

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011
October 8, 2010
10:00 AM – 12:18 PM
PAC Conference Room “H”**

Senators Present: D. Ballard, L. Bogle, P. Boltuc, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, 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, Y. Zhang and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: S. Borland, R. Garmil, and P. Wassenberg

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: H. Bapat, D. Brown, K. Burton, A. Carlsberg, J. Dooley, D. Ferk, R. Hadidi, J. Hall, B. Hayler, M. Hogan, R. Jehlicka, D. Larson, X. Li, A. McEuen, D. Morris, L. Pardie, K. Rutherford, A. Shures, E. Stanley, L. Troyer, and A. Winand.

The Senate was called to order at 10:00 AM. Chair Ting announced that President Hogan was running about 10 minutes late.

Approval of the day’s agenda

Martin made a motion to approve the October 8, 2010 agenda. Salela seconded the motion.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of September 24, 2010

Chair Ting asked for approval of the minutes from September 24th meeting. Sheridan motioned to approve and Van Vossen seconded the motion. Chair Ting called for corrections, deletions, or modifications. Martin requested a change on line 256. After the word suggested, remove “that” and insert “there is” as a replacement. Additionally, line 258 required the insertion of the word “but” after the word “sentence.” Salela corrected the spelling of Tosha Cantrell Bruce’s name on line 157, and line 221 needed a “t” inserted before “he” to create “the.” Additionally, Salela requested removal of the redundant “or at the time of hire” on line 222.

The vote to accept the minutes with suggested corrections yielded one abstention. All other senators were in favor of acceptance.

Announcements

Chair Ting asked for any announcements. Salela announced that the Library's annual book sale was taking place on October 8, 2010 in the BRK basement. Martin reminded senators of the Friday night Star Parties continuing until October 22, 1010.

Reports

Chair – T. Ting

Chair Ting reported that the Undergraduate Advising Task Force has been finalized and the 1st meeting has been scheduled. She also stated that the UIUC Campus Senate passed a resolution by majority vote, calling for the dissolution of the Academy on Capitalism and Limited Governance Foundation from the U of I Foundation. The University Senates Conference also took a vote in favor of resolving the affiliation with the U of I Foundation. Both resolutions have been transmitted to UIS. A UIS ad-hoc committee on the matter has been formed. Members include: Kline, Martin, and Boltuc. Once the committee concludes its work, a resolution along with the committee findings will be brought to the senate.

Chair Ting welcomed President Hogan and Dr. Troyer. She thanked Hogan for reaching out to UIS campus senate and encouraged senators and people in audience to ask any questions they may have regarding the proposed amendments to the statutes and general rules. On October 22, at the end of the discussion UIS senate will formalize our recommendations and conclusions regarding the proposed changes and forward the response to University Senates Conference and President Hogan.

Hogan thanked senators for inviting him to UIS as he really wants to make himself available to answer questions. Due to another meeting in Champaign, he only had a little over one hour to spend with Senate. After speaking with Ting on Tuesday, he wanted to talk with senators about the reorganization plan that has been put forward by the BOT and address any questions, comments or concerns regarding why changes are necessary, and what the effects of the proposed changes will be for the University. The BOT has proposed amendments to University Statutes and General Rules and forwarded proposed amendments to the Senates Conferences, per the process required by the statutes and general rules. Hogan asserted that the BOT is not asking that consensus is reached between campuses; however, they are interested in the views of each campus. Additionally, UIS Campus Senate is not required to vote on the proposed changes, but the Board would like to hear the views and ideas of faculty on this matter. The BOT has spent time thinking about issues and realizes that there may be things about the reorganization that have not yet been brought to awareness. Consultation allows for the BOT to work through issues in a proactive manner. Hogan reminded senators that he has been employed as U of I President for 3 months and 2 weeks and the Board has been contemplating changes for more than a year. Events prior to the admissions crisis and during the crisis, have helped inform the BOT's thinking about the reorganization.

