

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2010/2011  
December 3, 2010  
10:00 AM – 12:05 PM  
PAC Conference Room “G”**

**Senators Present:** D. Ballard, P. Boltuc, S. Borland, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, T. Helton, W. Kline, J. Martin, R. Melchin, C. Olivier, S. Owusu-Ansah, P. Salela, L. Schoo, K. Sheridan, A. Sisneros, C. Switzer, H. Thompson, M. Van Vossen, J. Villegas, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, A. Winters [AP rep], Y. Zhang and T. Ting presiding.

**Senators Absent:** L. Bogle, K. Jamison, and D. Schuldt

**Ex-Officio:** H. Berman

**Guests:** D. Anthony, H. Bapat, T. Barnett, D. Brown, B. Hayler, C. Jones, S. LaFollette, M. Mundell, K. Moranski, L. Newman, L. Pardie, K. Richardson, A. Riggle, K. Rutherford, E. Stanley, E. Wojcicki, and M. Yoder.

The Senate was called to order at 10:00 am. Ting announced that Interim Chancellor Berman would be late due to his attendance at the Holiday Star Party.

**Approval of the day’s agenda**

Salela motioned to approve the agenda for December 3, 2010. Eisenhart seconded the motion.

**Approval of Minutes from Meeting of November 19, 2010**

Chair Ting asked for approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. Olivier moved to approve the minutes, Salela seconded. Ting called for any corrections, deletions, or modifications of the minutes. Referring to line 194, Boltuc asked that “from the private account” be added to the sentence for clarity. All were in favor of accepting the minutes with the suggested correction.

**Announcements**

None.

## **Reports**

### **Chair – T. Ting**

Ting reminded senators that this was the last meeting of the fall semester and thanked everyone for their work on the campus senate. She stated that the senate meeting schedule is posted on the Campus Senate website. The next senate meeting will be held on January 28, 2011. Ting extended gratitude for service to Villegas and Owusu-Ansah as substitute senators and encouraged them to consider running for senate if they found the experiences rewarding.

Ting reported that the Undergraduate Advising Task Force has been working diligently and asserted that things are going well. The Task Force has been meeting regularly and frequently. During the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, time was devoted to discussion about the role of faculty in the advising process. According to the UATF minutes, UIS administrators, faculty, and staff continue to talk about offering a private liberal arts school atmosphere with public school price. However, we are not accomplishing this goal relative to advising. Research shows that students who have good relationships with their faculty advisors typically view UIS more positively. Nessie data shows that seniors, in particular, do not report positive relationships with faculty outside of the classroom. The Nessie report was full of student complaints about advising. Multiple faculty members, staff from Student Affairs, and a student member are on the UATF. The student member expressed strong opinions favoring faculty as primary advisors. The UATF is reviewing best practices and current research regarding advisement and the effects of advisement.

Ting reminded senators that the ad hoc committee report on the Academy for Capitalism and Limited Government had been endorsed at the previous senate meeting. She forwarded the report and received a response from President Hogan. According to Ting, Hogan reviewed the document and wanted to update the UIS senate about the steps he is taking. Hogan met with the U of I Foundation President and Board Members of ACLG. They are attempting to work out an arrangement whereby the Academy will become a freestanding entity, without the current umbrella of the U of I Foundation. As free-standing organization, the Academy will be open to receive proposals from U of I faculty, or others for funding and to engage the U of I community as other organizations do. Ting reported that Hogan has expressed to all parties that he believes the Ikenberry Guidelines are important in emphasizing that any proposal from faculty, in their capacity as a U of I employee, must follow the same grant and contract proposal process as it would to any other funding agency -- e.g., proper vetting and tracking through university channels. Ting continued by stating that President Hogan agrees with the UIS Senate's principle that a public university can and should engage groups of all affiliations and convictions. Hogan asserted that doing so is important for our students and intellectual growth and innovation. However, such engagement can occur without the groups enjoying certain advantages of a legal association with the foundation. Ting stated the President is not in support of any kind of banning. Hogan reportedly appreciates the UIS Senate's emphasis on this point. Ting asserted that President Hogan will keep our report on file as part of full record. Because the Provost was not yet in the meeting, Ting called for the SGA report.

