

9-29-2010

FS Minutes 2010-09-29

Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Northern Illinois University, "FS Minutes 2010-09-29" (2010). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 5.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-facultysenate/5>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, September 29, 2010, 3 p.m.
Holmes Student Center Sky Room

Disclaimer: These minutes should not be taken as a verbatim transcript but rather as a shortened summary that is intended to reflect the essence of statements made at the meeting. Many comments have been omitted and, in some cases, factual and grammatical errors corrected. The full verbatim transcript is available online at the University Council Web site under Faculty Senate / Agendas, Minutes & Transcripts.

PRESENT: Bennardo, Bishop, Blecksmith, Brubaker, Bryan, Cappell, Castle, Collins, Corwin, Cozad, Cripe, Feurer, Finley, Fisher, Freedman, Goldblum, Gupta, Haliczzer, Hansen, B. Henry, P. Henry, Houze, Kapperman, Kowalski, Latham, Lenczewski, Lusk, Martin, Mirman, Monteiro, Moraga, Newman, Nicolosi, Novak, Pitney, Rintala, A. Rosenbaum, Sagarin, Slotsve, Smith, Stravers, Tonks, Von Ende, Wade, Willis

GUESTS: Bauer, Boughton, Compher, Mickey, Spears

Parliamentarian Ferald Bryan was present.

ABSENT: Allori, Armstrong, Arnhart, Azad, Bisplinghoff, Bowers, Brandt, Bujarski, Butler, Calmeyer, Coles, Cummings, Elish-Piper, Greene, Hui, Jaffee, Jeffrey, Kostic, Lee, Lin, Liu, Marchewka, May, Mogren, Mohabbat, Poole, Prawitz, M. Rosenbaum, Shortridge, Snow, Staikidis, Thu, Valentiner, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.

A.Rosenbaum: reminded the Senate to identify themselves before speaking because we are using a new transcribing service.

A.Rosenbaum: reminded the Senate about the Faculty Senate Blackboard Community and encouraged senators to visit it. He also noted that the Discussion Board was open and Senators could post ideas and responses.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

A. Rosenbaum: noted the addition of two walk-in items to the agenda: **E.Hansen's** report on the FAC to the IBHE and **T.Latham's** report on the September 16 BOT meeting and called for a motion to accept the agenda.

A.Lash: moved to accept the agenda as amended by the addition of the walk-in items. **B.Lusk** was second. The motion passed without opposition.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 FS MEETING

J. Novak: made the motion to approve the minutes; **S.Willis** was second. There were no corrections or changes and the motion to approve the minutes passed without opposition.

IV. PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Intercollegiate Athletics – Jeff Compher

A. ROSENBAUM: Consistent with the request of the Senate made at the previous meeting, we have invited the Associate Vice President and Director of Athletics, Jeff Compher, to inform us about the funding of intercollegiate athletics at Northern Illinois University. He's going to give us a brief presentation, and then we'll open the floor for questions.

J. COMPHER: First of all, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here, Dr. Rosenbaum. This is the first time I have been able to come before this group, and I appreciate the opportunity. There's some people here that I want to introduce, some of whom you are very familiar with, some of whom you may not be. First of all is Janaan Mickey who works with me in my office, and she is my assistant. Debra Boughton to my left here is my Associate AD for Business Affairs. Christian Spears in the back is my Senior Associate AD for administration. Jan Rintala, who is our faculty athletic representative and a member of this group. Terry Bishop, who is our Chair of the Athletic Board, and Paul Bower, who is the Chair of the Budget Subcommittee on the Athletic Board. It's good to know that you have representation on our athletic board. I just wanted to point out who those members are that work with you each and every day.

First of all, we are an intercollegiate athletics program made up of 17 sports, seven men and seven women. There are 12 institutions in the Mid-American Conference. We have 130 staff members in our department, and there are 407 student athletes.

