

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 3-2-2011

Senate Meeting, March 2, 2011

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, March 2, 2011" (2011). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 828.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/828>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, March 2, 2011
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Holland called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senator Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of February 16, 2011

Motion XXXXII-52: By Senator McMahon, seconded by Senator Farrell, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of February 16, 2011. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: We have a busy schedule and then we have the ASPT meeting. Students, I know spring break is coming up. As my membership on the Alcoholic Task Force goes, I encourage you, your friends and colleagues to drink responsibly. Have fun and be safe.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Marquis: Today and tomorrow are the last two sessions, so tomorrow, if you know of anybody, Student Elections will be hosting sessions, so if you know anybody who is interested in running for student elections, those will be tomorrow night. The time and location are on flyers. Students have the opportunity, so just bring this up to anybody that you know is interested or that you think would make a great addition to this group here or just the Student Government Association. The actual dates of the elections are March 29 and 30. Campaigning starts immediately following spring break. I will continue to push the Off-Campus Student Association if anyone knows of any students who would be interested. The Wednesday we get back after break, at 6 PM, the State of the Student Body will happen. That will be me speaking. We will be in the Circus Room.

Administrators' Remarks

- **President Al Bowman - Absent**
- **Provost Sheri Everts - Absent**
- **Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams**

Vice President Adams: If you're going to be around until Saturday, residence halls close. There is one exception and that is Manchester Hall, which is where International House is. It will remain open for students who will be around for the break. We will also have the opportunity to have some other folks around that are not able to go home or are on somewhat of a vacation. The residence halls will be open Sunday afternoon, March 13. The dining centers are closed with some exceptions of places in the Bone Student Center. After lunch on Friday, the dining centers close. Then select dining centers will open on Sunday, March 13.

You mentioned spring break. There is an alternative to Daytona or Clearwater and it's something that has been growing by leaps and bounds and that is the alternative spring break. They started doing a variety of tackling traveling and social issues in various locations around the country. This has grown to 225 of our students who will be participating.

I want to give you an update on the student fitness center and McCormick Hall. We had the actual dedication of the student fitness center and the rededication of McCormick Hall on February 18. More than 400 people

attended that dedication and rededication. In the first week more than 26,000 people went through the doors of the student fitness center, some obviously more than once. Now that number is up to 70,000 in the last eight weeks. Almost 60% of the students have taken advantage of that center.

There is widespread influenza statewide which means we will continue to see those flu cases. Our doctors estimate low to moderate for flu cases.

Vice in the President of Finance and Planning Dan Layzell

Vice President Layzell: First with regard to the Cardinal Court redevelopment, we were successful in closing on the financing for that project last week. Construction will begin on a building-by-building basis in April, so we are very much on track to be complete and open by August of 2012. The governor's budget for the next fiscal year has been released. The bottom line for Illinois State in the governor's budget is our appropriation remains flat. It is just the beginning of the appropriation's process. The first legislative appropriations hearing is next week in the Senate and then we'll have one in the House in March. In terms of our cash flow situation, the state has begun making some regular payments to us. We're up to \$20 million of our \$79.8 million appropriation for this year.

Senator Marquis: The state is looking at a resolution in the Senate that would redirect the responsibility to increase fees and tuition to the state legislature instead of the Board of Trustees. Has anything happened or moved on that?

Vice President Layzell: No, that particular piece of legislation I believe has not moved. There does not seem to be much interest in moving forward with that.

Senator Woith: There are no markings on the buildings at Cardinal Court to identify them. It made me concerned about safety issues if there's a fire, if they need to call the police. There are 15 buildings and there are no letters or building numbers. I'm wondering if that can be addressed.

Vice President Adams: Housing does coordinate all those buildings. I was not aware of that. I will do my best to get a message to Senator Holland or directly to you.

Senator Holland: Does a flat appropriation include any inflation adjustments?

Vice President Layzell: No, unfortunately, with the state, flat is flat. It would remain at \$79.8 million.

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Woith: We had three items on our agenda. We looked at the new policy for Oral English Proficiency, we made one change, the revised Baccalaureate Degree Document and the Grading Practices Policy, which we will be sending forward without any changes.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Kalter: We spent most of the time tonight in executive session compiling and revising the presidential commentary.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Wedwick: We discussed two policies on the review cycle. The first one is Proceedings in Faculty Academic Freedom, Dismissal, and Non-reappointment Cases Policy. We decided we needed to set this one aside until the ASPT document is voted on by the Faculty Caucus. We moved on to the Intellectual Property Policy.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Van der Laan: The committee met this evening with Erin Minné and with her colleagues. The meeting will help us shape our report at the end of the year.

