

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, December 2, 2011
10:00 A.M. – 12: P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “H”

Senators Present: L. Atkinson, D. Ballard, P. Boltuc, R. Bouray, D. Bussell, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, T. Helton, C. Hoelscher, K. Jamison, W. Kline, X. Li, J. Martin, A. Mulvey, J. Case Pease, D. Ruez, P. Salela, D. Schuldt, C. Switzer, T. Ting, J. Villegas, P. Wassenberg, E. Wilson, Y. Zhang, S. Miller, J. Martin, C. Switzer, and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: K. Sheridan, G. Simo, A. Sisneros, J. Tienken

Ex-Officio: Karen Moranski for Lynn Pardie

Guests: Len Bogle, Deborah Anthony, Cecilia Cornell, Hilary Frost Kumpf, Kate Richardson, Evan Stanley

Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order by T. Ting at 10:00 a.m. A motion to approve the agenda was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by E. Wilson. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2011 Senate meeting was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by R. Garmil. The following corrections to the November 18, 2011 minutes were requested. L. Fisher requested a correction to the spelling of the name Vicki Megginson, which appeared as “Magnusson” in the Chair Report in the November 18, 2011 minutes. E. Wilson indicated that Shonda White was present at the November 18, 2011 Senate meeting, but her name did not appear under “Senators Present”. D. Ballard was listed as absent, but Shonda White was his alternate. L. Fisher requested clarification to lines 40 through 47 to indicate that Resolution 41-21 was tabled because Senators were not provided with a copy of the revised resolution. T. Ting clarified that it was tabled because the Senators wanted to see the amendments made to the Resolution and brought back after it was amended, rather than moving for a friendly amendment to the resolution that was being considered at the November 18 Senate meeting. A motion to append the minutes was not made. A motion to approve the minutes carried unanimously

Announcements

Parliamentarian Switzer is absent as she is serving as the BOT faculty observer on behalf of the USC. Secretary Sheridan will be running late due to grant problems.

Reports

Chair- T. Ting

T. Ting reminded senators that the University Climate Survey will be closed today at midnight.

J. Villegas was unsure of the closing time and advised Senators to complete it as soon as possible.

51 T. Ting reported that faculty/staff completion rate of the climate survey is around 26%, and student
52 completion rate is around 7%. This positions UIS' response rate "in the ball park" of the University-wide
53 response rate average. The UIS faculty/staff response rate was approximately 4% higher, on average,
54 compared to the other two campuses.

55
56 L. Fisher brought forth a concern regarding the climate survey. Specifically, the items in the second half
57 of the survey requested information about individual faculty members, which for many participants could
58 equate to identifiable information.

59
60 J. Villegas responded that the climate survey committee discussed this potential issue and he clarified that
61 the data would never be analyzed in such a way that individual participants could be identified. There will
62 be a committee specifically focused on how to approach data analysis, and that data will be presented at
63 the aggregate level by department or even at the college level as indicated by the number of faculty
64 members in any given department.

65
66 T. Ting reported on the ACCESS Illinois initiative, which the UIS Campus Senate is involved with. Vicki
67 Megginson wished to convey that it is both a pleasure and an honor to assist the campus Senate with the
68 initiative. She will add her check to kick off this initiative. At this point, they are working on the website
69 specifically for the campus Senate's account so people can make contributions. They are also going to
70 update the gift card so that there is a QR code on it. The formal kickoff of this mini campaign will occur
71 in January. There will be a letter from the campus Senate to the campus community regarding this
72 initiative. The draft will come from the SEC and presented to the Senate for feedback.

73
74 T. Ting thanked Sen. Ruez for following the IBHE agenda and for reading the IBHE materials regularly.
75 IBHE is approving Governors State University to start offering lower division programs and admitting
76 undergraduate students beginning in 2014. Governors State has a similar history as Sangamon State. T.
77 Ting posed the question, "What does that mean for us?"

78
79 K. Moranski replied that we don't know yet. It probably does not mean a whole lot. The folks they serve
80 are largely going to be Chicago's students who want to stay in Chicago. They are largely educating place-
81 bound people, even though their population has largely been transfer students. When they pick up
82 freshman, they are going to pick up students who are not interested in going down to the Prairie to attend
83 college. One of the things we hear from our freshman parents from Chicago, is that they're looking for a
84 place out of the city. They're looking for a quieter, smaller environment. K. Moranski believes it will have
85 little impact on UIS.

