FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
Wednesday, October 3, 2012, 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.


OTHERS PRESENT: Armstrong, Bryan, Haliczer (for Peska), Klaper, Smith (for Latham), Streb, Theodore (for Quick), Tollerud

OTHERS ABSENT: Freedman, Latham, Peska, Prawitz, Quick, Small, Snow, Sunderlin, Waas

I. CALL TO ORDER
A. Rosenbaum: Called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
A. Rosenbaum: There are no walk-in items. I need a motion to accept the agenda as written.

J. Novak: So moved; T. Arado: was second.

The agenda was approved without dissent or abstention.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2012 FS MEETING (distributed electronically)
A. Rosenbaum: Next we have the minutes of the September 5 meeting. I need a motion to accept the minutes.
J. Kowalski: So moved. M C. Smith: was second.

The minutes were approved as written without dissent or abstention.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Rosenbaum: I want to call your attention to the fact that the president will deliver his State of the University address next Thursday. The State of the University message is always interesting. The president lays out the agenda for the upcoming year and brings us up to speed on what’s going on at the university.

We have a couple of items that I want to update. One is that the Undergraduate Coordinating Council (UCC) has approved a plus/minus grading system which will go into effect in the fall of 2013. You may recall that we have been having an ongoing battle with UCC over the plus/minus grading system. The senate sent forward a grading system (with both an A+ and a C-) that was similar to the one that was adopted by the Graduate School, which included a C-. APASC didn’t like either the A+ or the C-. We had a sub-committee that worked with APASC and ended up with a compromise that I don’t think our committee was particularly happy with and this compromise does not include the C- nor the A+. Last spring when it became apparent that this is what APASC was going to send forward to the UCC, I asked the senate if they wanted me to go to the UCC and fight for the system that we had originally approved. The senate decided not to oppose the grading system. At its September meeting, the UCC accepted APASC’s minutes which means that this grading system will become policy in the fall unless the University Council acts to veto the policy and that will come to the University Council at its next meeting. Faculty Senate members who are also University Council members will have the opportunity, if they so choose, to oppose that plan. I have to say that I am not recommending that we oppose it because my concern is that neither the UCC nor APASC actually wanted the plus/minus system and therefore if the University Council sends it back to them, it’s my belief that they will simply table it and we will not have a plus/minus grading system. So it might be better for us to simply let this pass and then if we are unhappy with it going forward we can revisit it. I just want you to be aware of where that stands and the fact that it does not have to be approved by the University Council. If the University Council does nothing, it becomes policy.

Sonya Armstrong is our representative to the FAC to the IBHE. We need an alternate for Sonya. At the Executive Committee meeting, Debra Zahay-Blatz volunteered to be our alternate and so if anybody else would like to be the alternate we can have a vote, but if nobody else wants to be the alternate we can simply confirm Debra as the alternate. Does anyone have interest in being the alternate to the FAC to the IBHE? Would anyone like to hear Sonya speak a little bit about the position and what is involved? Yes, Sonya would you say a few words about what’s involved in this and why someone might or might not want to be the alternate?

S. Armstrong: Sure. So, basically, it entails traveling to a different university or community college once a month for meetings. Its good food, they feed you. The other benefit I think is really getting a closer look at state legislation that affects us all in higher education. For example, I’m about to give a report where a senator and a representative attended our meeting to talk with
us about issues related to higher education. You learn a lot more I think on the state level by attending these meetings.

A. Rosenbaum: And, again, the alternate would not be attending with any regularity. The alternate would be attending only when Sonya is unable to go. We have a budget in the University Council Office. We get you a car. We will pay for a hotel the night before if you want because these meetings generally start early in the morning and sometimes they are in Bloomington or Champaign or Danville and there’s a bit of travel involved. We will pay for your expenses, we pay for your meals and you get a nice NIU Prius to drive down in, so those are some of the perks. Anyone besides Debra interested, please raise your hand and we can put you in nomination. Okay, I don’t see any hands. I will nominate Debra Zahay-Blatz as our alternate. I need a second.

