

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, October 21, 2009**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2009***

**Motion XXXXI-23:** By Senator Marquis, seconded by Senator Mackey, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of October 7, 2009. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Distance Education Task Force Presentation (Darrell Kruger, Taskforce Chairperson)***

**Darrell Kruger, Distance Education Taskforce Chairperson:** We circulated a first draft of the taskforce's recommendations and we are at the stage where we are getting input from the campus community. Given the way that we were able to get data from Institutional Research, my comments pertain to 100% online courses. Data are not available for hybrid courses. In terms of online enrollment in courses, we experienced a growth from 1% to 3% from 2004 to 2008. If we look at the actual number of courses, they increased from about 50 in 2004 to just over 250 in 2008. If we look at student enrollment in courses, we went from 2,000 students in 2004 to more than 5,000 in 2008. In summer 2007, we had about 70 online courses. In summer 2008, it doubled to 140 courses. The other component that we looked at was how online courses were funded. In 2004, all online courses were funded with general revenue monies. In 2008, 60% of all online courses were funded through what we call cost recovery sources, i.e. contract, grant funded, as well as the flex model. So 40% of online courses were funded with GR money.

In terms of departmental participation, about nine departments participated in online course offerings in 2004 and that increased to about 21 departments in 2008. Having established that baseline, we could see where we were at and make recommendations about where we would like to be. The metaphor I like to use is that when we started our work about 18 months ago, the online course train had left the station. Our goal was not to advocate for an increase in online courses by a certain date; it was to make recommendations for planned and purposeful distance ed instruction, which included online courses, so that we could maintain the quality of our instruction.

We did not only look at ISU; we took a national view as well and we used the Sloan C Consortium data as a point of entry in terms of understanding what was happening nationally with online education. The data that we used was 2006 data at the time that we started, which was the most recent at that time. The conclusions that we drew from that were based on the reporting of chief academic officers of about 4,500 institutions across the U.S. What was particularly instructive was looking at the barriers that chief academic officers identified to the widespread adoption of online learning. The first barrier identified is that students need much more discipline to succeed in online courses. The second was a lack of acceptance of online instruction by faculty. During our focus groups and during our faculty survey, that was a theme that seemed to crop again and again...the skepticism of faculty in general about online courses and the quality of those courses. The third barrier to adoption of online learning was lower retention rates in online courses. Numbers four and five were it takes money to develop online courses and it costs more money to deliver online courses with 24/7 tech support and things of that nature.

With that groundwork, the second period of time, from September of last year until June of this year, the four work teams, which were a curricular work team, instruction work team, policy work team and a funding work team, crafted recommendations based on a number of data sources. We had about eight focus groups for faculty, students and advisors. We did a faculty and a student online survey. We had discussion forums with academic units, including the chairs council, as well as with departments and deans. We had a blog component on the distance ed website wherein during the second phase of our work, we would post reports and enable faculty and others to give us feedback.

In addition to those data sources that we collected, we used two existing sources of data. A faculty member in EAF had done a study at ISU called learning to teach online and teaching online, looking at mentoring. The Provost's Office in 2008 had conducted a survey for the summer three-week session. We used those data in framing our recommendations.

The third period of our work stretched from July to the present and that is where we have solidified the work team recommendations into a first draft. We have circulated this draft to the campus community and we are in the process of doing open forums. After those end at the end of this month, we will meet again and incorporate those suggestions into our final document and prepare that to give to Provost Everts in early December.

**Senator Kalter:** In terms of the increase from 2004 to 2008, would you characterize that as students who are already enrolled in ISU or are we capturing a group of people who we wouldn't ordinarily capture?

**Dr. Kruger:** I think it's primarily more of the first. What we discovered with the student surveys is that ISU students want the flexibility of being able to take primarily General Education courses during the summer when they are not at ISU.

**Senator Kalter:** How does that compare to other institutions since you said the train had already left the station? Is it true that online courses at other institutions generally do capture a group of people who wouldn't ordinarily be there?

**Dr. Kruger:** It is very difficult to get your hands on that level of data. ISU has comparator institutions. At the macro-scale, if we look at ISU regionally and we look at online enrollments, ISU tends to lag a little bit behind the Midwest, but not very far.

**Senator Kalter:** I was interested to hear that it costs more to offer an online course. I would have expected the opposite. How much more does it cost?

