

Approved  
UIS Campus Senate Meeting  
March 26, 2010

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD  
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010  
MARCH 12, 2010  
10:00 AM – 12:30 PM  
PAC Conference Room “H”**

**Senators Present:** L. Bogle, S. Borland, K. Burton, J. Casinova, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam, L. Giordano, J. Hall, W. Kline, J. Martin, P. Salela, B. Siddiquee, E. Smith, T. Sullivan-Stewart, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, and T. Ting presiding.

**Senators Absent:** D. Felix, N. Headman, C. Olivier, H. Thompson, and M. Van Vossen

**Ex-Officio:** H. Berman

**Guests:** B. Allen, T. Ambrose, T. Barnett, A. Boettcher, D. Brown, B. Bunch, T. Cantrell-Bruce, B. Cass, M. Cavanagh, B. Clevenger, L. DeFrates, J. Ermatinger, D. Ferk, A. Fitzgerald, R. Garmil, B. Grunzke, B. Hayler, W. Holden, Jr., W. Johnson, K. Kirkendall, A. McEuen, R. Melchin, J. Mitch, L. Mitkos, N. Niebur, L. Otterson, L. Pardie, J. Perkins, R. Prather, K. Pressley, S. Reed, D. Ruez, K. Rutherford, A. Schafer, R. Schweikhart, A. Sisneros, E. Staley, R. Williams, D. Williamson, A. Winand, E. Wojcicki, and M. Yoder

The Senate was called to order at 10:00 am.

**Approval of the day's agenda**

A motion was made by Eisenhart to approve the agenda and was seconded by Bogle. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Approval of the minutes from the meeting of February 26, 2010**

A motion to approve the minutes of February 26, 2010 was offered by Fisher and seconded by Smith.

Smith stated that her last name has changed and should be corrected in the minutes, and provided the correct spelling of GoldbergBelle. Giordano noted that there is a typographical error on line 48. Niebur stated that she wished to clarify her comments to Ting in the email Niebur sent to the senators, specifically that she did not ask Ting to engage in negotiations on behalf of her union, but rather that she was only asking Ting to assist in setting up a meeting for CS employees with President Ikenberry. With these corrections and clarifications the minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

## **Announcements**

Gilliam stated that he read in the newspaper about Friday night Star Parties beginning on March 26<sup>th</sup>. Martin stated that they would also be held on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup>, and 30<sup>th</sup>.

Borland announced that the prelaw center will be offering a free practice LSAT to students on Friday, March 26<sup>th</sup> at 9am.

Wassenberg announced that on March 24<sup>th</sup> and April 21<sup>st</sup> UIS will be hosting the second annual Under the Dome event. On this day we invite high school juniors from the Springfield area (March 24<sup>th</sup>) and from Chicago area (April 21<sup>st</sup>) to the capital. Those students will get an overview of the lawmaking process, there will be a keynote speech from a legislator, they will get to shadow UIS alums who are working at the capital, they will get to visit the press Blue Room, and finish by visiting with UIS faculty.

## **Reports:**

### **Chair – Ting**

Ting commented that there was a great turnout at the Faculty Forum with President Ikenberry, and it was a full house for the AP and CS meeting with him as well. The tone was very civil and featured a good, constructive exchange.

Ikenberry gave a report to the Board of Trustees regarding new ideas about the university, especially on the academic side. Martin stated that he will be filing his report on the Trustees meeting next week, and Ting stated that one of the items we will see in Martin's report in greater detail is Ikenberry's expressed desire to increase synergies within the U of I family. His comment on synergy stemmed from his visit with faculty at UIS.

Yesterday, Ting forwarded by email a speech from Burbules from UIUC, given on behalf of the USC to the Trustees, regarding shared governance and the importance of that process working both ways. Immediately after Burbules' comments Trustee Tortolero expressed his desire to have a faculty member sitting at the table with the board, rather than sitting at the back of the room. Ting expressed the feeling that this was a very welcome response. Chair Kennedy also had a very positive response, but would want some time to confer with the rest of the Board before providing a definitive answer regarding faculty representation. President Ikenberry also framed this comment from the USC as part of the ongoing discussions between the faculty, administration, and the Board.

The Senate has called for volunteers for committee service activities and the deadline is today at 5pm.