McHone-Chase: Second.

D. Zahay-Blatz was approved as the alternate without dissent or abstention.

Next item, an issue was brought up at the Steering Committee that involves the fact that we use a lot of paper to distribute our agenda. In addition to the amount of paper that’s used, it takes Pat a fair amount of time, even though she’s not complaining about it, to make copies, staple them together, put them in the envelopes and mail them out. Those who are ecology-minded seem to feel that we could probably do without this. We are already providing you the minutes in electronic form as you know. We could easily send you the agenda in electronic form as well. The Board of Trustees, for example is now using iPads, so if you have your own iPad you can download the agenda and the book onto your iPad. We could do it the same way. I don’t know how many people have iPads or who want to bring their iPads or computers or whatever. But certainly we have the option of going paperless if the senate is agreeable to that. We’ve discussed this at one time in the past and that’s when we decided to go paperless on the minutes. Does anyone have any thoughts about this, about whether we want to go paperless?

A. Rosenbaum: asked how many senators would be able to bring an iPad or laptop and more than half said they could.

M. Lenczewski: I was the person who brought this up in the Steering Committee. Right now I’m looking at the agenda. It’s actually really convenient if you bring your laptop with you because all the attachments are hyperlinked, and you can click on them when we’re discussing something. The room is wireless so you can see everything that is going on. You can get, if there’s any updates, they’re instantaneous in here. And one thing we discussed is if you really want paper, we could have it so that you elect to get paper. The other idea we brought up at the Steering Committee was if we wanted to project, if you didn’t even want to bring anything with you, if we projected the agenda up on a big screen everybody could see what’s going on. I really think that this could save a lot of paper and a lot of time.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, and we appreciate your passion and your respect for the environment. The one problem with the projection, and we can solve this if the senate so chooses, but we have to pay about $60 a pop for the hardware. We could, if the senate so chooses, ask the president to
buy us our own projector. We could do that, but again some of the materials that are on there are a little difficult to read when projected on a screen. It’s smaller and that didn’t really work that well at the Board of Trustees meeting, but we could probably figure out how to work that out as well.

G. Slotsve: Projecting it would be an interesting idea and that actually might work for I think hopefully a number of people here especially if we don’t have to spend the $60 every meeting. Second best would be to make it an option, but I do not think we should have just wireless that you bring your own notebook or iPad. There are faculty for whom the university has not bought notebooks or iPads, so it just isn’t going to work for those individuals. Now rather than sending it out if you want to save on envelopes at least, what you might do is at least have a few copies of it just brought to the meeting that if you want to pick up a hard copy of the agenda, we could just pick it up at the meeting if that’s how you prefer to have the agenda delivered and at least we are saving the envelopes if nothing else.

C. Cappell: One further thought in advocating for the resources is that the $60 charge is absurd. This projector should be mounted like a conference room or a smart classroom. There is absolutely no reason not to have permanent facility available to anyone who uses this room. I would advocate the president and the provost should absorb that cost.

G. Slotsve: If they did mount one it would not only serve the Faculty Senate but the UC has presentations. I mean it serves the whole body. It seems to make sense.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so I can talk to the president about it and see if he’s willing to instruct them to put a projector in here.

J. Novak: I would think either with having the small screens in front of us or having a large screen behind you, it would definitely change the dynamics of the meeting. I think that everyone looking at their electronics and moving their mouse around or having something above you all the time, it will work and it will say money, but I just think it will be a new dynamic that will take a while to adjust to.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so you would think it would affect the meetings in a negative way?


M. Lenczewski: I was just saying that’s where we are going electronically. Our classes are all now wireless.

B. Pitney: I think given the restrictions on students and the number of copies that they can print on campus, I think it’s incumbent upon us to start to reduce the amount of paper we’re using so I would certainly be in favor of this idea.

A. Rosenbaum: It sounds like we have a lot of positives but also a couple of concerns. Okay why don’t we do this, why don’t we just take a quick vote as to whether we would like to go paperless and then we will begin working out some of the details so that we make sure that the
people who want paper are getting it. I will ask the president about having an overhead projector installed.

