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

Approval of the day’s agenda
The meeting was called to order at 10:00. Bogle moved to approve the agenda for January 28, 2011. Li seconded the motion.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of December 3, 2010
Ting called for a motion to approve the minutes from December 3, 2010. A motion was made by Salela and seconded by Casinova. Schuldt stated that he should be listed as absent from the meeting, but was not listed as either present or absent. Additionally, he stated that APAC sent Amanda Winters as an observer. Ting asserted that Winters was listed on the minutes as present at the meeting. Fisher noticed needed name corrections on line 240, Sheila Stocks-Smith had been incorrectly spelled as Stuck-Smith. On Line 490, Lynne Price’s first name was missing an “e” at the end of Lynne. Referring to line 241, Fisher suggested that Jamie Kruger’s name included an extra “e” in Kru(e)ger. Jamison corrected the spelling of Czamy on line 240 to include an “rn.” The corrected spelling is Czarny. Sisneros asked whether lines 397-399 on page 10 was a complete report of what had been stated by Provost Berman at the meeting. Thompson stated that when numbers are presented she includes them in the minutes; however, she would listen to the tape to ensure that no information had been left out. Jamison asked that BOT be
capitalized on line 81. Martin suggested this may be stylistic. Jamison requested a space be included between with and I on line 107. Ting thanked the senators for a close reading of the minutes and called for acceptance with suggested corrections and modifications. Senators voted unanimously to accept the minutes. **Announcements**

None

**Reports**

**Chair – T. Ting**

Ting welcomed the senators back for the spring 2011 semester. She reminded everyone that the Grande Marshall election will close at 4:00 pm on Tuesday February 1, 2011.

Chair Ting provided an update for the ODS Director search. In the fall, Ting reported that Student Affairs would be conducting a search with the hope of having a new director in place at the beginning of the next academic year. VCSA Barnett asked for recommendations for 2 faculty representatives serving on the search committee. Shuang-Yueh Pui, Assistant Professor of Psychology, agreed to serve on the committee. One of her areas of research expertise concerns the impact of ADA on organizations. Kate Sheridan, Assistant Professor of Social Work, also agreed to serve. Sheridan also has extensive ADA experience. Ting asserted that the search is already in process. Casinova asked if there is a student member on the ODS search committee. Ting reminded senators that the committee was created because of problems and issues with one person, who is no longer at UIS. The SEC has discussed the need for CARR to remain as a standing senate committee. While CARR was working to identify issues of concern related to advising, recruitment and retention, they were not able to follow-up with the concerns. The SEC, in discussion with VCSA Barnett who is also in charge of enrollment management, concluded that Barnett will present a report to the senate every semester regarding enrollment management. Senators and faculty can raise concerns and ask questions at that time. VCSA Barnett also has an advisory committee which includes deans and chairs. Ting told senators that they will be seeing a resolution to call for the dissolution of CARR. When the resolution appears, a debate or discussion can take place on the senate floor. Again, Ting asserted that the decision to bring about the resolution was based on the feedback from meeting with CARR committee members and conversations with VCSA Barnett.

Ting thanked Yoder, Faculty Athletic Representative, for sending out an email the previous day regarding the student athlete and faculty recognition event on February 5, 2011. The event will take place at half-time. Student athletes who are on the athletic director’s honor role will be recognized, along with a faculty member who has had a tremendous positive impact on each student. Ting stated that she will try to be there to congratulate students and colleagues and encouraged everyone to come and support the students and colleagues. Yoder said he worked closely with athletics to plan the event.
According to Ting, the Illinois Times published an article entitled, *Not Ready for the Big Time*. While she reacted to the title, Ting believed that the article itself was more balanced. Ting wanted to share a quote from Interim Chancellor Berman which stated, “So much depends on a mutual sense of trust that I think we have developed now on the basis of the administration having really been forthcoming with communication with its leaders. … That takes you a long way,” Berman says. “Whatever was, was. What about right now?” Ting seconded Berman’s sentiment. She continued by stating that we have been trying to move forward and is glad to read about the importance of having mutual trust because distrust creates barriers and impediments. Ting doesn’t know how many people in the community actually read the article, but hoped that they didn’t stop at the headline. Ting wished that all faculty could attend the board meetings to get a sense of how well UIS is thought of by the BOT and President Hogan. She asserted that athletics does not define what we do at UIS as a whole. Ting believes that the BOT and the President see UIS as a gem, albeit small, of the U of I with great potential.