### **Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen**

Van Vossen reported that the SGA lobbied on the last day of session, which was December 1<sup>st</sup>. Due to the civil unions legislation and the retirement of Representative Black, the SGA had limited success. Many members were stuck in chamber and could not get out. SGA was able to meet with the delegation from the U of I in Urbana which consisted of approximately 20 students. Van Vossen believed the meeting to be very productive and a step towards collaboration between campuses for future lobbying. Ting asked senators if they had any questions regarding her report. Hearing none, she called for questions for Van Vossen. Boltuc asked Van Vossen if SGA needs help from faculty with organization. Van Vossen said the SGA is open to any assistance faculty can provide.

### **BOT Report – J. Martin**

Martin stated the report had been sent to senators the previous day. A couple of trends are building for the Board meeting. The BOT sub-committee reports have started to get much more succinct. The Board seems more focused on what they want to accomplish at the meetings. Martin wished to emphasize that Trustee Strobel, a very proud U of I alumnus, was very enthusiastic that we are 3 campuses, 1 university. She quoted heavily and offered appreciative comments of the document we produced about the proposed changes to the Statutes. Martin asserted that there are Trustees who did not graduate from UIS who now see us as an important part of the university. Ting thanked Martin for his animated and informative report. Believing the Provost's presence was important for the IAC report, Ting recommended waiting until his arrival for the IAC report. Senators were in agreement.

### **Old Business**

None.

### **New Business**

#### **Resolution 40-14 Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Management [1st reading]**

Van Vossen moved to discuss Resolution 40-14. Villegas seconded the motion. Ting noted that Laurel Newman was present for the discussion. The Graduate Council Chair was not present; however, Interim Provost Pardie was present. Ting stated that this was a 1<sup>st</sup> reading, and an approval will be sought at the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading during the 1<sup>st</sup> spring meeting. Sisneros stated that he believed the proposal was very well prepared and wondered if it was possible to approve on a 1<sup>st</sup> reading. Ting asked if Sisneros was seeking a suspension of the rules. Martin stated it was non-debatable. Ting said in order to pass, the vote would need a 60% vote (17 members). A vote to suspend yielded almost unanimous support, with 1 nay vote and no abstentions. Ting stated the resolution would be up for vote on a first reading. Martin asked if the program was budgetary neutral since the proposal was not available. Newman asserted that it is budgetary neutral. She reported that a current search is in process and that once the department is fully staffed, it will be able to offer the courses that are in demand. Martin clarified that existing faculty can manage the load. Newman stated yes. Sisneros also confirmed that the proposal is budget neutral. Olivier referred to language in the proposal. Garmil asked if the

certificate will become a feeder for new MBA candidates. Newman stated that is absolutely the hope as well as feeding into some MBA electives. Garmil then asked about the completion time for the MBA post certificate. Newman stated the MBA is 4 semesters full time and this is 12 of those hours. Martin stated that he is going to vote on this resolution but believed that having 2 readings is important when curricular decisions are being made. Van Vossen shared his enthusiasm and support for offering more opportunities for students. He encouraged everyone to support the resolution. Sisneros stated the proposal is a by-product of incredible cultural change in the College of Business; furthermore, it is good for the university. Initially, Sisneros had reservations because of a clause in the GC memo. After discussion with Ferk, his concerns were assuaged. A vote yielded unanimous support for resolution 40-14.

### **Resolution 40-15 Clarification of Personnel Review Schedule for Joint-Appointed Faculty [1st reading]**

A motion was made by Zhang and seconded by Villegas to discuss resolution 40-15. Anthony stated that there was some confusion about the evaluation process for faculty who are jointly appointed between an academic department and the center. This resolution clarifies that the review conducted by the center should be on the same timeline as that of the academic department. Aligning the process will enable the college level personnel committees in possession of all pertinent information. Wassenberg stated this has been a real problem in PAA for jointly appointed faculty. Depending on the faculty member, 1/3 or 1/2 of the documentation necessary for full review was missing from the process. Wassenberg reiterated the importance of resolving the timing issue. Referring to the example provided on lines 27 and 28, Martin wondering if it is wise to just list 1 example. He asked whether inclusion of all or perhaps not using an example would be better. Ting directed senators to lines 27 and 28. Kline stated that he has similar concerns because it takes two points to draw a line. It was Kline's opinion that 2 examples would provide a better sense of what the resolution is addressing. Ting stated that 40-15 will come back at first meeting of spring semester.

