

Approved
UIS Campus Senate Meeting
April 9, 2010

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
MARCH 26, 2010
10:09 AM – 1:03 PM
UHB 2008**

Senators Present: S. Borland, K. Burton, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam, L. Giordano, J. Hall, W. Kline, J. Martin, C. Olivier, P. Salela, B. Siddiquee, E. Smith, H. Thompson, P. Wassenberg, and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: L. Bogle, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, D. Felix, N. Headman, T. Sullivan-Stewart, M. Van Vossen, and T. Wang.

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: T. Ambrose, H. Bapat, D. Barrows, B. Bunch, B. Clevenger, C. Crumly, L. DeFrates, M. Fauser, D. Ferk, A. Fitzgerald, R. Garmil, B. Hayler, T. Helton, W. Johnson, C. Jones, K. Kirkendall, P. Kowall, L. Mitkos, M. Mundell, L. Pardie, J. Perkins, L. Price, K. Redfield, S. Reed, A. Riggle, R. Ringeisen, K. Rutherford, C. Ryan, D. Schnapp, R. Schweikhart, A. Sisneros, R. Williams, A. Winand, A. Winland, E. Wojcicki, and M. Yoder.

The Senate was called to order at 10:09 am.

Approval of the day's agenda

A motion was made by Olivier to approve the agenda and was seconded by Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of March 12, 2010

A motion to approve the minutes of March 12, 2010 was offered by Thompson and seconded by Olivier.

Giordano noted two spelling and punctuation errors, and Martin noted a grammar error. The motion to approve the minutes as corrected was approved.

Announcements

Olivier announced that SGA is delaying student elections by two weeks, and there will be a referendum on student fees for the construction of a student union. If approved the construction might begin in 2012. The construction would be funded entirely with student fees, thus it is important to have student input and a thorough discussion regarding the fee arrangements. Salela asked if this fee would apply to online-only students, and Olivier indicated it would not and that part-time students would be charged a lesser fee.

Martin announced that the Star Parties will begin tonight and he provided advertising posters for interested parties. He thanked Gary Bach from media services for his work on the poster. Ting announced on behalf of Casinova some details regarding the Rally Day for Higher Education scheduled for April 21st. Several streets around the capitol will be closed off to allow for a march until 3:30pm. Casinova will be at the next Senate meeting and can provide additional details then. Wassenberg reminded everyone we also have the UIS Day on the Capitol scheduled for that day. On that day we bring high school students to the capitol to job shadow our alums and hear a speech from a state senator. They would undoubtedly appreciate having some faculty stop by, so those who are participating in the Rally Day would be welcome to join them in the Stratton building committee room A-1.

Smith announced that the Staff Silent Auction is still taking donated items, as they currently have just two-third of the items they had last year.

Ting stated that there will be a prairie burn at the UIS Prairie tomorrow at 1pm.

Kline announced that CLAS will be hosting the first annual Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Symposium on April 9th from 10-6.

Reports

Chair – Ting

Ting provided an update on behalf of the SEC regarding the Chancellor search. Senate officers met with President Ikenberry regarding the timeline for the search, which we have agreed would

ideally be able to appoint a new Chancellor in January of 2011. The search committee will need to be created by the end of this semester, with the creation of a white paper over the summer and beginning the search in earnest in August/September. The current proposed composition for the Chancellor Search Advisory Committee was based on the 2007 UIC Chancellor search and the previous UIS Chancellor search. The proposed committee would have 15 members, comprised of eight faculty members, one student, one Academic Professional, one Civil Service employee, one Dean, one Alumnus, one community member, and the VCSA. The process for nominations will be up to each constituency. For faculty, there will be a call for open nominations that mirrors the process for the recent Presidential search committee. The SEC will then vet the slate of faculty nominees. The entire slate will be brought to President Ikenberry for finalization. President Ikenberry would like to be able to bring our search advisory committee slate to the Board of Trustees meeting on May 20th. The slate must thus be ratified by our final Senate meeting on May 7th. The SEC is seeking Senate endorsement of this composition and process.

Hall asked if there would be an intent to ensure representation from each college. Ting stated that the nominations would be open, and the search advisory committee needs to reflect diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, disciplines, and experiences. College affiliation will be one of the diversity elements.

Olivier asked why there would be just one student on this committee, when some previous searches, such as for VCSA Barnett, have had two students. Ting indicated that the SEC had this discussion with SGA president VanVossen. Previous UIS Chancellor search committee had just one student member, and the idea behind the inclusion of the VCSA was to add some additional representation for student viewpoints.

