

3-21-2012

UC Minutes 2012-03-21

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "UC Minutes 2012-03-21" (2012). *University Council Archives*. 38.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-univcouncil/38>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Wednesday, March 21, 2012, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Alden, Bender, Brandt, Corwin, Downing, Elish-Piper, Farrell, Greene, Haliczzer, Heller, Holly, Holt, Houze, Johnston-Rodriguez, Kapitan, Kostic (for Gupta), Latham, LeFlore, Lin, Long, Lopez, McCord, Middleton, Mirman, Mohabbat, Munroe, Olson (for Dawson), Pritchard, Quick, Rollman, Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Schoenbachler, Small, Smith, Steadman, Sunderlin (for Bond), VandeCreek, Walker, Willis, Zahay-Blatz (for Lee)

VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT: Barth, Bond, Bozikis, Coles, Dawson, Echols, Foss, Gupta, Hurt, Kreitzer, Kowalski, Lee, Lenczewski, Lindvall, Mogren, Neal, Peters, Rosato, Rossi, Shortridge, Theodore, Thu, Venaas, Vohra, Von Ende

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryan, Griffin, Hansen, Jones (for Hemphill), Williams

OTHERS ABSENT: Cunningham, Finley, Freedman, Freeman, Hemphill, Kaplan, Prawitz, Slotsve, Snow, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

R. Alden called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Provost Alden is substituting for John Peters who was unable to attend.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

R. Alden: We need to have four walk-ins inserted into the agenda. The FAC to the IBHE report will be under item VI.A. There is a change to grade appeal policy which will be under VI.F.1. There is the evaluation of the Ombudsman's Office under VI.I.1. We also have an item under New Business which will be presented by Dr. Long under VIII.

A. Quick: moved the adoption of the agenda with the four walk-in items. **N. Bender:** was second.

The agenda was adopted without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 22, 2012 UC MEETING
(distributed electronically)

R. Lopez: made the motion to approve the minutes. **S. Farrell:** was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

R. Alden: President Peters was called down the Springfield. He was specifically asked by the chair of the Public University Presidents to provide input and leadership regarding developing a statement from all the presidents and chancellors on the pension issue.

The other item is that we are making progress with the search for a dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences and I want to publically acknowledge the work done by Rich Holly as the co-chair of that committee. We've been in airport interviews for the last two days and then we had two final video interviews today for two people who were unable to participate in airport interviews. We will probably be going to make a final decision of which candidates to invite to campus tomorrow. Hopefully, in the next week you'll hear about campus visits by those candidates. I think there was a sense that there were some pretty good candidates.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – [report](#) – walk-in
- B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report
- C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report
- D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report
- E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – [report](#) – Page 3
- F. Academic Policy Committee – Karen Brandt, Chair
 - 1. [Proposed changes](#) to the Academic Misconduct Policy/Grade Appeal Procedure – walk-in

K. Brandt: Yes, thank you. The Academic Policy and Procedure Committee was charged with finding a way to achieve some consistency between the academic misconduct policy and the grade appeal policy. The academic misconduct policy was revised to include an option for students who did not find a satisfactory resolution to the charge of alleged academic misconduct. That option in

the academic misconduct policy was that the students would be allowed to appeal a grade penalty that the student felt was excessive and/or inappropriate through the grade appeal process. The singular problem was that no such option existed in the grade appeal process. As it stood, the grade appeal process only allowed for appeals of capricious grading. Our committee was directed to find a way to reconcile these two policies as we saw fit and reasonable. Our committee did receive recommendations for changes in the grade appeal policy from the UCC and APASC, and we took these suggestions into consideration as we worked on the policy.

What you see in front of you is the recommendations from our AP Committee. I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Tim Griffin and Cason Snow, the chair of UCC, in helping me understand the complexities of the issue. The AP Committee has accepted all recommendations from UCC and APASC regarding this policy and has added language that clarifies the student's appeal process under the charge of alleged academic misconduct. While we did not change the appeal process itself, we did add the language that students who considered a penalty for alleged academic misconduct to be excessive and/or inappropriate, can use the grade appeal process. One other note is that we did make a slight change in wording from the recommendations from UCC and APASC. We replaced the phrase, "academic integrity," with "academic misconduct," and you'll see that consistently in this policy that we are bringing to you today. The reason we did that was that we thought that the term, "academic misconduct," was inclusive of "academic integrity" and we thought it would also be easier to read.