**Dr. Kruger:** I think it's more on the development end than on the delivery end. Faculty salaries remain the same whether you teach a course online or face to face. It costs more for the instruction because you have technology issues that you have to grapple with and so you have to make that investment not on an individual course basis, but basically on a college or university level so that when students are experiencing a problem at 10:00 p.m., they can call in to a 24/7 help desk. So it is the support systems around the online courses that drive up the cost. On the development end, Sloan C data, as well as what we hear anecdotally from the faculty at ISU, point to the fact that it takes a whole lot more time up front to develop the course to put the course online than it would for a face-to-face course. We don't have any particular benchmarks.

**Senator Monahan:** Is there any discussion of getting an upgraded version of Blackboard since that is what

most online courses utilize?

**Dr. Kruger:** I cannot say yes or no. One of the recommendations in the fourth part of the report is specifically asking for additional resources to support platforms like Blackboard and other forms of technology.

**Senator Borg:** Is any sort of full implementation of distance education courses contingent upon getting those resources? Has the committee considered where those resources might come from or are you just stating that this is what needs to happen?

**Dr. Kruger:** The latter.

**Senator Borg:** In the report, those are essentially ideal or minimum sums of things that you are recommending?

**Dr. Kruger:** In Mark Walbert's part of the report, they are at a minimum and the taskforce does suggest those amounts be revisited annually. If you look at the amount of money requested, it's \$3.8 million. About \$2 million is for instructional costs and that figure was derived when you look at the flex funding model that existed. We looked at the number of courses that were offered online, whether flex funded or otherwise, and used that as a baseline to come up with that dollar amount.

**Senator Borg:** Was the committee under the impression that the university wants to pursue this aggressively or was it under the impression that it is inevitable so we had better do this?

**Dr. Kruger:** It is a reality that faculty, to the extent that they want to, have embraced online learning and have been fairly resourceful in developing those courses and delivering them, but the taskforce went into our work to make recommendations for the purposeful and planned delivery of online courses should academic units wish to continue to embrace it.

**Senator Glascock:** In reading the report, it appeared that online courses, at least in the summer, were funded by flex funding. There was some concern that if that funding were stopped, there would be fewer courses offered in the summer. I was wondering if that is the case because flex funding was stopped after 2008.

**Dr. Kruger:** Correct. The taskforce is making recommendations for distance education and funding models figure into that. With flex funding going away, it would be very difficult to fund the number of online courses at the level they were funded.

**Senator Glascock:** Do you know what happened to the flex funding?

**Dr. Kruger:** I know it went away. I don't know why.

**President Bowman:** Flex was gobbling up a large amount of general revenue funds and the growth in those expenditures wasn't sustainable, so we pulled back and are looking at other models for funding summer so that things like online courses for General Ed where there is a lot of demand can go forward. We put \$700,000 additional dollars into this coming summer session and that essentially replaces most of the flex dollars that were there before. That will get us through this year and then we can try to come up with some sort of sustainable model for summers 2011 and beyond.

**IBHE-FAC Report (Professor Lane Crothers)**

**Professor Lane Crothers, IBHE-FAC Representative:** When last I was here, there was a large hole in MAP.

MAP has allegedly been passed. I don't know where the money is coming from. Every single layer of the budget keeps getting worse and worse. While there is always hope that there will be some kind of meaningful tax reform in this state, I would say that it is extremely unlikely. The big issue in my report is positive time reporting. It is the law that we are supposed to do this. It is a law that has fallen in the breach. Positive time reporting means that we are supposed to explain in 15 minute increments what we are doing with our day. The good news is that it doesn't appear that in the state legislature anybody cares. It is not an issue; no one is angry or talking about it. It is my sense that it would cause such an upheaval on any campus to attempt to create such a mechanism that I would certainly avoid it if we can do so.

The Director of ISAC and the people who give out the MAP money apparently presented at the last IBHE meeting. I wasn't there, but Dr. Bowman was and can tell me if I am misstating this in anyway. There was some discussion about whether or not all of the public universities are using their resources wisely. One could ask the question why you should build state of the art biology labs at Chicago State. The faculty at Chicago State are probably not doing high-level, sophisticated biological research because of the nature of the institution. They are teaching a lot; they are working with students who demand a lot of time. So, if you can figure out a way to do it, why not have Chicago State use UIC's labs? There is some sense that the state ought to start pushing to see if there are ways to cross fertilize those resources. Along with that is the idea that there is a flagship institution, allegedly the U of I. Rather than having these 11 other institutions trying to be all things to all people, perhaps you ought to concentrate certain kinds of resources in certain kinds of schools going back to what is an older model of higher education. He wasn't so much advocating that as saying the conversation needs to start.