### **Provost – H. Berman**

Berman stated that the FY10 appropriation to U of I was to be \$700 million, and the UIS portion was to be \$22 million. The university is likely to soon receive their federal stimulus funding, which will be \$45 million, of which the UIS portion is \$666 thousand. However, the reality is that the state remains incredibly behind in their payments to all public universities. At this point the U of I may end the year with \$500 million owed, which has never happened before. Last year the state finished the fiscal year owing us \$120 million, but that was paid by September.

With regard to the MAP grant situation, the legislature has indeed authorized the MAP grants but has not paid them. The U of I is owed \$28m, none of which has been paid.

The Governor made his budget address this week, which is the beginning of the budget process. His proposal calls for a 6% reduction in higher education across the board. That is considerably less than the 15% we have been planning for. A tax increase of some sort would likely be needed, and the 33% increase in personal income tax rate that has been discussed, but that reflects merely a change from 3% to 4%, which compared to other states is quite low. The revenues from that tax increase are not a part of his proposal. However, his proposal does indicate an intention to push some receivables further into the future, which for us may create further challenges.

On a more positive note, we have had two recent excellent athletics events. We had the state high school super-sectionals that featured students coming from across the state. We also had the GLVC basketball tournament here. That brought people to our campus who had never been here before and we received nice compliments from the GLVC commissioner with regard to our facilities and staff. Berman congratulated the entire athletic staff.

Today we also have a CyberDefense conference being held on campus. Congratulations to Dr. Mims and Janis Rose and the entire Computer Science department for this successful event.

On a more personal note, President Obama nominated Provost Eduardo Achoa from Sonoma State University to be the Assistant Secretary for Post-Secondary Education. SSU is a fellow COPLAC school and it is wonderful to have a provost from COPLAC considered for service in that role.

Martin asked if there were any exact attendance figures for the two recent athletic events. Reed indicated about 4,000 attended the supersectional, and 3,000 attended the GLVC tournament.

Hall asked about the Governor's proposed 6% appropriation reduction, specifically wanting to know how much of that reduction was to go to Higher Education. Berman indicated that he was unsure, but Wassenberg indicated that her reading of the news coverage indicated that he was referring to both K-12 and Higher Education.

**Student Government – M. Van Vossen (absent)**

No report. Casinova stated that he did not have additional details regarding the rally day on April 21<sup>st</sup>, but hoped to have some by the next Senate meeting.

### **MPA Program Review**

Hall was available to speak on behalf of the Graduate Council. Ting asked Miller about the Graduate Council's requirement that his program complete the program review using the standard forms and format, rather than submitting their accreditation document. Miller indicated that they expressed concerns about having to do two major reviews in the same year. Hall indicated that their reporting cycles do not always align, and the reason for this requirement was because requirements for accreditation review and program review are not identical. However, relevant elements of the accreditation document can be used provided that the additional information required for the program review is also provided.

Martin noted that the Graduate Council cited faculty retention as an issue and wondered if Miller knew of the factors involved in that. Miller noted that PA programs are in high demand and it is fairly easy for faculty to find other jobs, especially in light of the fact that a good way to get raises in higher education is to move. New faculty who have a research emphasis also chafe at a 3/3 teaching load. Wassenberg added that often new faculty who are coming out of R1 institutions for their first jobs often think they want a job at a teaching institution, but once they get here they realize it is not what they thought it would be and move on to research institutions. We have thus lost talented young faculty to bigger institutions with lots of money.

### **Final Report by the Committee to Investigate Athletics**

Ting stated that this committee's work began with resolution 38-27 passed in the Spring 2009 semester. The IAC prepared a response to that resolution in which they suggested charges for the investigative committee and how it should be composed. They specified that the IAC chair should not be a part of the committee, and recommended increasing the size of the committee from 3 to 5 people. They expressed a desire to see faculty serve on the committee who were tenured and who can be viewed by all parties as completely neutral with regard to athletics, with no investment in athletics-related events and no expressed desire to pursue such activities in the future. It was also suggested that one member be non-faculty, and another be emeritus faculty. There was also a desire to have a committee that was diverse in its gender distribution. The new senate reached consensus before the completion of the spring 2009 semester to adopt the IAC's recommendations. Ting worked with then-chair of the IAC Williams to arrive at agreement on a slate that had tenured faculty, emeritus faculty, an administrator, and an AP. The APs selected their own appointment, and the slate was agreed upon and had the blessings of the Chancellor. The committee was confirmed by the end of June 2009. That committee was comprised of Hayler, Bunch, Perkins, Ferk, and Ambrose. The committee convened on July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009 to begin their organizational work.

