
Senators Absent:  L. Bogle, L. Schoo, and K. Sheridan

Ex-Officio:  L. Pardie


The Senate was called to order at 10:02.

Approval of the day’s agenda
Martin made a motion to approve the agenda. Switzer seconded the motion.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting of February 25, 2011
Ting called for approval of the February 25, 2011 minutes and requested corrections, deletions, or modifications. Ballard made a motion which was seconded by Li. Martin noted the misspelling of Bohlen on line 158 which had been spelled as Bolen. Additionally, Martin asked that the word “to” be inserted on line 284 before “full-time.” Martin also requested that when referring to Calculus I and Calculus II on lines 435 and 431 the C should be capitalized and roman numerals utilized. Referring to line 74, Pardie stated that word “admits” was missing after “up considerably comma.” Martin also asked that the word “is” be added to line 442 in between MSP and thinking. A vote to accept the amended minutes was taken which yielded unanimous favor.

Announcements
Ting acknowledged those devastated by the tsunami and earthquake in Japan. Ting announced that Rutherford is on medical leave and Ousley will be assuming Rutherford’s duties until she can return to work. Eisenhart stated that Rutherford has had the surgery and asked senators to keep her in their thoughts and prayers. Although Salela was not
present at the previous meeting she wanted to correct information given by Garmil. She stated that the Library does not have a new Information Services Director, but a new Information Systems Director who does not have authority over purchasing. The new Library Systems Director is Jan Waterhouse.

Martin announced that a new Star Party season will begin the Friday after spring break and continue until the last Friday of April. He has posters for anyone who wants to post them. Borland reminded senators of the Good As Gold ceremony on April 12, 2011. She said that nominations are still being accepted for extraordinary volunteers. Nominees can be students, staff or community members. Everyone who is nominated is acknowledged at the ceremony. Wassenberg announced that the 3rd annual UIS Under the Dome event was held on Tuesday. High school sophomores and juniors were invited to the Capitol for tours, lectures on law making processes, and shadowing UIS alumni. This year, over 40 students and teachers came. UIS was able to offer continuing education for teachers who participated. Ting announced that the 3rd Midwest-Great Lakes Society for Ecological Restoration annual chapter meeting will be held at UIS on April 1st and 2nd. She also acknowledged the Social Sciences and Humanities Conference, UIS Science Symposium, and the UIS Honors Symposium all happening in April.

Reports
Chair – T. Ting
Ting reminded senators that the call for volunteers for Senate Committees ends at 5:00 P.M. today. She thanked everyone for their service and willingness to serve. The Undergraduate Advising Task Force sent out a faculty advising survey to undergraduate faculty. Because they want to include all of the data in the report that will come to the senate in April, they are hoping that all undergraduate faculty will complete the survey today. However, the survey will officially close on March 25th. Undergraduate Council has also sent out a survey to Chairs about the thinking regarding undergraduate level certificates. This survey will also close today. Additionally, the Campus Planning and Budget Committee closed their survey on Monday. Ting asked Siddiquee if the results would be part of the committee’s annual report to the senate. Siddiquee confirmed that the results will be included in the report.

Ting informed senators of the UIUC senate statement that was passed last week, regarding the roles of the campus and chancellor. The statement asked: are we one university or one university system? She referred to parts of the statement including the following excerpt: “The University of Illinois Statutes and General Rules are ambiguous about these questions. The crux of this ambiguity is found in the reference in the General Rules to the University’s “organic wholeness.” One interpretation of this phrase would stress the idea of wholeness, to support the idea of a unitary institution; another would stress the term “organic,” focusing on the idea of distinct constituent parts. Similarly, for some purposes leaders emphasize the separateness and distinctiveness of the three campuses; and at other times they refer to them as merely parts of a whole.”

Ting stated that senators can read the statement in its entirety which can be found on the UIUC senate website. At the same time the Urbana student senate also passed a resolution calling for the creation of a committee on shared governance. Quoting the resolution, Ting
read the following: "We hereby fundamentally reject the One University model, with the intransigent belief that adopting such will drastically diminish the value of our degrees...." According to Ting, Trustee Kennedy responded to the UIUC senate statement. In his letter, Kennedy wrote: "...You ask, "Are there three universities or one?" The Statutes, The General Rules, the Board and the senior leadership team are all in agreement that it is one University with three campuses, each with distinct missions...As any member of a large family knows, one can be unique without being separate. The Urbana-Champaign campus has a vice president/chancellor, but that does not indicate separateness. The vice president/chancellor of each campus reports to the president of the University of Illinois, who is president of each part of the University..." Ting said that she would forward the letter to the senators so that senators can also read Kennedy’s letter in its entirety.