### **Provost – H. Berman**

Berman apologized for being late. His report began by talking about budget and planning as it currently stands for the upcoming fiscal year. According to Berman, the IAC report provided a good account of the budgetary situation. Provost/Interim Chancellor Berman highlighted the importance of approaching the budget in reverse, with the goal of making ends meet. Looking at potential income or revenue in terms of incremental revenue is important. Salient questions need to be asked such as: (1) what new revenue can be generated? (2) what kind of draws on existing revenue are present? Right now, we expect a tuition increase. The way it works at the undergraduate level for public universities in Illinois is that tuition increases only affect incoming undergraduate students. Transfer students and graduate students are also impacted as increases are implemented. Berman anticipated that we will have an increase in tuition, but not at the 9.5% level of last year. There will be some revenue from the increase in tuition. In addition, enrollment increases experienced over past two years will be included. This year we experienced 5% FTE student increase. Going into FY12, that number will be

included and will provide a new base level. As we go into spring, a tracking of admissions and deposits of new students for spring will occur. All of those things create a potential for additional money.

Draws (new recurring expenses) that need attention include the likely reduction from state appropriations. President Hogan mandated that we plan for a 15% reduction. We do not know yet whether this will happen, but that is the plan. Another recurring expense is concerned with a salary program, as we have gone for 2 years without a program in place for faculty and staff. The President and other leadership in the University have emphasized the importance of implementing a salary program. A third tier exists which deals with strategic investments that will place us on sounder financial footing. This is especially important in an era where we are getting less and less from the state. It becomes necessary to invest in ways that will yield long term benefits. For example, we are focused on benefits that will draw students to UIS. Three primary areas of investment have been identified beginning with marketing and recruitment. The second area deals with academic quality and student life. For example, CBM is down 7 faculty lines from the time of their original accreditation but have increased the number of students enrolled by 35%. Energizing student life on campus requires a stabilization of the budget in athletics. Increasing instructional capacity when we know that there are already students in the queue is also imperative. Such is the case for online programming in Public Administration. To reiterate, the 3 primary areas consist of: (1) addressing state budget reduction; (2) doing a salary program; and (3) strategic investments. Flexibility exists relative to implementation, but the planning is necessary. In addition to stabilizing the athletics budget, Berman noted that we are making headway on commitments made in the area of fine arts. Building operating budgets and staffing in Theater, Music, and Visual Arts is a priority. The combination of investments in Academic Affairs is more than twice as much as what is being proposed to stabilize the budget in athletics.

On a different note, Berman touted the success of the Speakers Series that students are required to take as part of the new general education curriculum. The committee, chaired by Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education Moranski has done a tremendous job. In Spring 2011, so far 500 students will be enrolled in 15 sections of Speaker Series. To meet requirements for the 1 credit hour, students need to attend 4 events and engage in Blackboard discussions. Students are attending more than 4 events and sometimes bringing friends, and people from the community are also attending. As a result, we need more space, which is a nice problem to have. Berman highlighted the award received from the Department of Justice to further the work of the Innocence Project, in the Center for State Policy and Leadership. The purpose of the grant is to assist people who have likely been wrongfully convicted with use of DNA evidence. Kirk Bloodsworth, the 1<sup>st</sup> person exonerated because of DNA analysis, gave a very powerful presentation. Bloodsworth, along with 2 others who had served time after being wrongfully convicted were present. We now have the ability to help people because of DNA evidence. Berman offered a huge congratulation to the Innocence Project and the students who participate.

The last item Berman reported was the Holiday Stars Party Event. During the party, there was recognition for the more than 9,600 pounds of food collection that occurred across all segments of the campus. The food will be donated to food banks in the community.

Berman acknowledged that this would be his final senate meeting in his current role and previous role as Provost. He stated that he had attended virtually every senate meeting for the past 15 years. Ting thanked Berman for his commitment to the campus senate.