86
87 T. Ting is concerned that Gov. State is cheaper and that that will make them competitive.

88
89 J. Martin asked if we know whether they will be open enrollment or if they will have in admissions
90 system like us?

91
92 T. Ting replied that we don't know yet. She believes it is even more important that UIS is well-positioned
93 in the enrollment management report because we do not have the same resources for marketing as the
94 other two campuses. University wide collaboration and facilitation is important because Governors State
95 could be competition in that market. T. Ting reported that she recently learned that Urbana has hired three
96 recruiters to specifically recruit in California. UIC specifically has recruiters working in New Orleans and
97 in the South. It is her personal view, that if we could have the kinds of recruiters for all three campuses
98 that would be beneficial because we don't have the resources.

99
100 R. Garmil commented that we also have to include online recruiting.

101

102 T. Ting apologized to senators for not having the draft enrollment management report today as promised
103 to the Senate and SEC. She wanted to receive feedback prior to forwarding to President Hogan. She hopes
104 that the Senators would allow her to send this via e-mail in order to receive feedback.

105

106 P. Wassenburg indicated that everyone was nodding.

107

108 T. Ting reported that the UIS resolution regarding leadership rotation at USC is being taken up by the
109 UIUC and UIC senates. It had its first reading by Chicago campus Senate yesterday. It will have its first
110 reading by the Urbana Senate by next Monday. Their SEC's and respective statutes committees
111 recommended a vote of "No", to go against our resolution. Additional discussion is invited at a later point
112 in time.

113

114 **Provost – K. Moranski for L. Pardie**

115

116 K. Moranski reported that the BOT is on campus today. Dr. Schroeder reported on the online presence at
117 UIS which was very well received. He also talked about the national perspective regarding online
118 education. It is worth noting that WCIA did a 5 min. spot on UIS' online learning, saying "online
119 learning's finest is here in Illinois". The article is available on their website. We are looking forward to
120 Ray's appointment today as the associate vice chancellor for online learning by the BOT.

121

122 W. Kline asked if the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for online learning is a permanent office.

123

124 K. Moranski indicated that she believed it would be, as it is a prominent piece of our educational puzzle.
125 To have representation and the Provost's office for online learning is important.

126

127 T. Ting indicated that she believed that to be the case as well and that someday Ray will retire and that the
128 desire to maintain our competitive edge will remain. This position elevates the importance of online
129 education. The position is a cabinet position under the Provost's office.

130

131 **Student Government Association - E. Wilson**

132

133 E. Wilson reported that the SGA co-hosted an event, *Chocolate with the Chancellor* this past Wednesday.
134 There was a good turnout (about 50 students) and a wide variety of questions and comments.

135

136 She has also heard back from the Illinois Student Senate (ISS) President, Dave Pileski about setting up a
137 student conference to the USC. They're looking at meeting the week prior to winter break.

138

139 E. Wilson reported good news regarding the IL MAP grant which has been funded for the remainder of
140 the academic year.

141

142 W. Kline asked, for the benefit of Senators going up for tenure, what is Chancellor Koch's favorite
143 chocolate?

144

145 E. Wilson reported that she likes the hot chocolate and the brownies.

146

147 **IBHE FAC Report- L. Bogle**

148

149 L. Bogle began his report by explaining that FAC stands for faculty advisory Council. The FAC meets
150 with IBHE once a month except for July and August in Chicago. Its sole purpose is to influence IBHE
151 policy which impacts us as well as to explain to senators why it is that some of the things they would like
152 to do aren't very smart. L. Bogle invited senators to think about volunteering as an alternate which

153 typically would require attending 1 to 2 meetings a year. It is interesting to see the inner workings of this
154 group.