Ting also informed senators of a PowerPoint presentation given by UIUC senate chair Tolliver which questions the consultation that has happened regarding restructuring and appointments of interim VP positions. The presentation can also be found on the UIUC senate website. There are at least a couple of errors or misrepresentations of facts in the slides. For example, the statement that persons for interim VPR and VPHA positions had already been selected by President Hogan before consulting with USC was not correct. The Executive Director of Human Resources has nothing to do with faculty reappointment, tenure, or promotion as the presentation suggested.

According to Ting, there are plenty of examples that the President has listened to us and acted on our concerns. They include: not combining the president and chancellor titles; not combining the provost/chancellorship; not removing the “provost” title for the vice chancellors for academic affairs; retaining the VP-Academic Affairs; changing the VP-Research, Technology, & Economic Development title to VP-Research; changing the statutory description of the VP-Research to ensure it described a facilitating role across campuses; changing the statutory description of the VP-Health Affairs to ensure it emphasized alignment of the clinical enterprise with the academic and research missions -- all of these adjustments were the result of consultations. In addition, just before President Hogan arrived, President Emeritus Ikenberry had obtained Board approval to combine the VP-TED and VPAA, and USC members expressed concern that this would diminish the academic mission and asked that it be re-considered, which President Hogan did. Ting stated that Urbana senate chair’s presentation also failed to recognize that the USC has a member on the ARR steering committee who has been engaged all along regarding implementation plans.

Martin agreed with the comments made by Ting as a member of the USC and the USC executive committee. Furthermore, Martin emphasized that statements made about the USC within the presentation do not represent the overall stance of the USC. Rather, some members of the USC hold particular views in support of the presentation. Martin shared significant concern that the UIUC senate is going to ask the BOT to take disciplinary action or seek dismissal of President Hogan. Martin believes this action may be predicated upon an assumption that the BOT is not aware of the President’s actions. According to Martin, this is not a well founded assumption. A public pursuit of this
action would be very unfortunate for all of us. He suggested that the senate and the SEC not get involved in the dispute.

Sisneros asked about Ting’s sense of the UIUC’s chair report. He wondered about her assertion that six new executive level positions have been created since December 6, 2010. Ting asserted that the only new position is the VP for Health Affairs. All of the others are an expansion of existing portfolios. In reference to the executive director positions, Ting stated that people have been doing these jobs all along. The title may be different and expanded, but the job is not entirely new. Sisneros asked if Ting and Martin believe that Tolliver is exaggerating relative to plans for centralization. Ting said yes. Martin stated that the presentation made at the UIUC senate was designed to reach a foregone conclusion and was not even-handed. Ting thinks the presentation is very troubling, such as misrepresenting the discussion during the USC executive session with the President. Another slide talked about the November USC meeting there is an indication that the HR position has something to do with making decisions regarding tenure and promotion. Ting asserted that Hogan outright denied this to be true. HR does not have anything to do with reappointment and promotion.

Siddiquee asked about the proposal to combine the chancellor and provost position. Ting stated President Emeritus Ikenberry first brought it to the attention of the chancellor’s search advisory committee that BOT was considering the idea. Siddiquee asked for clarification. Ting said she believed it was the chancellor’s position that would have been eliminated, not the provost’s position, because each campus needs an academic officer. Ting did reach out to President Hogan about this matter the minute he took the office. President Hogan responded positively by admitting that much was still new to him so he would need some time to reflect on Ting’s comments and to visit the chancellors and others as well. Martin highlighted this as an example of when consultation was sought and change occurred. Ting agreed with Martin’s comment. Responding to Siddiquee, Wassenberg said that this arose from a suggestion based on the structure of other two campuses. Both have very large staffs and the question was raised as to whether the chancellor position was necessary. Following up, Ting noted that some USC members from the other two campuses think that UIS is so small that we do not need a chancellor and a provost but Ting raised objection to that notion.