Lastly, Ting reminded senators that she sent out email to the campus community on Monday, January 24 at 1:02 p.m. to bring attention to campus community about the upcoming senate reports by Interim Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the Faculty Athletic Representative. Approximately 2 hours later, at 3:16 p.m., Ting received an email from Mr. Bruce Rushton, from the SJR. Ting said that she does not know Mr. Rushton or what he looks like. Quoting from the email Ting read, “Hello Ms. Ting, I would like to speak with you regarding the upcoming faculty senate meeting. It is my understanding that matter of UIS response to a FOIA request by the SJR will be discussed with/by Lynn Pardie. Could you please call me at …” Ting did call Mr. Rushton and he asked about the meeting and location. He also asked other questions. Ting stated that he may be in the audience and wanted senators to know that she did receive such a request.

Fisher asked for update on Chancellor’s Search. Ting said that due to the confidentiality of the search process, all she could say at the moment is that the search is moving along very well. Regarding the proposed suspension of CARR, Garmil wished to emphasize to the SEC that faculty plays a strong role in retention. Ting agreed with Garmil and suggested that when concerns arise, an issue-oriented task force might better address problems. According to Ting, CARR did well to identify concerns but did not address problems, which was also required of the committee.

Ting called on Hayler and reminded audience members the importance of introducing themselves. Additionally, Ting stated that sometimes there is not time to open discussion to include audience members. Hayler, Professor Emeritus of Criminal Justice, pointed out that every senate meeting is open to the public and that senate minutes are public record. Hayler stated that she was surprised that such a big deal was made about a reporter possibly being present. She hoped that no one would censor discussion as a result of having reporters or others present at the meeting. Ting said that she did tell Rushton that senate meetings are public meetings and wanted to let the senators know. Sisneros asked for clarification regarding Robert’s Rules of Order. Based on his understanding of the
procedures, any senator has the right to yield time to someone in the audience. Sisneros referred to a Spring 09 senate meeting where a student senator was recognized by the senate chair and yielded to someone in the audience. Sisneros wanted to bring this to the attention of the senators and also ensure that this was the understanding of the senate chair. Ting stated that she would defer to the parliamentarian. Helton said this sounded correct to her; however, she noted that the time allotted on the floor is finite. Sisneros agreed. He wanted senators to understand that they do have a right to yield time to audience members. Ting said she appreciated the point made by Sisneros.

**Provost – L. Pardie**

Pardie welcomed everyone back. She began her report by discussing faculty mentoring of student research at the undergraduate and graduate level. Pardie stated that the type of mentoring in student research that happens at UIS is part of what makes us a unique institution. We have students who present their research at regional and national conferences. Currently, there is a push at all institutions to increase the amount of mentoring that happens especially at the undergraduate level. We have a strong foundation including the Annual Science Symposium, which continues to grow. Last year we had our first Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Symposium which included work from both students and faculty members. In the fall, we were included in COPLAC and they filed a proposal through the council of undergraduate research for an NSF grant to provide funding for us to promote undergraduate research. Pardie was proud to announce that COPCAC was successful at getting the grant. Four faculty from UIS will be participating in the initiative and will be meeting with other institutions to brainstorm ideas and bring back creative strategies to deepen and broaden undergraduate research at our campus. Pardie stated that there was a short amount of time to select the faculty to participate. The four “core team” of faculty are: Rebecca L. Landsberg, Assistant Professor of Biology; Hei-Chi Chan, Associate Professor of Mathematical Science; Dennis Ruez, Assistant Professor of Environmental Sciences; and Carrie Switzer, Associate Professor of Psychology. According to Pardie, the COPLAC grant focused specifically on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. We are interested in much more broadly on our campus. More UIS faculty will be asked to participate in a research oriented campus group to take ideas brought back from the core team and deepen our involvement in undergraduate research. Pardie thanked the faculty who will be leading the initiative.

Discussing current headcount data, Pardie stated that official census data for Spring 11 will be available next week. Currently, it appears that undergraduate headcount is up by 1.7% over last spring. Graduate headcount will be comparable, but the FTE will be up for both graduate and undergraduate. We continue to work on transfer applications and admissions and enrollments. VC Barnett and Chancellor Berman have been working on articulation agreements with Community Colleges to help support our efforts. In the spirit of retention, Pardie reminded faculty teaching courses where midterm grades are required (09, 100, and 200 level courses) to submit midterm grades in timely fashion. The midterm grading deadline is noon on Wednesday March 16th. This is during spring break, which is a challenging time. The timing is about the academic calendar. Timely midterm grades are necessary to get an accurate assessment. When we accurately assess and report
midterm grades, this dramatically improves the probability of student success. Pardie emphasized that the midterm grading process is part of the heart of teaching to ensure that faculty are getting feedback to students and providing necessary guidance.

