clarified that Section 3 stated that specific criteria are established at the time of hire and/or contract renewal and suggested the issue was already dealt with by the current language. He asked if the concern was that a dean might demand intensified work if language is not amended. Kline said yes, that is the concern.

Harshavardhan asked if someone is teaching 4 courses, will they be teaching 16 contact hours? Ting answered yes and stated that 12 hours is the average per faculty across semesters as stated in the personnel policies. Berman agreed that this would be an exception to personnel policies.

Martin agreed with sentiment of amendment but believed that a larger issue needed to be worked out. He suggested that because this is a first reading, the PPC work with the language before the second reading. Boltuc questioned whether the amendment made sense. Anthony responded by stating the original intention was to ensure quality teaching. Discussion of order resulted in a decision to withdraw the amendment by Kline.

Provost highlighted the importance of broadening language as suggested by Sheridan. Helton agreed that non-tenure track faculty should not be denied the opportunity to engage in service if they want and have the time to serve. Martin suggested including the language "when scholarship and service are reduced, that may be replaced by..." Helton stated that she would like to find a balance between assisting deans and department heads

with negotiations and guard against excessive mandatory teaching, service, and scholarship expectations.

Zhang suggested that negotiation language is not specific enough. He questioned how much power non-tenure track faculty member would have to say no. Ting referred to the language of line 39. She emphasized the importance of finding a balance. When it comes to policy, we see that there is not enough specificity to make it useful and vice versa. What we want to ensure that workload for teaching can be above 3 courses only when other expectations are reduced.

Fisher suggested the term “exception” as a way to link the previous paragraph: “Exceptions to the previous rule may arise only in circumstances where there is a reduction.” Garmil stated that perhaps language suggesting the review of the non-tenure track faculty member who is assigned a 4-4 course load be based on teaching, not scholarship or service, would be useful.

Helton requested a clearer rationale from the PPC regarding the 10 percent number. Ting highlighted Boltuc’s concerns regarding Lines 29-30. Sheridan cautioned against the usage of exclusionary language if scholarship and service are an integral part of the position.

Ting suggested the PPC incorporate the comments made during the senate meeting and resubmit for 2nd reading.

Resolution 40-4 Designation of Scholar in Residence [1st reading]

A motion to discuss resolution 40-4 was made by Boltuc and seconded by Olivier.

Ting stated that UIS does have adjunct faculty member who currently carries this title. If we are going to bestow this honor, policies should reflect the practice. Martin asked if the resolution was geared toward adding this title, but not adding anything more. Ting responded affirmatively. Boltuc suggested a friendly amendment to the language whereas faculty teaching from a distance may be included. Ting stated that the resolution was not designed to exclude those faculty members. Eisenhart supported Boltuc’s sentiments.

Van Vossen suggested amending line 3 to read, “this designation recognizes the expertise that an (to replace the word some) adjunct faculty bring to the UIS curriculum from outside academia.” Van Vossen asked if this resolution is meant to address one faculty member, or several. Ting asserted that it may include more than one, but not all, adjunct faculty members. Martin addressed a point of order regarding the amendment process.

Olivier supported adding language that strengthens the resolution. Garmil asked why the resolution is being linked to adjunct faculty, rather than adding a new category of non-tenure track faculty. Ting reported that the title has already been given to someone on our campus. Fisher agreed that bestowing the title to an adjunct faculty seemed contrary to the intentions of honorary titles, which indicate long-term linkages to the campus. Ting asserted that the adjunct bearing this title does have a long-term linkage to UIS. Anthony

asked if the suggestion was to broaden the title to others who are not adjunct labor. Garmil responded that the word “adjunct” carries a connotation of course-by-course teaching.

Ting asked if UIS is at risk of losing adjunct faculty if we do not offer this title. Berman underscored the importance of having an honorific title for a subset of adjunct faculty who are widely acknowledged. Eisenhart encouraged the senate to examine the need for any honorific titles. She argued establishment of an honorific title should not emerge just because someone has been given the title. Additionally, she asked the senate to look at the larger issues. Provost stated that PPC had deliberated and believed the honorific title was worthy of consideration.

Ting encouraged continued discussion of the topic. Because this is a first reading, the resolution will go back to the PPC for further consideration. Senators always have the right to vote against a resolution.

Olivier requested a point of privilege to be excused from the meeting.

Borland suggested that the title is confusing. Perhaps reconsidering a different title concerns may be addressed. Ting asked Boltuc if he had a friendly amendment for PPC. Boltuc asked that the PPC address his comments for the next reading.

Resolution 40-5 Faculty Compensation Review [1st reading]

Ting stated that resolution 40-5 would be voted up or down. Changes to the resolution would not be accepted.