Rules Committee

Senator Horst: Due to the absence of Senator Bailey, the committee did not meet.

Action Items:

01.20.11.01 Ombudsperson Policy and Procedures (Faculty Affairs Committee) (Distributed in 2/16/11 Packets)

Senator Wedwick: We did make the minor revisions talked about at the last meeting. There were three edits that we made. One was to change the title proposed policy to Ombudsperson Policy. The second edit that we made was to make consistent the reporting structure. The third edit that we made was nominees will be confirmed or vetoed. We added the language or vetoed. The only other discussion that I noticed in the minutes was Senator Dawson's concern about the non-tenure-track faculty members' participation. I believe, from the minutes, that that was resolved. But the committee feels as though letter A of the policy that this would apply to the University community and does open it up for anyone who wanted to go, if Senator Dawson is okay with that, and that faculty is encompassing for all faculty.

Motion XXXXII-53: By Senator Wedwick to approve the Ombudsperson Policy. The policy, as revised, was unanimously approved.

01.26.11.01 Mennonite College of Nursing Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee) (Distributed in 2/16/11 at and Packets)

Motion XXXXII-54: By Senator Horst to approve the College of Nursing Bylaws, as revised.

Senator Marquis: The Student Government Association added a new senator position called the academic senator. The position represents two academic colleges. The SGA attempted to contact all of the deans in an effort to put an academic senator, who would represent that college, on the college council. So the academic senator who represents Mennonite would serve as an ex-officio, nonvoting member of the Mennonite College of Nursing. The deans were all getting back to us, but not every dean got back to us in time. What we're trying to do now is send it back to Mennonite and at least look at the proposal so they don't have to go back through this process all over again.

Motion XXXXII-55: Senator Marquis: I would like to move to send it back to the committee. In fact the Council, so that they could read the proposed change to allow for one SGA ex-officio representative that would be the representative for the college. Seconded by Senator Schlessler.

Senator Horst: It's not exactly clear from what I've heard from other faculty members that the dean is in favor of that. The second thing is that they have one meeting on April 6. It would have to happen very rapidly. They are trying to create new committees, so I would like to let them have this set up. If they want to revise it later, they should have the opportunity to debate that. If you want to get revisions made, I think you have to visit the college councils.

Senator Kalter: I would agree with Senator Horst that we not table these changes. I think it's a bad idea for us to hold up really extensive and important changes that they're making.

Senator Woith: I would also like to say that our college council is set up a little differently than other college councils. All of our faculty and staff are invited to attend. We also have students sitting on our council and the meetings are open. I would like to see our bylaws go ahead and send one of the senators to our meeting.

Senator Marquis: I'm perfectly fine with a senator going to a meeting and sitting and being able to listen and take notes, but we also wanted it to be somewhat of a formalized process. We are trying to allow the colleges to have the opportunity to discuss it. That is not something we are trying to forego. This is the opportunity we have that they are reviewing their bylaws now.

Senator Schlessler: Our goal is not just to be a visitor. We would like to have speaking rights sitting around the table. It becomes very hard with their busy schedule for a Nursing student to be in this room to be in our assembly and to have one of our senators sitting on that council gives you exponentially more representation than you already have. If we pass this tabling motion, they have the opportunity to say we're not comfortable with this right now and send back the bylaws the same way we have them today. They can address it at a later date. We would just like them to have that conversation this semester

Senator Horst: In the College of Fine Arts, we have students on the college council. If they approve this in April, after April 6, which is our Senate meeting in April, we will have a new Senate; we won't have any committees. Then I assume this would have to move on to the next academic year.

Senator Woith: If we don't allow the bylaws to move forward, that's going to hamper the work that we do for the students in our college.

Senator Farrell: Even though I do think that student representation is very important and they should be on these college councils, I do think the extreme changes that were made are much more important.

Senator Marquis: I will withdraw the motion with the strong recommendation that the college at least has this in their mind. We will take care of it on the council level.

Senator Rich: Would it be appropriate if there were discussion in the Rules Committee about a resolution regarding the desirability of student representation on college councils throughout?

Senator Horst: The Executive Committee approved this idea. Should the Senate approve this idea?