Our mission statement is to develop champions in the classroom, in competition and in life. As far as our academic success, you can see for ten straight semesters our teams have had a 3.0 GPA or better. 188 of our student athletes have earned a GPA of 3.0 or higher, and ten of them have a 4.0. All 17 of our sports programs have exceeded the academic standards set by the NCAA as measured by a relatively new measurement, our academic progress rate, APR. In particular, one sport has done very, very well, and that's our football program, and, as you see, we rank in the top ten in the country in APR ranking. This past year 89 student athletes graduated. 93 percent of the student athletes who complete their eligibility, that means they played four years out of a five-year period, will graduate from NIU. The NCAA also has a relatively new measurement called GSR, graduation success rate, and we rose that up from 81 to 82 percent, and we exceed the national average, which is 79 percent.

Then in life, we try to get our student athletes involved as much as possible, and you can see here over 8,000 hours of service, an increase of 3,000 hours from the year before, and we actually

participated in 50 different community service projects over the course of the year, many of which are brought to us from the teams and student athletes themselves.

So now we can get into some of the information that you were looking for. One of the questions that Alan asked me as we began this was, are the figures that were put out in a recent article -- and I think you all received a letter from the Faculty Senate, from the Ohio University Faculty Senate -- are those figures correct? And to our knowledge they are correct. I'd like to point out that we don't know what went into all of those figures, but from what we know from our end, our numbers are correct. What I thought I would do to start off originally is to tell you how we compare to the rest of the university budget. As you can see, we have a total university budget of \$490 million. Of that, roughly \$20 million is with athletics, which comes out to about four percent of the total university revenue.

Note that we have excluded foundation funding. When you think about direct institutional support dollars, those dollars that come directly from the university and those dollars normally come in either salary dollars from the State or with tuition waivers that we get for our student athletes, it's 17 percent of our total budget.

Now when you look at what Ohio has, and this is what we're going to get to in the next slide, Ohio's number is 64 percent direct institutional funding. And if I'm on their Faculty Senate, I'm probably asking questions, too. What is it about their system that's different than ours, and how are their numbers different than our numbers? So as we look at that, I can tell you that the biggest difference is our fee structure, and I wanted to kind of explain how that fee structure works and how that process begins each and every year.

It begins in September. There is a fee committee made up of students and staff. Then those committees review all the student fees, including the athletic fee. They make recommendations to the President, either to increase or decrease fees, and then following a full review with the student leadership and also the President, those fees are recommended back to the Board of Trustees for final approval. Unlike at Ohio University, at NIU, our students do have a say on how that money is distributed.

And then finally one of the other questions that Dr. Rosenbaum talked about was, what are some of the effects that athletics may have on alumni giving or support. Kathy Buettner and her group just did a survey. Almost 800 people were surveyed this past year over the last six months, and in that survey of current faculty, staff, current students, prospective students, parents, alumni and guidance counselors in the area, all six groups consistently ranked Division I athletics as a positive and important component of student life here on our campus at NIU. When you start trying to compare dollars and funding models, sometimes it's difficult to peel back the layers of the onion and really feel like how one university does it isn't the same as another university. We're not unlike many institutions that I've worked at, at previous places, but I think Ohio's model is a little bit different than most.

A. ROSENBAUM: invited questions for Jeff Compher.

G. BENNARDO: asked if the student fee for athletics is part of the \$4 million?

J. COMPHER: No, it is not part of that amount. Exactly \$7.7 million comes from student fees.

A. ROSENBAUM: What does that work out per student roughly?

J. COMPHER: Eighteen eighty-eight per credit hour currently. Roughly 24 percent of all of the fees collected for students.

S. WILLIS: You quoted a couple of different graduation rates, one for students who had completed their eligibility and one called the graduation success rate. We have this graduation rate that is mandated by some federal agency or other where we look at incoming freshmen and we see how many of them are graduated after four, five, six years. Do you have that figure for us?