We should keep monitoring SURS. The retirement system has been woefully under funded for 20 plus years. Ten or fifteen years ago, they passed a law requiring that it get the 90% funding of obligations. Every since Blagojevich became governor, those contributions were not really made. They were borrowing in an attempt to fudge the books. We are down to 41% funding of obligations at this point in time. This year's bond sale is supposed to cover the contribution, but has not been scheduled. If you look at the overall budget for higher education, it has actually gone up over the last decade, but all of the growth has been in SURS. The actual funding of the institutions has been going down. There were a couple of bills passed to actually do some taskforce investigation on the question of what is the relationship between tuition and state funding. It seems relatively obvious to us that when you slash state funding, tuition goes up. I don't think there are any easy solutions to any of this.

**Senator Borg:** In the discussion of the 12 universities and the allocation of resources and consolidation, did anybody bring up the discussion from some 20 years ago about PQP?

**Professor Crothers:** I must say that that is a second hand analysis. This presentation was at the IBHE and the chair of our body is reporting his understanding of it, so I would not go anywhere far enough down that road.

**President Bowman:** The comments came from Andy Davis, the ISAC Executive Director, and I don't think they signal any kind of new initiative. The comments were buried in the context of what the state could do to generate more financial aid for students that are needy. In the course of that conversation, he talked about the need for higher ed to be more "efficient", but this is a gentleman, to my knowledge, who has never worked at a university. So the comments lacked depth and understanding. John Peters, the President of Northern, and I

talked to him after his presentation and really took him to task for what we thought was a terrible line of reasoning. He apologized. I just don't think it's going to get legs.

### ***Chairperson's Remarks***

**Senator Holland:** Everyone was here last week for Homecoming. It was absolutely fabulous. We actually won the football game. There was a wonderful gala; there were 52 total events. ISU will be hosting the Council of Illinois University Senates meeting on November 10. This is where the chairs of all the senates from around the state get together. If you have any ideas that you would like us to discuss, please send them to me. Finally, please read the document from the Distance Education Taskforce. This is a very important issue.

### ***Student Body President's Remarks***

**Senator Spialek:** I told you about STOP, Students on Patrol, at our last meeting. They have had 13 students, or faculty and staff, escorted home. There were 14 university violation citations issued as a result of STOP and there were seven arrests. Hopefully, we can have that volunteer number go up a little higher. Again, it is open to students, faculty and staff. The number to call is 309-438-8631. We saved the MAP Grant, or I should say that students from across the State of Illinois saved the MAP Grant. We took with us those 4,234 signatures from our student body. We had 18 Student Government members travel to Springfield along with the Vidette and TV10. There were also two students who are not in Student Government, but who wanted to show that spirit of bipartisanship. The President of College Democrats and the President of College Republicans also came down. As Professor Crothers explained, there is no permanent funding source for the MAP Grant, so essentially what we did last week was a band-aid solving the problem for next semester, but it will probably come up in the next fiscal year, so Student Government is planning another lobby day in the spring to be more proactive on the issue. On behalf of Student Government, we want to thank you for all of your help in letting students know what Student Government was trying to do to bring the MAP Grant back.

### ***Administrators' Remarks***

#### ***President Al Bowman***

**President Bowman:** I also want to thank everyone for participating in Homecoming. The level of departmental participation has gone up pretty dramatically over the last few years. I think when I first started in this job, just a bit more than half of all departments were inviting back alumni for Friday activities. I think that we had full participation this year. I think that attendance at most events was the largest we have ever seen in our history. There is lots of interest in the institution on the part of alumni and that is certainly showing up in private gifts. We are already at the \$7 million mark in private gifts after the first three months of the fiscal year.

I want to thank students for getting involved in MAP funding. Shining light on that important program was extremely important. Our graduation rates for MAP recipients are very good, within four points of the general population. There were members of the General Assembly who just didn't know how important it was. We will certainly advocate strongly in the spring and I am glad to hear that students are going to continue to push.

I would like to really applaud Rod Custer's work. The grant applications and successful grants awarded have gone up dramatically. A couple of days ago, Rod informed me that this year so far we are at \$13.4 million in grants funded. That is 42% ahead of where we were in our best year. We also have had continuing interest in a number of companies who want to participate with Illinois State either in terms of supporting scholarships,

internships, recruiting on campus. Even Caterpillar, which is not hiring right now, inquired about upcoming job fairs.