**Provost – L. Pardie**

Pardie told senators that Mooney, Political Sciences Professor, was named the first Honorable W. Russell Arrington Professor in State Politics within the IGPA. Mooney is a leading national expert in the field of state politics and policy. He was selected for the appointment from a group of highly esteemed candidates. Provost Pardie congratulated Mooney and believes this is a tremendous honor for Dr. Mooney, the Political Sciences Department, the College, and UIS.

Last week UIS hosted Greg Mortenson. Pardie was struck by the size of the crowd. Many community people attended and almost 2000 people were in attendance. The event highlighted the importance of compassion for others and the value of education held by people living in such poverty and war-torn regions.
Pardie congratulated UIS graduate James Anderson, who recently won the Midwest Association of Graduate Schools competition for the distinguished thesis award. This is the second time that a UIS graduate has won. According to Pardie, the competition is intensive. Only one thesis can be forwarded from approximately 60 member institutions. This year, approximately 39 theses were put forward for consideration. Anderson is a graduate of the Communication Department. Anderson’s thesis entitled *Laughter is Critical: An Analysis of the Sociopolitical Satire on The Daily Show with Jon Stewart and The Colbert Report Using the Propaganda Model as a Guide* was recognized at the Department level and also received the UIS Special Merit Award. Amy Kincaid was the chair of his project. Anderson and Kincaid will be attending the MAGS banquet where Anderson will be recognized and giving a presentation about his thesis.

On the topic of the budget, Pardie did not have any new information as the legislators have not yet solidified the budget. Currently, the state still owes the U of I approximately $500 million. March is the last month of the billing cycle.

Pardie presented the top budget priorities for Academic Affairs for the next year and beyond. This information was shared with APAC as well as the Campus Planning and Budget Committee who had requested information regarding the Provost’s top priorities. The three priorities include: (1) using existing resources effectively and responsively; (2) supporting a salary program if at all feasible; and (3) increasing enrollments.

Provost Pardie elaborated on the first priority. She said that maintaining the core academic functions of the university and to continue efforts to ensure that we are maximizing instructional resources is critical. This is already happening by the use of the guiding principles and metrics created last year by the Instructional Resource Management Task Force. Because of the tenuous state financial situation, it is imperative that we continue to use resources wisely. Even with the best case scenario of flat funding, adjustments for inflationary costs need to be made. Secondly, Provost Pardie asserted that implementing a salary program is high on the priority list if at all feasible. This is a priority for President Hogan and Chancellor Berman, who are very committed to bringing this to fruition. The third priority is related to the decrease in state appropriations. One way to offset declining state support is to increase enrollments. Also related are the Administrative Review and Restructuring initiatives to save money operationally. Pardie stated that we are going to need to do more. Talking about increase in tuition, Pardie stated that we need to be cautious not to rely on this as a form of sustainable support as the public questions frequent and dramatic tuition increases.

Ting told senators that VCSA Barnett is planning to give a report on enrollment management at an upcoming senate meeting. Additionally, Ting informed senators about testimony given by President Hogan to the state appropriations committee. Ting said that the testimony was received positively from the committee which is encouraging. She talked about how in Utah, the state government was looking at revoking tenure and Iowa is going to drastically limit the number of sabbaticals to 3% of faculty from all four public institutions. Ting believed that IL is in a much better place than some other mid-
western states at the moment. She asserted that President Hogan is working very hard to build support from the state.

Sisneros asked Ting about her opinion about a bill that recently came out of the committee to create an inspector general for higher education. Ting said that she did not know the details about what this would mean for U of I.

**Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen**
Van Vossen reported that the SGA attended the conference two weeks ago on Student Governance. The conference was held at Texas A&M in College Station, TX. SGAs from around the country were in attendance. Through round table discussions and workshops, ideas were shared about how to better serve student government, leaders learned about other structures and initiatives. Van Vossen said this was a very useful experience and reported that the SGA took away some very useful suggestions. Several changes to the current constitution will be proposed and debated as a result. Van Vossen also reported that the SGA had been contacted by President Hogan to forward 3 student names for consideration for serving on the VPAA search committee. President Hogan will select one student nominee from UIS to serve on the committee. Applications were sent to students and 13 applications are currently being reviewed. Van Vossen asserted that the voting is taking place and the three nominations should be decided upon midnight. Ting congratulated Van Vossen for attaining 13 nominations.