155
156 L. Bogle indicated that the handouts provided to the Senate were regarding Performance Based Funding.
157 The handouts indicated some of the measures that the Illinois State Board of Education is considering.
158 ISBE has experienced dramatic staffing cuts, and there is question as to who will pick up the work of
159 performance based funding. The current best estimate is a 1 to 2% reduction in funding if performance-
160 based standards are not met. L. Bogle then explained the, “60 by 25” language, which means Illinois has
161 set a goal indicating 60% of Illinois residents will have some kind of post secondary certificate or degree
162 by 2025. Right now, only 41% of citizens have some type of certificate or degree. L. Bogle indicated that
163 a 19% increase by 2025 is challenging at best. The P-20 initiative is a goal to track every preschool
164 student until the age of 20 to see how they're doing. This relates to the common core standards, which are
165 national standards, to hold every child to the same standards. The common core standards and P-20 are
166 geared towards increasing standards which is good for colleges and universities in terms of admitting
167 well-prepared students. . L. Bogle also reported that the majority of MAP grant monies are being used for
168 remedial-level (below the 100 level) courses. This means that MAP monies are not going towards college
169 credits. In short, the ISBE has a number of good intentions and ideas that are not going to work. The
170 IBHE puts forth documents which suggest things that will work. In the Performance Based Language
171 wording, quality is not addressed, transfers are not addressed and affordability is not addressed. The FAC
172 is doing its best to navigate these complicated issues.

173
174 W. Kline commented that he would like to note that the Senate is not in unanimous agreement that some
175 of the core standards presented in the handouts great. For example, one standard reads, “the common core
176 State standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn so
177 teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them”. W. Kline finds that patronizing to parents
178 as most parents do not refer to the state standards in deciding how to help their children. At the same time,
179 it is aggrandizing to the committee which seems to say, we have now enabled you to help your child. W.
180 Kline commented that there are other horrible things about the common core State standards, including
181 the assumption that diversity and experimentation is not a good thing. The P-20 tracking implies that the
182 Social Security number will not be used to track a child's educational history, rather than solely for the
183 purposes of Social Security.

184
185 Additional discussion revolved around Senators’ opinions regarding the macro and micro level influences
186 of government intrusion into the educational practices of Illinois colleges and universities.

187 188 **Levels of Governance Approval Table on Curricular Matters**

189
190 T. Ting reported that this came back from last Senate meeting and reflects feedback from senators. K.
191 Moranski’s office made the adjustments to clarify items 18, 27, and 36. Item 27 is only applicable to
192 CBM, and reflects how that college has been handling cross-department courses. Changes to the cross
193 listing of courses in CBM are handled at the department level. Item numbers 18 & 16 will need also to be
194 reflected in the course catalog or website, in addition to departmental approval.

195
196 K. Moranski commented that for item 18, this will also include the college curriculum committee
197 approval. The college curriculum committee in CBM requires approval of any change to a syllabus or to a
198 course.

199
200 T. Ting reminded senators that this chart is a “living” document including a year pilot testing. Following
201 Senate endorsement the table will be made available on a website.

202
203 Y. Zhang commented that it makes sense to have a timestamp on the document.

204
205 W. Kline was thankful for an extra week to look at this document. He suggested that the endorsement
206 before one year and then, at the end of the year, we look at this again. He would also like to see that items
207 presented for endorsement go through appropriate channels. He remembers looking at this document as
208 part of graduate Council, and thinking this was a healthy aspect of shared governance. This time it
209 seemed that it just appeared without going through councils.
210
211 T. Ting clarified that the Provost's office received feedback from several councils following the pilot year
212 including, graduate Council, undergraduate Council, the Dean's Council, and also from departments.
213
214 W. Kline clarified that cross-council collaboration would be very helpful. He feels that the Senate having
215 the opportunity to remain active in the ongoing development of this document is important.
216
217 T. Ting clarified that the process involved in the development of the governance table involves the
218 undergraduate and graduate Council chairs. The understanding is that both the graduate and
219 undergraduate Council can bring forth concerns, and the Senate can discuss the issues.
220
221 L. Fisher commented that she agrees with W. Kline and that this is something that the Senate specifically
222 has to make decisions about which committee review what because that's the academic policy part of it.
223 At the right end of the document, it goes more into the administrative end of things. It is appropriate that
224 the councils have been asked about this and that the Senate has the opportunity to review the document at
225 the end of the year. She commented that this process did involve expanding what we do by systemizing
226 across colleges, for example. Taking the idea of changes to courses and making it related to faculty do. In
227 that way it affects our curricular work.
228
229 J. Martin commented that the document does not affect our curricular work. The rules that are
230 summarized by this document affect our curricular work. If there's an issue, it's the rules we should be
231 looking at, not this document. This document might help us highlight issues.
232
233 L. Fisher replied that the finer point is that it's not actually written down anywhere but here, which
234 committees have to approve certain things.
235
236 T. Ting commented that we have had this governance table for years. Never once has the GC, UGC, or
237 Senate asked about it. T. Ting asked for a review of the governance table because there was no systematic
238 approach to how colleges were making these decisions.
239
240 R. Garmil commented that was only one line addressing all minors in the first draft. This second
241 document does a better job of distinguishing between types of minor. He recommends that future reviews
242 of the governance table include descriptions of what is being changed.
243
244 K. Moranski commented that the current document reflects current campus policies as well as IBHE and
245 U of I policies. The committee working on this table also compared the governance table to the other two
246 U of I campuses. So our policies in the chart are now consistent. UIS created the chart, which was
247 borrowed by the other two campuses. In the future it may be that the SEC could periodically check to see
248 if there are changes to the table to bring forth for Senate discussion. The changes in policy should drive
249 changes to the document.
250
251 W. Kline commented that a review of the governance table in one year would allow for constituents to
252 have input and to communicate any concerns that they have.
253