Dr. Crothers is right. There is not a lot of good financial news coming out of Springfield, but I do want to assure you that the spending plan that we have implemented this year is based on a set of assumptions that includes the stimulus dollars not being there next year. We assume that declining state revenues will likely result in an inability on the part of the state to backfill and replace those stimulus dollars. We also assume that there may be at least some reduction in our state support in terms of GRF funding. We are also assuming that it is very unlikely that there will be a tax increase in this coming spring or even beyond. The best guess is that it is not likely to happen until FY12, which would be the spring session of 2011. That is driving how we are spending our dollars and we are continuing the hiring freeze. We are being very cautious in taking on expenditures that have to be annualized. We are doing things that I think in the long run will save us enormous amounts of money. The zone chiller efforts, Dan Layzell's work on identifying other opportunities to realize significant utility savings...those things will pay off. Our corporate support continues to grow so I think we are making all of the right moves.

**Senator Kalter:** Are you carrying the H1N1 report?

**President Bowman:** Steve Adams is out of town. There has been an up tick in cases at our Student Health Services this week. I believe they saw over 50 cases yesterday, so there seems to be a change and that is reflected statewide. It is still relatively modest given the size of our campus, but we may have begun to turn the corner. The other item that Steve would have reported on is the mass e-mail that you probably saw that included the link to the security video at the Marriott. Within an hour of that distribution on campus, two of our students turned themselves in to the Normal Police. There will probably be a media report in the morning.

**Senator Glasscock:** Would the restoration of the MAP funding have any implications on faculty salaries?

**President Bowman:** Absolutely. It removes our largest financial problem for this year, so I anticipate that we will be able to move forward with a raise in the spring. We are still dragging our feet because we are not completely convinced that there won't be a midyear cut. We want to wait until the spring semester to get a clearer picture about what's going to happen to our state GRF funding.

**Senator Wedwick:** I wonder if you could verify that those raises will be for all faculty groups and not just associates. I had heard that perhaps if we did get a raise in the spring, it would be just for associates and fulls.

**President Bowman:** No, it would be for everyone. I guess part of the confusion is that we have been doing midyear raises and this one happens to fall at the midyear point, but it would not be associated with the typical parameters of the midyear raise program.

· **Provost Sheri Everts**

**Provost Everts:** I am happy and pleased to be here. The library dean search continues. I want to thank the committee members for all of their expertise, time and hard work. Jonathan Rosenthal is serving as the Provost's liaison to that committee. Dr. Klaus Schmidt is serving as the chair of that committee. The first round of interviews is coming up soon. As soon as we have the information about on-campus interviews, we will get it out to the campus. I would also mention that work has started on the 2010 student recruitment. It never stops. Currently, we have about 5,000 new freshman applicants to date in line with last year at this time. The ACT profile of applicants also remains consistent at around 25. Interest from underrepresented

students remains strong, up 31% date to date, and we have admitted 24% more underrepresented students compared to last year, again date to date. Transfer applications are also similarly in line with last year at this same time. Finally, I close with a thank you to the Distance Education Taskforce. That has been a lot of work and it represents a lot of time.

· *Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams - Excused*

· *Vice President of Finance and Planning Daniel Layzell*

**Vice President Layzell:** The Campus Master Plan process is getting underway and this is going to be where we are going to be taking a look at the future facilities and infrastructure needs relative to our goals over the next ten to twenty years. We will be kicking off a meeting of the steering committee, which is essentially all four vice presidents and the capital planning and budgeting team. There are three members of the Senate on that team, Dan Holland, Matt Spialek and Brian Huonker. Our goal is to have the plan finalized and endorsed by the BOT and the campus governance groups by February 2011. We are currently working on getting a web page up with regard to the master plan and the master plan process. We hope to have that up in the next couple of weeks. We will be using this as one of our key modes of communication with the campus community on ongoing activities. We intend to provide several opportunities for input throughout this process. As an initial step, we are in the process of scheduling two to three public forums that will be held in November and December. We have not finalized the dates of those forums. We will be setting up meetings with the various governance groups, colleges and other stakeholders in the coming weeks. I would encourage any of you to contact me if you have any thoughts or concerns regarding the plan.