J. COMPHER: That's the federal graduation rate, and that's computed over a six-year period. I don't have that.

J. RINTALA: added that we are consistently higher for student athletes, above the student population who are not student athletes, by several percentage points on the federal graduation rate. What the federal graduation success rate doesn't account for transfer students, either those who leave in good academic standing or those who come in to our institution. The GSR the NCAA puts together does take those students into account, so it looks at those students for whom you are actually responsible, and that's where we get those 82, 84 percent graduation rates.

S. WILLIS: added that she would be happier if we used the GSR for the rest of the university as well.

J. COMPHER: It's a much fairer rate because students leave in good academic standing, go on to other institutions and graduate. Those students aren't even counted in the federal rate.

J. RINTALA: stated that she will bring the data on the federal rates to the next meeting.

B. LUSK: Is there any way that you can tell us how important athletics are to bringing in alumni dollars to the university?

J. COMPHER: First of all, anecdotally, if you go back and you listen to Bob Burk, who was the former Director of Admissions here, he talked about our best years of applications being when we had good football seasons. Many of the colleges buy tickets for our events, our football games and our basketball games, and are using athletics as a way to entertain former students and alumni and others. We want there to be that kind of synergy between the academic and athletic community. Whether I can point to a particular figure and say, well, we've won a championship and therefore our alumni dollars have gone up, you know, there are examples of that other places, but I can't give you a number on that.

P. HENRY: I think some of us have concern about the size of the student fees and to what extent has this been rising over the years.

J. COMPHER: I'm in my third year, so I don't have a long history here to give you, but I can say that that rate did go up last year, Every time tuition rises, every time other fees rise, our costs go up because of our scholarships that are associated with our budget. So what we've tried to do is match whatever those increases are with the dollars that we can use from student fees in order to offset those increases.

B. CRIPE: How much of this money do you use to provide scholarships to student athletes?

J. COMPHER: It's roughly 24 percent.

A. ROSENBAUM: Regarding the \$3.5 million or so that comes as direct institutional support, you indicated that most of that was salary and scholarship. How much of it is for salary and scholarship?

J. COMPHER: Well, most of it is. Of the \$3.5 million in direct institutional support, over half of this amount is for student tuition waivers. The other half is for positions in our department. Our compliance office, for instance, isn't funded through athletics. It's funded by the university.

C. CAPPELL: Are there any sports that are revenue neutral or that could sustain themselves without any infusion, such as football or basketball? And, secondly, part of it is a revenue question that might concern the academic faculty, but it's also the academic culture at NIU, and I wonder if you could comment on how the Athletic Department tries to foster an academic intellectual culture here.

J. COMPHER: Hopefully, with the success that we have enjoyed either through graduation or from our academic performance, what we're trying to do is all three of our mission statements, and that's really create an environment where academics is as important as athletics, and participation in life lessons and life experiences is as important. And your other question really talked about whether or not any of our programs are revenue neutral or would they sustain themselves without other support. No, I don't think they would.

J. KOWALSKI: Could you give us some idea what percentage of NIU athletes go on to play sort of professional sports after leaving NIU.

J. COMPHER: You know, nationally that rate is between one and two percent anywhere you go. So of our 400 student athletes, very few will go on to play professionally.

J. CORWIN: Has the level of administrative costs remained fairly consistent over the years, or has it grown increased at a faster rate than student support?

J. COMPHER: I think it's been pretty consistent over the years. I don't have a longitudinal look at that. We could certainly put that together. But we haven't had many operational increases, whether administratively or in our individual sports, for quite some time. So most of our increases come from scholarships or when there is mandated salary increases.

A. ROSENBAUM: So the staffing has stayed pretty constant. There haven't been additions of assistant coaches and assistant vice presidents and all of that?

J. COMPHER: Many of our assistant coaches are actually graduate students. They are not full-time staff. So we do have that, but those numbers have remained fairly constant over the last few years.