A lengthy discussion followed which included the following points:

- It was suggested that the timeline as currently stated in the policy might result in the student's window for making an appeal closing before a judgment from the Student Conduct Board was received. **S. Willis** suggested that the timeline be modified such that it would read that timeline could not preclude the student first receiving the judgment of the Student Conduct Board.
- **G. Long** suggested that some type of flow chart or graphic depiction be created to clarify the process for students.
- **A. Rosenbaum** noted a point previously made by R. Alden regarding the language in the current version which suggests that a dean could "direct a faculty member to make a grade change."
- **R. Alden** commented that the operative word that was of concern is "instructs" the faculty. Even the AAUP suggests that administrators have the right for the good of the university and recommendation of grade appeals boards to change grades, making the faculty member do it probably is one step too far.
- The suggestion was made that, if we are going to send it back to the committee for a rewrite, that the committee attend to the readability of the policy, perhaps making it less dense and complex.
- The council asked the committee to consider revising the policy in consideration of the comments and suggestions that were made and to bring it to the next meeting of the UC.

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Laurie Elish-Piper, Chair – [report](#) and [Statement](#) of Budget Priorities – Pages 4-5

L. Elish-Piper: The report is from our meeting on March 2 so I'm going to look at Dr. Williams as I say this and he can flag me down if there are any updates or any information that is no longer accurate. We talked about a number of issues that were basically updates from Springfield. We talked about the bill to eliminate the 50 percent tuition waivers for state employees. My understanding is that that has made it out of committee but has not yet been voted on. We also talked a bit about the governor's budget address and a couple of the key points from that are addressed in Item C. It was interesting to see that about six percent of the total general revenue funds in 2008 were attributed to pensions. That percentage is expected to increase to 15 percent in 2013 and up to 25 percent several years after that unless pension reform occurs and so the issue is obviously not going away. As of our meeting, the state owed us \$57 million.

E. Williams: Noted that we have received some payments from the state and the amount owed has gone down a bit.

L. Elish-Piper: We also spent time preparing a statement of budget priorities. We did this last year for the first time and we have updated that statement. It's very similar to last year because many of the issues that we were grappling with last year have not been remedied. So that statement of budget priorities is on page 5.

R. Alden: Thank you, any discussion or anybody disagree with any of this? I'm not sure we really have to vote on this. Is that what we decided or is it something we want to ask for an acceptance of the report?

L. Elish-Piper: Last year we did vote on it just, I think, to show a sense of unity that we were all in agreement that these were critical priorities that we wanted to have sent forward so if the group is willing to do that I make a motion that we accept the statement on budget priorities as outlined on page 5 in the packet.

J. Corwin: was second.

There was a brief discussion of whether the vote should be taken now or whether UC members should be given time to think about the priorities and have input into the statement. During the discussion it was clarified that the budget meetings would take place prior to the next UC meeting and that it might be helpful to the administration to have a statement from the UC. Therefore, the vote was called.

The motion passed by a vote of 36 Yes, 1 No, and 2 Abstain.

H. Rules and Governance Committee – Suzanne Willis, Chair – no report

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Greene, Chair

1. [Evaluation](#) of the Office of the Ombudsman per NIU Bylaws, Article 19.4.1 – walk-in

R. Greene: Rich Greene, speaking on behalf of the University Affairs Committee, stated that at the February 22 UC meeting, President Peters charged the University Affairs Committee with the task

of deciding whether or not to continue the position of the university ombudsman as Tim Griffin, the current ombudsman, announced his plans to retire. The UA Committee reviewed a number of documents pertaining to the office of the ombudsman and also solicited input from the Student Association, the SPS Council and the Operating Staff Council, which all supported and recommended the continuation of the position. The UA Committee and these other university bodies feel that the office of ombudsman serves an important role, helps to facilitate the well-being of this large and diverse campus especially in situations of stress that sometimes arise between and/or among individuals on the campus. The office of the ombudsman handles a substantial case load as documented in the annual reports of the office. The office serves all constituencies of the university, but it was noted by the three bodies and the UA Committee that the office of the ombudsman is of particular importance to the students as it serves as a safe place for them to air procedure and policy concerns with the knowledge that the office will initiate a process to seek resolutions for the concerns and hold them in confidence throughout and after the process. The UA Committee met March 7 and, through a unanimous vote that included follow-up absentee votes, decided in favor of the continuation of the position of university ombudsman. Therefore, I would like to move that the UC recommend to the president that the position of university ombudsman be continued and a nation search be initiated as quickly and as practical to hire a successor to the current ombudsman, Tim Griffin.