Pardie stated that she had been asked by the SEC to speak to the FOIA request. She believed that the concern of SEC was that UIS acted in a timely and cooperative fashion in response to the State Journal’s FOIA request filed in relation to events in 2009. Before providing information, Pardie stated that her comments would be limited because of the active FOIA request. Pardie suspected that fewer questions exist within the university than perhaps outside of the campus community because most of us understand that at the heart of the matter is a catch-22 between the requirements of FERPA (federal law which protects students’ right to privacy) and FOIA (newer state law that mandates public access to certain types of records). Each law presents its own set of intricacies and is incredibly complex. Each law has its own intricacies and within a university context, the conflicts of the two laws are very real. Most within the university understand this because we deal with FERPA regularly. Faculty and staff who deal with confidential information go through FERPA training before given access to information. Sometimes, even in our own work, it is not always easy to sort through the nuances. We are fortunate to have both a FERPA officer and a FOIA officer on our campus to assist in this process. Officers serve as consults and guides as issues arise and they in turn consult with campus legal counsel when complicated and competing issues emerge. Those officers have been involved in responding to the SJR’s FOIA request. Pardie asserted that the FOIA law is new and an oversight process is associated with it. The Attorney General’s office has public access counselors to help sort through issues. Very appropriately, the university has worked in conjunction with a public access counselor to help sort through competing requirements of FERPA and FOIA in dealing with the matter. Clarifying information that may not have been clear in the SJR coverage, Pardie asserted that the university’s cooperation included working with the Attorney General’s office to invite a friendly subpoena. This happened because the university was caught between the requirements of FERPA and FOIA. Pardie stated that the university was trying to comply simultaneously with both laws. As a lay person, Pardie stated that she would not think of the terms friendly and subpoena as being compatible, but this is indeed what has happened.

According to Pardie, numerous communications occurred between the university and public access counselors to resolve the issue. Every deadline required by law was met by the university in response to requests. Sharing her opinion, Pardie stated that the university has acted in an appropriately cooperative manner in the process.

Ting asked Pardie to talk about the continuing education. Pardie asked whether senators know about continuing education online. Ting asked Siddiquee if his question was about continuing education. Siddiquee had a question about the report just given. He said that he thinks everyone understands the importance of protecting the privacy of students. However, the questions are about the apparent protection of privacy of the coaches, not that of the students. Furthermore, Siddiquee referred to the article which stated that a student was given monetary compensation and asked whether compensation was also paid to others in dollar or in kind. Pardie reiterated that she was not going to speak to specifics because of the pending FOIA request. Pardie asserted that the university has
administrators who have responsibilities and clearly specified regulations regarding employment which begin with the search process and extend to hiring practices and evaluative procedures. The university has policies and procedures that must be followed. Furthermore, Pardie stated that there are university guidelines in place that we all have to abide by. In regard to the settlement, Pardie reminded senators that the university also has procedures in place for dealing with claims against the university. From Pardie’s perspective, the settlement being questioned was handled in accordance with those procedures. This included multiple administrative offices at different levels of the institution. Addressing Siddiquee’s question, Martin pointed out that when a payment is made from the university self insurance fund, it requires a motion by the BOT under normal role call agenda so that any payments made are publicly listed there. We are assured to that extent, according to Martin.

Sisneros stated that he understands the catch-22 mentioned by Pardie in terms of the settlement. He asked whether something is preventing or precluding the institution from notifying the community about the settlement before the news appears in the papers. He said this is an issue of transparency. Given the intensity, ramifications, consequences and implications of the matter at hand, Sisneros found the news shocking. He continued by stating that we all want to trust each other; however, trust is very difficult to have when we learn such information from external sources. Was there something precluding the institution from informing us? Secondly, Sisneros noted how significant $200 thousand dollars is in the current economic climate. We have enough challenge within the institution without the press we are getting about the settlement or the recent editorial or the next issue about vandalism.

Pardie shared in Sisneros’s distress related to the recent press coverage. While she did not want to speak for everyone, she stated that many feel a personal identification with the university. Pardie talked about how she did not plan to stay at UIS for 20 years. She is a Licensed Clinical Psychologist. Her initial plan was to come to then SSU, teach for a year while finishing her dissertation and move on to another institution. During that year, she fell in love with teaching and this campus. It is difficult to see anything that casts questions regarding the integrity of the university, students, or fellow colleagues. Those things happen. She suggested that we surely are not so provincial to think that we are the only institution where things occur. Things occur on other campuses as well. To some extent, prior to moving forward and doing the new kinds of things we are doing we may have been a sleepy campus and these things weren’t going to attract attention. Now they do. Pardie continued by stating that hopefully this won’t overshadow what happens day-in and day-out on this campus. She hoped that this kind of thing does not call into question the fine student athletes that we have or raise questions about the best interest that coaches have for the welfare of students or faculty. One incident should not be allowed to overshadow all of the wonderful things that occur here. Furthermore, Pardie stated that for all of the potential misunderstanding from the recent publicity, she does not hear a lot of negative feedback. With regard to settlements, Pardie asserted that claims occur all the time. Referring to Martin’s comments, Pardie said that there are many claims against the University that occur every year. Pardie stated this is not any different than what happens at other universities. She reiterated the importance of trust.
Overall, Pardie believes that the vast majority of faculty, administrators and coaches act in the best interest of the students, and behave in accordance with established policies and procedures.