N. CASTLE: Could you talk a little bit about where we stand in terms of Title IX, I notice we have more women's sports than men's, and how that affects us in terms of expenses?

J. COMPHER: In fact, some of those tuition waivers are a direct result of Title IX legislation in the state that enables us to provide waivers for gender equity purposes. We are still in the process of reviewing Title IX requirements, and this year, in fact, we'll be doing a survey of current students here on our campus and potentially incoming students to assess whether or not our Athletics Department at NIU meets their interests and abilities and whether or not we should look at adding another women's sport.

J. CORWIN: I think it's great that students are doing so well in terms of graduation rate, etc. I'm just curious, what does it cost to get a 3.0 out of an athlete, for example, as opposed to a 3.0 for a student who is paying tuition, and how much more attention are they getting as far as tutoring, etc., etc.?

J. COMPHER: I don't know that I have ever done a cost analysis on that, but we do have academic support services for student athletes that do monitor students, especially those that are at risk, and many of those are coming in as freshmen. I will say that many of the tutorial services and other academic services that we utilize are provided for all students, and it's run out of our Provost's office. I believe that we're accessing those at maybe a greater percentage rate than other students are because we do have a bit of a carrot there to say that we need you to do well.

T. BISHOP: I would like to piggyback on that, and as chair of the Athletic Board, I was subcommittee chair overseeing the evaluation of those student support services. And I want to reinforce the point that most of the services that student athletes use are available to all students. So we do have staff in the Athletic Department that helps identify those resources, work with the student athletes. I also want to point out that the spectrum of student athletes is reflective of the students that we have throughout the rest of the institution. We have a lot of self-service students, if you will, that are student athletes that really don't use those resources. We have some that utilize those services and, as Jeff mentioned, are at risk, and more intensive services are provided to them, or at least attention, and they are steered to those resources on campus. And, again, the focus hasn't always been just maintaining their eligibility. I have been proud of my association with athletics that the focus is on them completing their degrees ultimately and successfully graduating and doing well academically. It's not a rush to get them eligible and then cast them aside when they go on through their eligibility cycle and they are no longer useful to us. So I have been proud of the balance and focus on them as students first and athletes as a complimentary activity.

C. CAPPELL: I appreciated your comparison with Ohio University, their revenue structure.

I suggest it would also be very informative to extend that to all the MAC schools, and if you are going to submit a brief report to the Senate, that would be very helpful.

J. COMPHER: Sure, we could do that.

C. CAPPELL: While according to your data only maybe \$10 million of direct institutional support plus student fees is money that could be allocated to academic purposes if it wasn't going to the athletic department, it's still \$10 million, and I'm wondering if you have any models or any thoughts on how that level of support can be reduced over the years with an alternative revenue generating source that makes you more self-sufficient.

J. COMPHER: Well, we really have two ways to generate more dollars. It comes down to selling more tickets and raising more money. We don't want to be an anchor to the academic community. That's not what we're about. What we're about is hopefully enhancing the academic community in some way and allowing athletics to be a viable part of the institutional and educational experience, and hopefully it's a value-added part of our students' experience as well. So, yeah, would we like to raise more dollars and reduce that fee? We would, and we're going to try and continue to do that.

A. ROSENBAUM: On behalf of the Senate I want to thank you very much for coming, and we also have our Committee on Resources, Space and Budget looking into this as well, and so hopefully if they have additional questions, you will be as forthcoming with them.

This concluded **J. Compher's** presentation.

A. ROSENBAUM: I met with **President Peters** earlier today, and he wanted me to tell you that he is working almost exclusively on the [Vision 2020 Plan](#) that he talked about in his State of the University address and then reiterated at University Council. He also wants you to know that he will be coming to the Senate later in the year because his plan is to listen to all of the different groups in the university regarding their thoughts on the benchmarks that we should be setting for the university.