There were no objections to the search committee composition and process.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman reported that UIS has received its MAP payments for the Spring 2010 semester and the state is now up to date on their payments. Enrollments are also a bright spot. Giordano indicated that there was a 15% increase in deposited freshmen, transfers student applications are up 10%, and 10% in admissions. Graduate students are up 6% in applications and 19% in admissions. This data is relative to last spring. Those numbers may change when tuition is set and financial aid packages are announced, but at present enrollment looks strong.

Berman also complimented the office of Web Services. University Administration has been working to implement a website content management system, and needed policies and guidelines to do so. They have looked nationwide for models, and decided to use the UIS model. The policies themselves can be found at www.uis.edu/webpolicy.

Berman also congratulated Senator Kline regarding his recent awards of grant funding of \$15,000 to establish an online curriculum for Liberty Studies.

Student Government – M. Van Vossen (absent – reported by Olivier)

Olivier had nothing to add to his earlier comments in the announcements.

BOT Report – J. Martin

Martin noted a growing theme at Board of Trustee meetings of cross-campus synergies, and he has noted faculty interaction has been increasing. He felt that the time is ripe to reach out to people at other campuses and work together, for those who have the desire to do so. He described a presentation by a USC representative Burbules in which Burbules expressed the desire of faculty to be partners with the Board of Trustees in coping with the financial crisis, and his presentation was very well received. Trustee Tortellero expressed the desire to have faculty sitting at the table with the Board, and while Chair Kennedy's response was somewhat more measured he was generally positive.

The UIUC Interim Chancellor Easter described two projects that could be amenable to cross-campus interactions. The urban renewal project in East St. Louis is available as a service learning activity, and there is a UIUC library initiative to scan the contents of books onto flash drives rather than photocopying them.

The budgetary report noted that the state now owes \$484 million, but there has been some utility cost savings of \$50 million based on natural gas pricing. Berman noted that the state is now above the \$500 million threshold.

The Chancellor's retirement package was approved as laid out in the original recruitment contract, and sabbaticals for several UIS faculty were approved. The sabbatical awardees were Siddiquee, Li, Brecklin, Mooney, Williams, and Graf. Martin applauded Provost Berman's excellent presentation on behalf of the sabbatical requests.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Resolution 39-19 Clarification of the Use of 400-level Undergraduate Courses for Graduate Credit [1st reading]

A motion to begin discussion of the resolution was offered by Olivier and seconded by Thompson. Hall also serves on the Graduate Council and as a representative from that committee he explained that the intent is to clearly define the practice of using 400-level undergraduate courses for graduate credit in the catalog by the AY 2012-2013. The Council considered the benefits and costs of this practice, and noted that in some colleges this is not permitted at all. The desire was to standardize this for students and departments. Ting stated that this is a policy resolution, and the implementation would begin in 2012 and Hall confirmed her understanding.

Wassenberg stated that she discussed this resolution with her College Executive Committee, and every chair but one vehemently opposed this resolution. They agreed with the idea of standardizing this process, but the feeling was there were many holes that need to be addressed. For example, it does provide clarity with regard to undergraduate-only departments but offers

many 400-level courses that are important for graduate programs. This resolution also does not specify where the decision is made regarding the appropriateness of the use of such courses. She expressed the fear that the faculty of many undergraduate-only programs would end up in a state of constant negotiation. She will be meeting again with her CEC before the next Senate meeting and she expects there will be a formal resolution provided by her college opposing this resolution.

Hall stated that he of course wished to see that the language is clear and satisfactory, and asked if there were any discussion regarding the notation in the catalog of the use of 400-level courses being for graduate purposes, and Wassenberg indicated there was not. Hall stated that some programs routinely allow such a thing. Wassenberg stated that there may be some scenarios where such a practice may not be appropriate for graduate students who are expected to have advanced preparation in a discipline and 400-level courses would not provide that. However, there may at the same time be some graduate programs for which that 400-level course might provide some less advanced information that would be useful for their students. She indicated that Pardie will be attending their next CEC meeting to address these concerns.

Ting acknowledged that there are some realistic concerns there, but noted that there are many institutions that allow such a practice and clarity should be provided. Hall stated that is indeed the case and our catalog allows this, but his college for example does not. The idea is to make sure students are not surprised by differences in policy across the campus. Ting described some ways in which such courses could be used for graduate purposes.

Fisher stated that the question of who makes the decisions is a good one that she had not picked up on when she first reviewed this resolution. There are two actors here – the instructor of the class and the programs making decisions about the use of the course. While an instructor of a 400-level may assign extra coursework for graduate students, it would still be up to the graduate student's department to determine if that extra work is sufficient to make it a graduate experience. Hall added that there are some classes in which instructors do not assign extra work to graduate students. Ting stated that faculty would have the understanding that greater expectations should be placed on graduate students.