Ting suggested that questions specifically related to the budget and IAC wait until after the report is given. She called for other questions. Boltuc thanked Berman for placing raises high on the priority list. Additionally, Boltuc congratulated Berman and Moranski for the success on the Speakers Series. Noting concern, Boltuc stated that he had attended a meeting the previous day, organized by Newman. He is concerned that no one on campus does consistent recruitment for online students. According to Boltuc, that would be a potential expense that would pay off in the long run. Berman thanked Boltuc for his comments about online student recruitment and will discuss the matter with Barnett. Ting said that the salary program should be at the top of the priority list. According to Ting, both Hogan and the BOT have emphasized that while the University has not been able to do a General Salary Program, if we have the means, we absolutely need to do this.

#### **Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Mid-Year Report – L. Fisher**

Fisher began by commenting on the kind of report submitted and introduced other members present to assist with questions. Fisher noted that she hadn't initially anticipated a mid-year progress report for the IAC. The 3<sup>rd</sup> IAC meeting was scheduled right before Thanksgiving break. As a result, Fisher wrote the report over the break without an opportunity to really discuss within the committee. She emphasized that this was an interim report and was limited to discussions over 3 meetings of the semester. Therefore, the focus was on what the committee is trying to accomplish. Fisher stated that she received a couple of comments regarding some slight inaccuracies in the report, which she will address.

Fisher thanked the committee members for a very productive semester. Committee members include: Morsch, Winand, Gilliam, and Yoder. Fisher reminded senators that Yoder is also the faculty athletic representative. Fisher also commended the students who have been very active and engaged in the committee work. These students include: Kelli Kubal, Michael Czarny, and Lexi Kirschbaum. Committee member Sheila Stocks-Smith joined recently. Serving in an ex-officio capacity are Jehlicka and Krueger, and Vice Chancellor designee Barnett. Fisher reported that Barnett is playing a dual role as he was asked to be the administration's liaison to follow-up on recommendations from last year. Fisher thanked Barnett for the tremendous job he has done in his respective roles. Additionally, Fisher thanked Wojcicki for all of his time, investment, and assistance.

Speaking to the minor inaccuracies, Fisher corrected the assertion made in the current report that the report on budget and planning for FY 10 was to be provided to the IAC in May. In fact, Wojcicki never said he would have the report in May. In the future, the IAC should be able to access the report in July or August that will be received every year.

Fisher acknowledged comments made by Berman and pointed senators to the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point on page 3 of the report. She asked that the word “salary” be stricken from the sentence. Fisher said she would correct this mistake and the revised report will be posted on the senate webpage. Further correcting the report, Fisher said the academic initiatives alone are more than twice the amount. Including the salary would make that number much larger.

Fisher reminded senators that report presented is not a report on everything that has been done to respond to recommendations of the investigating committee. A number of initiatives exist that have not been finalized yet. For example, a priority last spring was to follow up on the recommendation of campus wide reporting system for disciplinary actions. While Fisher did not comment on this in the report, Student Affairs is currently working on this initiative. Barnett kindly agreed to be present to answer questions. He and Korte have been working to create a preliminary database. Additionally, they are planning to purchase software to help in this process. Fisher emphasized that a number of things are happening.

Ting thanked Fisher for her report and commended her for the work she is doing as IAC chair. Kline asked whether Jehlicka was present. Ting said he was not. Kline stated that when programs are being discussed, it is expected that the head be present. Talking to Berman, Kline suggested we coordinate more effectively. Ting stated that was partially her fault because she did not invite him to be present. Kline recapped the 4 priorities presented earlier by Berman and agreed that we need to stabilize the athletics budget. He asked about the purpose of the funding and whether we are funding athletics to win. Kline asserted that it would be nice to ask the director if we are recruiting the best coaches, increasing scholarships to create the best teams, or is this a “stop-gap.” Ting said that a few coaches were present in the audience. Coaches Mundell, Jones, and Riggie introduced themselves. Kline asked whether the \$200,000 is sufficient to make us a winning team. Provost Berman stated that of course coaches want winning teams. From his perspective, we are supporting intercollegiate athletics because it is important to the university in several ways. First, there is an educational value to participating in athletics. Second, athletics helps with the recruitment of students. Berman noted that he had been challenged by Ting to provide data supporting this assertion. According to Berman, successes are published in newspapers in Springfield and in the region. Additionally, Berman asserted that student athletes also recruit friends and relatives. One study suggested that on average 1.89 additional students were recruited per student athlete.