B. [Graduate School Dean Search](#) – Alan Rosenbaum – Pages 3-5

The Graduate Dean is a relatively new position at NIU. It previously was combined with the Vice President for Research. When Dr. Bose left, the position was split. Jim Erman took the Vice President of Research position, and Bradley Bond became the Interim Dean of the Graduate School. When Lisa Freeman was hired as the Vice President for Research, she was given the option of recombining those two positions but she chose to keep the position split. She will retain the Vice President for Research position and is looking to initiate a search for a Graduate Dean. You have seen the proposal. It was in your packet and posted on Blackboard. The search plan must be approved by the Senate. Dr. Freeman would like to begin this search quickly, and I have suggested we try to handle this on the floor, if possible, rather than send it to a committee.

There are two issues here. One of them has to do with the fact that they are proposing an internal search. As far as deans searches go, we typically do external searches, however, the administration

argues that searches for graduate deans are typically internal. I don't have any data to either support or refute that; however, that is the contention of the Provost and the President.

One of the arguments that they made for an internal search is that it is much less expensive. The second argument that they made is that they feel an internal candidate would be more familiar with the way our departments operate and would, therefore, be able to hit the ground running and not spend an enormous amount of time reinventing the wheel

The one concern that I had when I spoke to Lisa Freeman was to make sure that faculty were adequately represented on the search committee. It appears from the search plan, at least to me, that faculty are adequately represented. So with that as the background, I'll take a motion to accept the search plan.

B.Lusk made the motion, **P.Henry** was second.

S. WILLIS: I noticed that it says that the committee will be structured to include at least three Faculty Senate members. Do we know if there are three Faculty Senate members on the Graduate Council, and if not, how will those people be included onto the search committee?

A. ROSENBAUM: My assumption is if she doesn't have them coming from other sources, that she will come to us and we will ask for volunteers, the way we usually do.

G. SLOTSVE: I was just curious with the increased cost associated with an external search, what costs are those? Are those the actual search costs or are they talking salary costs?

A. ROSENBAUM: Well, I think what happens is sometimes for a Graduate Dean they hire a search firm, which is fairly expensive. They certainly have to bring people in and pay their travel expense and entertainment expenses while they are here. For some of the deans' positions I know they do airport interviews, and then they bring people on campus. So I think those are essentially the major expenses in an external search.

The search plan was approved by a unanimous vote.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERTION

A. Selection of a Vice President of Faculty Senate

A.Rosenbaum: The main role of the Vice President of the Senate is to assume the duties of the President of the Senate should the President become incapacitated.

I would like to nominate **George Slotsve** to be Vice President of the Senate. **P. HENRY** was second.

G.Slotsve was approved by a unanimous vote.

B. Faculty Workload Policy

A.Rosenbaum: David Wade is our faculty and SPS personnel advisor. He has recently seen a lot of concerns about the way different colleges are evaluating workload. Apparently every college in the university is looking into faculty workload, and part of this is connected to financial issues. There are also concerns about equity, and so David had made the suggestion that the Senate might want to consider taking this up and offering some suggestions regarding policies, setting policies as to how colleges establish workload.

When I informed the Provost about this, he said that he has already established a Blue Ribbon Workload Committee, and he thought that the committee would do what we were hoping to do. He asked each of the colleges to nominate faculty or representatives to this Blue Ribbon Committee. He has 14 or 15 nominees, chosen in proportion to the number of faculty in each college, similar to the way the representation on the Senate is determined.

The Provost is willing, if the Faculty Senate so desires, to add people to that committee.

A.Rosenbaum: read the Provost's letter establishing the committee.