A. Rosenbaum: explained the clicker voting system for the benefit of new members.

P. Erickson: Announced the vote.

1 – YES – 30
2 – NO – 6
3 – ABSTAIN – 0

A. Rosenbaum: So by a vote of 30-6, we will do what we can to go paperless and, let me put it this way, if you want paper, send Pat an e-mail and so she will keep a list of the people that we have to provide paper to. We will also try to send out an e-mail reminder about the meeting given that you won’t have the agenda in your mailboxes.

Moving on, I don’t know if I announced this previously but all university employees have been designated as mandated reporters of child abuse. You will be hearing from HR shortly. The original plan was that all faculty and anyone else getting a check from the university was going to have to go to the DCFS Web site and complete the mandated reporter training. Apparently, the Web site can’t handle the volume – too many universities, too many employees. HR is developing a modified version of that. As soon as they have that in place, you will be hearing about the need to do this. My understanding is that you will do it once and that’s it. There will be a paper on file with your employer that says that you are aware of your mandated reporter status and you’re all set. New employees will be doing this as part of their orientation.

A. Levin: What if people have already done this training?

A. Rosenbaum: I believe if you have already done this training and you have a certificate or something, there will be an opportunity to provide that to Human Resources.

D. Haliczer: This is a new state law. We are working on getting the information to the Web site. Lots of you already are mandated reporters and you know who you are. All we need to get back from everybody is a certification, a statement that you recognize that you’re a mandated reporter. Alan went ahead and did the entire training. You can, if you choose, do the entire training if you are in a background where this is something that would be appropriate for you. For most people you just need to read the essential materials about what constitutes child abuse, when you should make a report, and how you should make a report. But we are working on all the details and coordinating with DCFS and we should have that very soon. So it’s a one-time thing, we are including all 8,500 or so employees, that’s everybody – student workers and everyone – to do this form.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so in other words, they don’t actually have to do the training, they just have to do the form that says they are aware that they are a mandated reporter?
D. Haliczer: The state law only requires that we acknowledge that we are mandated reporters. If you’re like me, I like to know a little bit, have a little training on what exactly I have to do and what this means, and so the training will be the essential information. If you want to do the whole hour to hour-and-a-half online training, its excellent training.

A. Rosenbaum: It’s actually not bad at all.

D. Haliczer: No, I did it too and I have my certificate, but all we need is for everybody to understand the basics and what to do.

A. Rosenbaum: If somebody has no familiarity of the mandated reporter training and even if they’ve done the thing, they still have questions about what’s reportable, do we have someone who they can talk to?

D. Haliczer: It is likely that I am the person who is going be designated in Human Resources as your advisor if you have questions what to do. Obviously we are all directed to call the Department of Children and Family Services if we have a question, but for basic internal questions I’ll be the consultant on that.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, so essentially if somebody sees something or knows of something and is not certain, they can call you and you will advise them on whether or not they need to make a report or not.

D. Haliczer: We have to assure everyone that if you see or suspect or know of, there is no one who can restrict you from calling the hot line at the State of Illinois. It’s your obligation now by law. No one will tell you not to do it.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, last item that I have has to do with the senate Blackboard community. The policy that we’ve had is that only senators can get into it and I have denied many requests since we started the Blackboard from people who are not senators who wanted to have access to the Blackboard community. The reason I have done this is because I wanted to have it be a place where senators could discuss issues without concern that it’s leaking into the outside community, administration, Northern Star or whatever. Now we have had a reasonable request from Sonya Armstrong to be given access to the Blackboard. My initial thought was to deny the request but then we thought about it and it seemed like she might have good reason to have access given that she’s representing our issues to the IBHE. We discussed this in Executive Committee and the Executive Committee felt that Sonya had good grounds for being given access to the Blackboard Web site.