President Hogan responded to 2 primary questions: (1) Why does the Board think this is a good idea and (2) What is the Board trying to accomplish. Hogan asserted that the BOT feels strongly that there is not enough currently happening relative to research across campuses or to protect and enhance the clinical mission, mostly through the hospital. Revenues generated through the hospital help to fund health sciences. The Board believes, and Hogan agrees that we haven't done enough to promote healthy collaboration and coordination across campuses, particularly in the area of research. Furthermore, we are missing opportunities through the lack of complementarity which has promoted competition and unnecessary duplication and triplication often in back-office operations that can no longer be afforded in a time of acute financial crisis. The Board wants less unhealthy competition and more collaboration. This is the philosophy that the BOT has proposed. While changes may seem small, the philosophy and purposes behind this is a substantial departure from the way the university and campuses have functioned. BOT thinks U of I campuses have significant siloing mentality problems both on campuses and between campuses. Hogan stated the BOT is unsympathetic to unnecessary redundancies that are triplicated not simplified. The Board wants to squeeze savings for more important purposes. For example, savings will assist to avoid furlough days, and to begin moving more resources toward compensation for faculty and staff. In all probability we will receive less money from the state. Savings should be carved out of back office operations and administrative overhead. The effort to manage cost structure reinforces the BOT's conviction that we need to reintegrate the University and create something that is greater than the sum of its parts. Currently, we are lesser than the sum of its parts. Hogan stated that he is building a website FAQ to address questions.

In addressing the question, why add Vice President to the Chancellors title, Hogan informed the senators that this proposed amendment was already a substantial compromise on the original proposal. Prior to Hogan's arrival there was a vacancy on the Urbana campus. Serious discussion occurred about collapsing the two positions of University President and UIUC Chancellor. A decision was made not to do that or to consolidate the Chancellor and Provost positions. Ikenberry supported that plan initially, but Hogan did not. Instead, a proposal was made to enrich the Chancellors title to Vice President of the University of Illinois, Chancellor of X campus. The search firm for the UIS search thought it would be a fabulous idea and enrich the pool of candidates.

Next Hogan addressed the question about the rationale of the BOT. First, Hogan asserted that the title realignment does not change general authority of the chancellor. Rather, it is designed to remind all of the chancellors that they have authority and to encourage active management of their campus. Hogan reiterated that in period of acute economic crisis Chancellors must be actively involved in the management of campus. The change is designed to re-empower Chancellors to exercise their power. Secondly, Hogan stated the changes are designed to remind chancellors that they are officers of the university; their own success depends most heavily on their ability to contextualize what they are doing on their campus and for the university as a whole. Hogan quoted Robert Frost's "good fences make good neighbors" to support the idea that good collegial relationships between the BOT, President, Chancellors and down the chain of command, depend on a clearly delineated chain of command. Ambitious and aggressive people will try to move

into open spaces. The U of I reputation overall, particularly between Urbana and the President's office, has been a reputation of contest and dysfunction. Although UIS was not part of the admissions scandal, we were also impacted. The admissions scandal resulted largely from a much larger leadership crisis which grew from the fact that lines were not clearly delineated. Personal alliances were formed, and the BOT was fractured, which resulted in the scandal and a dysfunctional university. This embarrassment has something to say about the diminishment of the reputation of the university. The BOT recognizes that steps need to be taken to create a clear chain of command that goes from the BOT to the President to the Chancellors. Chancellors must see themselves as general officers of university.

Hogan next addressed the addition of "research" to the Vice President of Technology and Economic Development title and stated that this is adding to the portfolio and current responsibilities as opposed to creating a new VP position. This title change will address part of a larger issue raised by the BOT. The Board is convinced that we lack strong coordination across campuses and are not doing enough to link research initiatives. U of I is perhaps the only institution that does not have this configuration. At most universities, the functions are normally combined in the same office. Most of what happens technologically is driven from research and it is imperative to bring the pieces back together. Additionally, the BOT has been irritated by the lack of cohesion between campuses. When each campus is submitting a competing proposal; others are making decisions about what the U of I priorities are going to be. Hogan reported hearing stories from legislators as well. The BOT wants campuses to harmonize requests and establish our own priorities. This has persuaded BOT that someone needs to be at the top of coordination between campuses to allow for a unification of voices and emphasize cross-disciplinary collaborations, especially because federal funding is given toward these kinds of projects. Currently, it is very difficult for the three campuses to penetrate any other and build collaborations. According to Hogan, the National Institutes of Health has been collecting data on federal funding for research. In the recently released report, Urbana dropped 10 places and Chicago dropped by 5 spots. Hogan emphasized that as an institution, we cannot afford this kind of damage to our reputation. Part of the issue is related to a dearth of synergy between and across campuses. To move forward, we have to get past that kind of competition and build more collaboration, as well as establish a big strong voice to represent U of I with funding agencies in Washington.