Kline offered the opinion that more paperwork does not necessarily improve the quality. There may be concerns about "chiseling." Even if statements of additional work are in a syllabus, those who do not currently provide additional work for graduate students will probably continue that practice. He also stated that he likes the variability in the use of 400-level courses, and he is not aware of any problems with graduate students in his program having difficulty communicating with instructors about the expectations for graduate students in their 400-level classes.

Pardie wanted to make clear that the Graduate council was not approaching this with the mindset that faculty were not doing their jobs. Their concern primarily was that graduate students would be completing their graduation contracts and be surprised to learn that their program would not permit the use of those 400-level courses. The idea is not to generate more paperwork, but that this would entail a minimal notation in the course description. Using her own discipline of Psychology as an example, an upper division course in Psychological Testing cannot be made into a graduate level course, as it serves as the foundation for graduate study in Psychological

Testing that would look very different. The gray areas described as concerns previously are intentional. This process is not intended to be some sort of oversight, and there is nothing in this resolution that prevents a department from saying “this does not matter to us...all courses must be 500-level.” The idea is to make this a minimal requirement and addition to the course description indicating that the course has been designed to be usable by graduate programs.

Borland stated that in her view this almost seems as if we are trying to use the catalog as a substitute for proper advising. When students have questions about the appropriate use of such courses they should be asking their advisors, rather than going back to the catalog. She expressed the worry that with such a notation in the catalog students might be less inclined to reach out to their advisors. Ting stated that another way to look at this is, if one of your students wished to use a course from another department, this catalog statement might be helpful. Borland stated that could be true, but she wished to emphasize her point that proper advising cannot be replaced by catalog statements.

Salela asked if we could extend the clause in the catalog to indicate that the final approval for the use of these courses is up to the advisor/department. Ting stated that is what ENS does.

Kline asked why this is being done via a senate resolution, as opposed to doing this via a program review. Hall stated that this arose out of the survey of program chairs that was done on this practice, and discrepancies were noted amongst departments with graduate programs. Because the catalog policy says this can be done, students often assume that will be the case and not consult with their advisor. Kline followed up by asking what tool this resolution provides that would allow the Graduate Council to do their jobs. Hall responded that this is important both for students and for the university to have clarity on this policy.

Berman described his view of this policy as a product of a lengthy effort to establish quality assurance about graduate programs – to ensure that a graduate degree is truly a graduate degree. This issue of “swing courses” is one that is felt country-wide, and when the Higher Learning Commission reviews our programs they want to see that the graduate degrees that utilize “swing courses” are in fact ensuring that graduate-level instruction is happening in those courses for those students. There have in the past been some graduate programs featuring the majority of their courses at the 400-level, which is problematic.

Siddiquee asked about line 65’s mention of a “brief statement” and asked if that is referring to something that should be in the catalog. Pardie stated that this statement would be an internal document for the department, and is not something to be included in the catalog copy.

Kline asked about the structure of the resolution and whether it would be advisable to move some of the rationale to be added to the whereases. Fisher asked if the furthermores should also be listed as “be it resolveds” and Berman stated that it appears that way. Pardie indicated they would take all of this information back to the Graduate Council.

Resolution 39-20 Establishment of a Process for Awarding Emeritus Status [1st reading]

A motion to begin discussion was offered by Siddiquee and seconded by Borland. Kirkendall from the Personnel Policy Committee described this resolution as serving a housekeeping function. An appendix of the Personnel Policies addresses emeritus awarding and was based on a VP memo from 1996. That memo calls for a process for awarding emeritus designations, but we have not had a process and this resolution is an attempt to rectify that.

Borland asked about the free parking statement under the same terms and conditions as other faculty. Kirkendall stated that they are subject to the same terms and conditions we are, but they do not have to pay for parking.

Siddiquee asked if Kirkendall had seen the email from Professor Duvall and if she wished to respond. She stated that there was a call for using the same criteria as is used for tenure, but that language is different purposely. She also stated that there was a call for automatic awarding of emeritus status for all retiring associate and full professors, but the goal with this resolution is to say that the awarding of emeritus is not a given. Ting stated that Duvall comments indicated that the chair makes these determinations and that is not correct. The chair writes a nomination letter.

Kirkendall suggested that someone may wish to provide a friendly amendment to modify the language to read “immediate unit head, in consultation with the unit.” Hall moved for a friendly amendment to include that language, and that was seconded by Thompson.

Wassenberg noted that of the categories eligible for emeritus, the Provost is not included. She asked if that was an oversight and Kirkendall stated that it was not. The University system evidently does not provide for emeritus for Provosts, and that is an unclear omission. Berman stated that he was part of these discussions and agreed that Provosts are excluded for reasons that are not clear.