This report has been a long time coming and the committee has done tremendous work. Especially the chair, Hayler, who has done amazing work despite having significant personal

matters she needed to attend to. Ting noted that the communication between her and Hayler was very good throughout the period of the committee's work.

Ting noted that the committee could not do their work alone either, as they needed to interview many parties. They interviewed students, administrators, faculty, and athletics personnel, and Ting expressed her appreciation for the cooperation displayed by all of those parties.

Ting stated that she looked forward to a calm, reasoned discussion at today's meeting and indicated that it would take time to digest everything. Ting added that she invited Ringeisen, Barnett, Wojcicki and Jehlicka to today's meeting. Unfortunately Ringeisen and Jehlicka could not be present today (Jehlicka is taking a furlough day), but Jehlicka sent Fitzgerald (the Athletics Compliance Officer) and Reed (Assistant Director) in his place. Berman, Barnett, and Wojcicki are here.

Hayler provided a Powerpoint presentation summarizing the committee's report. Part of their charge was to examine the extent to which current UIS policies address recommendations from the 2004 Task Force and the 2008 IAC report. The IAC report was organized around four major principles: 1) Academic Integrity and Quality; 2) Student –Athlete Welfare and Well-being; 3) Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics; and 4) Fiscal Responsibility. The IAC report reflected core principles endorsed by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.

The committee interviewed administrators & staff members responsible for Athletics and policies affecting student athletes at UIS, including staff in Athletics, the Chancellor's Office, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs. They invited staff, faculty and students to discuss their experiences with athletics at UIS. They reviewed available documentation about athletics at UIS and requested information that was not routinely available, such as budget reports, team rules and student-athlete academic profile information. The committee restricted its investigation to recommendations made in the 2004 and 2008 reports and related policies. At the administration's request, the committee agreed to follow an audit-style procedure that would allow administration to review and respond to the report prior to release. The Administration's response to the committee's recommendations, and the committee's comments, are provided in Appendix 10.

The committee decided not to focus exclusively on the events of Spring 2009 – it was not ignored, but was not an exclusive focus. The committee also did not conduct a formal legal inquiry, did not take sworn statements, did not hold public hearings, did not require people to meet with them, did not formally request UIS e-mail files, did not file formal requests under the state FOIA, and did not investigate all aspects of Athletics.

She noted that the full report is available on the Senate website, and it will be broken down into constituent parts for easier downloading.

Hayler summarized the committee's general conclusions. She stated that UIS lacks written policies in many areas relating to intercollegiate athletics which would document current practices, create institutional commitments and priorities, and provide guidance when UIS personnel changes or new challenges arise. UIS also lacks standard procedures and written guidelines for handling critical situations, which promotes a "damage control" reaction mode.

This ends up potentially putting more emphasis on what people are saying about the event, rather than focusing on the actual problem. UIS also lacks clear identification of parties that should be consulted when campus incidents occur, and lacks clear lines of institutional responsibility for handling critical incidents. It is not always clear who is supposed to be making decisions about procedures. There is a tendency for these incidents to end up on the Chancellor's desk, but she opined that might not always be the best place for incidents to be handled.

Athletics currently lacks effective external supervision or oversight. It is located in the Chancellor's Division, and they are thus the only organization responsible for oversight yet at the same time they are not an external party who can provide objective oversight. Often issues stop within Athletics, and no documentation by external agents.

Educational policy and athletics are integrally connected at UIS, as seen in Athletics Objective #2: "the educational goals and mission of UIS determine the standards for athletics." The NCAA itself says that the primary focus of athletics needs to be academic and educational, as that is the reason why athletics are housed in educational institutions. However, the pattern over the last several years has not been one of shared governance or active collaboration. The administration agreed to bylaws language making IAC advisory to the Chancellor and the Athletics Director on "budget and finance, personnel, and operational aspects of the intercollegiate athletics program." The committee feels that an advisory role requires active participation in considering options, not just receiving information about actions taken. That comprises a reporting line, rather than an advisory line.