Berman continued by discussing the number of questions regarding athletics that emerge from prospective students. Another significant factor is the engagement with community that is encouraged through athletics. Berman stated that currently people come to campus events at the Sangamon Auditorium. Going forward, we will also have intercollegiate athletics to draw the community here. This is very positive for engagement and reputation. Responding directly to Kline, Berman stated he is looking at this from a different perspective. Kline acknowledged the potential importance of athletic programming. However, Kline raised a concern that next year we will be sitting here needing a “winning” team, which would necessitate more funding. Furthermore, he

wondered how this fits in with 5 year plan of athletics. Berman agreed that what is proposed does not go the whole route and posited that he is not in the best position to answer. He emphasized the importance of seeking advice from experts. Wojcicki said that a consulting firm had been brought in to assess the area of athletics fund raising. Good suggestions were given on ways to increase operational and scholarship fundraising. Currently, UIS is at the bottom in coaches' salaries and scholarships within the Great Lake Valley Conference. Goals are being formulated to move us up from the bottom. With the assistance of the consultant's report, we will move forward with the fundraising plan.

Acknowledging Berman's comments, Yoder underscored the broader focus. He posited that Division 2 athletics operates from a partial scholarship model. Money is allocated to teams at the discretion of the coach. The coach has a pot and can choose to allocate to 10 students at particular amount, or 2 students at particular amount. Yoder has started to survey student athletes about their experiences in athletics. He will soon begin to collect data relative to the likelihood that a student would have chosen to attend UIS without athletics. If athletics were an important factor, how much influence did the partial scholarship play? Ting confirmed that there are no student athletes who receive a full scholarship currently. Fisher agreed.

Addressing Fisher, Switzer guided attention to page 2 of the report. Noting the 100% increase in the future budget, Switzer stated she would like assurance that noted problems have been corrected. Additionally, Switzer inquired about who oversees the budgeting problems and inaccuracies. Fisher said that this question had been asked of Berman during meetings in various ways. According to Fisher, the simplest response is that expense of funds in athletics is under the Chancellor's direct authority. The Athletic Director approves funds, communicates with Barnett in everyday matters and ultimately information goes to the Chancellor's office. Fisher noted that the money being doubled is the recurring budget which is state funding and tuition dollars. The entire budget does not come from that source. In FY 10 there was a one time temporary increase of \$150,000 to the recurring budget, which is \$195,000, for a total of \$345,000. Other sources of income were \$945,000 from student athletic fees and \$200,000 in gifts that included some fairly substantial amounts from corporate sponsors. The total expenses in FY10 were around \$1.5 million. Martin referred to the report on-line with the U.S. Department of Education. Fisher stated she was adding up the sources of funds. Martin clarified that revenue is different than expenses. Fisher stated that the increase in FY 10 was only about 23% from the recurring funds. Consequently, Fisher asserted this would be very far from doubling the budget. The stabilizing will really be regularizing what has done through one-time transfers.

Berman noted that just as colleges have assistants to the deans who handle financial matters, so does the Chancellor's office. Berman acknowledged the work Erica Michael is doing. V.C. Barnett also works very closely with the day to day oversight.

Sisneros agreed with the value and worth of athletics. He expressed concern relative to budget and planning and asked Berman if push comes to shove whether the athletics budget will be cut or if cuts come from other areas. Following up on Switzer's comments, Sisneros asked the Senate if we will require budgetary accountability and transparency by requiring information to be posted on the webpage. Berman stated that he cannot definitively predict where things will be in June. However, he anticipates we will be able to absorb cuts without having to go back to units. In anticipation of reduction for FY12, nearly a million dollars was set aside which was not allocated to units. Sisneros asked if the Senate is comfortable with general funding being used to cover deficits. Kline said that question was not answerable without a general vote and noted the rhetorical nature of the question. Ting asserted that this is also a rhetorical question to Berman. Ting asked if long-term, will athletics be cut just like the other units, or will other cuts be made to keep athletics afloat.