Martin noted that the resolution lists all of these different ranks, and he wondered why we do not simply say ‘faculty.’ Kirkendall stated that those specifications are there on purpose, as there are some faculty who are not eligible for emeritus, such as adjuncts. Martin noted that there are some people who are treated as faculty for voting purposes in the college, but they would not be treated the same way for emeritus and expressed the opinion that such a distinction might not be fair. Kirkendall stated that this derives from the VP memo. Berman stated that there is a philosophical rationale for these restrictions, as emeritus designation is intended to be a distinct honor for those who have been in the tenure system, and not just for anybody who retires from the university.

Martin stated that we are adding a layer of contribution assessment in designating emeritus status, and asked if the committee deciding on emeritus status would be assessing those contributions rather than just examining years in rank.

Berman clarified that emeritus is awarded to those who are in that professorial ranks, and is not restricted to those who hold doctorates.

Siddiquee asked about the professorial appointment qualification, as there are some institutions that have granted emeritus status to Chancellors or Deans who had no teaching or professorial

experience at the institution. Ting noted that it is peculiar that we spell out this process for associate and full professors, but we did not do so for administrators. Kirkendall stated that language could be added. Each of those individuals has a home department, if they are tenured, and the process for emeritus nomination would come from those departments for those people.

Berman offered a suggestion that the PPC look into this a little further. The umbrella policy addressed faculty and administrator separately, and the PPC policy addresses faculty only. Clarity is needed on whether or not that applies to administrators.

Martin stated that other institutions have had a more egalitarian approach to those who might not fall into the specific categories of eligibility to faculty. He suggested that some institutions offer an “emeritus fellow” option for those who make significant contributions to the institution but are not eligible for emeritus status as described above. Fisher agreed that this is a good idea, and that it might also be worthwhile to provide exceptions for faculty in other ranks who have made an outstanding contribution. Kirkendall stated that her understanding is that we are limited by the VP memo. Fisher noted that the memo includes categories that we do not have and suggested that it might be difficult to fully apply to UIS. Kirkendall stated that this policy was written for all three campuses, and the other campuses have positions that we do not have.

Martin asked if this is an administrative directive and not part of statutes, and Kirkendall indicated that was the case. Berman added that emeritus status is ultimately awarded by the Board of Trustees.

Garmil noted that for clinical instructors there is no promotion process like there is for faculty. Berman stated that the rank for instructors is tied to credentials, rather than a promotion process.

Ting asked Kirkendall to include the friendly amendment and to clarify the questions about administrator eligibility and to provide a revision for consideration at the next Senate meeting.

Discussion

Final Report by the Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Intercollegiate Athletics

Ting acknowledged that Chancellor Ringeisen, Provost Berman, VCSA Barnett and Associate Chancellor Wojcicki are all in attendance to discuss this report. Athletics Director Jehlicka intended to be here but his wife had emergency surgery last night and he cannot attend. Assistant AD Reed and Compliance Officer Fitzgerald are in attendance.

Ting began by noting that the SEC and administration agreed on the outstanding nature of the committee’s report. She described her expectation that the discussion it generates will be civil, positive and productive.

Ringeisen began with some comments. He acknowledged that the Senate and administration owe thanks to this committee for the time, effort, and quality of work they have done. He was also pleased that the administration’s response was included in the report. He wanted to note that recommendations are in fact recommendations, and that he often gets recommendations in his

cabinet meetings and sometimes not all can be pursued. He noted that between the 2004 and 2008 reports there were a total of 38 recommendations. Of those 38 recommendations, 28 have been either fully or partially implemented. With regard to the current report, there were 31 total recommendations. In the administration's response it was indicated that eight would be implemented, four would not be appropriate, and the remaining nineteen require further discussion. He stated that he would like to see a subgroup of senators and administrators discuss the remaining recommendations. He asked that this group be up and running by the end of the semester and that they make a progress report to the Senate by the end of the semester.

Ting responded that the Senate will expect a progress and update report with regard to the recommendations by the end of the semester, and stated that our last Senate meeting of the semester is scheduled for May 7th. With regard to the further work that needs to be done on the recommendations, Ting stated that the SEC decided at our last meeting to have the SEC, IAC and administration work collaboratively. Fisher has agreed to serve as the SEC liaison to the IAC, she will fill the vacancy created by Cheney's departure for the remainder of the semester.

