

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 9-10-2014

## Senate Meeting, September 10, 2014

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, September 10, 2014" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 937.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/937>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, September 10, 2014**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Ed Stewart called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of August 27, 2014***

**Motion XLV-84:** By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Powers, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Higher Learning Commission Assurance Argument Presentation (Jim Jawahar, Associate Provost)***

***Document: 08.25.14.01 HLC Assurance Argument***

**Associate Provost Jim Jawahar:** Illinois State is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. The last accreditation was in 2005. The next ten-year site visit is scheduled for April 20 and 21, 2015. For this accreditation, we are participating in the Open Pathways to Accreditation. It has two components: quality initiatives and the assurance process.

For the quality initiative, we selected student learning assessment plans in all degree programs and the strategic assessment of student learning in General Education. Both of these projects were coordinated by the Assessment Academy Team. The results of the projects were presented at the HLC results forum in June 2014. We submitted the Assessment-related Sustainability Plan in July 2014 to the HLC. We have asked the Assessment Academy Team to merge with the Assessment Advisory Council, which is a broader council. This is another opportunity to expand faculty membership on the council.

We would like to modify the assessment documentation process. All of the programs on campus have assessment plans. We want to help them focus on data collection and use that data to improve student learning. We typically ask departments to provide us assessment updates every fall. We are going to postpone that until the spring semester for better documentation.

Two comprehensive reviews take place during the ten-year assurance process cycle. One in year 10 and one four years later. There is no visit associated with the four-year cycle. Quality initiatives can be anything; because we are in the Open Pathways, we get to choose what the quality project would be. A quality initiative is supposed to be conducted between the fourth year and the tenth year.

Comprehensive reviews involve the submission of two documents: the Assurance Argument and the Federal Compliance Document. In the assurance document, we are making arguments to show how we are meeting the criteria for accreditation. In the Federal Compliance Document, we have to show that we are meeting all of the applicable federal laws and regulations.

There are five criteria for accreditation: 1) mission of the university; 2) integrity; 3) and 4) deal with teaching and learning; 5) resources, planning, institutional effectiveness. In the assurance argument, we are writing to make arguments that we are meeting all the standards set forth in these criteria. The overarching theme is student learning and student success.

We started working on this project in the fall of 2012. I consulted with all four vice presidents to identify individuals who would have the information needed to complete this report. We identified people and established seven teams—one team for each of the five criteria, a sixth team for federal compliance and a seventh team for campus communications and external relations. On January 30, 2013, we had the HLC kickoff

orientation meeting. The teams were given until June to provide arguments that we wanted to make in the assurance documents and identify evidence to support those arguments. The work teams reviewed the first draft in October. Draft two was reviewed by the members of the work team in January of this year. In early March, we distributed draft three to all faculty and administrators in Academic Affairs. We received good feedback and prepared draft four. Draft four was reviewed by the vice presidents and deans and members of the other three divisions. Toward the end of July, I had given a draft to President Dietz and his insightful comments and suggestions were incorporated into the document. The draft that you reviewed was draft six. The goal is to send draft six to the Board of Trustees by the end of this month. It will be reviewed by the president and the board in October and maybe into November.

Toward the end of this semester, we will begin to prepare the campus for an onsite visit on April 20 and 21. The peer review team has been named. The chair of the team is from Metropolitan State University in Denver. The team will review the document, do the site visit and submit its report to the HLC in June. There is an HLC Board meeting in September and we are very hopeful that the Institutional Actions Council of the HLC will render its decision at that board meeting.

At the current moment, the document is being reviewed by the Academic Senate. Then it goes to the Board of Trustees. Then we will make revisions and submit the document in February. As we get closer to the onsite visit, I will be distributing a one-page document to everybody on campus about all the things people should know about accreditation. In January, the HLC will administer an online survey to the students. I will be counting on the Student Government Association to encourage students to participate.

During the site visit, the first and last meeting of the peer review team is with the president. Based on the assurance argument and the compliance document, the peer review team will decide who else they want to talk to. Peer review teams generally do not hold open forums.

**Senator Cox:** The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed this draft and our chair is going to compile and forward our comments to you. Will the Senate receive a draft seven?

**Dr. Jawahar:** If you would like to see a draft seven, I would be happy to forward it to you. I am happy to make any changes for suggestions you might have.