Lastly, Hogan discussed the proposed amendment to add a Vice President for Health Affairs, which has grown from the same philosophy for BOT and President. While the major clinical enterprise is housed on the Chicago campus, it exists all over the state including Peoria, Rockford, and Urbana. One-third of the university budget is allocated to the Health enterprise. At every other university, a Vice President oversees and coordinates clinical operations, coordinates research and teaching aspects with other life sciences on all campuses. Currently, U of I does not have anyone to perform that function. The hospital is falling down and is too small to be competitive. This is an area where we really need a strong, unified voice that is currently missing. The addition of this position will help us get to where we need to be.

Chair Ting called for questions for President Hogan. Boltuc asked if proposed changes would assist at the ground level, in providing opportunities for faculty at UIS to collaborate and become more involved with initiatives at UIUC. Hogan stated that he has heard the same story many times from UIS and UIC and noted the reluctance to create standardized procedures across campuses. He talked about how academic professionals are treated differently on each campus, which is problematic. Hogan also used the example of online education and asked, “why would we bother reinventing the wheel when we have perfect model on Springfield campus?” Differential standards and individual efforts have detracted from our ability to create a unified system which has made the U of I system lesser than the sum of our parts. Numerous examples exist where resources have been wasted and services are duplicated which detracts from the ability to put money and resources in more effective places. Troyer added that places that have a VP for Research who oversees multiple sites and campuses often create opportunities to support visiting scholar positions across campuses. Hogan stated that he had a meeting with BP who is interested in only funding cross-disciplinary research. In order to take advantage of opportunities, we have to create a more fluid system.

Hall stated that he has a concern with the nimbleness relative to reacting to grants if the research position is elevated to a higher level. He would like for the university to build an infrastructure that will promote opportunities, rather than slow the process. Hogan stated that Hall had just described the position description which is highly concerned with pulling campus efforts together and removing barriers when necessary. The position will be facilitative and is not intended to create more bureaucracy.

Eisenhart talked about some of the historical and contextual dimensions of the current problems. Problems began when the BOT positions moved from elected to appointed positions. Eisenhart urged everyone to consider whether or not proposed changes will fix the problem. While the problems may be solved temporarily; problems will re-emerge as the players change.

President Hogan responded affirmatively to Eisenhart’s concerns. He asserted that right now we can fix the part of the problem that is our part of the problem. Additionally, the U of I will do everything possible to stand up and resist unethical dealings. Hogan reiterated the importance of the University Statutes which discuss the U of I as an organic whole. The BOT is trying to invoke the original intent of the bylaws and general statutes, not overturn them.

Van Vossen asked if the Chancellors’ role will be diminished in determining strategic plans, with the proposed changes. Hogan emphasized that this is to empower Chancellors, not to diminish. Each Chancellor will be asked to advocate for his/her campus, within the context of the common good.

Fisher reinforced President Hogan’s statement about the perceivably small changes having big implications and inquired about the implications for the Provost role within the proposed changes. Hogan responded by saying, no. The general rules or statutes require each campus to have a provost/vice chancellor or equivalent position. He does not

foresee that function changes. Currently, functions are being performed differently based on campus needs. Provosts are chief academic officers, and are 2nd to the Chancellor and are in charge when the chancellor is not available. However, the Vice Chancellor is not necessarily in charge of facilities, another VP exists for that role. Ting referred to the statute language which states that each campus shall have a Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or equivalent officer. Removing the Provost title is not in violation of statutes. Troyer referred to inconsistent wording in the general rules where the title provost was the only language given which raised concerns. Changing the language is partly an effort to provide consistency.

Fisher noted that as UIS is a small campus in a big system, discussions about redundancy of offerings and duplications can create a shudder effect. She inquired about the possible trade-offs involved in emphasizing systemic strengths and developing programs locally so that faculty and programs are not limited. She wondered about academic departments' ability to expand based on faculty expertise and the needs of students within this new structure. Hogan did not foresee any major shifts occurring as a result of the proposed changes and encouraged Chancellors and Vice Chancellors to make decisions at the university level about where a campus might want to go with its own programs.