In doing that, the committee also raised a couple of issues which are that the assumption has always been, although I don’t think it’s stated anywhere, that the conversations that take place on the Blackboard are confidential. So if we have a chat or if we open up a discussion thread, the intention was that senators would not violate the confidentiality of that. On the other hand, many of the things that we post on Blackboard are there for you to download and distribute to your departments, if you wish. I agreed that we would put a confidentiality statement on the Blackboard community and that confidentiality statement that we’re working on will say
something like the materials are not confidential unless it specifies on the material that it’s confidential, but any discussion that’s taking place on Blackboard should be kept confidential.

We also decided that we couldn’t simply make an exception for Sonya without also having a procedure for considering the requests of others, so what the Executive Committee decided was that if anybody who is not a senator wants access to the Blackboard community, then they would have to write a letter to the Executive Committee explaining why they ought to have access and how that would benefit either the senate or the faculty as a whole, and we will consider those in Executive Committee and not burden the senate with them. If anyone has any concerns about that or would like to suggest that the senate as a whole should rule on these, please say so.

M C. Smith: Are Faculty Senate meetings open meetings?

A. Rosenbaum: We have treated the Faculty Senate meetings as open meetings. I don’t think they are technically open meetings. If we wanted to, we would not have to follow the Open Meetings Act, because we are not a policy-making body. We invite people to come, the Northern Star covers us, so for all intents and purposes, we behave as an open meeting but we’re not required to do so.

M C. Smith: So, if we’re acting as an open meeting, then that suggests to me that our Blackboard community site should also be open in the interest of transparency.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, one of the problems with that is we have gotten burned a few times on things that we have discussed in the senate that found their way into the Northern Star and then created some problems, so sometimes it makes us a little gun shy about discussing certain issues on the floor of the senate and that really shouldn’t be the case. We should be able to discuss issues that are of import to the faculty without fear that anything we say might end up in the newspaper. So for that reason we have closed the Blackboard community to outside individuals.

D. Zahay-Blatz: I also think the Blackboard site has documents that are under discussion and under review and it’s a good place for us to talk about those things off-line so I’m not sure it should be public.

A. Rosenbaum: I would oppose making it public. I think we would largely lose the purpose of it if we did.

M C. Smith: I’m just in favor of transparency.

A. Rosenbaum: I can put it to a vote if you ask for that.

M C. Smith: I’m not sensing a lot of love here. It’s my own opinion.

A. Rosenbaum: Okay, fair enough. Any other opinions on this or comments? If we don’t have any other comments, we’ll follow that policy of considering applications on a case by case basis and will not burden the senate with making those decisions unless the senate would like us to do otherwise.
J. Kowalski: In the case of Sonya, the reason why the exception might be made is essentially that she is the NIU representative to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council. That makes good sense, but it’s really the position of the person involved that should be the criteria and I think not the person.

A. Rosenbaum: Yes, exactly.

J. Kowalski: I hope that would be the applicable principle used.

A. Rosenbaum: That’s the only reason she’s been given it – by virtue of her position.

V. ITEMS FOR FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

VII. REPORTS FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Sonya Armstrong – report – Pages 3-4

The Three-Year Bachelor’s Degree, AASCU (also posted to FS Blackboard)

MAP 101 (also posted to FS Blackboard)

A. Rosenbaum: We have reports, the first one coincidentally from Sonya who will update us on the FAC to the IBHE. Sonya.

S. Armstrong: So we met September 21 at Moraine Valley Community College. I’m trying out a new format here so you have to tell me if you like this better where its topic-based and I’m using my best journalistic principles to put the most important information at the top. First, some news, the IBHE staff is growing. They’ve recently hired three new assistant directors of academic affairs and right this minute they are actually doing interviews to replace the deputy director, Bob Blankenburger. We’re told that we should have a new deputy director in place by the end of this month, early November at the very latest. Staffing is going well.

The second item is actually the three-year bachelor’s degree. I did get a document posted on Blackboard in case you want to know more about this. I’m bringing it kind of as an information item only. It was posed to us at the meeting with some urgency, however, what you’ll note is that when we had guests, Senator Ed Maloney and also Representative Bob Pritchard, when we had them come in and discuss this, they had no knowledge of a three-year degree, they did not feel like it was something that we should be worried about. But given the urgency with which this was posed to us, I thought I’d bring it back just so it’s on our radar that this is a possibility. That document will actually explain the various models for a three-year bachelor’s degree in case you’re interested.