Hayler described the organizational structure of the IAC report in 2008 and stated that her committee used that same organizational structure for their current report. Given the Provost's report on the budget earlier today, Hayler thought it appropriate to begin by discussing the Fiscal Responsibility principle.

#### Fiscal Responsibility Issues (Section V)

University President Ikenberry himself stated at the recent faculty forum meeting that intercollegiate athletics is one of the things that UIS should examine to ensure that the existing program is consistent with campus priorities, given our tight fiscal situation. To do that, a clear understanding of the finances is needed.

Hayler presented a breakdown of the cost of intercollegiate Athletics at UIS: total FY09 final expenditures: \$1,550,000. Team operating expenses: \$267,000; General Office/Administrative \$70,000; Salaries: \$560,000; Scholarships & Waivers: \$525,000 (tuition waivers comprise \$125,000 of that). These costs do not include debt service or some operating costs for TRAC. The total FY09 Actual Revenues: Generated revenue- \$197,100 (14%); Allocated Revenue: \$1,193,050 (86%). State appropriated funds: \$218,260 (16%), Tuition waivers \$125,000 (9%), Student fees; \$849,000 (61% - Athletics Fee and Online Student Services Fee). The latter figure does not include the TRAC recreational services fee.

The FY10 Budgeted Revenues are not complete, but the proposed expenditures would be a little over \$1.7 million. The Generated Revenue is estimated to be \$130,000 (8%) and Allocated Revenue is \$1,584,000 (92%). She showed a chart demonstrating how state funds allocated for

athletics almost doubled over the last year, and student fees also increased. Everything but expected generated revenue increased.

An examination of finances dating to 2006 shows increases in student athletics fees each year: FA06 \$96 for full-time (FT) students and \$80 for part-time (PT, neither increased from the prior year); FA07 \$102 for FT, \$85 for PT (increases of 6% each); FA08 \$115 for FT, \$97 for PT (13% and 14% increases, respectively); FA09 \$132 for FT and \$112 for PT (15% increases). In total, there has been a 38% increase in student athletics fees for FT students and a 40% increase for PT students between FY07 and FY10.

Hayler noted concerns about transparency. The entire athletics budget is not presented in a single budget document. The published FY09 base budget (in U of I Budget Summary for Operations) was listed as \$75,000. Total state appropriations (GRF + tuition funds) spent on FY09=\$218,260. FY10 base budget = \$75,000, yet state appropriated funds in FY10 budget are \$434,000. There is a big gap between what has shown up in the base budget and what we intend to spend. While that kind of arrangement is not unheard of, it makes things confusing.

Salaries paid by the state funds are included in the “gray book” report to the Board of Trustees. However, salaries paid by student fees or other non-state funds are only reported in internal UIS budget documents. All FY10 salaries are currently posted on <http://data.illinimedia.com/salaries/index/2009/spr>. She noted that sometimes the breakout of the salaries shows up in the grey book and sometimes it does not. The Daily Illini submitted a FOIA request for U of I salaries and that information has been posted at aforementioned website.

The budget is generally presented to the IAC in November or December, which is halfway through the fiscal year and that makes it hard for the IAC to have constructive input. At that point administrators are working on the budget for the next year. Proposed capital projects and facilities related expenses are not included in the Athletics budget. For example, we do not know of the arrangements for off-campus golfing and tennis facilities.

Other funding-related findings: expenses associated with NCAA Div II and GLVC have been higher than anticipated and are expected to continue to rise. The Athletic Director stated that he thought the total expenditure is expected to rise to about \$2m, at which point it should stabilize. Part of the unanticipated rise in expenses has to do with the move to full-time coaches in most sports, and we may also be moving to full-time assistant coaches (which is standard at other GLVC schools). Men’s baseball is required for membership in the GLVC and will need to be added 2-3 years sooner than anticipated. Baseball is an expensive sport, and by adding baseball we will probably be out of compliance with Title IX. We will thus need to add women’s sports in 2013 or 2014. An increase has also been seen in “athletically-related” financial aid – aid they get because they are an athlete. However, the Chancellor in particular has mentioned that what we give in financial aid for students is not competitive with other GLVC schools. Then there are facilities costs – a baseball field will be expensive and even our tennis courts are barely acceptable as a practice site. Thus the costs of maintenance and expansion of facilities will increase.