**Faculty Nomination Slate for VPAA Search Committee**
Ting reminded senators of the search committee composition. The search committee will be comprised of 1 faculty member from each campus, 1 student from each campus and 1 dean from each campus, as well as AP representation. Ting said she is very encouraged by this approach and believes this supports the idea that all three campuses are on equal footing. The SEC received 5 nominations for the faculty representative on the search committee. After deliberation regarding nominees’ experiences and service records, the SEC brought forward the slate of three names for senate endorsement: James Hall, Associate Professor of Management Information Systems in the College of Business Management; John Martin, Assistant Professor of Astronomy/Physics in the College of Liberal Arts and Science; and Tih-Fen Ting, Associate Professor of Environmental Studies in the College of Public Affairs and Administration. Ting called for a vote. All senators were in favor of endorsing the slate of nominees. Ting told senators that the slate would be forwarded to President Hogan for his consideration.

**Academic Review – Interim Chancellor Berman**
Chancellor Berman greeted the senate. He came to share a presentation that he had given to the BOT at its January meeting. According to Berman, Ting asked Berman to make the same presentation to the UIS senate. On November 8, 2010, President Hogan sent a letter to the Chancellors requiring each campus to prepare for a 15% reduction in appropriations for FY 12. Hogan indicated that each campus needs to plan at that level based on a belief that we will continue to see a decrease in state funding, and that even flat funding is equivalent to a decrease. Berman read from the letter, “each campus needs to strengthen and accelerate its academic program reviews. Each must also demonstrate
that it has a viable assessment strategy for programs, centers, institutes, and departments. My preference would be to have a methodology and process in place by the start of the calendar year [2011]. This should include a realistic and firm sunset policy for institutes, centers, academies, and graduate programs that are not productive or considered central to our mission. The program reviews should be based on clear, objective assessments especially the rankings information available in US News and World Report and the recent NRC Report. The goal is to identify our top ranked programs and so far as possible protect or invest in them. The process should also identify a smaller group of second tier programs that might move up with additional investment. It goes without saying, it is important to include undergraduate student demand in making these assessments.”

Chancellors were asked to give a report as to their progress at the January BOT meeting. In our case, Berman did not think some of the request was relevant to our situation at UIS. He believed that UIS has a lot to say about the program review process we have created and the work being done on instructional resource management. He wanted to use the opportunity to convey that the faculty and staff at UIS are competent in this arena. Berman wanted to demonstrate that we know how to manage our institution.

Referring to the power-point presentation, Berman began by providing a framework for understanding academic program review at UIS. He said that the purpose is twofold. First, we want to ensure academic quality and make the most of instructional resources. As we become more and more dependent on student tuition dollars, we have a moral obligation to make the most of instructional resources. Compared to the other campuses, UIS offers 44 degree programs (23 undergraduate programs, 20 master’s degree programs, 1 doctoral program). Because of this difference, UIS can handle the program review process differently than the other campuses. Here, it is possible for the Provost and Chancellor to know about all degree programs being offered. Comparatively, UIC offers 220 degree programs and UIUC offers 381 degree programs. The challenge at UIS is not to eliminate programs but to expand on what we offer to meet student interest. According to Berman, it is however imperative that we be vigilant about our enrollments and productivity.