Berman asked if it makes sense to invest state dollars in athletics. The rationale for making that investment lies in strengthening campus culture, student recruitment, and improving community connections.

Martin thanked Berman for being engaged with this issue during his first semester as Interim Chancellor as this sets good tone. However, Martin noted that one way we made the local paper was through the website and inaccuracies therein. He asked if there has been follow-up. Barnett stated there were problems at the beginning of the year. Currently, athletics is in the process of transferring responsibility of the website so it will be up to date and accurate. Martin also asked if attendance figures are being tracked and made available. Fisher reported that athletics is collecting data about ticket sales; however, she does not have that information handy. Martin asked if there is a plan to make the information public as it is helpful in public discussion. Fisher agreed with Martin and wanted to comment about the discussion regarding the budget planning process. Fisher acknowledged the significance of having just received the briefing from Berman. Fisher asserted that IAC is generating a list of questions. Furthermore, she noted the importance in monitoring the balance of funding between student fees, state funding, and fund raising. The IAC needs to continue requesting data. Fisher asserted that the IAC is asking questions raised by Martin.

Van Vossen agreed with statements made by Berman regarding the importance of athletics on the UIS campus. He believes this is an important investment for student retention. According to Van Vossen, campus life is incredibly important for the retention of students. He voiced curiosity regarding retention rates since joining the NCAA.

Borland announced that faculty can purchase a pass for \$25, which will get them into every sporting event for the entire year. This is a family pass. Publicizing such initiatives is important to increasing attendance at the games. Borland asserted that crowds draw crowds. She suggested hosting free student nights and asked why students are charged admission to games. Someone clarified that students are not charged admission if they have their ID. Passes for community members may also generate more attendance, visibility and excitement.

Sisneros asked about the status of recommendation 13, which speaks to the code of conduct for coaches. Fisher assured Sisneros that the item is on the agenda for the IAC; however, the committee has not yet had an opportunity to address the recommendation. Barnett reported that coaches do have to take an NCAA test on ethics annually. Boltuc applauded the goals presented by the Chancellor. He still thinks it was a mistake for us to move to division 2. Additionally, Boltuc expressed disapproval at the absence of the Athletics Director. Boltuc would like for Jehlicka to be present during the next discussion on athletics. Supporting concerns raised by Sisneros, Boltuc suggested that all of the points raised by Sisneros be addressed. Berman clarified that when we did have budget reductions, athletics also took cuts. He emphasized that right now we are talking about potential not a certain cut.

Fisher asked Berman how he envisions the ongoing process of planning from here on out. She asked: where are we on this and how do you see opportunities for faculty and the senate to contribute to the process? Berman stated that the budget is a constant moving target but plans need to be made. The VCAA will provide budget updates in the campus senate and will be meeting with the planning and budgeting committee. The fact of the matter is that a lot of unknowns persist until late in spring and sometimes June and July. The unknowns involve state action, tuition increases, and enrollments. Fisher suggested as a senate member, not as IAC chair, that it would be useful to have public discussions about university priorities. Berman agreed.

Martin raised concerns regarding the accounting issues with the budget. The reporting line of athletics is directly to the Chancellor and the AD sits at the top. Good accounting practices are needed. Martin expressed serious concern that the leadership within athletics has not changed. On a different topic, Martin stated that he is very pleased to see that the IAC has dealt with the progress reporting issues. He asked whether students are informed about their rights relative to FERPA. Ensuring he understood the question, Yoder stated students are aware that their coaches are not able to directly contact faculty about their progress? Martin confirmed that this is what he was asking and thinks it's important that students know what their rights are and wonders how we are accomplishing this goal. Yoder referred to the survey he is conducting with students. One item states, "I am comfortable with faculty releasing my information to coaches." Hayler asked whether FERPA is comfortable with this release of information. Martin said he want students to be educated and informed about their rights. Yoder said he is also sensitive to this issue. According to Yoder, student athletes must relinquish certain rights in order to be eligible to play. Students sign a Buckley amendment to waive rights. Yoder acknowledged that this is a loss of freedom, but by signing they are aware that they are giving them up. Martin reiterated the importance of clarifying the extent to which rights are being waived. They should know specifically who has access to their information. By signing, they may think they have signed away all of their rights. They need to know that some of their rights are intact. Yoder said he would be willing to write something up for the students. Ting asked Stanley, from the registrar's office, if he had any information to share. He stated that students are given general info regarding FERPA rights. Additionally, information is given to coaches about what is appropriate.