254 T. Helton commented that she is in favor of reducing bureaucracy. There is enough structure in place such
255 that constituents could go to UGC or GC if there are issues. The Senate does not need to get involved in
256 overseeing this table. It has been brought forth now because it is the end of the pilot year. Perhaps the
257 Senate could review it in five years.

258

259 T. Ting asked for a vote of senators to formally endorse the governance table. The endorsement carried
260 with one “no” vote.

261

262 **Old Business**

263

264 **Resolution 41-21 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 5, 6, & 7 -- Clarification of Reappointment, 265 Tenure and Promotion Application Procedures [2nd reading]**

266

267 A motion to consider Resolution 41-21 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by T. Helton. No
268 discussion was presented. The motion carried with unanimous support.

269

270 **Resolution 41-23 Faculty Personnel Policies Article 2 -- Modifications in Personnel Review 271 Procedures [2nd reading]**

272

273 A motion to consider Resolution 41-23 was made by S. Miller and was seconded by R. Garmil.

274

275 J. Martin indicated a Point of Order. This resolution had been tabled and needs to be removed from the
276 table in order to be considered. A motion to remove Resolution 41-23 from the table was made by W.
277 Kline and was seconded by P. Wassenberg. The motion carried with one “no” vote.

278

279 A motion to consider Resolution 41-24 was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by D. Bussell.

280

281 W. Kline asked his fellow Senators to indicate specifically the number of people with whom senators
282 have spoken and who do not support this resolution. W. Kline indicated that he knows of only four
283 people, who have communicated to him via e-mail and not come to speak with him personally.

284

285 J. Villegas indicated an approximate number of six people from his college.

286

287 J. Martin indicated six or seven people from his building.

288

289 T. Helton reported one additional person beyond the emails (which were circulated).

290

291 Y. Zhang and X. Li reported several people.

292

293 R. Garmil reported 8 or 9 against and the only pros were at this (the senate) table.

294

295 J. Case-Pease reported 3 against, and 0 in support.

296

297 K. Jamison reported 2 who said no first hand knowledge documentation.

298

299 K. Moranski, speaking for L. Pardie, L. Pardie asked her to communicate that she felt that T. Helton made
300 a clear argument that there's no way to get rid of first-hand knowledge, that the resolution represented a
301 “middle way” to make direct knowledge transparent that the departmental level. L. Pardie’s concern is in
302 regards to this moving from one extreme to the other and to completely deny direct knowledge or to
303 accept it completely without circumscription is not effective to personnel policy. She wanted us to be

304 reminded that we have a very robust process for personnel with multiple avenues for feedback. She would
305 hope that we would not continue to accept the status quo, which is so open to competing interpretations.
306

307 D. Bussell asked if the Provost seems to be saying that she favors this modification.
308

309 K. Moranski replied, "Yes."
310

311 C. Hoelscher commented that he is still undecided about this resolution but believes something should be
312 done. Part of the discussion has been focused on whether or not there are alternatives. He wondered if
313 senators wanted to discuss alternatives.
314