Berman said that we do not see a lot of low enrollments here. In fact, we have a pattern of increasing enrollments in most departments. At UIS, we are monitoring the enrollment trends. There is an intent to reduce staffing in departments with significant enrollment declines. Berman showed a slide about 5 year enrollment trends. Departments in the green section represent departments that have increased major headcount enrollments across the five years (FY 06-10). Increases range from 11 – 171 students. The yellow band represented stable programs of plus or minus 10. Programs shown in red are representing programs that have seen a decrease in student enrollments ranging between 14-187 students. Berman stated that decisions about staffing are made with these figures in mind, barring other considerations or in relation to some other considerations including departmental overall credit hour generation or contributions to general education. Berman went on to state that for departments that have experienced decline, open positions due to retirement, resignation, or expiring visiting appointments, in some instances Deans have reallocated the resources to programs with higher student demand. For example, this has
The reallocation of resources based on student demand is what we call instructional resource management. Last year, Berman created a Faculty Administrative Task Force to develop principles and guidelines for instructional resource management. Berman noted that their report is posted to the Academic Affairs web page. One core idea that came from the report is that departments must pull their own weight. One tangible way to demonstrate this is to have departments generating 2x the faculty salaries through tuition. A primary rationale for this is to support services and the physical infrastructure of the university in addition to supporting faculty and staff salaries. Four main points came from the report. The first is the importance of measuring how well we are doing with respect to the management of instructional resources. Performance metrics were agreed upon in the task force. Departmental performance metrics include: utilization, median seat count, credit hours generated, tuition revenue per dollar of faculty salary. Berman noted that each of the metrics touches on important aspects of instructional resource management and complement each other. Improving instructional resource management strategies include: implementation of curricular changes especially through the examination of prerequisites; increasing offerings or spread of concentration within a major; improved course scheduling; and adjusting course caps. Metrics are being used when authorizing faculty hires. In some instances course caps have been increased to meet target enrollments. Noting the sensitivity of this issue, Berman stated that he is not talking about raising all course caps, it does require consideration. Courses requiring low course caps need to be offset by courses with larger enrollments. Lastly, Berman talked about the ratio of available seats within a course to student enrollments. This is referred to as utilization.

Berman showed a slide demonstrating a steady upward trend the utilization of resources. He said that this is where he concluded his presentation. At the Board meeting, Chairman Kennedy asked Berman what he meant by knowing the score. Following up, Berman sent Kennedy a document describing each of the performance metrics and the ways they are used. Olivier asked if the slide demonstrating growth and decline presented programs in order. While they had not been arranged in order for the BOT meeting, Berman did provide a rank ordering of the departments in the slide shown at the senate meeting. Berman stated that the programs at the top had the greatest increase while the programs at the bottom demonstrated lesser increases and so forth. Berman handed out the data table from which the slide was created to all of the senators and guests. He did not think showing the complex table was necessary or prudent at the BOT meeting. Berman thanked Hutson and Khaund for their development of the slide. Berman also noted that the number of headcount majors is one way to think about this. Also important are credit hour generation and credit hour per staff year. Hayler asked for clarification about the title of the slide. She wanted to know if the data was based on headcount majors or headcount enrollments. Berman stated the data was headcount majors.

Referring to the matrix about departments pulling their own weight by generating twice the faculty salary, Martin asked if consideration is given to overhead generated by grants brought in by departments. Berman said this is not part of the calculation, but something that a department could raise if appropriate. According to Berman, it is important that
everyone across colleges be using the same data. Ting added that the BOT and President Hogan are very interested in data driven decision making. She asserted that UIS has the most clearly articulated strategies. Furthermore, she highlighted that we use multiple metrics, not just one.

Wang expressed concern that the slide demonstrating growth and decline may promote general erroneous assessments. For example, Wang noted that Computer Sciences is still the largest computer science program in the state but appears to be shrinking on the slide. Berman suggested that two things co-exist. Yes we have the largest Computer Science Program and the decline was real. He went on to talk about the student to faculty ratio, and emphasized that they are not exempt from the metrics. Siddiquee asked where the idea of academic program review originated from. Berman said this follows the administrative review and restructuring. The academic side is not immune from restructuring and review. Siddiquee asked if this came from the IBHE. Berman said that this initiative is coming from President Hogan. Referring to the faculty salary/tuition generation metric, Switzer asked how many departments are actually meeting this goal. Berman said that not many are currently meeting the goal and the ones that meet the goal are in the minority. Dean Ermatinger has data suggesting that approximately half of the programs in CLAS meet the metric. Wassenberg offered that all programs, except one, in PA&A currently meet the standard. Berman stated this is about the relationship between tuition revenue and expenditures. If expenditures increase, we may need to raise the goal. Based on current financial structures, if all departments can meet this goal UIS will be in a financially sustainable situation.

Kline asked about the rationale for utilizing a 5 year span to represent the data. Berman responded by saying that data of this kind is commonly presented in this way. Li asked if departments need to meet this goal within a 5 year period. Berman said that a date has not been set although this is interesting to think about. Arriving at a common understanding was an enormous task. Now that we have mechanisms in place and are tracking data we can monitor progress. We know that we are making improvements in utilization. Now we can track this information too. Siddiquee asked whether the faculty salary metric is based on the average for the program, or whether each faculty member is expected to meet individually. Berman thanked Siddiquee for the question and clarified that this is departmental, not individual.