Senator Marquis: I don't think that the Senate as a whole needs to approve it. We are trying to avoid the implication of saying that they have to do it. Senator Rich, would it be more like the recommendation that we would move towards that direction?

Senator Rich: That at least it be considered across all colleges.

Senator Marquis: If the committee is willing to do that, we could try to work out something there.

Senator Holland: I think that Sen. Horst is correct in that the Executive Committee already approved this idea. I suppose we could communicate that. It's not a bad idea of sending it out to everyone. We are now debating whether to accept Mennonite College of Nursing Bylaws.

Call the Question: Senator Farrell called the question.

Vote on Motion: The Mennonite Bylaws were unanimously approved.

Information Items:

02.18.11.07 University Naming Procedures Proposed Policy (Rules Committee)

02.22.11.01 Facilities Naming Policy (Current Naming Policy) (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: The Senate has received two documents. The only thing being considered is the University Naming Procedures Policy. One of the main things it does is expand the categories of what can be named, so in addition to facilities and buildings, this policy includes language to name programs, institutions, centers, positions such as endowed chairs, which we will talk about later, and other University entities. It includes language that entities would only have to be in front of the Board as Information Items. Facilities would still have to go for a vote. It makes slight changes to the committee. The committee would be named the Presidential University Naming Committee. It would now be jointly chaired by the representatives from University Advancement and Office of the Provost and one representative from the President's office. The Rules Committee made some changes to the proposed policy, specifically our concern for historic buildings. We added language that will protect the name of buildings named for historic persons of ISU. If these were to be changed, that would have to be approved by the Senate. The Provost's Office desired a way to un-name facilities so this policy addresses that. It continues to include language that there be a five-year waiting period before any University entity or facility can be named after somebody.

Chuck McGuire, Vice President of Academic Administration: The old policy was designed because the Board of Trustees's rules required that facilities naming go to the Board of Trustees. We noticed that over the past several years that we have named a lot of other entities, centers, institutes, endowed chairs. You need some kind of process for naming those entities, as well as facilities. What we're trying to do here besides organizing the committee a little bit is the un-naming process. You want a process so you can undo that if at all possible and it provides for the Board of Trustees to be apprised of those namings. While we're only required to send naming of facilities to the Board of Trustees, we are going to present other names to the Board as Information Items.

Senator Kalter: I had a couple of questions for the committee to consider. In the Executive Committee meeting, this came without the original policy attached. On the third page, the second paragraph down, the committee, to the extent it deems necessary and appropriate, will solicit views of members of the campus community. That's where it stops in the proposed policy. The old policy had: deans, directors, supervisors or other officers exercising responsibility for the primary use of the facility or the head of facility services. I kind of like the idea of naming in the policy the people who might be significantly affected and need to be consulted. I kind of like leaving in deans, directors and supervisors, etc.

The second one was on page 2 at the bottom, right before procedures. I'm not sure about the addition of facilities named for historic Illinois State University persons will not be renamed without prior Senate authorization. Personally, I'd like to strike everything from without authorization and simply say that facilities named for historic Illinois State University persons will not be renamed.

Finally, I noticed that within the process on page 1, in the first paragraph, reorganizing the committee, that it went from saying the President will appoint five additional members to the President may appoint five additional members. I understand that there are some confidentiality and also timing issues here, but I'm wondering about the wisdom of removing all of those members, particularly...

Dr. McGuire: It's never been done.

Senator Kalter: They've never been appointed?

Dr. McGuire: No.

Senator Kalter: I will still ask the committee to consider those points.

Senator Horst: I can talk about the line that I added. We were considering scenarios such as Cook Hall renovation. That could cost a lot of money. We just wanted to leave the door open. The Senate would authorize it if it were deemed necessary after a case was made by the administration.

Senator Fazel: On the first page, in terms of membership, Chuck mentioned that the President... I really think it's important to have at least one faculty on the committee because of the renaming of the College of Business. I know that faculty have strong feelings about that, as well as students. So my recommendation is for the President to appoint at least one faculty member and one student to this committee.

Dr. McGuire: I think the idea was to leave as much flexibility to the President as possible. I think that's important depending on the nature of the kinds of naming opportunities that come forward. As Senator Kalter mentioned, there may be confidentiality issues.

Senator Fazel: But we do have faculty and students on many committees in which we have confidentiality. At least one faculty and one student still leave a lot of flexibility.