Ringeisen provided his perspective on athletics and its place at UIS. He commented that athletics is an embedded part of American culture, and it is closely associated with universities. Our students come to universities expecting to have athletic programs. There are some ways in which athletics can help us achieve our vision that many might not have considered. For example, joining the GLVC means that the name U of I Springfield is seen in St. Louis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Indianapolis, Cincinnati and elsewhere. We could not afford to put ads in newspapers in all of those cities. In addition, we had nearly 3,000 students from all over Illinois walking through our campus for the high school super regional basketball games that were recently hosted here. It would have cost a lot of money to get that many people to view our campus via other means.

With regard to the development of athletics, he stated that we are "there." We now have 11 teams and we now have gender equity in our teams. The addition of women's soccer will counter the addition of men's baseball next year, so there is no need or plan to expand further. The NCAA requires 10 teams, and we have met that requirement.

Ringeisen offered an aside in which he noted that the bill signed by the Governor yesterday that reforms pensions may have been necessary to address the budget problems, but as an institution we should be very concerned. We will have a difficult time recruiting Deans, Chancellors and Presidents with their retirement based only on a \$106,000 salary cap.

With regard to the budget for athletics, this is not the first time we have built during difficult financial times. The College of Business and Management is one example of having done so in the past. It was controversial, but we needed to do it and we are proud of what we have done. We also spent a lot of money when we added freshmen, and that was a lot of money we did not have. Another example is the fine arts – those were new faculty slots. We did not have drama, we did not have music, and we had only one faculty member in the Visual Arts.

Ringeisen acknowledged that there is a deficit in the athletics budget. He stated that while some have commented on the lack of a complete budget, he stated that it can be found in Appendix 7

of the Athletics report. He added that, while there is a deficit, it should be viewed in context. Sangamon Auditorium has a near \$1 million budget deficit, the General Education program is running a \$750,000 deficit, and the Capitol Scholars budget is also in deficit. While there is a deficit in athletics he stated that it can be fixed. He spent some of the Chancellor's division private funds to hire athletic fundraising consultants to examine whether UIS could raise \$200,000 per year from the community. The answer was "yes" and they provided a plan for doing so.

Ringeisen stated that there is \$130,000 of one-time money in the Athletics budget, because they were hoping for more private money that did not materialize. But we spend one-time money all the time, such as our purchasing of instruments for the music program and equipment for the sciences. This is not permanent funding, and none of this one-time funding came from academics. This money came from Student Affairs. Athletics is a student life issue, and the fees that support athletics come from students. Student fee increases always happen in consultation with students and are voted on by students, and during his time here the athletics-related fee increases have been uncontroversial amongst the students. Next year the budget will increase with the addition of baseball, which is already accounted for by a planned increase in student fees that had already been approved. At that point the budget should level off and we will hope to add private funds. However, we are not fully competitive with our peers in the GLVC with regard to scholarships. We are almost at the bottom of the GLVC in that regard, but that is OK because we are new. As we increase our private funding we will improve in that area. A noted concern about the use of private funds for athletics is that doing so diverts money from academics. He argued that is not the case. Rather, it is his experience and that of his peers across the country that those who contribute to support athletics at an institution often then become more aware of the other activities of the institution and then make investments in those other areas. He noted a good example is that of the Hooglands, who contributed to the TRAC but also have made funding available for scholarships.

There have been questions regarding cuts and whether or not we will all experience the same reductions. In an atmosphere of severe budget problems and approvals for all hiring having to go through the Chancellor, we are hiring 11 new faculty this year, more than in any other area. With regard to budget cuts, Ringeisen decides how much cutting will occur, and then the VCSA and VCAA make decisions about how to cut within their organizations – and those cuts will not be uniform. Ringeisen decides about the cuts to the Chancellor's Division, which includes athletics. He noted that all of the coaches and ADs took the same furloughs as the rest of us.

Berman commented that one of the points in the report was about the use of student fees in supporting athletics, and he noted that the bulk of the increase in those fees has originated from the students. For those on the academic side it can be difficult to see that. With regard to the student fees overall, ours are not exceptionally high. In Illinois we rank ninth out of the twelve public institutions at the undergraduate level and seventh at the graduate level. While there have been increases in fees for athletics, we are still in the right ballpark for fees. That being said, there are issues with fee equitability for part time students and that is an acknowledged problem that will be addressed.

Berman added that one might think ‘what difference does it make to have UIS mentioned in Cincinnati or St. Louis?’ He stated that it matters in a couple of different ways. It allows for additional recruitment diversity, especially from other states. In addition, there is the US News ranking system that relies heavily on reputation. While we might wish that reputation did not matter, it does.

Ting commented that she hopes the Chancellor will share the private fundraising plan with the IAC, and he stated that he would do so once they begin meeting. Ting also noted that the SEC has requested and he has agreed to have four athletics budget reports to the IAC every year at different times of the year – May, August, December, and February. Ringeisen agreed that is a good idea, especially given the fluctuating nature of budgets.