Kline wanted to follow-up about the major headcount enrollments slide. Referring to the computer science, Kline noted that they suffered a decrease of students between 2003 and 2008. However, when looking at the trend in last 3 years, they are up by 80 students and yet they are still in the decreasing area of the slide. Berman asserted that the point of the slide is that we don’t have much decline in enrollment as is demonstrated by the green area. In areas where declines have happened, adjustments in staffing have been made. Thompson asked Berman to talk about how accreditation requirements play into the faculty tuition generation expectation. Berman said this could come into play. He went on to say that the metric accounts for the fact the graduate students pay more in tuition than undergraduate students which may moderate the difference.
Fisher asked for Berman’s impressions of how the President is viewing our process. Berman thanked Fisher for her question and stated that he wanted to really convey that we are being responsive based on our campus structure and core mission. Berman asked Olivier to comment on Fisher’s question. Olivier said it was very interesting to see the three very different presentations by the campuses. He believed that the BOT was surprised at the differing responses given. Olivier went on to say that President Hogan is trying to tailor to the different campuses. Berman agreed with Olivier’s comments.

Siddiquee stated the list is based on headcount major but doesn’t include service. Berman said that the beauty of the tuition dollar per dollar of faculty salary takes this into consideration.

Fisher talked about the emergence of the academic review process happening in tandem with the administrative restructuring. She asked if Berman has a sense of the administrative mantra. Berman stated that the mantra is to create a $60 million reduction in administrative costs. Ting asserted that her understanding is to feed the money back to the academic core. She asked Berman if this is not the case. Berman asserted that this becomes complicated with faced with budget reductions. The savings are occurring in IT, capital projects, HR, and procurement. Martin gave the example of saving a dollar for each toner cartridge which can be measured in units, but doesn’t really end up in a big pot. Siddiquee asked about our share of the $60 million dollars. Berman said that our savings are dependent on contracts negotiated by the U of I. Our savings then will be based on our purchases of paper, toner, etc. Ting agreed that this is difficult to track. What is important is that we can demonstrate to legislators that we are being responsible. Ting thanked Berman for his report.

Old Business

Resolution 40-16 Graduate Certificate in Entrepreneurship [2nd reading]
Olivier motioned to discuss Resolution 40-16. Borland seconded the motion. Ting stated that Helton and Cornell were present representing the GC, and Ferk was present from the college. Martin appreciated that the whereas clauses addressed the questions typically asked. Siddiquee asked about the implementation date of the certificate. Ferk stated that it will not appear in the catalog until 2012. Martin stated the proposal says 2012. A unanimous vote was taken to accept the resolution.

New Business

Resolution 40-17 Changes to UIS Campus Senate Bylaws – Committee on Admissions, Recruitment, and Retention [1st reading]
Ballard motioned to discuss Resolution 40-17. Olivier seconded the motion. Ting offered some background to the resolution. She reported that the committee is currently suspended for the academic year. The SEC has discussed the issue and initially supported the abolishment of the committee. They believe it would be much more effective to create task forces to address issues. However, after looking into the history of the creation of CARR more, the SEC has come forward with a resolution calling for drastic reduction of its membership, rather than abolishment.
The CARR committee was created in part because the other two campuses have a similar committee. UIS CARR committee was very much modeled after the UIC committee. One major difference exists between the committees – that is, committee membership. Our committee currently calls for 19 members. When looking at the UIC and UIUC membership, they have only one ex-officio member. Because our committee is so large, it is difficult to schedule meetings, which seriously curtails the effectiveness of the committee. Ting met with the CARR committee members at the beginning of the academic year to discuss the issues. The committee supported the suspension. Ting went on to say that if the senate decides to keep the committee, we need to reduce the membership and sharpen the focus of the committee. Concerns have been raised about faculty responsibility in this area. If we decide to continue the committee, Ting suggested dramatically reducing membership. If senators support the resolution, the idea is to have a small membership for committee so the committee will be charged with working on specific issues, essentially fulfilling the requirements of a task force. If a particular issue requires, the membership can be adjusted to meet the needs while having the CARR members remain as the core of the “task force”.