**Senator Rich:** I count on your work teams 52 individuals, including administrators, several faculty and students. Is that typical at other universities?

**Dr. Jawahar:** On this campus, we value shared governance, so that is why we included all four divisions of the university; we have representation from administration, faculty and students. That's how we do things here.

### ***Open Access to Research Articles Presentation (Jim Jawahar, Associate Provost)***

#### ***Documents:***

***08.28.14.02 Open Access to Research Articles Act***

***08.28.14.03 Open Access to Research Articles Proposed Policy***

***08.28.14.04 Open Access to Research Articles Taskforce Report***

**Associate Provost Jim Jawahar:** The open access act was passed by the legislature last year. Open access means providing public access to scholarly articles via the internet free of charge. Most copyright and licensing restrictions call for long-term preservation and access to publically funded scholarly work and broad accessibility for the public to use and reuse open access work, particularly for research. Open access can extend beyond research articles and include other things such as artistic images, dissertations, scientific databases, etc. The act requires each Illinois public university to appoint a taskforce. The act then places a charge on each taskforce to review current publishing practices and then draft a policy regarding open access based on criteria that are appropriate to that individual university. The act has ten elements and the report we submit to the board

has to address those ten elements and also have a proposed open access policy. There is an 18-member taskforce led by myself and Dr. Stephen Juliano, who is a Distinguished Professor. There are several members of the Senate who are also taskforce members. All of the colleges are represented.

We set up a website and posted meeting agendas and minutes, announcements, open forum dates and times. We also posted a FAQ document. We conducted three open forums to solicit input from the campus community regarding open access and the implications of an open access policy. We also administered an online survey to faculty and graduate students; 501 participants responded to the survey. Faculty generally felt that research articles produced by faculty at public universities should be made as widely available as possible. Faculty generally agreed with the statement that ISU should strongly encourage faculty to place copies of their research articles in the ISU Institutional Repository. Faculty neither agreed nor disagreed that publishing in open access journals would have a positive impact on their research. Many believed that open access journals were not viewed positively in their disciplines.

Some of the key features of the proposed policy are that it neither requires nor prohibits authors from publishing in an open access format or a non-open access format. The choice of where and how to publish is the author's choice as it has always been. One of the fundamental decisions we made was to protect academic freedom. We also defined what is considered research for the purpose of open access and what is not covered by the term research for the purpose of open access. Lastly, we are encouraging authors to deposit their research, scholarship and creative activity with the institutional repository.

We have distributed the draft report and proposed policy to the Academic Senate, to all faculty and administrators. We have also posted the report on the website. We will be holding two open forums—one this Friday and the next one on September 18. We will incorporate all of the feedback we receive and make as many revisions as necessary. The goal is to submit the report to the president and the board in late September. The board may make some comments at its October meeting. We will take their input and make revisions as necessary and then we give it to the president. The president will give it to the Board of Trustees and the chair of the board will submit the report and proposed policy to the IBHE, the legislature and the governor. They have to do that by the end of this calendar year to be in compliance with the act.

**Senator Cox:** Of those surveyed, was there any feedback to give you an idea if faculty were favorably disposed to also depositing the data that they may have collected in the writing of the article?

**Dr. Jawahar:** The taskforce members talked about what should be covered by research. Based on the qualitative comments provided by the participants and the discussions we had in the taskforce, we felt that data should be excluded. We don't want researchers to be put in a position where they have to turn everything over. Only the finished product would be turned over and only if they choose to.

**Senator Gizzi:** It's important for people to understand that that proposed policy does not mean that that is a policy that is coming to the Senate. It does not mean that we have to do anything on this right now. The legislature could mandate that we implement a policy or it could do absolutely nothing. The Board of Trustees could ask us to implement a policy; the Senate could do that on its own, but nothing at all has to happen beyond this probably for at least a year or more.

**Dr. Jawahar:** If the legislature wants us to do something with it, I want to make it very clear that the proposed policy will follow the normal procedure. It would come back to the Senate and the Senate would get an opportunity to work on the policy.