Martin drew a distinction between recognition and recruitment/retention. He stated that it is undeniable that we do many things on this campus that get us recognition and they get us some help with recruitment and retention but they are not directly intended to do so. However, those things we do to get recognition are not free – they cost us something. We might get good advertising from athletics, however when we do advertising we would do a cost-benefit analysis to ensure that our investment is worthwhile. Such a thought process would be helpful with regard to the investment in athletics. He acknowledged that athletics gets us more than just recognition/marketing, but wanted to see similar data-driven thinking applied to athletics investments. Ringeisen stated that was a good point and he agreed that athletics is really all about the students and the quality of student life. That is the primary reason why we have athletics teams, and the recognition is a side benefit. He added that it benefits all students, and students frequently ask about athletics.

Martin agreed that students frequently ask about athletics, and that may simply be the way they go about asking about student life. He stated that when we are recruiting and get questions about athletics that we make sure students understand the full array of considerations in student life. Barnett agreed to some extent that many students equate athletics with student life. We also get questions about Greek life, which reflects on the institution a bit differently. Barnett provided an example of how athletics increased applications from other states at his previous institution.

Ringeisen mentioned his efforts on the Geographic Diversity grant program, and that is beginning this spring in the St. Louis area. Fisher asked how many such grants would be given out, and Ringeisen stated we would give as many as we can to attract students. It ends up being a “money-in, money-out” arrangement, so the number will hinge on the money it brings in. Berman stated that there would only be a small number, given how late this is in the recruiting season. Ting clarified that this is not a program for specifically recruiting student athletes.

Hall appreciated that administration came here to speak with us about athletics, and noted that he himself likes athletics. However, he wanted to address the fee issue and provided some statistics: 40% of our headcount are graduate students, of which about a third of those are FTE. Also 25% of our students are online and about a third of graduate students are completely online. The average age of those graduate students is 33, and their interest for on-campus athletics is likely not the same as for on-campus students. Those part-time students pay about \$700 per semester in fees, while full-time students pay just over \$800. That inequity results in complaints to him from

many students, and those complaints are not restricted to the athletics portion of the fees. His concern is that while SGA does approve the fees, those students voices are not a part of the process. Hall's belief was that this hurts recruitment at the graduate level. Barnett noted that he is aware of the problem and it is something they wish to address, within the constraints of ensuring that they continue to make their debt payments on bonds.

Olivier asked Hall about where he was receiving complaints, if they were from MBA or from Peoria, and Hall indicated he heard complaints from both constituencies. The principal complaints were from part-time students. Olivier stated that the SGA has had a senator from the Peoria center in the past, but that seat is open this year and he asked that Hall make sure students up there know about that. Hall stated that he does make such announcements every semester. Further, the online student and graduate student representation on the SGA is not proportional.

Thompson asked about the four recommendations that the administration opposed. Ringeisen said he did not recall them offhand, and Ting added that even if administration opposes the recommendations as written that does not preclude further discussion about them. Ringeisen agreed, and added that it is important to know that consulting does not equate to adopting.

Yoder noted that recommendation #7, which bears on the reporting of on-campus incidents involving student athletics, is one of the items unlikely to be implemented. He would like elaboration on why that recommendation is viewed as a problem and why we should not adopt it. Barnett stated that he agrees with the need for improving communication across campus about student issues generally, and there have been discussions about acquiring software that would allow communication between housing, residence life, and athletics to have access to student discipline issues. However, because there is no system set up right now for that communication it will not always be possible for those who are aware of incidents to be able to identify that the students in question are student athletes. One element of this recommendation that the administration was not comfortable with was tracking student incidents off campus, as they do not have the staff to be able to track such things down. With regard to the reporting recommendation, he was not comfortable with monthly reports but quarterly reports would be acceptable and the FAR should know of the specific incidents. The broader group should have access to the statistics.

Yoder followed up by asking for specifics about how the AD is informed of on campus student athlete incidents. Barnett stated the AD would typically find out about incidents from the Housing Director, the Associate Dean of Students, or from the Chief of Police. Yoder asked how those sources would know if the student involved in an incident is a student athlete. Barnett stated that Housing would know by virtue of the room assignments, but that the Associate Dean of Student and Chief of Police might not always know. Yoder asked if there would be times when the AD might not be informed of on campus incidents involving student athletes, and Barnett stated that 99% of the time on campus incidents would involve housing and in those cases the AD should know. He stated that his understanding was that such transmission of information has not happened as frequently as it should have this year, and his goal is to correct that over the summer.