The last thing and this is something I think I reported on last spring, the IBHE is considering and is now moving forward with, a Faculty Fellows Program. This is kind of a cool idea, I think, in that faculty can actually take sabbatical time to work on special projects with the IBHE. So this
would be you know on a case-by-case basis, the university would have to absorb costs and such, but as soon as I get information about this I can bring this back in case any senators want to apply for this for a sabbatical.

The remainder of the meeting was spent with Ed Maloney and Bob Pritchard putting items on our agenda and suggesting to us avenues to take in our discussions. As always MAP funding was number one.

Performance-based funding came up again and the way that it came up was really more just kind of an information item. I’m told that at the next meeting we’re going to have performance-based funding 101 because it came back that a lot of us don’t really understand the principles of performance-based funding, so I’ll be able to update you on that next time.

And then finally, the issue of public and media relations continues to come up and both Pritchard and Maloney gave us a lot of suggestions as to how we can better communicate with the press.

The last thing I point your attention to is on the second page, those of us in the public caucus met to determine what topics we wanted to address this year and you can look at the list. It’s probably all the usual suspects: pensions, performance-based funding, program elimination, and so on. If there are other topics that you want us to address in the public caucus, if you want to send those to me then I’ll be happy to take those back, but currently this is our list of topics for discussion this year. I think that concludes my report.

A. Levin: I would like to draw everyone’s attention to I think its slide 14 in the MAP PowerPoint, and if you don’t have it here, when you leave here. It’s a breakdown of how many weeks a year a student would have to work full-time to afford college these days. And according to that chart, it’s 36 weeks a year. I adjusted it for Illinois minimum wage which is as you know a dollar more than federal, and it would be 32 weeks a year. So this means that a student would have to work full-time for 32 weeks to afford college before paying for any living expenses and I think that’s a critical issue for all faculty to be aware of because it’s going to affect everything about how we approach students. So I just wanted to draw attention to that.

A. Rosenbaum: Other comments, and remember Sonya is also asking how we feel about this new format, which I think by the way is great. It really makes it a much more readable report. Sonya, one point that I was concerned about is that they keep making this point that performance-based funding – the money is insignificant at this point. And I think that’s a way of getting us to go along with anything they want but the percentage is going to increase and so we have to make sure that the criteria that are in place, the metrics, are favorable to NIU or we’re going to find ourselves in some trouble.

S. Armstrong: I think it was at that point where we determined that we really didn’t have a good understanding, many of us, and so just like the MAP 101 presentation was given, we’re going to do, like I said, someone is in charge of a performance-based funding 101 for us all and I’ll be able to bring that back.
A. Rosenbaum: Mike Theodore is going to give us the Student Association report.

M. Theodore: presented the following points regarding student concerns:

- Quotas on student copying paid for by the university – professors need to be aware of these quotas as may require a great deal of printing.
- The student grievance policy which is working its way through the UC Committee on University Affairs. The students have developed a working draft which they hope will serve as a stimulus for discussion of a grievance policy.
- Safety and crime issues, especially in off-campus housing areas.

A. Rosenbaum: Does the Student Association have some idea of what they would be asking the university or the faculty to do about the safety problem? Or are they just saying the university isn’t doing enough?

M. Theodore: Well, from my perspective, from Austin’s perspective, and from the perspective of many people in the Student Association, first of all, before it gets to any specific ways to address crime, is we have to get past this perception-versus-reality issue. It’s been talked about so many times and I’ve talked to so many people within NIU, within the administration, about the crime issue and they keep saying: It’s not a crime issue we’re dealing with, it’s a perception issue. From the students that are around here, this is not a perception issue, this is a reality when you are dealing with major crimes around the area where students are living every single night. That’s definitely the first step we have to get behind that this is not a perception issue, this is a reality. Once we get past that step and once we start looking into this issue as a reality and not something we can just push away, there’s a large amount of things that can be done and they’ve already been looked into. We’ve been talking a lot with the safety cabinet as well as with NIU police about options. But when I talk with many people above them, it’s all about perception and that’s a problem. This is reality. In many ways when we hear a lot of talk about what’s going to be done about crime, we don’t really take it very seriously when it’s just being talked about as this is a perception issue. When it’s a reality issue then we can start taking this seriously. That’s the first step.