Senator Crowley: When nobody is mentioned, there is no policy on the books that anybody particularly really should be on the committee. So the effort to say who might be preferred might actually enhance the document.

Senator Marquis: It specifically says that at-large members would have to serve two-year appointments. If a student is on there, that would need to be changed. More often than not, a student might not be able to serve two years. If that consideration is going to be taken into account, it should say the student will serve one year.

01.18.11.02 Endowed Chairs and Professorships Proposed Policy (Rules Committee)

Senator Horst: This is a brand new policy to address some of the issues that have come up regarding endowed chairs. The first thing it does is define what an endowed chair is and an endowed professorship is. Then it establishes that these shall be named under the policies and procedures of the policy we just talked about. That's why they're linked. In concurrence with that name being approved, there will be a gift agreement that would go through the Provost and the President. This policy establishes that a faculty member, who will be hired as an endowed professor and chair with tenure, the tenure process would have to go through the DFSC, just like anybody who is hired with tenure would have to go through the DFSC. It establishes that this will be a fixed term and the appointment may not exceed five years. However it could be renewable, but that's not guaranteed. After this fixed term, there could be a non-reappointment of the endowed chair. If there's a non-reappointment of that part, if we had tenured faculty, they would go back to their tenure line and a department or school would assume the salary. Section E addresses termination and reappointment issues and these are all regarding the endowed part of the title. It establishes that the endowed faculty member will have to file an annual report with the DFSC and they're subject to ASPT policies just like all other faculty. It also clarifies that endowed positions created prior to this policy shall be governed by the gift agreements of those positions.

Senator Van der Laan: When I read through the definitions here, it was a very clear to me what the distinctions are. The distinctions are quantitative. I wonder if there are qualitative distinctions. If you talk about

a chair or professorship, can the people writing up the document write something a little clearer as to what the differences are.

Dr. McGuire: A lot depends on the discipline. A lot depends on what a chair is thought of in a variety of contexts. The basic distinction here is in a chair, you are funding that person's nine-month salary or virtually all of it. That's for in perpetuity because if you hire someone from outside to be an endowed chair, then that money is from the outside. It needs to be endowed and it needs to have the entire amount of money in place. If you're going to fund an \$80,000 salary; I think that's \$2 million. If you're going to do an endowed professorship, that's a partial. That's an add-on to salary. That's maybe a summer increment or maybe it's an add-on salary for a set period of time. That could be paid out of current income.

Senator Van der Laan: Is there any need to make clear to people that this is not the chairperson of the department.

Dr. McGuire: I hope not.

Senator Fazel: My understanding of these positions is that people who get the professorship or endowed chair are paid significantly higher than the rest of the faculty. When the appointment is terminated or the person leaves, is the assumption that they will keep the same amount of salary because the unit is now responsible for it?

Dr. McGuire: They will keep the same amount on a nine-month basis. That will have to be a contractual issue.

01.11.11.01 Request for Additional Academic Planning Committee Members for 2011-2012 (Rules Committee)

Senator Holland: We really want to do this because I think there are I believe 32 programs up for review next year. So we're going to try to create a one-year ad hoc committee to handle the load.

01.18.11.04 Withdrawal Policy-Revised (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Woith: There are really only a few minor changes to this policy. We have added websites where students can get further information. We have combined the Withdrawal Policy with the Involuntary Withdrawal Policy. There were some wording changes that clarify the reporting structure.

Senator Kalter: I had two concerns I wanted to ask the committee about. One was in the fourth paragraph down, which is what happens between the 10th day of classes and the end of the eighth week. In the current policy apparently it says a student may withdraw from a full semester course with a grade of WX by contacting the University Registrar. It's being changed to reporting. I'm a little bit concerned about that, particularly with respect to spring break. There are cases where students might make the decision at the very last minute on Friday of the eighth week to drop a course and if they actually have to physically report to the University Registrar, but they've already gone home, I'm not sure why we would change that from contact to reporting.

Dr. McGuire: The problem is one of identification, making sure we got the right person withdrawing from the class. If it's done telephonically, who knows who's at the other end. If it's done electronically, maybe we get a better handle on it but I am not sure.

Senator Kalter: I had a feeling that that might be the response, but we do a lot of other things by ulid and password that are confidential. I'm wondering why there would not be other ways other than physically reporting. One of the instances that you could think of would be a medical problem. For example, somebody is

in the hospital during the eighth week and they really actually cannot make it to the Registrar's Office. I'm hoping that we can leave it open so that in general even students that are supposed to go to Moulton Hall, that there is the ability to have some flexibility.