Ting shared that three senators serve on the University Senates Conference. Currently, Eishenhart, Martin, and Ting serve. Serving on USC has taught us how overall U of I operates. Through work on the USC, attendance at the BOT meetings, and work on BOT subcommittees, Ting has learned about the “nitty gritty” of how the university functions.

Ting wanted to bring to the attention of senators that the U of I, and many higher education institutions, have multimillion dollar pot of money called the self insurance fund. This fund allows the university to address multiple issues like medical operations when colleges of medicine get sued, workers compensation, general or public liability. The endowment is principled and addresses a variety of different kinds of claims. Last year, we had furloughs because of the problem with cash flow. Ting asked Eisenhart and Martin to confirm a visit by VP Knorr to USC last year who said that we have other cash such as the self insurance fund, but the University does not want to touch this pot because that is the money that is used to address different claims. Ting asserted that money for claims comes from the University level and is not part of the Springfield campus budget.

Fisher stated that she wanted to follow-up on the question raised by Sisneros. She recalled the outcry by faculty that emerged over email during the spring 09 incident. The plea was for information regarding the nature of the problem. This led to the appointment of the investigating committee. Fisher believed that everyone understood that if a report was given on the events, it might be necessarily limited because of the need to protect students and the need to be confidential in the early stages of personnel matters. Fisher agreed with Sisneros, that in the face of an unusual incident where a direct request for access to information existed it would be useful to have bare information. She asked if something precluding administration from sharing 3 specific points: (1) there was a problem; (2) here is how we are going to handle it; and (3) here is how we are going to try to make sure that this kind of thing doesn’t happen again. Pardie appreciated the sentiments raised by Fisher. Given the small size of our campus, Pardie said we are susceptible to rumors. She suggested that it is not that simple which is why we have people whose work responsibilities involve sorting out these matters. They are very complex issues and this is where the trust comes in. Pardie stated that she understands that this may not be a very satisfying response but has no reason to believe that the people charged with making those decisions are not doing so in the best interest of the institution.

Borland also expressed concerns related to information about the $200 thousand dollar settlement being released through the SJR. As a senator, and representative of the university, she expressed frustration with the lack of information. According to Borland, it is embarrassing when someone outside of the campus approaches her in her capacity as a leader about information in a newspaper article. She believed something as simple as an email stating simply that the settlement has been made would be useful. Garmil said this is also comparable to the email sent by the Chancellor about the FOIA request. Siddiquee clarified that his prior question was not about where money is coming from but about
transparency. Ting, speaking for herself, said that she does not share the frustration expressed by others regarding the settlement. She continued by stressing that faculty need to think about our role which is part of the governance structure. Faculty governance is one part of structure; faculty shouldn’t expect to be at the center of every matter. She said that she understands the frustration comes from a love of the campus and colleagues don’t want to see people being disadvantaged or harmed. Ting encouraged faculty to think about normal administrative procedures to resolve or get to the bottom of similar issues on the campus. She suggested that faculty need to be more patient. However, Ting agreed that if for nothing else, a heads-up to campus community from the administration stating something like, we really regret that such a thing has happened and we are doing our very best to resolve it, would be much appreciated. She asserted that this type of communication would be appropriate. Demanding specifics at that time, according to Ting, is not appropriate. Speaking to Pardie, Sisneros stated that she, Chancellor Berman, and the institution have his empathy. He continued by stating he continues to be ambivalent particularly given the email sent that morning by President Hogan and Interim Chancellor Berman regarding the fall vandalism incident stating “we do all we can” (note: the email said “we do all that we can to address the situation and help those who are victimized”). Providing more information is necessary to nip matters in the bud so we don’t have issues continue to resurface. Pardie appreciated the comments made by Sisneros. In response to the email sent by President Hogan, Pardie reiterated that we are a small institution and we are doing new and different things, both positive and not so positive effects emerge. She urged senators to understand that this is part of the growth process as an institution. Pardie continued by stating that just as we urge students to apply critical thinking skills to new areas of their lives, so must we. She challenged senators to be very cautious of staying away from making spurious associations between isolated things that have come up. Ting announced that it was 11:00 a.m. and we need to move on to other agenda items.

Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen
Van Vossen stated that the SGA Vice President and the co-chair of the governmental affairs committee graduated at the end of the fall semester. Part of his duties was leading the lobbying efforts. Van Vossen appointed Ballard to this position, which means he is no longer parliamentarian. Currently, the SGA is in the process of searching for a parliamentarian. Another vacancy occurred because the freshman senator transferred to another university. SGA is considering a resolution on the Dream Act, even though this failed on a national level. Because the SGA believes the act is symbolic of what this university wants to accomplish, the SGA thinks it is important to consider.

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs – T. Barnett
Barnett referred senators to the email that had gone out this morning from President Hogan and Chancellor Berman. In December right before the holidays, an incident occurred in a residence hall. Graffiti was written on the marker boards which hang on the residence doors. The issue was addressed very quickly by the student affairs staff. The alleged perpetrators were identified, and addressed the next day. Several meetings took place with Student Affairs Administrators, including housing, the LGBTQ resource
office, and the diversity center. Barnett believed the issue was addressed in a quick and efficient manner.

According to Barnett, several boards were vandalized. Counseling and services were made available for victims. One student was offended much more than other students by the anti-Semitic marks made on her board. Student Affairs, housing, and VC Barnett met with the student to help her deal with her final exams. According to Barnett, the disciplinary process is still ongoing. As a result, he could not speak to that aspect of the incident. Barnett asked senators to trust Student Affairs to deal with the matter. Barnett stated that a number of issues occur in residence halls and that residence hall staff are trained to deal with most issues. Occasionally, an issue will rise to a greater level of concern which is when the Dean of Students and VC Barnett get involved.

Korte disseminated a document outlining how Student Affairs handle various issues that come up on campus. Barnett asserted that Student Affairs division, staff, or faculty do not tolerate such comments or remarks. He asked that if faculty see or hear questionable material that they contact Korte, or Barnett. He said that SA will not send out an email regarding every incident that occurs because they are dealing with the victim(s) and students involved. However, Barnett is happy to answer particular questions when possible.

Referring to the Campus Incident Response outline provide by Korte, Barnett said that when an incident occurs the people who respond can include housing, the Dean of Students, Campus Police, AEO (Access and Equal Opportunity Office) and the VCSA. In regard to the recent incident, Barnett said housing responded first. VCSA Barnett was informed the following day. Consultation/briefing with various entities occurs, depending on type of incident. Barnett reiterated that each is different. Next is the discipline process. Once the housing staff has responded, the police are contacted when necessary. Staff will conduct a review and meet with the individuals involved. If it is determined that further action is required, the Dean of Students Office is contacted. He will make decisions about how to move forward. If the offense rises to the level of a University discipline response, a discipline committee comprised of faculty, staff, and students selected by the senate are given relevant information to make a further determination. If the executive panel determines that sanctions are in order, a hearing panel is formed. It is the hearing panel that determines the sanctions. The list of possible sanctions ranges from probation to expulsion. According to Barnett, our procedures are not different from other institutions.

Lastly, Barnett asserted that housing responded in an appropriate way to the incident. Housing sent out a letter to all residents of Founders Hall stating that we have a non-tolerance policy regarding bigoted comments. A meeting for anyone who wanted to come and talk about the incident was held, although those who came wanted to talk about other housing issues. Barnett highlighted other forums designed to target such behavior. For example, the tunnel of oppression, sponsored by the Diversity Center will deal with issues related to bigotry, and violence will be discussed. Barnett emphasized the importance of educating every new group of students. Things that they do many times
can be hurtful and they may not understand how hurtful. We are trying to address these concerns.

Ting thanked Barnett for his report. She stated that the incident occurred at the end of last semester. It was well after the last senate meeting. Ting, as senate chair, asserted that Barnett was very proactive in his handling of the incident. She stated that Barnett called Ting to meet about the incident and the procedures. Ting shared the information with Helton. But due to the timing everyone was wrapping up the semester, Ting asked Barnett to prepare a report for the campus senate about how student affairs addressed the issue. From her perspective the incident was very unfortunate; Ting thought this was a prank gone awry. She supported the notion of turning this incident into an educational opportunity for students who live in the living-learning community. She asserted that it is important to educate students about how their actions can have tremendous consequences. Based on what has been briefed and shared with the SEC, Ting believed this is what Student Affairs and Academic Affairs strove to accomplish. Many boards were written on. Student Affairs reached out to students who felt offended, according to Ting.