Hayler noted that the administration's concerns about the four recommendations they have disagreements with are listed in the appendix. She noted that, while they may have some disagreements on those recommendations, such a position does not mean that they will not do them. As could be seen in Barnett's comments, there are often considerable areas of agreement within these recommendations, but some things that need to be worked out. The other three specific recommendations they disagree with likely involve establishing the best way to go about doing something, rather than a disagreement about whether or not something should be done. Her understanding is not that there is absolute rejection of these recommendations, but rather disagreements of how to go about them. The committee's opinion was that administration should now proceed by indicating how they would prefer to proceed on those items.

Martin asked to return to the budget, and indicated that he appreciates the complexity of budgeting. We all know we are in a budget crisis, and many groups on this campus have made sacrifices to ensure that more drastic measures do not need to be taken. The idea was to share the pain – faculty did not want to see a situation in which we would lose valued staff because of money. We are all in this budget crisis together and it is important that we all perceive this, and while the increases in athletics budget come from student fees it is important to make clear that such increases are not coming from huge increases in GRF. Otherwise it would seem as though there are favorites. Berman stated it is a matter of stabilizing the athletics budget, and as the Chancellor indicated the use of such funds depend heavily on our judgments about the area of the institution that we are trying to build. However, the recurring athletics budget in FY10 will not increase in FY11.

Siddiquee appreciated the Chancellor's comments about the flexibility of budgets, and his question was about recommendation #20 bearing on the limits of growth in the athletics budget to keeping it on an annual basis comparable to other units. While he agrees with that in principle, he would suggest doing a 5-year average as a standard for growth comparison rather than an annual comparison. However, some limitations in growth are needed because we are all in this crisis together. Secondly, he noted that there is a general tendency to equate Campus Senate with faculty, and while there is a greater percentage of faculty on the Senate it is not exclusively a faculty body. Thus, in many of the administration's responses they indicate that the recommendations are not the responsibility of the faculty, such as items like #14 which objects on the grounds that this is not a faculty purview. Given that the Campus Senate is not entirely comprised of faculty it appears there is a misunderstanding. Finally, he agrees with Hall regarding the fee issue and suggested that the next time around we think about separating the debt-financing portion from the operating budget portion. While all students should contribute to the debt servicing that allows for the functioning of the university, those operating elements that benefit only on-campus students should be applied at a differential rate.

Ringeisen stated that there will be times when different parts of the campus will need a bump in their budgets and putting a 5-year comparison in place would make it difficult to accomplish targeted development. Ting noted that the GRF portion of the Athletics budget for next year is intended to stay flat from this year. She stated that it is very important that the increase in private fundraising would reduce the need for use of GRF in the future. Ringeisen stated that was possible, but it was also possible for the budget to go up due to private fund raising. It will have to if we are to be competitive, but it will not increase via GRF funds.

Giordano wished to remind everyone that APs are sharing the pain, and the staff in athletics is comprised of many APs who are taking furloughs just like everyone else. Ringeisen added that he did not want to do furloughs and hates what it does to morale.

Wassenberg added that she hopes we all approach budget cutting with a more mercenary mindset, and that we need to think of academics as revenue generation. Tuition is right now the most reliable source of funds for our institution, and is now a majority of our funds. She added that, while she is an avid athletics supporter, she feels that if doomsday cuts of 8% come down those cuts have to happen in athletics as well and must be perceived as happening in athletics. We have seen a lot of pain in academic affairs from a surprise reduction of enrollment in a couple of graduate programs, and cuts there create a snowball effect in revenues. Ringeisen indicated that any cuts directed to athletics would come from the GRF, and they have the opportunity to avoid those cuts by being supported to a greater extent by private funds. We have a very small proportion of state funds going to athletics compared to other institutions in the state.

Hayler seconded Wassenberg's emphasis on revenue generation and noted that even the deficit-running entities like Sangamon auditorium generate some revenue. As a proportion of their budget, they bring in much more than they require in subsidies. For some other programs, such as General Education and the College of Business and management, we would expect them to receive GRF and tuition dollars as they are a part of our mission. She also thanked the Chancellor's office for the budget noted in Appendix 7, and asked for updated information to be consistently provided as that information was dated last October. Ting added that, as of May, we will have an updated budget for the next year.

Berman noted that there are similarities with regard to the overall financing of athletics on the one hand and WUIS, Sangamon Auditorium and Illinois Issues on the other. Each of them has a different proportion of reliance on state dollars. Illinois Issues is very high, while Sangamon Auditorium is not. While they do generate revenues, they vary quite a bit in what they bring in. These are all very worthy activities and they are ways we connect with the larger community, but athletics relates more to the experience of student life than any of the others. Further, he clarified the purpose of mentioning General Education and CBM is simply to illustrate that additional funds are needed to go into things we build, especially in their early phases.