President Hogan talked about the redundancies that occur primarily in back office and administrative functions. The goal is to create greater efficiency and save money as we anticipate and plan for the day when 17 percent of the budget is not coming from the state. Currently, we are probably 18 months to 2 years behind where other institutions are relative to planning. To the extent to which we do plan, each campus does so individually. However, coherent university planning needs to occur to handle significant future reductions. Important questions need to be asked relative to what, as a university and as individual campuses, need to protect in order to advance. If we do have to give something up, what will it be? Because Hogan cannot be at UIS or UIC every day, it is imperative that Chancellors are fully empowered to tackle identity issues and determine priorities in consultation with faculty and staff. University leaders are interested first and foremost in ways to create a \$60 million savings on the administrative side. Chancellors will have to sit down with faculty and make decisions. If we don't have the resources to support current footprint, changes will need to be made. Unfortunately, there is no way we will come out unscathed. Planning is imperative so that the process is not driven by people who do not know or understand our mission. Taking charge of our own destiny is critical. To achieve this goal, Hogan needs really good Chancellors. Ting asked if it is fair to say that by supporting the proposed amendment, we are not saying that only one biology department or one English department will exist at the U of I, or that UIS will only be online. Hogan stated that each campus must have offerings that support programs and departments. Additionally, UIS has already delineated and focused on selected areas in graduate studies which make us distinctive. If Urbana and Chicago both have a College of Education, there should be complimentary relationships. Healthy, cross-campus collaboration is the goal, not the elimination of one.

Martin referred to discussion on Senates Conference that centered around what should be done and what can be done. As he has been listening to the President's vision, he is

concerned about the political climate. Is the BOT thinking about how changes may be perceived publicly? Martin stated that some folks may think we are expanding administration. Hogan stated that the BOT is very comfortable with the proposed changes and approved an issued statement describing how the results of the reorganization will produce a 5% to 10% reduction in overhead. Hogan is less concerned about what public might say than the fact that there may be people on campuses who have a hard time understanding that the reorganization is necessary to drive down costs. Proposed changes make it possible to grow substantial revenue streams that are currently missing. Ting asked for an example of the redundancy in back office operations. Hogan suggested a review of the administrative review and restructuring report. Hogan talked about how a chunk of life sciences at UIUC struck partnership with the Mayo Clinic rather than seeking the same partnership with medical school on the UIC campus. This is an example of how we are wasting opportunities to build a better university. Each campus can have a different identity and missions, but everyone benefits by being a part of the U of I brand. As UIUC dropped from 9 to 15 of public universities in one year, that is also a UIS problem. Ting asked if faculty can continue to follow-up through the FAQ. Troyer stated that it will be dynamic. Hogan encouraged participation. Ting, Senators, and visitors thanked President Hogan for taking the time to talk with the Senate.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost reported that payments have been received from the State to the U of I. Money is still owed on the FY10 appropriation, but this is less than anticipated. The State still owes \$33 million of \$743 million for FY 10. While it is a worse situation than last year, it is not at the level we feared. The U of I is in same boat as other institutions as far as slow down on payments from state. UIS is planning to absorb a 15% reduction in the budge for FY 12. Provost will discuss this in detail with the Planning and Budget Committee at the next meeting.

Provost Berman talked about the international dialogue event that took place on October 1st. Thirty three faculty and staff participated and created innovative ideas regarding housing and generating diversity. A report will be submitted along with the goals and strategies in the next couple of weeks.

Provost reminded everyone that the SICA campaign is starting and encouraged participation. Additionally, everyone must complete the ethics training as employees of the State of Illinois.

Berman acknowledged the Lincoln Legacy Lectures presented by Endowed Professors Burlingame and Holden. Both lectures focused on Lincoln and race from their respective disciplinary perspectives. Congratulations to the Center for State Policy and Leadership, especially Barbara Ferrara. Today is the Wepner symposium. Visiting scholars from different parts of the country along with UIS Political Science faculty are talking about the relationship between Lincoln and the discipline of political science. Lastly, this is homecoming weekend.

Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen

Van Vossen reported that SGA passed a moratorium on student fee increases for FY 2012 at the last SGA meeting. One exception, an athletic fee increase was included due to previous agreements. SGA is also considering a possible \$2 cut in student fees. Kline asked if the fee decrease is possible because of an increase in the number of students attending UIS. Van Vossen stated that SGA is not relying on an increase in student numbers to support the cut. In past years, SGA has had a reserve and SGA is planning to cut their budget in half. However, the planning is still in the very early stages. Martin asked how much the student fee is increasing with the athletic fee. Van Vossen reported that the planned increase is \$12. Olivier stated that SGA plans to keep a record of all conversations for future reference. Fisher asked if the understanding is to have a flat fee for next year. Van Vossen said that SGA did discuss what will happen at the end of the 5 year plan, and it will stay at that level.

IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee Report – L. Bogle

Bogle stated the report complements what Hogan and Berman said about the shrinking pot of money, which begs questions regarding how we get what we need at the higher education level. The FAC is comprised of representatives from higher education institutions across the state. Monthly meetings are held to consider issues, and provide information and feedback to decision makers, specifically the Board of Higher Education. At the September 17th meeting, the FAC discussed questions about how to get our message to legislators, help them understand that higher education is important and that we are forced to compete with public education. Specifically, what is the message we want/need to send. Research is being conducted to collect data.

Bogle provided specific statistical information in the report regarding income increase and level of education. According to Bogle's report, the data is being used to highlight a message about the need to use higher education as a way to increase the tax base. Additionally, college educated people contribute significantly to the cultural milieu and are more active socially. The FAC is brainstorming ways to spread this information.

Bogle discussed the Complete College America Initiative and overviewed the statistics in the report. Disparities exist regarding level of education and job performance requirements in Illinois. Legislators need to understand that there are some major problems that higher education can address. The revenue shortfall can be addressed through higher education and it is important to get the message out to newspapers, media, etc. Bogle stated that in Illinois our poverty level at the public school is 50%. If the kids are not reached, they will drown us. A commitment needs to be made to help address the poverty issue.

Sheridan said this is a fantastic endeavor and made a suggestion to fine tune the argument by looking at ways that UI is unique compared to other institutions. Bogle stated the FAC members are emailing and working on identifying university specific strengths. Fisher stated that the remarks were very interesting and noted that the link to the report on the webpage does not work. Ting had previously emailed the report to senators and stated that Rutherford will fix the link. Fisher asserted that the U.S. is falling in international prominence primarily because of a lack of public support for higher education. This

phenomenon is not happening in other countries to which we compare ourselves. In terms of the developmental workforce, we are reaping benefits of high economic inequality and broader issues about taxation. A fundamental point is that our system is completely unsustainable because of big issues about what we do with our money as a nation. Ting stated that Germany used to have totally publicly funded universities, but that is no longer the case. Fisher agreed they have incorporated some fees, but not to fund the system. Martin asked if the FAC to IBHE is in discussion about coordinating the way tuition is raised among public institutions. He wondered about ideas relative to the coordination of efforts so that all state institutions do something similar. Bogle said this did not come up at the last meeting. Ting highlighted that 64% of Illinois citizens received high school diploma or lower. Attainment of a college education will help with the tax base. The rationale document provided by the BOT discussed the goal to provide greater accessibility to all students through the administrative reorganization plan. Casinova reported that it is important to keep students involved so they can also provide data driven information when speaking to legislators.

BOT Report – J. Martin

Martin stated that his report is linked to the Campus Senate Website. He is happy to answer any questions. No questions were posed.

Ting notified senators of the designated area to post reports on the Campus Senate website.

Old Business

Resolution 40-9 Clarification of Review Cycle for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [2nd reading]

Chair Ting called for discussions. Hearing none, a call was made to vote on the resolution. Ballard moved, and Olivier seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Resolution 40-11 Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment (USC OT-259) [to be approved]

Ballard motioned to discuss Resolution 40-11. Boltuc seconded the motion. Referring to section 3a, Boltuc asked about adjunct faculty being mentioned. Pardie stated the policy provides guidelines necessary to meet federal and state laws, but there is flexibility in application. Berman further said there may be different kinds of conflicts that emerge. For adjuncts, conflicts of interest are a consideration and need to be reported. Martin asked if the adoption of Resolution 40-11 will be helpful. Pardie nodded affirmatively. No other questions were raised. A vote was taken which yielded unanimous favor.