Siddiquee asked for clarification about the composition of the executive panel. Barnett referred to Korte who pointed to the student code and rights policy. Korte stated that the link can be found on the Student Affairs webpage. The panel consists of 4 faculty, 4 staff, and 4 students. Three of those, 1 faculty, 1 staff, and 1 student are selected to serve as an executive board every year. The board receives disciplinary charges, reviews disciplinary charges, and determines appropriate actions to be taken. They make recommendations or form hearing panel from other members. Ting said this is a senate process. There is a standing senate committee on student discipline. Kline asked where in the process we are with this specifically. Per his understanding housing is the first level, and if severe enough it will move to the campus discipline. Barnett said that it is with the executive committee. Speaking as Faculty Advisor for the Jewish Student Organization, Garmil wished to thank Barnett for the responsiveness in addressing the issue and the senate. Garmil said he was aware of some conversation that was happening online with students and agreed with the importance of education, which should be a priority. Barnett stated that once a residence director was made aware of some facebook postings regarding the incident, the RD confronted the individuals involved.

Sisneros expressed his respect for the professionalism and responsiveness of Student Affairs. He noted his confusion regarding the varying language of the email which used words ranging from deplorable to offensive to a prank. Sisneros asked if it is possible to inform the community about the sanction without being premature about the process. He asserted that if we believe we can get away with it, we are going to do it. If there are sanctions, it may encourage the community to engage in a more respectful manner. Ting asked Sisneros about his thoughts about the message sent from Hogan and Berman. She asked him if this clarifies the expectation. Sisneros stated that it does not because it says that “we do all we can.” At this time, Sisneros requested to yield his time to Hayler. Ting asked if it was related to the current topic of discussion. She stated that Sisneros had
already used his time. Hayler stated that her comments were in relation to the Provost’s comments.

Ting recognized Martin. Martin asserted that it is an academically debatable point as to whether sanctions offer deterrence. Barnett again assured senators that Student Affairs will address things. He encouraged everyone to contact himself, Korte, or Ringle with issues or concerns. Ting said that 10% of faculty serve as senators so it’s not difficult to reach out to our respective colleagues, and encouraged everyone to take the invitation to heart instead of jumping to the conclusions. She thanked Ringle for his work.

**FAR Report – M. Yoder**

Yoder stated that his report has two parts. The first concerns the academic preparation for incoming students comparing athletes to non-athletes. He looked at ACT scores, high school class rank, and high school GPA of incoming students. Yoder stated that for fall 2010, no meaningful difference exists between athletes and non-athletes. He based this on an analysis of effect size, which allows for comparison between two groups while accounting for natural variability that exists within groups. Yoder said there is a brief tutorial in the report if interested. Effect sizes can be interpreted as follows: if the effect size is 0, the groups are the same. If the effect size is negative, the athletes are below the non-athletes. Conversely, if the effect size is positive, the athletes are above the non-athletes on the 3 admission criteria. Looking at the Fall 10 numbers in a historical context, located at the bottom of page 2, for 2010 the ACT scores, class rank, and GPA are 0 or very close to 0. He dissuaded senators from assigning meaning to -.08 and -.09. Because the numbers are so close to 0, Yoder did not believe they are meaningful.

Referring to the numbers in table 2, they can be viewed in two different ways. In isolation, there is no difference for the 2010 numbers. If looked at from a historical perspective, more positive numbers can be seen in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 than in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. He does not see this as a concern at this time because of the fluctuation of the numbers from year to year. They are what they are for the fall and a variety of influences factor into the numbers. He encouraged senators to not read too much into the data. The second reason he believed the numbers for fall 2010 is that the numbers for the two groups are the same. Yoder said that he is satisfied with these numbers.

Talking about the second part of the report, Yoder looked at students’ categorization in school in terms of 1st year students, continuing students, and transfer students, comparing athletes to non-athletes. Yoder stated that this is not what he typically reports to the senate; however, an issue regarding an area of potential concern regarding student recruitment and student athlete recruitment was discussed in a meeting with athletics, Berman, Moranski and Yoder. Some of the data are presented in table 3. Yoder pointed out a mistake in the footnote which stated that athletes had been removed from the numbers. Athletes have not been removed from the data. Yoder will submit a revised report correcting that mistake. Based on his interpretation of the numbers, if student athletes are removed, the general conclusions are the same.
Table 3 provides data regarding 1st year, transferring, and continuing students compared to the student body. Generally speaking, there are about 12 or 13 non-athletes to every 1 athlete. If athletes were in the same proportion as non-athletes, he would expect the ratios to be right around 12:1 or 13:1. The only number that is close to that is for transfer students. For 1st year students, there are fewer non-athletes to athletes. Among 1st year students athletes tend to be over-represented. If looking at continuing students, the ratio is about 21:1. We would expect it to be about 12:1 or 13:1 which means there are more non-athlete students to athletes when looking at continuing students. Another way to look at the data is to look at how students clump within the general student body and within student-athletes. Figure 1 shows that about 13% 1st year, 19% transfer, and 66% continuing students. If one were to remove the athletes from the data, the number would change by about 1%. Yoder stated that the mistake in table 3 was solely his fault and not the fault of anyone from institutional research, athletics, or administration. Figure 2, student-athletes shows 38% 1st year, 21% transfer, and 40% continuing students. If Figure 1 and Figure 2 are compared differences can be seen. Table 3 represents one way to understand the data, using Figures 1 and 2 together is another way. Both demonstrate the same thing. Yoder stated that this fall the baseball team is being filled for the first time. The athletes on the baseball team are overwhelmingly 1st year students. Yoder’s opinion of the “over-recruitment” in presented in the report.