R. Alden: Expressed concern about moving forward with the vote in the absence of President Peters. I'm not entirely comfortable just going on and accepting the report and moving on. I would like him to have an opportunity to hear the report and the discussion. I almost suggest we postpone the final vote to the next meeting so that he would be able to interact since it's his charge. Again, I'm not trying to get in the way of due process here.

A. Quick: Since this report comes directly from us as a body, wouldn't it be appropriate for us to take a vote as a body to show our approval for this and then that goes to the president and, should he have questions, he can obviously contact the members involved in that?

R. Alden: Right, but he may, again, since he gave the charge to the committee and I'm not sure whether he had any sense that this would immediately come to the council and him not being here it's a little bit odd. If this was some of these other things that are just part of the due process of the system, but since he specifically charged the committee with the review and is not here to receive it, I just feel a little bit odd with that, but I'll go with the will of the group. So I guess we have a motion, do we have a second and we can certainly discuss this more.

A. Small: was second.

R. Alden: Okay, any other discussions on this topic? Well, hearing none and it sounds like you want to have the vote now I guess we'll have the vote.

The motion passed by a vote of 30 Yes, 3 No, and 4 Abstain.

J. Student Association – Austin Quick, Speaker – [report](#) – Pages 6-7

A. Quick: Yes, first off let me start off by saying a couple of quick things that we're working on with the Student Association the things that I want to bring to the attention of this body and

everyone here and I ask that you take this to your workspaces and other departments across the campus.

The first and foremost one, I know that many of you that know me, know that I have been pushing this for most of the year now and I wanted to address it again, and I'm going to keep addressing it every time until we fix this problem. And that is the parking and driving on our campus sidewalks and grasses and our green areas on this campus. It's very important to the students that it be resolved in a timely fashion. It is a current regulation of this university that you are not allowed to drive and or park on sidewalks without a special permit and it actually says it's only granted for certain circumstances, not for mail trucks going to deliver mail, not for vehicles going to lunch, not for vehicles parking next to the Convocation Center because its closer to walk to go buy tickets for a concert, not for those things and these are all things that have been reported to me.

I talked to Bill Finucane at Transportation. At the very beginning of the school year he says, "Austin, you know I'd love for it not to happen anymore but I can't get them to stop and I can't hold these people accountable." So someone in this university needs to take initiative in the leadership of this university to say "enough." It's a safety issue, it's a finance issue and what kind of example that we have students coming on campus today. "Welcome to NIU, by the way, stay out of the way of the vehicles on the sidewalk they might need to get around you to get closer parking spot." I know that I didn't ask for this, but a vote of showing support for this initiative from this body to President Peters that we push on this. I would like to make a motion at this time to ask the University Council to vote and support forcing the university to enforce the regulations that are already currently in place at the Northern Illinois University.

T. Latham: was second

R. Alden: Okay I guess we have a motion and a second and we probably need to have the specific wording, do you have the words for that motion?

A. Quick: The members of the university, represented in the University Council, hereby request the university officials and administration to enforce the current regulations regarding parking and driving on sidewalks and grass ways of the campus. Enforcement is left to the university police and Campus Parking Services. Departments are required to ensure that their staff members do not park university vehicles illegally and that anyone needing to park near these areas may get approval and permission from Parking Services.

T. Latham: As second, accepted the changes in wording

The motion passed by a vote of 31 Yes, 2 No, 5 Abstain.

A. Quick: Also initiated a motion to request the university administration and officials to enforce the law, House Bill 43 that vehicles must stop for pedestrians in crosswalks at all times and that the university campus police will enforce the law and the university will purchase signs stating that.