Ringeisen stated that while the things Hayler mentioned do produce revenues, overall the three things Berman mentioned require \$750,000 per year to keep functioning. They would not exist without GRF and tuition dollars. In raw numbers that amounts to much more than athletics, and athletics is much closer to student life.

Fisher also appreciated the comments provided today and the committee's hard work. She noted that there has been a lot of discussion about the value of athletics, which is an important discussion, but she felt that is not what the report was about. In fact, most of the recommendations from this report bear on communication between administration, the Senate, the IAC and the FAR. A primary concern was to make sure that these entities always get the

information they need to do their jobs. The committee never considered whether or not we should have athletics.

Martin added that he has heard IAC members say before that they want to provide advice that not only parallels what others do, but that we wish to provide advice that is better than what others do.

Ting invited Barnett to share his thoughts on nine of the recommendations. However, we only have 15 minutes left today so she asked Barnett to choose which recommendations he wished to address immediately. She added that this will be a continuing discussion, and asked for his initial thoughts. Barnett stated that with regard to the admissions recommendation, his view was that UIS has excellent admissions policies and in no way does admissions' work get influenced by student-athlete considerations. If the student does not meet standards for admission they do not get in and Giordano indicated that she has never experienced pressure to do otherwise. Further, there is an appeals process that is available to students who do not meet the minimum admissions requirement and that is available to all students, not just student-athletes.

Barnett commented that the recommendation bearing on reports being presented to faculty on IAC and the FAR is appropriate. Reports on graduation rates, retention rates, academic status and so forth would be appropriate and an added benefit to the athletic department. This kind of information could be provided by the office of Institutional Research.

Barnett stated that he already discussed recommendation #7. He felt that students should be far more afraid of their coaches than they should the Associate Dean for Students or the Director of Housing. They should be reporting their incidents to the coaches the first thing the next morning that they will need to be going through the disciplinary process. His feeling was that some coaches require their players to do this, and acknowledges that players have a standard of behavior they need to live up to. He noted that this suggestion does not mean that Student Affairs will not deal with those students. With regard to the communication of student athlete incidents, he feels that once a database is set up that information flow will improve.

The recommendation bearing on student health, currently campus health services contracts with doctors who provide care, and this is not consistent with other Division II school practices. Whether that policy will continue is not yet decided.

With regard to a coach's code of conduct, it is his belief that all administrators should be expected to engage in ethical conduct and that coaches do not need to be singled out.

With regard to recommendation #17, FERPA restricts the sharing of data to parties who have a legitimate academic right to know. The courts define that very narrowly, and we try hard to work within those constraints. An educational right to know within athletics would typically be restricted to the coach, AD and perhaps the FAR.

With regard to student fees, his feeling was such things were the responsibility of student government. His understanding is that the AD will present budget needs to IAC and SGA, and fees are thus proposed to the SGA for their consideration.

Ting asked if Barnett could review the financial aid appeal process. He stated that all students have the right to appeal financial aid related decisions. Sometimes those decisions have to do with academic suspensions, sometimes with debt load, sometimes with academic load. For athletics, he feels that coaches have the right to decide whether student athletes should be on the team, and if a coach decides that someone should not be on the team it is their right to end those athletics-related year-to-year financial aid arrangements. That student then has the right to appeal that decision.

Ting stated that we have a 5-member financial aid appeals committee, which does not include a faculty member at present. The SEC has consulted with Barnett about having a faculty member serve, and he was not opposed to that idea. The SEC will pursue that with him. Director of Financial Assistance Joseph was also in agreement. Kline asked if that committee's role is advisory, or if they make final decisions. Barnett stated that the committee's decision is final, and athletics does not have a member on the committee. Hayler stated that there is a connection to athletics as Noll serves on that committee and she is the academic advising liaison for athletics. Ting stated that if the desire is to prevent all connections to athletics we can look into that.

Borland inquired about scholarship criteria with regard to athletics. She asked if a student who maintains GPA and does everything they are asked to do can still be cut. Barnett indicated that he believed that was the case, which was the same as for resident hall assistants. They are hired for one year. If they meet all expectations they can be renewed, but if they do not they will not be renewed.

Ting stated a progress report will be filed with the Senate by the end of the semester. She again thanked the ad hoc committee for their tremendous work. She acknowledged all members of the Ad Hoc Committee and asked the senate to accept their report so the committee's work is concluded. Siddiquee offered a motion to accept their report, and the motion was seconded by Olivier. The motion was unanimously approved.

Adjournment:

A motion to adjourn was offered by Hall and seconded by Martin. The motion was approved and the meeting was adjourned at 1:03 pm.