Hayler noted that the largest number of recommendations in this report related to fiscal information. Most of those recommendations focused on allowing access to financial information. The administration has accepted 5 recommendations and believes they can act on them now, including recommendations 20, 23, 25, 26 and 28. The administration wanted to have further discussion on seven other recommendations, including 21, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 31. The committee feels that most of these are informational and should be easy to implement, but there is apparently some disagreement in administration.

The committee wishes to see a specific implementation plan from administration for the accepted recommendations, and wishes to have a written administrative response identifying disagreements with other recommendations. They also want clarity with regard to who is responsible for making and implementing decisions regarding athletics at UIS. How will the campus communities be involved in these decisions? Decisions made in the next three months will bind UIS for several years and may create Title IX problems that will need to be addressed. She stated that there needs to be a clear sense of the process by which we will move forward.

### Three other brief questions

The committee wanted to know if athletics is an effective recruiting tool. There is some anecdotal evidence bearing on this, as can be seen in the Flutie Effect. However, the empirical evidence is unclear on this point. Research has found that such effects are limited to Division I schools with national football or basketball success. Pope & Pope (2009) measured applications to the NCAA's top 20 football schools & top 16 basketball schools and found increases ranging from 2-8%. However, this effect is limited to one or two years- if the school does not remain competitive or successful this effect dissipates. Intercollegiate athletics does help with recruitment of student-athletes, however that needs to be examined in the broader context of budget priorities. In FY09 UIS had 123 student-athletes, with most but not all receiving athletically-related student financial aid. The total spent on athletically-related student aid was \$580,000 (an average of \$4730/athlete). However, a NCAA Division II survey of athletes found academic offerings were more important in recruiting student-athletes than athletic programs. For those who got scholarships, that was the most important consideration, with quality of academic programs second.

Another question the committee asked was: does athletics increase donations? Anecdotal evidence can be found from the fans and boosters who give to schools whose teams they support. Ikenberry shared his doubts about this. The empirical evidence from Humphreys & Mondello's (2007) study of NCAA Division I schools found postseason success in football and basketball led to increased gifts restricted to athletics for some schools, but found no increase in unrestricted giving. Baade & Sundberg (1996) found a slight but positive effect on giving for schools that participated in NCAA Div I championship games, but winning records alone had no significant effect on donations. A Congressional Budget Office (2009) review of this literature concluded that the effect of winning records or postseason success on total giving to the university "is likely to be small."

The committee's final question was: is intercollegiate athletics a net revenue source? The NCAA examined this question itself and found that just 25 of 333 NCAA Division I athletics programs were self-supporting without institutional subsidies (reported a net profit) in FY08. Hayler also

presented a graph based on an Orszag & Israel (2009) study, commissioned by the NCAA. They examined only those programs with football and basketball and found that only the top 10% of those programs generate any profits. The last study that examined Division II was from 2005. Without institutional support, Div II institutions without football reported average total revenues of \$600,000 in FY03 and average expenses of \$1.9 million – a net loss of \$1.3 million. Institutions with football programs generated revenues of \$1.1 million and expenses of \$2.7 million - a net loss of \$1.6 million. Some were able to make profits solely on their basketball or football teams, but in the broader examination of the entire athletics programs they did not generate money. The only sport to show a net profit at Div II was ice hockey.

### Student-Athlete Welfare Issues

The committee examined six broad areas; Advising and Academic Support; Oversight of Student-Athlete Behavior; Campus Health Services and Athletics; Expectations for Coaches; Events of Spring 2009; and Events of October 2009.

Campus Health Services and Athletics. This issue provides an example of the need for a written policy, which was noted in the 2004 Task Force Report and remains a recommendation by the current committee. An agreement on such a policy was reached in July 2008 and by July 2009 the administration reported that a written policy was being prepared. In February 2010 the administration says it will implement a plan by summer 2010.

With regard to the expectations of coaches, the current behavioral expectations are based on NCAA standards for things such as recruiting, practice time, sportsmanship, etc. The handbook mentions expectations for behavior by students, but the only point they make regarding behavior by coaches deals with alcohol consumption. The committee felt that a code of conduct for coaches would be appropriate.