315 L. Fisher commented that she appreciated the changes in red that have to do with the clarification in the
316 committee's responsibilities in terms of documenting its discussion. The attempts to deal with this issue
317 have been an attempt to deal with two different problems. First, inconsistencies in the interpretation of
318 documentation in the personnel file. The other, committees don't always write a letter that says what was
319 talked about. There was some discussion about the need for policy that points to best practices. The
320 current text does that. She is still on the fence too about the issue of direct first-hand knowledge, but also
321 did not want to see the resolution asking departments to have a discussion about direct first-hand
322 knowledge.
323

324 D. Bussell commented that it might be possible to consider this resolution by getting rid of the "first
325 person" language and just make the resolution about proper documentation. That seems to be with the
326 Provost is indicating as well. Can we make an amendment to make this change?
327

328 T. Ting agreed that a shift away from firsthand knowledge needs to be made and should instead focus on
329 documentation either prior to deliberations or the letter that is generated afterwards.
330

331 D. Bussell commented that she is somewhat wary about the prior discussion regarding the number of
332 persons against it who have contacted Senators. She questions how many of those people have read the
333 resolution.
334

335 R. Garmil commented that the issues of documentation and the content of the discussion are two separate
336 issues. He agrees that documentation is important. The question remains, should faculty members have
337 the right to know the content of the basis of the personnel decision? In his opinion, they should. Faculty
338 members should know when something negative is put into their file. They should have that knowledge
339 before the discussion is held.
340

341 W. Kline suggested, due to the importance of the issues and the deep divisions surrounding them, that the
342 Senate issue a direct plebiscite saying this has to be clarified- choice A) change nothing, choice b) direct
343 firsthand knowledge, then submit it to the faculty to vote on it. Ten, what we do as a senate is to approve
344 the plebiscite and then send it to the faculty.
345

346 T. Ting questioned this approach, saying many people have not been a part of the deliberative process and
347 the vote could so easily be influenced by lack of understanding of the big picture.
348

349 P. Boltuc commented that this draft is close to what we want. The problem is that the resolution is trying
350 to do 2 different things.
351

352 J. Martin agreed with P. Boltuc and added that the personnel process is not an objective process and we
353 can't treat it as such.
354

355 P. Salela thanked P. Boltuc for his comments, which she agreed with. She commented that you can't
356 predict the process of discovery and you also can't legislate ethics which is one thing that this resolution is
357 trying to do. The greater concern is documenting where decision was made and what it was based on.
358

359 C. Hoelscher agreed with these comments, if he suggested saying not formalizing whether or not first-
360 hand direct knowledge should be part of the process. Rather, documenting comments made by persons in
361 the committee. The resolution could distinguish between significant direct knowledge and lesser direct
362 knowledge.
363

364 D. Bussell emphasized that due to the fact that we have junior faculty involved in this process, not
365 documenting something means that due diligence has not occurred. This ignores completely the power
366 dynamics that occurs in many departments particularly if they are smaller. She supports looking at
367 transparency, but we have to clarify that transparency includes the decision-making process on the
368 contents of letters. The current policy is an adequate. It has been disastrous in some cases and causes a
369 great deal of stress. There is a clear mandate to address the problematic part of this.
370

371 D. Anthony reported that direct first-hand knowledge and documentation are related. What's happening,
372 people have the sense that they're not supposed to talk about certain things but they do and because of that
373 they don't document it. This resolution attempts to address the transparency issue by saying that it must be
374 documented when it is brought up.
375

376 T. Ting called for the vote. In the event that the resolution fails, we are in essence asking PPC to address
377 these issues by bringing forth another resolution. She asked Senators to please provide input to PPC. The
378 motion was defeated with 5 "yes" votes, 14 "no" votes, and 5 abstentions (R. Bouray, S. Miller, E.
379 Wilson, P. Wassenberg, and P. Boltuc).
380

381 **Resolution 41-24 Modification to Academic Integrity Policy - Sections III & V [2nd reading]** 382