Fisher thanked Martin for his comments as this is an active discussion within the IAC. She believes there are different issues relative to protecting student privacy. Students need to understand that information that must be made available is just information related to eligibility to play. Progress reports that some coaches are using raise questions and concerns. Fisher asserted that it is not the case that all barriers are down relative to information sharing. Yoder is working diligently to reword forms and to clarify. Many unanswered questions still exist. The goal of the coaches in seeking information is well intended so that students are not just hoping for best and not getting all of the assistance they need to be successful academically. Martin stated there is a role for faculty too. He said that when students provide the form to him, he clarifies with them that he is giving them information and they control that information.

Garmil stated there was a point raised in the report of notifying faculty of student suspensions and when the committee met with Clevenger he commented it was not a legitimate education interest. He disagrees with what Clevenger said and would like the committee to readdress this point. Fisher agreed that the faculty does not need to know if student is not continuing in class. Unfortunately that has to be the student's decision as to whether to drop the class or continue. According to Fisher, the worst situation is when the student stops coming but does not withdraw and the faculty member is forced to fail the student. Garmil asked if a student is allowed to continue in class if they are suspended. Barnett stated that suspensions typically are very brief. FERPA is very clear that nothing can be released unless it is a very special case like in an instance of sexual assault. Fisher added crimes of violence as an exception as well, but only when it is resolved.

Olivier asked Berman about the new initiative regarding fundraising and wondered when the plan is going to be released. Berman stated that he had met with Associate Director Reed, along with VCSA Barnett. He is very excited about the plan which is a near-term, intermediate, and long-term plans. Information will be coming soon.

Ting reported that VCSA Barnett started an initiative to invite Fisher, Ting, and two coaches each month to sit down for lunch discussions. Ting emphasized how coaches continually express the importance of academic performance for student athletes and that the student role comes first; not the athlete role. Coaches care very much about the welfare of the students. Ting's impression is that coaches would be more upset about students not succeeding academically over winning games. Ting informed senators that the SEC pushed Interim Chancellor Berman to produce recruitment data supporting assertions about the importance of providing increased athletic support. This is especially important given that approximately half of the UIS budget is coming from student tuition. Facing the potential decrease of state funding, this will likely be patched with an increase in enrollment. Berman talked about the building of the general education program. At the beginning, the program was in the red. Now the program is generating revenue. Ting's understanding is that if something like GE expansion will eventually bring in money this is great. She asked if it does not pan out, what the exit plan will be. She encouraged the Chancellor to continue to think about this and engage in discussions with senate. Ting asked if it is possible to build a sustainable athletics program without having to bleed from other campus operations.

Making a final remark, Fisher expressed her appreciation for the lunches with coaches. A goal of the IAC this semester has been to facilitate comfortable communication between athletics and the IAC so effective problem solving can occur. Much progress was made this semester. Fisher also noted that we do have problems to address. She asserted that no one is more aware of this than the coaches in the UIS athletics programs. Fisher also wished to express thanks to Hayler, who chaired the investigation and is raising really important questions. She just presented us with a response to Fisher's report and raises one question about the progress in the creation of a policy addressing the communication between campus health and athletics. According to Fisher, IAC has followed up with Lynn Price about her perceptions of Summers' innovative plan. Barnett has also met with Price and asked her to come forth with some language for policy.

Switzer acknowledged support for the athletics program, especially with the direction and involvement of Fisher, Barnett, and Yoder. She also supports Martin's concerns relative to the AD leadership. Sisneros believes what is good for UIS athletics is good for UIS. He asked to officially enter Hayler's report into record. Martin seconded. Ting agreed and stated that she had talked with Hayler previously. Ting thanked Hayler for coming to the meeting prepared with her own response. Ting also thanked Fisher, Barnett, and Berman for their leadership. Closing the discussion, she thanked Wojcicki for his service.