The committee examined the events of Spring 2009, with a focus on how the events were handled by Athletics and the Chancellor's office. They interviewed the Chancellor, the AD, and other administrators who were part of the ad hoc "response team." Also interviewed were the FAR and IAC Chair, neither of whom were consulted about what to do or kept well-informed as events unfolded. The committee also interviewed some student athletes who were involved in the incident. They did not interview the coaches involved in the incident.

The committee found that Athletics had no clear policy on alcohol use by coaches or student-athletes of legal age. The policy only addressed situations in which crimes were committed while drinking or under the influence. The investigation was conducted within the Athletics Department. No outside parties were involved, which creates an arrangement that would appear to be of concern even if the investigation was well done. Another committee concern was that the coaches were allowed to resign with no information or explanation placed on the record. No written resignation agreements were negotiated to limit post-resignation behavior. No systematic records were kept about the response team's activities. According to the Chancellor and Provost, no written memorandum of record or incident report was prepared and no meeting minutes were kept. No written policy or guidelines exist for dealing with major incidents involving student-athletes away from campus; administration resists creating such a policy because every incident is different and requires a unique response. The committee disagrees with that position. Further,

the lack of any public statement by UIS fueled rumors and made it difficult for those without information to respond appropriately.

Hayler concluded that one year after those events, UIS does not appear to be better prepared to prevent or to deal with another such incident. The committee could not identify any major changes (other than the inclusion of coaches in the Department's alcohol policy) implemented as a result of "lessons learned." There were some changes in the way the October 2009 event was handled, but not reflective of a policy change.

Hayler provided her contact information. She also commented, speaking personally and not for the committee, that she has learned recently of a few other items regarding Athletics that were upsetting to her. Most students who are offered athletic scholarships are assured that they will receive year-to-year support provided that they maintain eligibility. However, three recent female athletes have had their FA cut before their eligibility expired without explanation. Thus, she feels UIS is not living up to our commitments. She expressed the feeling that we have different standards for different teams, and different treatment is given to teams that succeed. She also expressed her concern about putting academics first. The Athletics Director and coaches assured the Committee numerous times that student-athletes would not be required to skip classes to attend practices, but she can no longer believe those assurances based on some things she has learned. Several student-athletes who have used the Athletics Department appeals process have been told nothing can be done, as a coach's decision regarding athletics scholarships is final.

Ting expressed her regret that she did not specifically ask Hayler and hence did not know how much time Hayler's presentation would take. Eisenhart moved that we extend the meeting by 30 minutes, and Fisher seconded. The motion was approved.

Ting began the discussion by providing some background on the current IAC situation. The senate bylaws for the IAC were substantially revised in September of 2009. With the passing of that resolution, the new IAC did not convene its first meeting until 12/09. At that point they were given the budget, and the IAC had to select a chair. No faculty members were willing to be nominated as the chair, and that remains the case. Ting has remained in contact with the IAC, and Cheney has served as a conduit of sorts for communicating with Ting. After the winter break she contacted Cheney about the IAC chair situation, but at that time the furlough news broke and faculty attention was elsewhere. Cheney indicated that the IAC members wanted to wait until this report was issued before revisiting the chair situation. Ting invited the IAC members and the FAR to meet with the SEC, but both of the dates that she proposed did not work for all of the members. Yesterday, the IAC had its second meeting, but that meeting was convened by Barnett, an AP designated by the Chancellor. It remains the case that no faculty members are willing to serve as chair. Cheney decided that effective today he would step down from the IAC. That committee has thus not been functioning, and that needs to be resolved and will be on the SEC's agenda for our meeting on March 22<sup>nd</sup>.

At the faculty forum with Ikenberry the issues regarding athletics were raised. Ikenberry was very clear that athletics would be an open question for the new leadership. As a final point of

clarification, Ting stated that Ringeisen is not resigning as had been previously mentioned but is retiring and his last day is October 31<sup>st</sup>.

Ting stated that, once we begin discussion the Senators will have the floor. Once the Senators are finished the guests can ask questions. Eisenhart moved to conduct this discussion after we conclude our old business, as this discussion is likely to be time consuming. Siddiquee seconded. Martin noted that the proper procedure would be to table this report. That motion was offered by Eisenhart and seconded by Siddiquee. The motion was approved 11-5.