Wassenberg highlighted the difficulty of working on the committee because of the large number of members. Continuity was impossible, according to Wassenberg, because different sets of people attending different meetings. Borland also likes the idea of creating a smaller task oriented committee. Referring to line 83, Borland asked clarification about the intent for faculty representation from each of the 4 degree-granting colleges. She made a friendly amendment to insert one from each of the degree granting colleges for clarification. Ting accepted the friendly amendment. Zhang talked about the flexibility of members. Ting stated that 4 faculty members will serve, but depending on the issue it may require others to come in and work on the issue. Those brought in for specific issues will finish serving once the task is completed.

Kline stated that he is neutral about the resolution and encouraged senators to really think about whether or not we need this committee. If it is decided that we do, we should have a solid rationale. Ting agreed with Kline. Based on her understanding of the creation of the CARR committee, Helton stated that she believes the committee was created to address relationship issues that existed in the past. She currently thinks the issue has been resolved but also acknowledged that it might emerge in the future. She supports the idea of retaining the committee may be important as is reducing the membership.

Fisher said she was glad to see a proposal to streamline and reduce membership. Currently, recruiting and retention are major issues on our campus. Fisher argued that the committee can be very helpful to sustain and coordinate efforts. Garmil agreed with Fisher’s comments. Sisneros advocated for more mid-level administration to be involved in the committee. For example, the registrar would be useful. Ting asserted that this is implied in the revised structure as people will be called upon to serve based on expertise. Martin suggested that the language clearly specify to the committee that people at mid-level are accessible to the committee. He proposed adding language introducing the spirit. Martin also stated that the purpose of standing committee is not that it is always busy.
Just because it isn’t busy, doesn’t mean it needs to be abolished. Martin argued that faculty have an important responsibility delegated to the faculty.

Siddiquee asked why the job description for the VCSA is given in line 92-93. Ting stated that it is currently within the job description of the VCSA includes oversight of enrollment management. Ting stated that it is different here than it is at the other campuses. Siddiquee asked again why we have the job description included. Borland suggested that it might clarify for the other campuses. Martin suggested language about the person overseeing enrollment management as the ex-officio. Borland thought this could be confusing. Siddiquee argued that the policy would not hold if the descriptions changed. Ting stated that it would need to be amended if that happened. Ting asked if the VCSA has the title of Director for Enrollment Management. If he does, she will change the language.

Bapat asked what CARR has accomplished in the two years of operation. Ting stated that they have made 2 reports to the senate that can be found on the senate web page. While they have been effective at identifying issues they have been unable to address the issues. Bapat asked what we have missed out of in this academic year due to the suspension of the committee. Helton asked how she might answer that question. Referring to the charges, Bapat asked if we have fallen behind on concerning issues. He argued against maintaining a committee simply because the other campuses have a similar committee. Helton stated that retaining the committee is about promoting oversight. Borland stated that it is important to have faculty input on very serious recruitment and retention issues. Symbolically, Borland believes it is important to retain the committee.

Garmil agreed with Martin regarding faculty responsibility in recruiting and retaining quality students. Especially when thinking about retention, Garmil asserted that faculty can’t just sit back and say it’s not part of our job. Acknowledging the importance of the symbolism and faculty involvement in retention and recruitment, Kline asked who will be willing to serve on the committee. It is important to think about service demands in making this decision as well. Wassenberg noted that the committee might have been valuable contributors to the Chancellor’s Enrollment Expansion Retreat. She suggested that their deliberations might have proven valuable to the process. Additionally, Wassenberg was at a meeting where a discussion about an institutional research database to track information was discussed. She believed that having people with some level of expertise would have been useful in discussions.

Referring to line 66, Bapat made a friendly suggestion that CARR should not being doing this. Perhaps the UCG and the GC might be better equipped to handle. Ting stated that she would have further discussion with Bapat regarding his thoughts and with the SEC. Li asked if the faculty being members would be appointed by the dean. Ting asserted that this will be just like any other standing senate committee that happens through the call-for-volunteers process. Depending on the pool, the Committee on Committees might recruit people. Zhang asked whether we want to be so strict as to limit to one faculty member from each college. He suggested adding “try” to the language. Ting stated that
Zhang could offer a friendly amendment, but this might not be considered a friendly amendment. Zhang stated that he would bring his idea back to the next reading.

**Adjournment**
Olivier motioned to adjourn the meeting. Kline seconded and the meeting adjourned at 11:58.