### **Discussion on Shared Governance**

#### **Statement of the Faculty Advisory Council of the IBHE on Shared Governance Participation in Budget Decision-Making and Policy Implementation**

Ting moved the discussion to shared governance. The statement was brought to the SEC by Bogle who serves as UIS representative to the Faculty Advisory Council of IBHE. According to Bogle, four Illinois public universities have had a discussion about this issue in their respective senates. SEC also decided to bring this to the UIS senate. Both UIUC and UIC campuses have been engaged in a process of evaluating academic programs with the goal of identifying and reducing multiplicities. According to Ting, they have also been looking at programs that for years have had poor performance. This process at UIUC is called the "stewarding excellence" evaluation. UIS has not been engaging in the same kind of process as the other two campuses. They are looking at eliminating some programs. For example, aviation at UIUC is gone. We are not going through this process.

Sisneros clarified that this is not new information as it is the foundation that has been used in the past at UIS. Berman confirmed that this is consistent with policies and procedures that we have utilized. Wassenberg asserted that the reason we aren't going through a traumatic process is that for 5 or 10 years we have been doing this in an incremental way. We should be proud of the work we have done by focusing on growth opportunities. In some ways, this is a compliment to the hard work of everyone in this room. Ting said that UIS is unique in having a standing Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. Such is not the case for the other two campuses. We are well positioned to identify weaknesses and strengths of academic programs through regular program reviews.

Fisher wished to comment about the processes on UIS campus. As member of CLAS, she only hears about budget distribution on the college level. She asserted that she has not had much opportunity to hear upper level administration's input as to how the budget is affecting long term goals. For example, in CLAS, Dean Ermatinger has discussed the shift toward 85% tenure-track faculty and 15% non-tenure track faculty. Fisher expressed strong concerns about this movement. According to Fisher, a campus discussion has not occurred as to whether or not this is the way we wish to proceed. Many questions about the effects on retention, whether this will shift UIS toward providing an average education, etc., have not been discussed. This is a matter of concern.

Berman stated that he was struck with a comment made by Fisher during the discussion of the IAC. The comment was about the balancing of sources of revenue and expense. Berman suggested that the balancing also must happen within colleges on behalf of the deans. Three primary concerns emerge including balancing obligations to deliver curriculum, concerns about academic quality, and funds necessary. Berman told Ting that he appreciated her comments about our continuous program evaluation, noting that we evaluate on an eight-year cycle all degree offerings at all levels. Consequently, if we have a program that has very low enrollment and no graduates, it becomes a very public knowledge. Conversations have occurred around the senate table. The reason our situation is different is that there is a multiplicity of graduate degrees, particularly doctorate degrees, at Urbana and Chicago with a small number of students but what keeps them going is they are a part of a larger department that keeps them going. Berman stated that over the past 5 years, virtually all of our departments have increased. In the 5 that have not seen that, decline in staffing occurred. Berman believes he is making considerable headway in conveying to President Hogan that we are being responsible in the management of resources.

Kline said that in line with balancing act, he would like to begin a discussion. In terms of shared governance, we flourish in faculty program reviews with program acceptance. We might wish to consider whether there are options for the administration to be more entrepreneurial in some form of educational programming. This might offer faculty opportunities to earn more money and also offer community members the opportunity they might not otherwise have. One model involves continuing education. Berman thanked Kline for asking this question. He asserted that before the end of the semester, an email will be launched with exactly this kind of initiative. Additionally, Berman encouraged senators to review the piece by Olson from Idaho State University (Go Bengals!) as it is a very wise statement about shared governance.

Speaking to the article recommendations, Garmil wished to humbly submit a suggestion. One area of frustration is dearth of communication once administration has made a decision. Garmil suggested that it would be extremely helpful if information about rationale for decision making outcomes were articulated more transparently. Wojcicki's continuing memos are excellent examples of that continued communication. Ting agreed with Garmil's recommendation.

Martin noted differing perceptions as to the qualities necessary for an effective leader. He suggested that it is important to look back with hindsight and be able to say that the person's decisions are our decisions. Ting acknowledged Berman and again thanked him for his service. She extended an invitation for him to continue to attend senate meetings.

**Adjournment**

Olivier motioned to adjourn the meeting. Martin seconded the motion. Senate Adjourned at 12:05 pm.