**Senator Hoelscher:** Is ISU ReD operational?

**Senator Buckley:** Yes, ISU ReD has been in existence since 2011. There are 761 papers in there to date and almost 50,000 downloads to date. Authors are generally permitted to put in pre-print or draft versions of articles. Sometimes there are copyright restrictions about what can go in there.

**Senator Horst:** Is the direction toward this voluntary approach at other institutions?

**Dr. Jawahar:** Most of them are moving towards voluntary.

**Senator Crowley:** I was reading an article and it might have been the 4<sup>th</sup> version on google scholar or some such thing. Maybe that explains why the draft version is in some repository in draft form. We are seeing that a thing has two or three versions before it is picked up by a journal and then it becomes copyrighted by a journal. Would you have to take it down from ISU ReD at that point?

**Dr. Jawahar:** We are encouraging faculty to post accepted versions of the manuscript, not draft versions. Faculty have the right to post anything they want. As the editor of a journal, if your manuscript is already available, I will not publish it in my journal. So it is not to your advantage to post things before they are being published.

**Senator Kalter:** Because most of our departments have peer review processes, we are encouraging faculty to go through that peer review process, get that work accepted and then have negotiations about having it also in open access, either with a year lag or right away or the version that has been accepted after revision. That is what the proposed policy would recommend.

**Senator Dane Ward:** There are a number of ways for an article to become open access. Many institutions have a staff member, often in the library, who will help negotiate contracts with publishers. Publishers are becoming increasingly open to publishing variations of the official version and it can be a pre-publication, a post-publication. What is helpful is having a staff member who is familiar with the publication process and can help authors work with the publishers to know what our rights are. All institutions seem to be just encouraging open access. Down the road, we might want to enhance the staffing of the institutional repository so that we can have the kind of support that all of you will need to make sure that your scholarship is published.

**Senator Kalter:** I want to extend our thanks to the valiant Jim Jawahar who is the first person in a long time, if ever, to give two presentations in a row. I want to thank also to the HLC work teams, the Open Access task force, and all of the other campus members who have contributed their thoughts and recommendations over the past two years (for HLC) and the past year (for Open Access).

I have gone through both documents twice with a fine-toothed comb and am very impressed with the work of both groups. These are both very large documents, and as such, I wanted you all to have plenty of time to review them. Therefore, we sent them out as early as possible before this meeting and will be allowing two more weeks for consideration and comment.

In two weeks, after you have all had another chance to review the two extensive sets of documents, we will be looking to endorse the HLC document as a full Senate and to endorse the direction of the Open Access report as a full Senate. These items are not policies, so they do not go through the Information/Action processes; but they are a bit more than advisory in the sense that Senate endorsement is sought.

#### *Chairperson's Remarks*

**Senator Kalter:** Good evening, everyone.

At our last meeting, we had some discussion about events that have occurred at another university down the road regarding academic freedom and freedom of speech in general for government and university employees, and that raise important questions regarding processes of faculty appointment at our own university. I will let Senator Dietz clarify those in his own comments. I just wanted to call our attention to two items regarding those events.

First: According to our own Higher Learning Commission Accreditation questions, our Trustees are expected to be free from undue influence by donors and other external constituencies.

The Higher Learning Commission asks whether: “The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.” You may read our response on page 19, section 2.C.3.

Meanwhile, our university policies require that assessments of faculty teaching be based on student evaluations from students who have actually been enrolled in one’s course, not upon predictions by other students of what one’s teaching might be like based on Twitter or rumor.

Second, the American Association of University Professors has written a letter dated August 29 to the chancellor of the University of Illinois. That letter is posted on the AAUP website; you can read it in full there. I would like to quote and paraphrase the parts of the letter that I see as pertinent to our role as Senators:

[Between the time when Dr. Steven Salaita was offered an appointment and when he was notified that the Board would not even be voting upon that appointment] “ten months elapsed during which time no one in the university administration gave any indication that the appointment as agreed upon might not be brought before the board. Only this August, after Professor Salaita had resigned his tenured position at Virginia Tech ... did he receive notification asserting that...he did not have an appointment at the University of Illinois. Aborting an appointment in this manner without having demonstrated cause has consistently been seen by the AAUP as *tantamount to summary dismissal*, an action categorically inimical to academic freedom *and due process* and one aggravated in his case by the apparent failure to provide him with any written or even oral explanation.