After some discussion, a motion was made, but **R. Alden** raised a point of order that involved whether a motion that had not been submitted in written form could be brought before the body. Parliamentarian, Ferald Bryan offered the following opinion: **F. Bryant:** I am taking your objection

as being a point of order and our bylaws specifically address that. It specifically says that proposals affecting policy must be presented in writing and we really don't have anything in writing on this issue and technically we would have a problem with the last motion but we can let that slide. But it does further say, and this is 3.2 in the bylaws, proposals affecting policy must be presented in writing and may be discussed at the meeting which first presented but shall be held until at least the next regular meeting for action. Since policy is specifically being addressed here and I understand the passion of the Student Association, but we do have procedures and I think at the best we can accept this as a first reading and if necessary vote on it the next time.

A. Quick: In respect to that, I do withdraw my motion for this meeting. I understand that I want to make sure this is done correctly and we have a month so we'll see if maybe people enforce the law in the meantime. So I withdraw that motion.

E. Williams: I want to say this and I said it before. Our police do not need any incentive to enforce the law. That's their job, that's what they do and your implication is very sad because you're saying that our people are not out there trying to enforce the law. I've been silent, but I do say this: This whole issue of pedestrian safety began years ago before you got to this campus. Many things were done to improve safety especially on these major thoroughfares that go through our campus such as Annie Glidden. There were committees that were put together working with the city. That's why you have the countdown on the pedestrian walkways going across the streets. That's why you have the speed indicators that are at both ends of north and south of Lucinda on Annie Glidden. We do have, on Garden Road every day, you will see an NIU police officer directing traffic both pedestrian and vehicular traffic at the corner of Garden and Lucinda because that has been identified as an area where there has been the potential of an accident.

So I don't want the body or anyone to have the implication that our police or staff are not aware, conscious, and doing what is necessary and what is part of their job. Obviously you can always go into one particular position or another position on campus or in the city of DeKalb or in Chicago or Naperville or whatever and you can see a vehicle that does not obey that particular law. The only way to enforce that on a 100 percent basis to have someone who is assigned to stand at every corner and every walkway. There will be exceptions I think part of it is a matter of communication and education to also say to our drivers, those who are driving cars through the campus, that they be aware of pedestrians. You may have experienced a car that did not stop; well I came across Normal and the cars did stop when I entered the crosswalk. So there is a multi-faceted dimension to this but I do take exception to the terminology over and over again to tell people to enforce the law because that's what they are there for and that's what they do.

1. [Proposed changes](#) to NIU Bylaws, Article 4.3, Student Representation – **FIRST READING** – Pages 8-9

A. Quick: So I would like to introduce the bylaw change Article 4 which deals with the election procedures to University Council specifically for student representation. **D. Munroe:** was second.

R. Alden: This is first reading because these are bylaws, is there any discussion?

S. Willis: I just wanted to say I am certainly sympathetic with the idea of making it easier and more straightforward to find student representatives for the University Council. I'm not sure it's entirely

wise to remove all references to the date by which these students need to be named to the council. I know when I was executive secretary it was always an issue finding a quorum when positions were either unfilled or students had been named but were not actually attending. Perhaps it's not necessary to have specific dates but perhaps some gentle encouragement to get these positions filled as early as possible in the academic year might not be inappropriate.

A. Rosenbaum: I should add that this motion was actually initiated by our office because the students don't ever seem to be able to meet those deadlines and don't seem to be able to meet the quotas that are established in the bylaws and so it makes sense to change them so they can get whatever representatives they can. They have a difficult time getting student representation for the committees, for the University Council and so the hope was that this would make it a little easier for them to comply with the requirements of the constitution and bylaws.

R. Alden: Okay, this is a first reading; please bring this back to your constituents and consider whatever vote we have next time including potential amendments and so forth.

K. Operating Staff Council – Andy Small, President – [report](#) – Page 10

L. Supportive Professional Staff Council – Todd Latham, President – [report](#) – Page 11

T. Latham: We are hosting a 2012 leadership summit. It's essentially focused on dealing with a lot of student issues as well. You can look at our Web site, it will take place in April. If you have any questions, please contact me, I can make you aware of some of the guest speakers that will be coming up at that particular event.

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

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. [Proposal](#) from Greg Long regarding disability disclosure – walk-in

R. Alden: Greg has come to present some issues that I think are extremely important.

G. Long: I'm here in my role as chair of NIU's Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities.

You have a walk-in report from me but I'd like to provide a little context first because talking about disability for a lot of people is a difficult thing because it reminds us of our vulnerability or it reminds us of mortality and it's a club we can join at any time. Any of us can go out and have an accident today and tomorrow be disabled. There is some discomfort even from an etiquette standpoint. What do I do, for example, if a student is stuttering? Do I finish their word – is that the polite thing to do or do I not? If the student has a personal assistant, do I talk to the personal assistant or to the student? Even for people who want to do the right thing, there is some confusion about what the best behaviors are.