Dr. McGuire: The Registrar was pretty adamant about this. There have been issues with contacting. He was pretty firm that this had to happen for the reasons that we've had.

Senator Kalter: Since this is the information session, I will ask if the committee could discuss that part and maybe contact the Registrar about more information. The other thing that I was quite confused about, in light of what happened in Arizona with the shooting of the congresswoman, was why we would want to strike out the line that says the University reserves the right to interview a student who has been withdrawn... This is an involuntary withdrawal where we are doing it for the safety of the campus. When a student has withdrawn and if that student contemplates readmission, I think we would want to leave that right to interview a student in rather than taking it out.

Dr. McGuire: I think it's in the admission's process, but I'm not positive.

Senator Kalter: Meaning that it's stated elsewhere in another policy?

Dr. McGuire: Yes.

Senator Holland: I think the University gets to interview whomever they want to.

Senator Kalter: So it's not changing the right? Okay.

Senator Van der Laan: If I were a student reading this and it said report to the office, I would not necessarily think I had to report in person. I think that it's advisable to put that in there if that is the intent.

Senator Rubashkin: I have a question about involuntary withdrawal. I see that the word temporary has been stricken out. Does that mean that students can be removed permanently?

Dr. McGuire: The temporary there probably was extraneous and relates to what amounted to a suspension. We don't do that anymore; we either separate them or not separate them, one or the other.

Senator Sanchez: I'm wondering if there was any conversation on page 2, the second paragraph, where it talks about basically we are telling students, hey remember, if you withdraw, you need to contact housing, you need to contact financial aid, you need to contact all of these people. One of the populations that withdrawing can seriously hamper are student athletes. Would that be too specific to have any kind of directions there in this policy that if a student athlete withdraws, just to make sure that they talk to those people as well.

Dr. McGuire: I would imagine that the coaches have had that kind of conversation with every athlete.

02.18.11.04 *Blue Book Revision to Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Functions (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

Senator Kalter: We have on our agenda for this year the five-year review of the Administrator Evaluation Policy. While reading it, we noticed that the existing policy had a line in it that said that the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee is supposed to look at questionnaires evaluating deans and department

chairpersons. The committee never knew that that was supposed to happen. This is suggesting that we revise the Blue Book charge for the committee so that they actually know that this is one of their tasks.

02.18.11.05 Academic Impact Fund Recommendations (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.18.11.06 Accompanying Table

Senator Kalter: We reviewed the Academic Impact Fund in December, so the numbers that you see in this report reflect unemployment numbers from December not now. The first paragraph basically reiterates what the Academic Impact Fund is. As we say there, it's a budget mechanism through which tenure-track faculty positions are maintained at levels that sustain the research standards, accreditation, and reputation of the University, and through which these positions are reallocated to go to the areas of highest need. One of the things that is not in this report is that I believe we are now at the highest tenure-track faculty on campus that we've been in about the past 15 years or so.

We say in the second paragraph that we are pleased to see that we had an increase this year of about 8.3 additional tenure-track/tenured faculty on campus compared to the previous year and compared to the general employment and budget situation in the country at universities and elsewhere. That's extremely impressive. There was a very slight decrease in non-tenure-track faculty which we thought also was getting the ratios in line with Senate recommendations.

At the meeting, the Provost's Office informed us that the college deans had met together during the planning process for the AIF and agreed to put attention on the College of Education because of the upcoming NCATE accreditation to make sure a significant number of lines were going to the College of Education in preparation for that accreditation. We also found out that they had discussions with VP Layzell's office to add two permanent lines to Mennonite College of Nursing, not coming out of the AIF. These are two completely new lines that Nursing will have and when those people leave, those lines will go back into the AIF. So, eventually, it's the gain of two lines for the AIF. We thank the Provost's Office for giving us all of the statistics that they gave us because both them and Planning and Institutional Research do a lot of work to get us those statistics.

Our specific recommendations start out at the bottom of page 1. Looking at the table that's attached, we wanted to call attention to departments that have deficits or at least apparent deficits in tenure-track lines compared to previous capacity, but are also having increased demand and students and/or have high absolute values of non-tenure-track faculty. The list is presented there. I believe that list is just in order of college and this is not to say that there aren't other considerations besides those, but we wanted to call attention to those departments to make sure that they're getting attention.

