The meeting began with an introduction of Neil Sapienza as a new member of the Committee replacing Paulette Popovich.

Next, Sue McKibben introduced Kent Marsden, a member of University Council, who worked for over eight years working with the Exploratory Committee to form the University Council.

Kent provided the Committee with the history of University Council noting that the need for the Committee stemmed from a 2003 university accreditation process whereby the need for shared governance was identified. Since that time, the faculty unionized and the communication processes were reviewed. Faculty Senate was formed to look at shared governance to show inclusiveness – everyone is informed who wants to be informed. On August 19, the final University Council document was presented. Kent noted that the document needs some changes including defining VP responsibilities. The next accreditation process will be held in March 2013. By December 2012, the document needs to be finalized, terms of office need to be in place, and an outline for each committee’s goals needs to be defined.

Issues such as “what constitutes a member” are being reviewed because current committees are including part time employees, retirees and ex-officio members. The document states that only full time employees can sit on the Council. Another issue is the term year – is it fiscal year, calendar year or the academic year? This needs to be clarified in the document and there is a preference to using the academic year for purposes of defining terms. The Committee agreed that the academic year made sense but emphasized that the term year needs to be consistent. Because it was not defined clearly in the document, the first year of service on the committees will extend until April 30, 2013.
Mr. Marsden asked the Committee to review and finetune the bulleted items of the Talent Development and Human Resources Committee’s responsibilities and also take another look at the University Council document for any other changes. He emphasized that the Committee should not attempt to micromanage Becky Hoover’s position but instead use Becky as a resource. The topic of bringing an issue forward to the Steering Committee that did not have the full support of the standing committee was discussed. It was suggested that maybe both sides could be presented showing the consequences of each. Becky Hoover brought up her concerns with the issue of duplication of efforts with other committees of the university (e.g., the Diversity Council) and suggested that the issue needed further attention to better integrate everyone’s work.

There was also a discussion about the mechanism for others at the University to bring matters or suggestions before the standing committees. Sue indicated that there is a link on the University Council Sharepoint site through “contact us” that offers people a chance to submit suggestions or issues. The Provost’s office receives the suggestions and disseminates them to the proper committees. Sue indicated she would send everyone the Sharepoint link to view the form.

**EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION**

**DISCUSSION**

The Committee discussed employee recognition programs at the University. It was suggested that a sub-committee be formed to research this issue. Susan Speers volunteered to chair the sub-committee for this purpose. It was suggested that someone should contact Dr. Karla Mugler who had done previous research on recognition/service awards. Sue asked that committee members let her know if they would like to be part of this sub-committee.

**MEETING SCHEDULE**

**DISCUSSION**

The next meeting will take place in March. Margaret will send an email to committee members with some suggested dates.