So we've got some initial discomfort and the second thing is we have not necessarily a lot of experience. Students with disabilities have actually only had a right to attend school, a federal right, for the last 40 years. The laws that insured access to education were only passed in the 1970's. I graduated high school before students had a right to go to K-12 as well as accommodations here.

We're getting greater numbers of students here at NIU. If we look at the number of students, for example, who access CAAR, greater numbers each year, we keep growing and we are getting more non-traditional students, more students with mental illness, more veterans. There's a wide range of people coming to campus who have disabilities who may not be readily observable. There are people in this room, I guarantee you, who have disabilities and yet by a quick visual inspection who would know?

And so we have very little experience and then the third kind of point would be background knowledge. This would be where I would have to tell you I had a bad case of ivory tower-itis from the standpoint that disability is very central to my life. I'm a guardian for my brother who is deaf and intellectually disabled, I have a stepson who has autism, all of my work has related to disability, I am chair of the commission. So for me the idea that people don't know about the Americans with Disabilities Act and what it entails, was like it hit me over the head because we don't and in looking at that, what I found out that is yeah, the students don't know about it because they are not taught about the Americans with Disabilities Act in high school. It's not covered in any of the poli-sci classes. I have a gen-ed class on Disabilities and Society and I have one lecture on it, but that's it. There is no systemic training for any of us to know how it works.

During the first part of February, a student came in and reported that she was outed in a classroom by a professor who had her CAAR accommodation and said basically that quizzes are a horrible pain and then accosted her and said, "Well if I could teach a blind girl, I can teach you." This is for a 50-year old female who has nothing, there's not a mental illness, there is not a learning disability; it is simply a health condition. That really disturbed me.

And then not more than two days later, two other students came in and mentioned similar things, that they had been in classes and again, in both cases they were students who had invisible disabilities, so you would not know to look at them. But they both reported that, in their experience this semester, that faculty had questioned them if they really had a disability. And secondly, that faculty had said, "No, I'm not going to provide your accommodation." Or faculty have phrased it, often times I have heard as an issue of academic freedom.

So these things bothered me and I went out and I have because I do all the work with this disability, I've got a lot of students that I know and I have asked now at this point ten students and ten out ten students told me that, while at NIU, they've had a faculty member who has either questioned their disability, questioned their right to an accommodation and when we think about the power differential that exists between us as faculty and the students. And I've asked in my class, I've got 300 people enrolled in the class, we've probably had 200-250 present that day. I described the situation to them and I asked them, "So how many of you have witnessed this?" And I had a good 20 out of say 250 who raised their hands and said "Yes, I've witnessed this."

So from my standpoint I'm kind of flummoxed. I'm not exactly certain exactly what we need to do from the standpoint of within the disabilities commission we have consistently tried to look at the

positives. We are pushing universal design, the captioning, the readability, the architecture; those things are really important. On the other hand, for me personally, those things assume far less significance if we are not creating an environment within the classroom where students can feel comfortable because if you have your accommodations questioned, it's a hostile environment. Trust me, when I've asked these students the humiliation on their faces when I ask has this happened to you. They are humiliated and they are also in a position where they have very little power because, yes the ombudsman exists and Tim, I'm a fan of you, but from the standpoint of: Do the students know that they go to the Ombudsman? Do the students know what path to take when they have a grievance or problem? And they really truly don't.

They are most often told, at least from the disability standpoint, "Well just go back and talk to your teacher about that." Please, is that, I mean realistically, is that ever going to happen? If I'm a student and a teacher has outed me in classroom and has questioned my disability and embarrassed me, am I going to go back to that teacher by myself and say "Hey, let's make this right"? It's not going to happen.

I've talked to lots and lots of people. I have been on a mission for the last six weeks and I have talked to pretty much all the administrators, as many people in any supportive positions as possible to let them know that this situation exists because it is systemic. It's not an academic affairs issue, it's not a student affairs issue, it's a university issue and it's faculty as well as staff as well as students. No one truly knows what the ADA means what our rights are and I'm just very concerned that we leave ourselves open for some very serious liability issues because, if as a faculty member I tell you that I'm not going to honor your accommodation, I don't have that right.