Ting asked Yoder for the bottom line of his report. Yoder stated that bottom line, there is no difference between incoming students. Furthermore, we are not over-recruiting transfer students. If the data look somewhat skewed, it is because of the high number of 1st year students in baseball. Yoder believed this is overall very positive. Siddiquee thanked Yoder for his report and agreed that the trend is not there because of the short amount of time the data has been collected. He continued by stating that generally it’s in the convergence of both groups coming together. Siddiquee asked if the data is comparable with other universities and whether UIS is similar to other campuses. Yoder stated he does not have that data because it is not required data. GLVC schools abide by standards which require equitable admissions standards. The GLVC is known for having a strong academic focus. Yoder is unaware as to how UIS compares to other schools. Martin thanked Yoder for giving the numbers and encouraged him to continue collecting data. Martin agreed with Siddiquee about the difficulty in determining based on the length of data collection. Ting thanked Yoder for his report.

BOT Report – C. Switzer

Switzer stated that she was the official UIS observer for the January BOT meeting. According to Switzer, the big news coming from the meeting is about the new Trustees. At the end of 2010, 3 appointments were ending. These included appointments held by Karen Hasara, Carlos Tortolero, and Frances Carroll. Governor Quinn reappointed Karen Hasara, former Mayor of Springfield. Ms. Hasara earned bachelor’s degree in psychology and master’s degree in legal studies from UIS. The new trustees are Ricardo Estrada and Patricia Brown Holmes. Mr. Estrada is the Executive Director of Erie Neighborhood House and President/CEO of Erie Elementary Charter School in Chicago. He earned an MBA from UIC. Ms. Patricia Brown Holmes is a former federal prosecutor and state court judge. She earned a bachelor’s and law degree from the UIUC campus. Also at the January meeting,
the BOT elected the Chair and members of the Executive Committee. Trustee Kennedy was re-elected as chair, and Trustees Strobel and McMillan were re-elected to serve on the Executive Committee. This means that the same Executive Committee will exist as last year.

Many reports and presentations were given. All are outlined in the report provided by Switzer. Some highlights include a presentation made by Maryman about the state of the State budget. He pointed out that even with increases in tax, a large structural deficit will exist for the fiscal year 2012. One of many resolutions that passed was the academic year tuition rate recommendations. Next fall, when Chancellors and the Presidents make recommendations to the BOT, recommendations need to be tied to the rate of inflation, increase or decrease in state funding, and the University’s ongoing cost reductions. This resolution passed.

Switzer said that at the end of the day there was a bit of controversy near the end of the meeting. One resolution that brought about discussion was resolution 10, calling for an increase in student fees for all 3 campuses. There was a call to vote on the resolution and Daniel Soso, UIUC Student Trustee, stated that he had received an executive order from the UIUC student government the night before regarding the item. Two fees in particular were of concern: (1) the Library/IT Assessment and (2) the Academic Facility Maintenance Assessment (AFMA). Of primary concern was the lack of consultation and discussion with the UIUC student leadership regarding the proposed increases. According to Switzer, some of the confusion emerged because rather than fees, the proposed increases are actually assessments that had been agreed upon five years prior. A major communication disconnect had occurred. There was discussion as to whether or not to table the resolution. Student Trustee Olivier represented UIS very well. Trustees decided to table those two fees, but voted on the rest of the resolution which passed. The potential student protest was thwarted with this decision. Ting clarified that only the UIUC portion was tabled until the next meeting. The fees for UIS and UIC passed.