The second item is that a year or two ago, we had recommended, because of salary inversion in a couple of colleges, a reallocation from another source into the AIF of \$325,000 to make up for the fact that we appear to have lost money. In other words, the AIF works on the principle that a person coming into the University as an assistant professor will generally be making less than a full professor who is retiring. In some fields, that is not true. So that inversion of salaries has the potential to start draining dollars out of the AIF. We are actually withdrawing our original suggestion to reallocate that money because what they did instead was they decided to start giving the AIF an annual raise. This year's raise amounted to \$194,000. That's more than halfway to the \$325,000 that we recommended. Just one more year of that raise will get us to where we thought we should be. We are also cautioning that we want to keep reassessing to make sure the AIF isn't having too much money put into it without sort of looking at where that's going.

The third recommendation is a revision of a recommendation from last year where we were hoping, during program review, each individual department would start talking about what is sort of the optimum number of

tenure-track lines compared to non-tenure-track lines compared to APs who are teaching in each department. After discussing this with the Provost, it's a little bit too much to add to the program reviews. We said we would ideally like to see a ratio of 75% tenure line to total faculty and where that is not occurring to have reasons presented to the Senate that are compelling asking why that ratio might be different. The list of departments that are under 75% are at the bottom of item number three and those are in order of the least to the most. Nursing has the lowest ratio of tenure/tenure-track faculty to other faculty. English has the highest, but still under 75%.

Number four was just asking if we could have statistical help because the English Department chairperson of the committee will not always be there to do this statistical analysis and probably isn't the best person to be doing it. If you see any errors in the chart accompanying this report, please call them to my attention. We are getting the basics statistics in the chart from Planning and Institutional Research and the Provost's Office.

Number five is renewing our recommendation from previous years that the Provost's Office work with Finance and Planning and the deans to decide whether or not we could have an expedited authorization process for tenure and tenure-track lines and/or an alternative budget mechanism because one of the original major purposes of the AIF had to do with sick leave payouts that are basically going to decrease in a couple of years, I think it's about five or 10 years. So is this the best mechanism to use in this process.

Number six is restating last year, we had as one of our main priorities to look at Milner Library because Milner does not generate credit hours in the same way that other colleges do and because the AIF in the last couple of years switched to more credit hour driven, number of majors graduated, that kind of a process It put Milner having to prove that it was doing something that it just doesn't do. So what were basically saying is that we are happy that the Provost's Office, the Dean of Milner, and Finance and Planning are thinking about ways to make sure that Milner is still staffed adequately with faculty.

Number seven, we were just reiterating that statistics only tell part of the story. Within any department, the ratio of students to faculty is going to be vastly different depending on what particular course or what kind of teaching a person is doing. Towards that end, we recommend that the Provost... The Provost is already basically talking with the deans about the budget and each other's budget. We asked that she charge the deans of the colleges with convening the chairs and directors of their own colleges to do the same kind of process so that departments and schools start to understand the demand that other departments have for tenure-track faculty and thinking in the same way they thought about whether the College of Education needs more people this year because of NCATE--thinking about that on the college level, not on the University level. So those are the recommendations that the committee is sending forward.

Communications

Senator Horst: March 3, Michael Lowenstern is coming from New York City. He is a very exciting soloist on the bass clarinet. March 14-17, there is a Red Note New Music Festival. There will be free concerts every night. Those will all be in Kemp Recital Hall. March 18-19, there is a jazz festival. March 22, faculty member Michelle Voigt will be giving a solo recital.

Senator Dawson: I received today a legislative watch for the 97th General Assembly and these were bills that have been introduced since January 12 through yesterday. Some are likely to be acted on soon and, in consultation with Senator Rich, he said maybe we should just at least mention them. One of them that is not likely to come up very soon if Senate Bill 1318 involving tuition waivers. They would like to repeal the tuition waivers, that is, children of employees. One that is kind of friendly; it calls on what Senator Kalter said. Senate Bill 1634, again not likely to come up really soon, but put forth to increase service credit to two years from one year for sick leave credit toward years of service. The final one is concerning. It's House Bill 146 and it's

regarding caps on salaries, the highest salary for annuity purposes. They are looking at having a cap on the 106 800, which is currently for the FICA. Then some other provisions that it go up 3% or the Consumer Price Index. This one I don't know; they think it may come up soon.

Adjournment

Motion XXXXII-56: By Senator Dawson, seconded by Senator Rubashkin, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.