Provost provided background information on promotion compensation, which occurs when a faculty members advances from assistant to associate professor, and associate to full professor. The resolution will raise the amount related to promotion from assistant to associate professor from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and \$4,000 to \$5,000 for faculty being promoted to full professor. Additionally, faculty promoted from assistant to associate will receive a one-time professional development stipend in the amount of \$1,000, and promotion to full professor will include a one-time \$2,500 professional development stipend. Berman also announced the increase in overall faculty development money, from \$650 to \$700. Associate Provost Shures calculated the costs involved. Provost accepted the recommendations of the committee as they were presented.

Ting asked for a motion. A motion to discuss was made by Boltuc and seconded by Eisenhart.

Sisneros asked when the committee met and the timing of the meeting. Provost said the review occurs every other year. Sisneros asked when this would be effective and if people who were promoted last year would be eligible. Berman affirmed that they would receive the increase.

Salela questioned the wording of the resolution and indicated that some faculty members are on a 12-month contract. Provost emphasized that the increase will be the same regardless of 9- or 12-month contract.

Van Vossen asked how the proposed increases will be funded. Berman stated that this is possible largely due to increase in enrollment. He underscored the relatively small percentage of funds needed to support the program and believes it will have a tremendously positive impact on moral and retention. An average of 7.1 people receives promotion from assistant to associate, and 2.3 faculty are promoted from assistant to full professor per year.

Borland suggested removing “9 month” from the language to correct the issue raised by Salela. Berman accepted the change.

Fisher commended the increase in the faculty development funds.

Van Vossen voiced his lack of support for the resolution. He stated that it is being funded by student tuition, which was just raised by 9.5% last year. Additionally, Van Vossen argued that with furlough days last semester, students are paying more for the status quo.

Kline acknowledged Van Vossen’s comments and asserted that furloughs also strongly affected faculty.

Martin stated he is receiving less now in inflation-adjusted wages than when he was hired. Switzer stated that retention of faculty is important in maintaining quality. Jamison said that a small number of faculty members will be receiving the money, after the tenure process.

Schuldt inquired as to when the current numbers decided upon. Berman stated the current numbers were instituted 15 years ago.

Bogle reported he took a financial hit with furloughs, but that his students were not impacted by furlough days because he made sure to hold all classes.

Wassenberg highlighted the importance of taking a proactive approach to combat salary compression.

Van Vossen reiterated the poor timing of this initiative given the uncertain economic time. Ting acknowledged the concerns raised by Van Vossen and encouraged the importance of joining together to advocate with legislators. Helton noted that not supporting the resolution does not mean that the money is going back to students. Ting supported Van Vossen’s fiscal vigilance and suggested that SGA look at some of the ways student fees are being spent. Salela stated that faculty at UIS are way below competitive markets and applauded Van Vossen for voicing concern.

Kline made a motion to suspend the rules. Sheridan seconded the motion. Three nay votes were counted and no abstentions. The main motion carried with 24 favorable votes, 3 nays, and 0 abstentions.

Resolution 40-6 Amendment to Resolution 31-1, Section III [1st reading]

A motion to discuss 40-6 was made by Zhang and seconded by Martin. No questions or comments were expressed.

Resolution 40-7 Science of the Environment Concentration in Chemistry and Biology [1st reading]

Martin made a motion to discuss resolution 40-7. Ballard seconded the motion. Ting referred senators to a memo from the Undergraduate Council regarding some slight modification of the proposed curriculum. Garmil noted confusion about page 3 of the biology guide referring to the usage of 400 level courses; however, in the chart no specification indicates that it is only for honors students. Ting asked if this was a substantive change and suggested that Bapat, the chair of the Undergraduate Council, can clarify.

Martin thanked EHS for working with Biology. Pinky echoed her thanks regarding the collaboration process.

Resolution 40-8 Campus Senate Endorsement on SGA Resolution in Support of Discounted Tuition Zones in Contiguous States

Martin motioned to discuss Resolution 40-8. Garmil seconded the motion.

Ting reported that SGA passed this resolution in the summer and had forwarded it to the BOT. The resolution is now before the senate for a vote.

Van Vossen encouraged senate support of this resolution to promote an increased number of students who will be eligible for in-state tuition. He believes this will be good publicity. Ting stated that the proposed tuition program allows in-state tuition instead of out-of-state tuition for students. At the last minute the proposal for the program was pulled from the July BOT agenda due to a concern from central administration about supporting out-of-state students with in-state tuition. President Hogan will assess the situation. Ting stated that we already offer this program in the form of scholarships.

Eisenhart moved to suspend the rules, so a clear message is sent to President Hogan. Sheridan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 2 nays and 1 abstention.

Kline inquired about the positive or negative implications of this resolution. Fisher expressed support the resolution and asked the body to consider how many more students we can accommodate on this campus. Ting reiterated to senators that this program is already in place but under another name as a “scholarship” program. Berman suggested resolution 40-8 would provide a more straight-forward way to offer in-state tuition rate so that it could be marketed. Borland and Eisenhart also expressed support for the resolution. A unanimous vote of support was taken.

Adjournment

Martin moved to adjourn the meeting; Eisenhart seconded the motion at 12:20.