And secondly, last year we saw when homecoming came around which we all know is a big time where we see a lot of stuff happening in the area, last year the campus starting getting a lot more involved in the area where there is usually crime. We have walk-around programs just making sure nobody is doing anything dangerous outside. That is something that I know is being taken into account again this year, so that’s the first step. Besides that, I don’t have any, because I’ve heard so many different opinions and Student Association we haven’t exactly gotten together and relayed exactly what we want done, so I don’t really feel comfortable talking specifically about specific things, but definitely starting to take it seriously is the first step.

A. Rosenbaum: But, again, the idea that you’re suggesting is that the administration is seeing this merely as a perception and that would imply that they are not doing anything, when in fact it appears that they are deploying a lot of university security into those areas, some of the higher
level administrators are working very closely with the police, so they are taking actions they are not just saying you’re imagining this. It would seem that perhaps they’re concerned that the impression in the outside world that NIU is not a safe place is not fair, but that doesn’t mean that they are not concerned about things that are going on in the community because it sounds like, to a great extent, they are working to keep things under control in the areas that you are talking about.

M. Theodore: And this is really what confused me and bothers me in many respects is that the university is taking steps but at the same time is saying that it is a perception issue. So it’s sort of a very odd balance. So the question is: If you’re saying it’s a perception issue and you’re taking steps, are you taking steps to appear as if you are taking steps, or are you taking steps because there is a crime issue. So there is this really uncomfortable balance that I think is occurring and I think we all need to get on the same page here and that it is a real issue around the area.

A. Rosenbaum: Other comments?

G. Chen: raised the question of whether NIU should be doing background checks of incoming students and also expressed concern that certain groups of students might be contributing disproportionately to the problem.

A. Rosenbaum: NIU doesn’t do background checks I think on any of our students so that’s not a university policy.

Several individuals present suggested that identifying specific groups was unproductive and discriminatory and strongly expressed their disagreement with Dr. Chen’s comments.

M. Theodore: I just wanted to comment further that the big issue that we’re seeing off-campus is not just something dealing with the student body. What we frequently deal with are non-student to non-student problems. We look at non-student to student relations that often cause a lot of these crimes to be committed and what I’ve heard from many people, and I’m not saying this is the general add to this being said, but a lot of saying: Okay, if it’s a non-student committing a crime to a student off-campus, that’s not really university concern. But that is a concern, because it is hurting the safety of our students directly in the area of where they are living around campus and that is something that NIU needs to address because we need to protect the student body even if it’s protecting the students from non-students off-campus. That is where we are seeing a lot of the crime being committed and that’s why a lot of these crimes aren’t coming up in the Clery Act report and so the statistics are not accurate.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, I believe the Clery Act does report on crimes in areas adjacent to the campus. It’s not just restricted to the campus proper.

M. Theodore: Yea, I know but just when I read the Clery Act it just doesn’t seem to be totally accurate regarding the real issue around campus. And maybe it is just because I live off-campus around where these things are occurring. I’ve known people who are being directly affected by it and so when I’m reading, you know, that things are looking better, when in the past month around the area where a lot of students are living, including myself, we’ve been seeing a lot of
issues and issues that we just can’t ignore anymore. Even if these are issues with non-students, this is something that’s affecting us, you know, when we’re having all these issues happening right by us and so that’s why we’re bringing it up. That’s why we’re bringing this to Faculty Senate, to University Council, to everywhere we can because this affects everything.

A. Rosenbaum: Well, again, I’m sure the faculty shares your concerns about the safety of students so if there is something that faculty can do, I’m sure we would be happy to do that. We certainly need to keep students safe. Any other comments or questions for Mike?

C. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Kerry Freedman and Andy Small – no report

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

E. BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Todd Latham and Rosita Lopez – no report

F. BOT – Alan Rosenbaum – report – Pages 7-8

A. Rosenbaum: The main issues had to do with the approval of the internal budget. The budget for 2013 was approved. They also approved the budget guidelines for the FY2014 budget.

The president presented an update regarding the progress on the Vision 2020 initiative. You have a link in this report to the president’s PowerPoint. Among the highlights were improvements in enrollments of first-year students. Our enrollment of new freshman students, first-year students, was good. It reversed a trend of decreasing enrollments for the last couple of years. The quality of the students was higher and we had improvements in the number of students coming from the top ten percent and the top 25 percent of their graduating high school classes. We had an improvement in our average ACT. We had a very good enrollment of honor students, I think close to twice as many as last year, with an average ACT score of 29 and an average high school GPA of 3.96 out of 4. The number of students retained has continued to be a problem and the number of transfer students state-wide has declined and all the universities are feeling that decline.

G. Slotsve: Just wanted to comment on a couple of things here. I’m happy to see that among the honors, the ACT, the average score went up. On the other hand, the mean is a summary statistic and it would be useful to maybe see a histogram of these ACT scores. For example, 16-17, 17-18, I can get a mean going up and have a bimodal distribution sitting here and have a higher percentage coming in at the bottom end. This was also reported for honors students. It would be interesting to see this for all students. It’s nice to know what’s going on with the honors students and our best students, but what’s happening overall to our student body? Once again, a mean can mask underlying distributional changing. I would hope we can get some information as to what’s going on at the low end of the distribution versus the top end of the distribution and see if we got a bimodal distribution of the students at the university and how that’s evolving.
**A. Rosenbaum:** We can certainly get that information. I have spoken to Ray Alden about coming in and addressing the senate and he was very amenable to that. He asked that we wait until after the president’s State of the University address. If the senate would like, we can invite Ray to come in and he can address some of these issues with us.

**R. Feurer:** For those who are statistically accomplished, I’ll put it in another way. I have been told that the number of students coming in with 16 and 17 ACTs has gone up markedly and that those students are not being sent to the CHANCE Program. There is a formula that’s been developed so that there are more admissions. I’m gravely concerned. I’d like to know if that’s true.

**A. Rosenbaum:** Okay, we’ll invite the provost to come in and fill us in on those issues and address questions that we might have for him and we can do that at our next meeting.

**VIII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES**

A. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities – Brad Cripe, Chair – no report
B. Academic Affairs – Charles Cappell, Chair – no report
C. Economic Status of the Profession – Debra Zahay-Blatz, Chair – no report
D. Rules and Governance – Ibrahim Abdel-Motaleb, Chair – no report
E. Resources, Space and Budgets – Jim Wilson, Liaison/Spokesperson – report – Page 9
F. Elections and Legislative Oversight – Therese Arado, Chair – no report

**IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**X. NEW BUSINESS**

**XI. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**XII. INFORMATION ITEMS**

A. [Alternate Policy](#) – Page 10
B. [Annual Report](#), University Benefits Committee
C. [Minutes](#), Academic Planning Council
D. [Minutes](#), Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee
E. [Minutes](#), Athletic Board
F. [Minutes](#), Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee
G. [Minutes](#), Committee on Advanced Professional Certification in Education
H. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education
I. [Minutes](#), Committee on Initial Teacher Certification
J. [Minutes](#), Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Experience
K. Minutes, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum
L. Minutes, General Education Committee
M. Minutes, Honors Committee
N. Minutes, Operating Staff Council
O. Minutes, Supportive Professional Staff Council
P. Minutes, Undergraduate Coordinating Council
Q. Minutes, University Assessment Panel
R. Minutes, University Benefits Committee

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

A. Rosenbaum: Called for a motion to adjourn.

C. Cappell: Move to adjourn. J. Novak: was second.

Meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.