Siddiquee asked for clarification about the stability of tuition rates at campuses. He was glad to hear that the BOT believes tuition should be tied to inflation and state appropriation. He continued by stating that the stability issue of inflation unknown. State appropriations are unknown. Tuition is set before we know what the state appropriation is going to be. Switzer said she was not fully prepared to answer the question, but would try. They are requesting a comparison to the most recent 4 year annual rate of inflation to get a stable idea. Right now, the BOT is trying to create some structure to the system. Acknowledging that we can’t have an exact and clear number, there can be more guidance as to the process, according to Switzer. Ting followed by stating that tuition is guaranteed for 4 years. The resolution is not so much about trying to predict state appropriation, but to factor the inflation piece into the discussion about tuition. The BOT wants to provide some more stability.

Martin stated that the BOT are savvy business people and are becoming savvy political operators as well. He believes that if the part about state support is included, that volleys the ball back to state support. It says to the legislature if you do something we will react. Kline said he heard that graduate student fees will now be assessed per credit. He asked if
someone could say more about that. Pardie stated that they are trying to be responsive to
feedback that has come from graduate faculty and graduate students about issues related
to student fees. She has been working with VCSA Barnett to develop models that would
reduce the graduate student fees. This will be a revenue neutral initiative. Approximately
75 percent of graduate students are part time. Martin said this had been discussed at the
campus level. A committee that counts beans investigated and demonstrated that many
students would pay less in fees. Boltuc asked whether Chancellor Berman is investigating
online student fees. He asserted that many students get lost that way. Pardie thanked
Boltuc for his comments and suggested they speak more after the senate meeting.

Referring to the BOT meeting, Ting said she, along with the rest of the faculty attending
the board meeting, was invited to a dinner the night before the BOT meeting. She was
invited to sit at the President’s table. She sat between the U of I Foundation President and
new Trustee Estrada. In conversation with Estrada, he expressed that he would like to
visit our campus because he has never been here. Ting also noted that Senator Jamison
will be the faculty observer for UIS at the next BOT meeting in March. Martin with be
the observer for the USC and Switzer will be the informal observer.

Old business

Resolution 40-15 Clarification of Personnel Review Schedule for Joint-Appointed
Faculty [2nd reading]

Van vossen moved to discuss the resolution. Kline seconded the motion. Ting stated that
Anthony was present to answer questions. Martin asked if any revisions occurred. Ting
stated that no changes had been made. Helton pointed to a typo on line 12. Ting stated
that Rutherford would correct the typo. Siddiquee, referring to the beginning of resolution
about non-departmental units, asked for clarification about what the term meant. Anthony
stated it was intended to include centers and institutes. Ting said she was not aware of
any faculty having appointments within student affairs. Boltuc said it is good that the
resolution is broad so that it could be inclusive. Siddiquee asked if the purpose is to cover
any appointments in the future. Ting asserted that resolution is talking about faculty
evaluation. Siddiquee argued that the definition of faculty is 50% appointment. Anthony
said she could not speak to that; however, the resolution was to address an issue related to
the review process. The purpose is to make sure that all reviews are happening at the
same time and that all information goes to the college level at the same time. If appointed
somewhere else the same principle would apply. The resolution passed unanimously.

New Business

None.

Ting called on Hayler. Hayler thanked Ting. She reported that she was the chair of the
senate’s committee to investigate athletics. Ting corrected Hayler regarding the standing
of the investigative committee stating that it was not a standing senate committee, rather
an ad hoc committee that was created by the senate for the purpose of conducting an
investigation. According to Hayler, one of the committee charges was to gather
information for senate, including where the relevant information regarding the events of
spring of 2009. Hayler believed that many senators may have wondered why there was a
dearth of information related to the settlement in the report. According to Hayler,
Ringeisen stated that the issue was resolved with resignation of the coaches. Through the investigation, information emerged regarding how some athletes were dissatisfied with the resolution. This information was reflected in the report. The Chancellor did not put investigative committee in a position to provide this information to the senate. Next, Hayler discussed an item related to student privacy. She asked how imposing a gag order promotes privacy. From Hayler’s perspective, this is disempowering the student from being able to make decisions. Pardie stated first that she is not an attorney. She stated that based on her understanding, confidentiality portions of settlements are standard and routine. She also encouraged everyone think about issues of language. According to Pardie, it behooves the campus community be thoughtful in our language. Using phrasing like “gag order” or “secrecy” this is a presumption. Pardie continued by emphasizing the usage of more neutral terms. She asked that we defer to the U of I attorneys who know the law. She encouraged that we be thoughtful about the presumptions we make. Ting told senators that the ad hoc committee’s work had been completed and is no longer active. As a university we are moving forward. Ting thanked Hayler for comments. Ting clarified that her comments were made from her personal view, which was not made clear. Hayler said that as the former chair of the former committee, she was sharing these opinions.

**Adjournment**

A motion was made by Siddiquee to adjourn. Martin seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:59 p.m.