## **Old Business**

### Resolution 39-10 Changes to the UIS Academic Integrity Policy - Section V.3.C. [2nd reading]

Ting noted that this resolution had its first reading in October of 2009. The language regarding student selections for the hearings pool was of concern, and so it was sent back to have that language addressed. The SGA has continued to have difficulty identifying students who can serve on the hearings panel, and this reworked resolution intends to help with identification of students who can serve. Putting the selection of student members entirely in the hands of SGA is also somewhat restricting, and allowing suggestions for students to come from departments would expand the pool of available students.

Martin stated that he felt that students would be abdicating their responsibility and is opposed to the resolution. Fisher stated that the SEC discussed that issue and offered a friendly amendment that would allow for final approval of student members by the SGA. Ting described the amendment language as, "Each academic department shall nominate one student member who will serve as a potential hearing panel member. The AIC will forward the slate of nominations to SGA for approval at its following meeting."

Hall asked if this resolution would address the concern of a lack of student participation in the summer. Ting stated that is not clear, as there are students who are around during the summer. The key is to have departments nominate students. Fisher stated that what is happening now is the SGA is requesting if current hearing panel members will be around in the summer. The idea is to create a broader pool that would create adequate summer coverage.

Pressley asked about the frequency of SGA meetings, as she is still concerned about summer. Ting stated that the SGA meets every two weeks. Hall asked who would coordinate this nomination process, and Ting stated that the AIC would.

Martin stated that the friendly amendment does not make it clear that the student nominees would then be members once approved. Fisher stated we should strike the word "member" from the first sentence, and Martin offered that as a friendly amendment to the friendly amendment.

Siddiquee asked if the student member term was to be one year. Pressley stated that the length of the student term is not specified in the policy. Ting stated that length can be a separate issue that we can return to if needed. Siddiquee also asked if online students were eligible, and that was confirmed by Pressley.

The resolution was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Eisenhart moved to un-table the discussion of the Athletics report, seconded by Fisher. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

### **Resumption of Athletics Investigation Discussion**

Ting noted that Hayler's final few slides on the PowerPoint were presented on her own, and she had not provided that information to the SEC in our meeting on 3/5. Hayler indicated that she was not aware of that information at the time of our meeting.

Fisher stated that she appreciates all of the hard work that went into this document and strongly encouraged everyone who cares about this issue to read it thoroughly. One of the things she liked the most about the report is its emphasis on the importance of transparency. She stated that she hopes we can have productive and collegial discussions about that, and she is encouraged to see that the Administration has already shown willingness to move forward with some recommendations. She added that the recommendations present in this report could also be of benefit to the broader campus, outside of athletics. For example, having clear procedures about critical incidents would be helpful for incidents that involve non-student-athletes. She described her own situation with field trips concerns and the need for her to develop policies to address the potential for critical incidents. She stated that this is a good starting point for further discussions, and stated that a strong institution can only make itself better by having an honest assessment of its own functioning.

Hall stated that the fee issue is troubling to him, as he hears complaints about this frequently from his graduate students, Peoria students, and online students. Those students will not benefit from the athletics fees, and Hall feels it is inappropriate to use online fees to help fund athletics. He stated that a good next step would be for the Senate to endorse the recommendations of this report and there would be a need to establish a process to revisit this issue.

Martin stated that he wished to address both the more general involvement of Student Affairs in this with regard to how they protect the health and welfare of our students and the extent to which they are a part of the appeals or student aid processes. Also of concern is the financial aspect of Athletics detailed in committee's report. He feels this should be a useful starting point to make sure everyone is aware of the financial situation and the costs involved therein. He encouraged the administration to see this as an opportunity to come forward with updated information that considers current budget realities.

Ting invited Berman to share his thoughts and Martin moved to invite Barnett to have a seat at the table for the purposes of the current discussion. There were no objections and that motion was approved.

Berman stated that he appreciated being invited to comment. There are four things he wished to speak to immediately. He wants to comment on the process, the function of athletics, the budget issues, and the future. With regard to the process, he noted that it was highly significant that the

committee and Senate agreed to incorporate the administration's response in the final report. The lack thereof was a source of concern in the 2004 report. He appreciated that as a great precedent.