My facilities update will deal with Stevenson. That is the only new news. The first floor bathrooms should be open this week. The second floor will be open shortly thereafter; likewise with the drinking fountains. Benches will be installed as part of the project. They will look similar to what is currently in Schroeder. Finally, the Associate Vice President for HR search, which was put on hold in September, is now gearing back up. We will be getting that search started again very shortly and our goal is to have somebody in that position by late in the spring.

***Committee Reports:***

***Academic Affairs Committee***

**Senator Gudding:** Tonight the committee discussed and approved changes to the Residency Status Policy. We will be sending that to the Executive Committee in a few days. We also discussed and drafted language for a Sense of the Senate Resolution that we will bring forward next month.

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

**Senator Kalter:** We talked about some improvements that we would like to make to the survey instrument that we use to gather commentary on the President annually.

***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Senator Liechty:** We ended our work on the University Professor proposal or our recommendations for wider Senate approval and have already passed that on to the Executive Committee. We discussed what might happen to the ombudsman position and we are planning to have recommendations for that.

***Planning and Finance Committee:***

**Senator Fazel:** Tonight, we had Mark Walbert, Associate VP for Information Technology, as our guest. We

had a very interesting and informative discussion of the status of IT at ISU compared to our benchmark institutions.

### ***Rules Committee***

**Senator Solberg:** We have three Information Items on the agenda this evening.

### ***Action Items:***

#### ***09.24.09.01 Equitable Treatment of Students Participating in University Sponsored Events Policy – Revised (Academic Affairs Committee) (In 10/7/09 Packets)***

**Senator Gudding:** Just a reminder, we are only taking action on the revisions for these action items. There was some confusion last time. This policy was changed to allow students to be able to make up exams for university sponsored events. Some professors had been dropping exam grades for times students had missed classes and this is just to put a stop to that and make it more equitable for them.

**Motion XXXXI-24:** By Senator Gudding to approve the policy as revised.

**Senator Borg:** My only concern is how this might be enforced since the changes have to do with grading on the part of the faculty. I simply mention that as a potential difficulty in enforcing this policy, but I do urge the senators to vote in favor of it.

**Senator Fazel:** Is the document exactly the same as the one we discussed at the last Senate meeting?

**Senator Gudding:** It is exactly the same.

**Senator Cedeno:** If a faculty member specifies that he is giving four exams and is dropping one and the dropped exam happens to be the one the student misses while engaged in other activity, that's a legal move.

**Senator Holland:** If a student is missing an exam explicitly for a university sponsored event, then the student must be given the opportunity to make that particular exam up. It is not automatically the dropped exam.

**Senator Cedeno:** Would there be any disciplinary action if a faculty member does not abide by that?

**Senator Holland:** If a student were denied this opportunity, they would have just cause to take it to a grievance panel because it will be official university policy that you have to allow them that opportunity.

**Senator McMahon:** Can it be a different exam?

**Senator Holland:** Make up exams are kind of at the discretion of the faculty member, but it has to cover the same material.

**Senator Brown:** So the enforcement of this falls to the student?

**Senator Holland:** My impression would be that if faculty are made aware of this policy, most would be more than happy to go along with it. In the rare event that somebody says, 'I'm not going to do that', then the department chair or the dean can say that they will do that. If they still refuse, it can be taken to grievance.

**Senator Briggs:** Did we include field trips in the suggested activity?



**Senator Holland:** As I recall from the discussion last time, there is a partial list. Since field trips are usually required, I would assume that that would be covered.

**Senator Gudding:** Point of order. That is not the part of the policy we were concerned with, just the underlined portion.

**Senator Fazel:** If another faculty member schedules a trip and therefore it's a choice between which one to miss, I don't think that would require faculty to give a makeup. That's different from a sporting event where the student has to go. The other is choosing between two classes.

**Senator Kalter:** Point of order. This is out of bounds of the motion on the floor. The motion on the floor is only about the underlined detail that's changed. We can talk about the other stuff at a later time.

**Senator Gudding:** The committee can look at that later.

Senator Borg called the question. There were no objections and the policy was unanimously approved.

**09.24.09.02** *Community College and Other Transfer Students – University Studies or General Education Policy – Revised (Academic Affairs Committee) (In 10/7/09 Packets)*

**Senator Gudding:** The entire policy is unchanged except for one line clarifying the difference between the college program of University Studies from the General Education program of University Studies.

**Motion XXXXI-25:** By Senator Gudding to approve the policy as revised. The policy was unanimously approved.

**09.24.09.03** *College Level Examination Policy – Revised (Academic Affairs Committee) (In 10/7/09 Packets)*

**Senator Gudding:** Point eight was changed because CLEP was changed in a different policy and this change here reflects the change there. Point nine was changed to show the updated information concerning the University Testing Office policy.