Until these issues have been resolved, we look upon Professor Salaita’s situation as that of a faculty member *suspended* from his academic responsibilities *pending a hearing on his fitness to continue*. Under the joint 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, *any such suspension is to be with pay*. As detailed earlier in this letter, Professor Salaita has incurred major financial expenses since he accepted the University of Illinois offer. We urge –indeed insist –that he be paid salary as set in the terms of the appointment pending the result of the...proceeding of the [University of Illinois’s Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure],” [which is now acting under its statutory authority in having initiated an examination of the case.]

So, were we at ISU to see potential cause to revoke an appointment between the acceptance of an offer letter and the start date, I would strongly advise that we would want to send that issue through Academic Freedom and faculty review committees, and be cognizant of avoiding even the appearance of summary dismissal by treating the matter as a suspension with pay [were the issues not resolved before the start date], until those processes were completed. Given that we are working on more explicit suspension and dismissal policies, this is a very opportune time to make sure we have no gap, even for such a rare event.

The AAUP letter goes on to say:

“We see Professor Salaita’s online statements as *extramural activity as a citizen* rather than as faculty performance, and the 1940 Statement of Principles cautions that when faculty members “speak or write as citizens they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline. . . .” The document goes on to explain that *faculty members should nonetheless act responsibly as citizens* and (...) states that *an administration may bring charges* if it believes that these admonitions have not been observed "such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position," but that in doing so it “should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens.” We see that a very serious issue of academic freedom has been raised by the actions against him, an issue that will not be resolved as long as the actions remain in effect and their soundness has not been demonstrated by the University of Illinois administration under *requisite safeguards of academic due process.*”

I bring these items to your attention in the interest of furthering the important discussion of freedom of speech and academic freedom that the Salaita case has raised on college and university campuses across the country. As our own Academic Freedom policy reminds us:

“Academic freedom is a *right* that has been *recognized* by the United States Supreme Court to be embodied in the First Amendment right to freedom of speech.”

“Education and the freedom of inquiry are two of the cornerstones of a *free* society. For a nation to uphold the principles of *liberty* and *freedom of conscience*, it *must* foster an environment in which intellectual freedom, open debate, and a diversity of positions are actively valued. . . . A "market place" of ideas and a strong educational system *must exist for our democracy to survive.*”

With that, I will take any questions that you may have.

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

**Senator Joyce:** Pig Out with the Prez was held yesterday on the Milner Plaza. We had over 500 students show up. Every year, we have seen increasing numbers. Thank you Senator Dietz for coming out and speaking with the students. Fraternity and sorority recruitment has been going on for the last two weeks. 490 women signed bids to sororities, which was an increasing number. Fraternities are also seeing increasing numbers. The Greek life here at ISU is growing at a fairly rapid pace. It is good to see more students getting involved in RSOs. Student Government is looking at different options for students to be able to register to vote. That is a big factor of being a student. We have looked at online voting systems and different campaigns to get students to recognize the need to register to vote and the need to voice their opinions by voting. For the Emerging Leaders Program, the freshmen program that the Student Government holds, we had the biggest applicant pool this year with over 100 applicants. 27 students are going to be in the Emerging Leaders Program.

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

#### **• *President Larry Dietz***

**President Dietz:** I enjoyed the Pig Out with the President very much. We had a similar thing today. It was lunch with the department heads and directors. I really have enjoyed the high level of interaction I have had over the last six months with a lot of different groups.

I want to address the questions that were brought up relative to the University of Illinois issue, but I will do that after I finish some informational items. Thanks to Associate Provost Jawahar and all the teams who have worked diligently to get us to where we are in the accreditation and open access issues.

We are now ranked 74<sup>th</sup> best public university in the nation, according to *US News and World Report*. That is jumping seven spots from 81<sup>st</sup> last year. In the magazine’s best colleges ranking, Illinois State broke into the top

150 for all best universities moving up ten spaces to 142 from 152 last year. The university rose in the category of smaller classes. The faculty-to-student ratio remains 1:19. Our graduation rate rose to a high of 72% continuing to maintain a rate far above the national average of 56%. My hat's off to the good work that faculty, staff and students do.