“As you probably know, higher education is currently in a very dynamic period of change that includes greater demands for accountability and productivity for universities. Many states, including our own, are either considering or have already implemented evaluation systems to hold institutions accountable for productivity. In addition to demands for institutional measures of student success and attainment, politicians and the public are asking about systems that ensure faculty productivity. These words sort of strike fear into our hearts, I think, as they are always misused. In many states the question frequently asked of university administrators is what do your faculty do with all of their time. This has been followed with restricted workload policies and tracking assessment systems from centralized boards and/or legislatures. It is clearly more desirable for universities to develop their own policies and systems for demonstrating the productivity of their faculty members in accomplishing their distinctive institutional missions.

At NIU we are aware of the dedication and productivity of our faculty in accomplishing our mission areas of education, research, creative activities and service. However, we do not have a comprehensive university workload policy that addresses and documents the diversity of activities that our faculty members undertake to accomplish these mission areas. We want to be proactive in addressing this important area so that we can demonstrate that we are responsive to the increasing demands for accountability and productivity.

While the focus of most political and public attention has been on classroom teaching, we need a university workload policy that clearly acknowledges and documents the full variety of professional activities that are required of the faculty at a student-centered, engaged public research university. It is recognized that each program may have different missions, demands and expectations and that within programs individual faculty members may serve different but equally important roles. Thus, the NIU workload policy should represent a set of guiding principles, a big picture road map, that may be focused/adapted to meet the needs of individual disciplines by more detailed specific college and/or departmental level policies. The goal is to have equitable and defensible but not necessarily identical workloads for faculty members across our campus. The

workload system created by this policy should document the full richness, productivity and significance of the efforts of all of our faculty.

I hope that you will accept the invitation...”

That defines the mission of this committee. I'll ask David to comment on whether he feels that addresses completely what he thinks needs to be done, and then we'll take comments from the floor.

D. WADE: Yes. I mean, assuming the composition of that body is reasonable, it sounds to me like the charge is reasonable.

K. FREEDMAN: recommended that we check to make sure that faculty are adequately represented, because as we have seen in previous task forces where the Provost or Vice President has requested Deans to appoint people, often those appointees are administrators, like Associate Deans or Assistant Deans, so I would just recommend we check to find out how many of those people that get appointed are actually faculty. And if we don't feel that there are enough faculty, then I think we request that some faculty from the Senate be appointed.

A. ROSENBAUM: Provost Alden offered to give me the list, so I will get that list from him and post it on Blackboard, and then you can all look it over, and if we have concerns, he seemed very amenable to us adding members. I also asked if the report when it's final can come back to the Senate for our approval, and he said that he would do that.

N. CASTLE: questioned why the colleges are already doing this if the panel has not yet been formed and suggested we ask the Provost to have the colleges wait until the panel had issued some suggestions.

A. LASH: I very much agree with Nancy because, as some of you know, our school began to initiate something like that as early as last year. So I learned that our school was one of the earliest that implemented such a workload distribution allocation without any advance warning to the faculty or anything. So I think it's very much needed, number one. And, number two, I think it would be very fair if all the schools could wait until this Blue Ribbon panel's job is done, because Deans and Chairs are doing all kinds of things.

A. ROSENBAUM: Course assignments have already been made for this year and I think the Provost intends for this to be completed this academic year, and so for next fall when those assignments are made, hopefully there will be something in place.

D. WADE: stated that many of the complaints he has seen relate to the fact that colleges are already putting policies into place and faculty have no recourse for complaints. He stated that he hoped the Blue Ribbon panel might provide that clearinghouse for information and complaints. He suggested that the faculty grievance procedure might not be sufficient because people are reluctant to file grievances for fear of retaliation. And, therefore, this body is the body that represents faculty concerns. So I'm not trying to disparage the Blue Ribbon Committee, but I'm not sure that necessarily answers our fundamental concern, and that is that faculty's rights and responsibilities

are respected and considered in this process regardless of their representation on this Blue Ribbon panel. We might want to refer this to Rights and Responsibilities to at least police the Blue Ribbon panel in the faculty's interest.