The committee has made recommendations, and the administration is taking those recommendations seriously. Berman recognizes that there are concerns about implementation of the recommendations, and the ones that the administration has already agreed to are the ones they intend to report back on by the end of academic year. The recommendations that need further discussion are of two types: some touch on a multitude of offices across campus and so many people need to confer about a response; the other recommendations that need further discussion are those for which there is some question with regard to whom administration should be talking. At present there is no IAC and so it is unclear to whom they should turn.

With regard to the financial issues, from where he sits as a Provost there is a two-fold function to the investment in athletics: marketing/recruitment and student life. He views money spent on Athletics as an investment. The thought of losing money on athletics or even breaking even is not the right way of thinking – we do not make money on Student Affairs, but we still invest money in it.

Regarding the size of the budget, he appreciated the committee's analysis and that there should be a discussion about how large we want the athletics budget to be. Speaking specifically to the student fees, it was not mentioned here that the students themselves voted in favor of those fees. The students have thus provided considerable support for Athletics of their own volition. With regard to state funding size as appropriate, there are a variety of things we invest state dollars in aside from instruction. We might wish to compare Athletics to some of those things on a recurring basis, such as our investments in WUIS, Illinois Issues, Sangamon Auditorium, and Athletics. Athletics is not unique, and he would argue that Athletics is closer to the student experience than those other things, although those other investments are also highly valued.

The committee has provided a model that the administration should pay a lot of attention to. They brought in some empirical studies and he stated that they need to take a clear-eyed look at those data. Another source of empirical information can come from our peers in the GLVC and in COPLAC. That kind of data can also be brought to bear in the future and it would be his intention to do so. He endorses the idea of using empirical information for making decisions.

Barnett stated that he was also very impressed with the report and appreciated the opportunity to comment. For him, the purpose of athletics is to contribute to the student experience. Athletics is an important part of the lives of student athletes and allows for non-classroom competition and competition against other schools. The majority of our students will never go on to professional sports, but athletics remains an important part of their lives, including at the intramural level. Athletics does also help to provide recognition for the institution. We are very new to Division II athletics. He provided an example from his experience at UAF of how recruitment can be influenced by athletics events. With regard to the process he agreed that processes should be clear and followed. One of the recommendations in the report was for Student Affairs to create a database on campus infractions for all students, with which he agreed.

Barnett added that there is a need for students to have a place to go with concerns, and that in his view is the role of the FAR. If students do not know that then we need to make that clearer to them. The IACs he has participated in previously serve a critical role for the institution. There needs to be trust between IAC and Athletics for both to be successful. It is most important for students to feel that the university as a whole is looking out for them.

Eisenhart asked about Athletics staying directly under the Chancellor, and if there was any discussion about having it moved back under Student Affairs. Ting stated that at one point the Chancellor said he would like to give it back to Student Affairs, but that it would be an open question for the new leadership. Eisenhart also stated that it is a primary Senate concern that, in this time of incredible state fiscal chaos, we are using GRF money of about \$500,000 for athletics while we are cutting money for instructional purposes. In her opinion, athletics should not be the golden child and we should consider the wisdom of having their budget grow to \$2m in the next few years.

Ting stated that we still have new business to conduct and expressed the desire to continue this discussion at our next Senate meeting. Fisher asked to mention, before we conclude this discussion, that we do in fact have an IAC. She wished to clarify that the committee has been fully staffed all year and Williams was continuing as an acting chair early in the fall. The issue of the chair came up later in the semester.

Martin stated that to cut off debate we need to have a motion to do so, he opposed doing so. A motion must be offered and a vote taken. Ting stated that she does absolutely wish to continue the discussion at the next meeting, but we have new business she wishes to address today. Bogle offered a motion to table the present discussion for continuation at the next meeting, and that was seconded by Hall. The motion carried with a 14-2 vote.

Eisenhart noted that it is 12:30 and suggested that we adjourn. A motion to table the first readings of new business was offered by Salela and seconded by Eisenhart. The motion was approved by voice vote with one objection.

**Adjournment:**

A motion to adjourn was offered by Bogle and seconded by Casinova. The motion was approved with one objection and the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 pm.