On September 18, I will be issuing the State of the University Address at 2 p.m. in the CPA. At the last meeting, I announced that the Vice President for University Advancement had taken another position. I have appointed Pat Vickerman as the Interim Vice President. Pat will do a fine job.

Board Chair Rocky Donahue and I have agreed to get together a couple of times a month just to have information shared back and forth. I drive to Morris, Illinois and he drives down from Chicago. It has been really good to keep him in the loop so that he knows what's going on at the institution.

Senator Kalter had sent me some questions related to the University of Illinois issue. I will be reading the question and then reading the answer because I have deliberated about this a lot and I have had several meetings on this with Provost Krejci, Lisa Huson and we have thought about this a good deal. Our processes for hiring are different. The Board of Trustees for Illinois State University makes one personnel decision and that is to hire the president. Our board knows that we are believers in shared governance. From my perspective, the only thing I really know about the case at the University of Illinois is what I have read in the paper and heard in the news. I think it would be unwise of me to make any specific judgment about who did what and why they did it. One of our values is integrity. I don't expect that I would get a call from a board chair who would say I have been hearing about an existing faculty member who is doing work in a particular discipline and I don't think they ought to be doing that kind of work and I want you, as the president, to fire him. I can't imagine that happening in our system. It is also unfortunate to see headlines that board members can fire faculty. It depends on the institution. There aren't many times that a person in my role and other administrative roles fall on their swords. This would be one of those times for me. I am at the age and stage where the most important thing to me is integrity. In my estimation, if something like this happened here, I would have terrific difficulty with that.

The first question that Senator Kalter asked was what is in the standard offer letter for appointment to a tenure-track/tenured position that indicates who has the final approval for appointment—president, board, etc. My answer is that the standard offer letter states, "All academic appointments are subject to approval by the President of Illinois State University and contingent upon proof of eligibility for employment in the United States." I am the senior officer at the institution; the board hired me to make those kinds of decisions. Having said that, I am reliant upon the provost. The provost is reliant upon the deans. The deans are reliant upon the department heads. The department heads are reliant upon the faculty to hire the best people we can hire at a given time. I can't imagine that I would dip into any process and assume that I have more expertise than all of you around the table who are the experts in your particular disciplines. I would have no intention of interfering in any kind of departmental hiring decision.

The second question was how long it takes between the time such an offer letter is approved by the provost, signed by the prospective employee and the time when the final authority indicated in the letter and by ASPT policy and/or law, if applicable, actually performs the final sign off. My answer is that it really varies. Practically speaking, the provost has been delegated the authority for hiring in the academic areas. The same would be true for the vice presidents in the other areas. The provost then apprises me of the appointments and unless the department notifies us that there might be some problem with the offer, those appointments go through the human resources process and are finalized by the issuance of an employment contract, which begins on the date specified in the offer letter.

The third question was how often in any given year that final authority decides or meets as a board/committee to decide and, if necessary, vote upon such appointments and whether, under a rolling calendar for appointments that differs from department to department, there is also a rolling and time efficient process for



such final approvals. The question is applicable to the University of Illinois, not to ISU. We have a different process. The deans apprise the provost of the offers of appointments in their areas and then the provost apprises me. This information is shared in our individual meetings on a rolling basis. I met one-on-one with each of the vice presidents on a regular basis and, oftentimes, that is part of our conversation. The colleges and departments have the responsibility for the appointment and would need to notify the president and the provost if there is a problem with the appointment. The language in the offer letter making the appointment contingent upon presidential approval might be used if the department or college comes forward with a problem. We would be happy to share those appointment letters electronically if any of you would wish for us to do that.

- ***Provost Janet Krejci***

**Provost Krejci:** A big thank you to Dr. Jim Jawahar and all of his teams for the incredible work they have done on two very large endeavors. Some of the other great news about our students is that our student default rate is one of the lowest in the nation. Every kind of metric that people are looking at, Illinois State continues to come to the top. That really shows the passion faculty and staff have here. I do continue to visit colleges and departments. Both President Dietz and I had a fabulous time visiting the farm. At the game last weekend, the entire student section was just about full and it is amazing how many of the community leaders and the Board of Trustees comment on that kind of energy. The Bone Scholar Luncheon was last Sunday here and it was very impressive to see those students and what they have accomplished. We are trying to respond to requests to the Senate. As Senator Kalter sends a variety of requests for reports and data and questions to clarify, we are trying to be as responsive as we can.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Brent Paterson***

**Senator Paterson:** From my perspective, we are off to a great start. Students are becoming involved in fraternities and sororities across the campus.

