

## MINUTES

University Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, Nov. 5, 2014, 3:00 PM  
Cofrin Library 750

Present: Clifton Ganyard, Kristin Vespia, John Lyon, Kristin Aoki (Academic Staff Representative), Sylvia (Mimi) Kubsch, Steven Meyer (chair), Cristina Ortiz, Vanya Koepke (Student Government Representative).

Guests: Cliff Abbott

1. The minutes of October 29 were approved.
2. The proposed changes to the code for the Learning Technology Collaborative Committee and the Legislative Affairs Committee were reviewed and confirmed as appropriate for submission to the Faculty Senate for their approval.
3. In the UC Chair report Dr. Meyer identified some issues that may be part of the Chancellor's next report to the University Senate. These included the Enrollment Summit and the site visit from the Academic Partnership team.
4. Dr. Meyer presented the information that neither Regan Gurung, nor Chris Martin were vetted before they were identified as members of the UPIC. Clearly someone had dropped the ball on this one and the UC expressed its concern that loose ends are not being tied up by the provost's and chancellor's offices.
5. The annual report of the Future Phoenix program was shared with the UC. The report highlighted the successes of the program over the past few years. Concern was expressed over what students were being told was required for their participation in the program. The idea that the student participation in the Future Phoenix Program, being a University sponsored program, should be treated equally with that of student participating in intercollegiate athletic competition was presented and received widespread support by the UC members.
6. The discussion moved to the topic of administrator evaluations. The first question discussed was who should be evaluated and why. In general terms, the lead person in each area of the university was identified as being someone who should be included in the group to be reviewed. The question then turned to how often they should be reviewed, at what time of year would they be reviewed, how the information collected would be organized and distributed and who would do the organization of the review material. The concept of starting with the leadership of the academic areas first and then expanding to other areas was discussed and received strong support. No decisions were made at the time, as other business items became more pressing.
7. The topic of the library budget was next on the agenda and the idea of a senate resolution was discussed. The UC decided to include the topic in the next UC chair's report to the Faculty Senate.
8. The topic of the proposal to change the schedule for the summer session was discussed next and it too was identified as a topic for the UC's chairs report to the Faculty Senate.
9. The final topics of discussion were the suggested changes in the code that dealt with the position of the Faculty Representative. It was presented that this position requires a

significant amount of time to become familiar with the roles that it can assume and therefore having a person fill the position for more than a one year commitment would be desirable. It was also presented that it is desirable to have the person filling this position attend all of the faculty representatives and all of the regents meetings. The discussion dealing with the relationship between the faculty representative and the UC and Faculty Senate identified the advantages and disadvantages of having the person being a member of the UC. The time demands that would be expected of this person were discussed. The proposed changes in the code dealing with the faculty representative position included an expanded description of the duties of the position and a statement identifying the position as having a two year term. The UC agreed that if this position is restructured in this way that it should include a 3 credit reassignment from teaching.