That's not part of academic freedom. There's been legal precedent set on this. I'm not just saying it because I believe it passionately, but because it's true. You can't defer and say, "I'm not going to do an accommodation simply because I don't want to, it's my academic freedom." Some awareness of that I think is really quite important and so I'm bringing to you the recommendations I've suggested and we would all cringe at the first one, it's a state-mandated training. That's a hard one, I just had to put it there to say, "We need to get some training for everyone" because again, it's not just students, faculty or staff, it's all of us.

I think that certainly some sort of an Ally Program. I know that CAAR has already talked about this. I'm not trying to steal anyone's thunder it's the sense of much like the Ally Program with LGBT community that I've got that notice on my door and if you want to come to my door, you know that I'll be fine with talking to you. I'm not going to judge you on anything, wouldn't it be nice to have a similar thing as it relates to disability.

The other thing that I would say is very significant is some sort of meaningful grievance process because right now I've met with lots of people on this and the students say, "I don't know where to go." They have very few options in terms of coming back and say "Hey, wait, this isn't quite right."

And then the fourth point I mentioned in my note was simply, again, probably far-fetched, but the idea of putting in the constitution that academic freedom does not mean you can ignore accommodations. That is, it's a job responsibility, it's not an option. I'm just making the plea that we as a group here please become aware of it and that we, whatever body, whatever committee that would take charge of this.

R. Alden: Obviously, the recommendations cut across a lot of issues, a lot of jurisdictions, even bylaws and constitution changes. I think perhaps the most appropriate way to dealing with this is to ask the University Affairs Committee to consider all these recommendations and consider the commission and CAAR as a resource and obviously HR and any number of other offices and come back with whatever recommendation and or by-law changes and or other aspects of the recommendations to this body when they feel they are ready to do that either piecemeal or together.

D. Haliczzer: HR already does ADA awareness education. Attendance is really quite small because so many people have not realized that this is something that they ought to attend to and so I've already asked Greg and the Commission on Persons with Disabilities to collaborate with HR for more extensive training programs in the fall in collaboration with faculty development. And any student as well as any faculty or staff member has the right to file an affirmative action complaint for any form of discrimination, including students in classes in instances like this. Our students often don't know that they can file an affirmative action complaint. That's something that we need to speak about further.

R. Alden: It really needs to be formally referred to committee that if you can consider my motion and if I can get a second on that.

A. Quick: Second.

R. Alden: Is there any discussion on sending it to University Affairs Committee for consideration of various options of how to deal with these recommendations and maybe come up with others that are related that may come through the committee?

S. Johnston-Rodriguez: I'm also in a disability-related area and having been at a previous institution that was sued because of the refusal to accommodate it is a pretty serious issue. But I think one of the ways they did address it was faculty training. But I think also the waters get muddy because some students will disclose to the whole class and then faculty who aren't really aware don't know what to do with it. So it's a pretty complex issue.

G. Long: There is a wide range of disability-related issues that I could certainly share with you, but the one that to me takes the most precedence now is the fact that we are not providing a safe environment for the students who have the disabilities. They don't have the support I think from the faculty that I'd hope.

C. Downing: Just a quick statement, as a faculty member we often have lots and lots of things going on. Several years ago, someone important, I don't remember who, sent an e-mail with the disability paragraph to all of us in the College of Business and said, "Please include this in your syllabi," and most faculty that I know, are not these, I mean if somebody says I'm not going – that person should be, they're breaking the law.

R. Alden: called the question to a voice vote. The motion was approved without dissent or abstention and the matter was referred to University Affairs.

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

X. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
- B. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
- C. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
- D. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
- E. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
- F. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
- G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
- H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
- I. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
- J. [Minutes](#), General Education Committee
- K. [Minutes](#), Honors Committee
- L. [Minutes](#), Operating Staff Council
- M. [Minutes](#), Supportive Professional Staff Council
- N. [Minutes](#), Undergraduate Coordinating Council
- O. [Minutes](#), University Assessment Panel
- P. [Minutes](#), University Benefits Committee
- Q. [Meeting Schedule](#) 2011-2012

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.