Last meeting, Senator Gizzi made some comments about the ratio of our ISU Police Department in their traffic stops. I asked Chief Woodruff to respond directly to Senator Gizzi, but I thought I might share a few of his comments with you. Chief Woodruff is very committed to a university police force that understands their role as police officers at a university. In our hiring process, he is very clear about that. He reiterated to me the disappointment in seeing those figures, but as a person, he is very involved in our community in racial issues. He and I are active in the local chapter of the NAACP. He has also been the Chair of the Minority and Policy Partnership that involves leadership in our police forces in town and the county and minority leaders in the Bloomington-Normal area. We have department policies for university police that prohibit discriminatory behavior and biased-based enforcement.

One of the core values that is important to Student Affairs is equality and the others involve professionalism, respect, integrity and diligence. The police officers are very proud of those values. They are posted right inside the police department and they view those every day and talk about them in many ways. Our police force is progressive, not just in integrating cultural competency training, but also trying to expose our officers to different multicultural experiences to build on their understanding of different issues of inclusion. They were involved in some training we did as a division this past summer, so they were involved in a day-long training on diversity and inclusion. We are also hosting a new program out of the Department of Justice about transgender awareness training for law enforcement.

One comment about the statistics that might have changed the ratio and that is how IDOT reported the population of the university. It looked at and used a ratio formula that 14% of the population of Illinois State was minority when in fact it is actually 18% looking at last year. I don't know what that would have done to the numbers.

We both view this as a concern when we looked at those numbers. We have had discussions about it and discussed actions that we will take. One of those is developing our own system to monitor the data. The data that is put into the IDOT system we are not able to pull that back in ways that would give us good trends or trends that show a particular officer making more stops than others. We are developing our own database to track that information. Beyond that, our police supervisors have been doing and will continue to do monthly random inspections of traffic stops and we have those on video. They are going to go back through those to evaluate whether our officers are making any unnecessary stops and to be sure that they are following policies and procedures. We are also working on professional accreditation for the police department.

I want you to know that Chief Woodruff and I are very committed to working with our police to ensure that they are well aware and committed to diversity and inclusion. Hopefully, over time, that will improve that ratio.

The Department of Defense was selling off some weapons and made those available to state and local governments. So being transparent, I wanted to tell you that we did buy four rifles as part of that program that had been converted from military use to civilian use. We were replacing some out-of-date firearms that we have. Those are not things that the police carry with them daily. They are locked away in a cabinet in the police department, although they do train with those.

Last time we talked about sexual assault and sexual harassment training. That information has been sent out to students. About 93% of new students have completed that. There is also a state law that deals with sexual harassment so what is coming around is the information that we are required to post on campus and required to send out to all students.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Greg Alt***

**Senator Alt:** I have nothing to note from a financial perspective other than what I provided last week. Staff is in the midst of closing out the prior year and we are working through the audit process with the Office of the Auditor General. The budget office continues to work on our budget request to the state for FY16, which will be presented to the board in October. Planning for the first stage of the Bone Student Center revitalization project is well underway. The design team is working towards the development of a concept design that involves a new welcome center, administrative office space for Campus Dining, renovations of the loading dock area and relocation of the catering kitchen. That planning process is well along as well as the design for the fine arts complex renovation, which is a state-funded project. The state's funding of a \$54 million renovation in instruction and classroom areas is at the design stage. That is progressing as well. We also are on target for the construction and opening of our university gallery at Uptown Station. That should be open sometime in September.

**Senator Horst:** For the fine arts, do you have a sense of when the money will officially be allocated past the design money?

**Senator Alt:** In past practice, that was somewhat predictable, that when the design was completed, the state would release the money. During the last several years with the state's fiscal crisis, that is unpredictable. We do know that the design money has been released and that will be completed and it has been appropriated for the construction, but we have no surety or guarantee that as soon as that design process is completed that they will release the funds for construction. Deb, do we know when the design will be completed?