New Business

Resolution 40-12 Policy on Definition and Criteria for Graduate Level Certificates at UIS [1st reading]

Wang motioned to discuss Resolution 40-12 and Bogle seconded the motion. Helton, representing graduate council, was present to answer questions. Wang inquired about lines 26-29 which refer to the number of minimum credit hours. He stated that he is in a department that offers a few very successful certificate programs and believed the passage of the resolution would result in faculty shortages and student enrollment would

be significantly reduced. Helton stated that the lines do not mandate the certificate program be 12 credit-hours. Rather, a justification needs to be made during the review process. Martin asked whether the policy affects existing certificate programs. Helton said justification would be necessary as certificate is reviewed.

Zhang reiterated the need to differentiate between 4 credit-hour based programs and 3 credit-hour based programs. Helton said the policy is for the university, not individual colleges. Ting asked whether a justification regarding the 3 credit-hour structure is enough or if more is needed. Helton stated that more would be needed. Wang asked for the rationale for using courses instead of credit hours in the policy. Pardie reported that the spirit of the policy is to leave as much flexibility as possible to departments and prescribing the number of courses is still setting guidelines. Zhang asserted that his department would need to increase the number of credit hours for their certificates. Wang requested the rationale for 12 versus 14 or 15 or 9 credit hours. Helton reiterated the importance of having a guideline. A set of courses is 3. Historically, courses have been 4 credit hours. Wang highlighted the fact that further justification would be needed for 3 credit hour curricula. Pardie stated that an existing policy was never put through as a resolution.

Kline remarked about the historical nature of the policy and asserted that when establishing a baseline, what has traditionally been acceptable is often used as a reference point. Boltuc asked about comparisons to other institutions. Hall stated that variability exists between UIC and UIUC. Zhang again discussed the additional hurdles that will be necessary to negotiate if the policy is passed, only because of the differential credit hour structure. Pardie responded to the issue related to meeting and honoring different approaches. Zhang proposed an amendment to the resolution to include language for a 12 credit hour minimum, based on a 4 credit hour structure and a 9 credit hour minimum, based on a 3 credit hour structure. Villegas seconded the motion. Switzer asked if the GC has an underlying concern that 9 credit hours are not sufficient. Ting said the answer is no. Sheridan clarified the level of acceptable justification is more than a rationale based on 3 credit hour curricula. Helton stated that demand and enrollments are also considered in all proposals.

Boltuc asked whether there is a technical name for how classes are counted. Ting stated that we are talking about the proposed amendment. Ting asked Zhang to state his amendment again. Zhang said on line 26: "ordinarily graduate certificates require a minimum of 12 semester credit hours of courses for 4 credit hour based programs and a minimum of 9 credit hours of courses for 3 credit hour based programs." Ting asked if Senators were ready to vote. Fisher relayed confusion about the various issues being addressed. One issue being is about workload, but another should be the expectations about how much work involved in to receive a graduate certificate. Sisneros asked why the word ordinarily does not suffice. Zhang stated it would require some departments to justify. Ting called for a vote on the proposed amendment. All were in favor to change the language.

Chair Ting announced that a motion was needed to extend the time. Boltuc motioned and Casinova seconded. All Senators were in favor. Ting called for further discussion. Boltuc

referred to line 22 which stated that any academic department can propose a graduate certificate; however, line 31 speaking about graduate-level certificate hours being no more than 50% of Master's degree hours. Boltuc suggested that many Bachelor's level programs may offer certificates, even though they do not offer a Master's degree. Helton offered that if a department or program does not offer graduate courses, it does not apply. Boltuc said that further clarification needed. Helton suggested that recommendations go back to GC and they will fix lines 26-29 and clarify 30-31 of the resolution.

Proposed Amendments to the *Statutes* and *The General Rules* from the Board of Trustees to Effect Streamlining of University Administration & Operations [to be discussed]

Ting announced that this will come back to the Senate on October 22nd for discussion and asked Senators if they will be ready to formulate input after the discussion. UIS needs to provide feedback to University Senate's Conference by November 9th. Sisneros reinforced that Senators are not being asked to take a vote to support or oppose, rather our opinions are being solicited. Ting stated that the BOT will not take action without consultation; however, our action should not come down simply as a vote but not provide input. Ting wants the senate to provide informed thoughts to the USC. Sisneros asked questions about some of the changes proposed by the BOT. Ting said that senate will continue discussions and asked senators to educate themselves and read through the Statutes and the General Rules.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Casinova. Kline seconded the motion and meeting adjourned at 12:18.