K. FREEDMAN: So were you suggesting earlier that Alden would be perfectly happy giving the policy statements to us to approve?

A. ROSENBAUM: I can't promise that he said "approve." I said that I would like to be able to tell the Senate that you will send this to the Senate for their comments and he agreed. I don't think we will have right of veto power, but we certainly could assert our opinion.

K. FREEDMAN: I would like to make the request that you guarantee that he does allow those policies to come to us at least for review and comment, if not approval.

C. CAPPELL: To my mind, the one key issue that may not have been as prominent in the Provost's rhetorical charge as I would have liked to have seen is a link of workload to quality, and it seems like the faculty that are delivering the academic goods are the ones that have the most knowledge and the greatest sense of how quality is intimately linked to workload and that that should be something that's on the table at the very beginning.

A. ROSENBAUM: Would it work if we asked for representatives from the Senate to be on this committee? Would that satisfy this concern?

K. FREEDMAN: after some discussion, nominated **D.Wade** to be suggested to the Provost as an addition to the committee. **A.Lash** seconded.

A. ROSENBAUM: clarified that if the Senate approved, he would ask Provost Alden to add **D.Wade** to the Blue Ribbon Panel. He also asked **D.Wade** if he was willing to accept the nomination, which he was.

The motion was approved unanimously.

T. FISHER: I just wanted to check, do we have to vote on the fact that someone suggested that the recommendations come to the Senate for review?

A. ROSENBAUM: I think I would prefer to clarify that with the Provost rather than send him a resolution. If it's okay with the Senate, I will ask the Provost exactly how much veto power we'll have or whether it's just going to be input, and I'll bring that back to the next meeting, and if we're satisfied with that, then we'll leave it as is.

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Earl Hansen – [report](#) (walk-in)

B. LUSK: Do you know why Judy Irwin left the board?

E. HANSEN: We asked that question as a council, and the response we got was that she was looking for something else, which tells me that the choppy waters down there were maybe a little more shark-infested than we think they are.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Ferald Bryan – no report

C. BOT Finance, Facilities, and Operations Committee – Alan Rosenbaum and Greg Waas – no report

D. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Jay Monteiro and Todd Latham – no report

E. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – [report](#) (walk-in report presented by Todd Latham)

The last items were action items that the Board of Trustees had to review and approve. They are listed in the order that they were presented. If you have any questions on those, I would refer you to the book that they provide because some of these areas go into great detail.

A. ROSENBAUM: clarified that the book that Todd was referring to is available in the office of the Faculty Senate, University Council.

VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report

B. Economic Status of the Profession – Sonya Armstrong, Chair – no report

C. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair no report

D. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jozef Bujarski and Laurie Elish-Piper, Co-chairs – report – Pages 6-7 (Walk-in - updated version of [report](#) presented by Todd Latham)

A. ROSENBAUM: Todd is going to report briefly on the Resources, Space and Budget Committee, because Jozef Bujarski and Laurie Elish-Piper, who are the co-chairs, were not able to come to this meeting.

E. Rules and Governance – Nancy Castle – no report

F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – David Wade, Chair

D. WADE: instructed the Senate regarding the completion of the ballots.

IX UNFINISHED BUSINESS

X. NEW BUSINESS

XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

XII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. [Alternate Policy](#) – Page 10
- B. [Annual Report – Office of the Ombudsman](#)
- C. [Annual Report – University Benefits Committee](#)
- D. [Annual Report – Undergraduate Coordinating Council](#)
- E. [Committee on Initial Teacher Certification meeting minutes, May 7, 2010](#)
- F. [Committee on Advanced Programs for Certification in Education meeting minutes, April 5, 2010](#)
- G. [Athletic Board meeting minutes, June 16, 2010](#)
- H. [Academic Planning Council meeting minutes, August 23, 2010](#)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. ROSENBAUM: invited a motion to adjourn. **J. Novak** made the motion and **B. Lusk** was second. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.