383 A motion to consider Resolution 41-24 was made by E. Wilson and was seconded by S. Miller.
384

385 T. Ting introduced Hilary Frost Kumpf from AIC and pointed out amendments to the resolution from the
386 1st reading.
387

388 W. Kline suggested that there is some precedence for not spelling out all of the policies that have to be
389 followed by committees. Rather, the Senate has entrusted that to the councils with approvals by the
390 Senate. He indicated that bureaucracy would slow down the process of change required by the AIC in the
391 future. He supports the initial resolution to remove the policies from the Senate bill and put that into the
392 Council, but does not support the addition of procedures as indicated in lines 15-9.
393

394 R. Garmil asked a question regarding the first section of the new language where it talks about the unit
395 had asking faculty to verify whether or not it was a first offense (lines 21-22). Will the Provost's office
396 still keep track of these offenses?
397

398 T. Ting clarified, "Yes".
399

400 L. Fisher asked for some background regarding the issues that the AIC is experiencing.
401

402 Hilary Frost Kumpf indicated that timing is the most common issue. The process of moving through the
403 AI process is time consuming, especially related to waiting for student and faculty response. The point
404 would be to get issues resolved in a timely fashion. Another issue is related to the time commitment for
405 faculty involved in hearings.

406 T. Ting clarified that the problem has been that the AIC needs to be able to be responsive to complex
407 situations. In order for the AIC to change procedures in the AI policy, the process of bringing resolution
408 each time for any change has hampered the AIC committee's ability to respond in a timely fashion. There
409 also needs to be language in the procedures of the AIC to protect students' rights to due process. At this
410 point, the AIC is asking for the flexibility to modify the procedures of the AIC without coming to the
411 Senate.

412
413 W. Kline indicated that given the spirit of the 1st draft of the resolution which was to remove procedures
414 from the policy, he would like to propose that we vote on removing that language so we can vote on the
415 original. W. Kline moved to strike the inserted text in red in the current resolution which reflected
416 changes made to the document since the 1st reading. The motion was seconded by T. Helton. A friendly
417 amendment was made to keep the lines 16-9. The motion was defeated with 7 "yes" votes, 11 "no" votes,
418 and 4 abstentions (P. Salela, S. Miller, J. Case-Pease, & P. Boltuc)

419
420 The resolution passed with 2 "no" votes and 1 abstention (D. Ballard).

421

422 New Business

423 **Resolution 41-25 Faculty Personnel Policies Articles 2 & 13 -- Modification of Post-Tenure Review** 424 **Committee Selection Procedures [1st reading]**

425

426 A motion to consider Resolution 41-25 was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by E. Wilson.

427

428 D. Anthony introduced the resolution by indicating that existing language in policy does not accurately
429 reflect who is involved in making decisions regarding the make-up of the post tenure review committee.
430 Existing language within the faculty personnel policy places selection of Post-Tenure Review Committee
431 members within the purview of the Campus Sabbatical and Awards Committee. This resolution aims to
432 separate the appointment of members of the CSAC and Post-Tenure Review Committee.

433

434 No questions were presented.

435

436 A motion was made by S. Miller to extend the senate meeting an additional 15 minutes. The motion was
437 seconded by (ui). The motion carried with 1 "No" vote.

438

439 **Proposed Revisions to the Statutes, Article X, Section 2 --Academic Freedom (USC ST-72)**

440

441 Discussion

442

443 T. Ting introduced the amendment to the USC statutes by explaining that there are some concerns
444 raised amongst the Senates at the other campuses that the amended language is too broad. First, the
445 amended language, read by T. Ting, drastically broadens the scope of academic freedom. Secondly, there
446 is question as to why the Urbana Senate seemed to single out the international members of the academic
447 staff, by saying that they should also enjoy the same freedoms. Third, there is an issue between academic
448 staff and faculty. Specifically the existing statutes only talk about faculty and the Urbana Senate changed
449 "faculty" to "all academic staff". The definitions of these two terms are different in the statutes. T. Ting
450 clarified that the UIS Senate is being asked to respond to the resolution regarding the amendments.

451

452 Adjournment

453

454 A motion to adjourn was made by R. Garmil and was seconded by everyone, but specifically W. Kline .

455 The motion carried with unanimous support and the meeting was adjourned at 12:14 p.m.