**Dr. Smitley, Senior Associate Vice President of Finance and Planning:** We are looking at another 12 to 18 months.

**Senator Eckrich:** I met with a student who expressed grief about student parking and commuter parking in the green lots, that for the morning classes, it is very hard for them to find spots and when she was picking up her permit, there were long lines. And when she got to get hers, which she had ordered over the summer, and

questioned how many people were there, she was told that they had over sold the student permits. I don't know how wide spread it is. I wondered is something is going on in relation to student needs.

**Senator Alt:** This is the first complaint I have heard about the green space parking. Did she indicate what area of campus she was struggling with?

**Senator Eckrich:** Yes, on University Street, the lot south of...

**Senator Alt:** The south part of campus on University Street?

**Senator Eckrich:** Yes and then the next closest one to there.

**Senator Alt:** I would be glad to follow up on this and report back to you. I do know that we have had less demand for parking in that part of campus due to the decommissioning of the south campus residence halls.

**Senator Breeden:** Student Government has heard a few complaints about the parking situation. We are just now looking into it and talking to parking. It is interesting news that they did oversell. Hopefully, we can make some inquiries about what the situation really is.

**Senator Cox:** For the design stage of the Milner area, do we know yet what the fate of the canopy will be? Will the canopy stay where it is?

**Senator Alt:** We are not along that far yet. In fact, the design has not started on Milner yet. It is being conceptually thought through strategically.

**Senator Cox:** About two or three years ago here, we heard a report that the canopy would be dismantled and perhaps reassembled around CVA or at the farm.

**Senator Alt:** The canopy's purpose in one regard is to try to help with the leakage of the plaza to the first floor. It serves a functional purpose in that way, so I am not aware of it being taken down until that is resolved another way.

**Dean Dane Ward:** There is a lot of talk about the Milner canopy—not the canopy itself, but the water leaks continue. Milner and Facilities Management kind of have a joint appointment for a facilities manager, so we have person who is the director of the library facility, who works for Facilities Management, but has an office right next to mine. We are having tremendous conversations about how we can stop the water, but we are not really in any stage of planning.

#### ***Committee Reports:***

##### ***Academic Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Crowley:** We will send our recommendations and comments to Dr. Jawahar regarding the Higher Learning Commission Report. We are also working with Jonathan Rosenthal regarding the Global Studies requirement and Writing Across the Curriculum requirements. Coming down the pike are some recommendations about developing a university policy regarding granting two undergraduate degrees at once, which we don't have a policy on.

##### ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

**Senator Lessoff:** We discussed our agenda for the year and began discussing the food service policy.

##### ***Faculty Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Horst:** The committee had a planning session prioritizing our items for the year. We were joined by Jim Jawahar and Stephen Juliano and we discussed the proposed open access policy and the taskforce report. The committee endorses the principles espoused in the proposed policy. We look forward to working with the Provost's Office in the future in the creation of an actual open access policy if it is deemed necessary.

***Planning and Finance Committee:***

**Senator Rich:** Senator Buckley agreed to serve as our secretary and we reviewed the schedule for the year, including topics for information sessions. We have received written feedback and I will be getting in touch with the vice presidents to begin making arrangements on those priorities.

***Rules Committee:***

**Senator Bushell:** Senator Fernandez will be our secretary for the committee. We began to work on one policy; we are continuing work from last semester—the Policy on the Creation and Revision of Policies. We have finished that and will send it to Exec and it will be an Information Item at our next meeting of the full Senate. We began to look at our task lists and tried to prioritize things.

**Senator Horst:** Are the CFA Bylaws on your list?

**Senator Bushell:** We are going to see if we can get to them soon, but a few other things are slipping in before that.

***Communications***

**Senator Hoelscher:** Keep November 7 in mind and on your calendar. We will have our fourth start-up showcase. Our prize package is up to \$91, 000 now in goods and services and some cash. Three years ago, we had Pack Back. They have been very successful. Two years ago, we had Biz Baits; they are still in operation. Last year we had Open Source Classrooms and they are contracting with COB to do some work for us. We would love to have everyone here as a part of that excitement.

**Provost Krejci:** It's family weekend this weekend. There are going to be a lot of parents with children at home who may be our future students, so if you see them around, make our campus as welcome as possible.

***Adjournment***

**Motion XLV-85:**By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Holland. The motion was unanimously approved.