**Senator Kalter:** Point eight essentially tells you how many credits you are allowed to receive in particular categories if you have a certain score on the CLEP exam. Point nine is telling us that there are other exams you might be able to take. Is that correct?

**Senator Gudding:** Yes.

**Motion XXXXI-26:** By Senator Gudding to approve the policy as revised. The policy was unanimously approved.

**09.24.09.04** *Deans' List Policy – Revised (Academic Affairs Committee) (In 10/7/09 Packets)*

**Senator Gudding:** Some minor revisions were made just to keep up with the current ways of doing things.

**Motion XXXXI-27:** By Senator Gudding to approve the policy as revised. The policy was unanimously approved.

**Information Items:**

**10.08.09.01** *Blue Book Revision: Academic Planning Committee Membership Confirmation (Rules*

*Committee)*

**Senator Solberg:** For all of the External Committee faculty memberships, it generally requires that they have approval by the Faculty Caucus or the Academic Senate with the exception being the Academic Planning Committee. Unless someone is aware of some institutional history of why that is so, we think it was just an oversight when it was put together. So the language simply reads, “faculty representatives from each college, dean appointment, confirmed by the Faculty Caucus for staggered two-year term”. The only change is that they would be confirmed by the Faculty Caucus of the Senate.

The document will come before the Senate as an Action Item at the next meeting.

**10.08.09.04 College of Education Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Solberg:** In keeping with the process of going through the bylaws every five years, we received the revised bylaws of the College of Education.

Senator Solberg highlighted some of the substantive changes within the bylaws.

**Senator Kalter:** When bylaws go through the Rules Committee, have they already been voted on by the entire faculty of that college or just by college council that has revised the document?

**Senator Thompson:** It was just the college council, which was elected by the college as a whole.

**Senator Fazel:** Are the questions limited to changes or anything about the bylaws?

**Senator Holland:** It’s usually about the changes, but there are so many of them here.

**Senator Fazel:** The membership of the college council consists of 14 faculty members and 3 students. Have they considered adding AP and civil service to the council?

**Senator Solberg:** We looked at the amendments and that was not an issue that was brought up at our meeting.

**Senator Fazel:** Would they consider that?

**Senator Solberg:** I can ask.

**Senator Holland:** That may be something that we want to encourage them to do because that would be in keeping with the spirit of shared governance.

**Senator Fazel:** On page 3, section 3, Terms of Office, it says that each year shall begin August 15 and run through August 14. Then on page 4, Election Schedules, Schedule 2, by the third week in April, departments will elect their members. Then Section 3 says that they would begin their terms at the first regular meeting of the college council following their election. That may not necessarily be August 14, correct?

**Senator Thompson:** Historically, you are elected in the spring and you start in August, so the council members finish out the term.

**Senator Fazel:** You may want to revise that or remove that since you already say that it is August to August.

**Senator Holland:** You don’t really need section 3.

**Senator Solberg:** I will inquire about that as well.

The document will come before the Senate as an Action Item at the next meeting.

**05.08.09.03 College of Business Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee)**

Senator Solberg highlighted the substantive changes.

**Senator Dawson:** My question is similar to Senator Fazel's in terms of representation of some of the other constituents within the college and somehow, where appropriate, providing for AP, civil service and non-tenure track as well. We talk about appointed members, but there is no provision for including those groups.

**Senator Kalter:** Are you saying that on page 2, under Article 4, Section 4, it says that faculty, staff and students are all eligible to serve, but there is no provision that they will necessarily serve?

**Senator Dawson:** Correct. There's no initiative there to provide for that.

**Senator Solberg:** I can take that back as well. Historically, there tends to be an advisor on all those groups and some may have student involvement. Typically, all of the teams I have been on have had an AP staff from student advisement and things like that. Again, I will bring the question up.

**Senator Fazel:** Senator Dawson makes a very good point. I have already brought it up and the college is working on it. This is a document that was approved last year by the faculty so we thought we would just take it through the Senate and then work on improving the document so that it is much more inclusive in the future.

The document will come before the Senate as an Action Item at the next meeting.

**Communications**

**Senator Mackey:** Last year the Association of Residence Halls brought home three school of the year awards on the state, regional and national levels.

**Adjournment**

**Motion XXXXI-28:** By Senator Marquis, seconded by Senator Stewart, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.