

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-23-2018

January 23, 2018

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 23, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1096.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1096

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
23 January 2018 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.
Dean's Suite Conference Room, Doudna Fine Arts Center

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.
Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

Senators present: T. Abebe, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, R. Cash

Senators absent: S. Brantley, B. Young

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), Stacey Ruholl (CAA), Misty Rhoads (CAA), Rick Wilkinson (CAA), Marita Gronnvoll (CAA), Rebecca Throneburg (CAA), Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:03 p.m.

[*ROBERTSON announces reorganization of agenda items to accommodate guest schedules*]

Provost's Report

GATRELL: Student Success Task Force (approximately 20 people from across campus) looking at a variety of initiatives: student services, advising, learning communities; they have issued preliminary draft documents and will be working on recommendations; priorities are investigating learning communities, paired courses, one-stop, supplemental instruction; also a recommendation not to transition students from advising in CASA to their departments until they have 24 earned EIU hours – I want to thank the review team for Vitalization workgroups 8 and 9; their report has structural and qualitative suggestions, emergence of themes around student success, commitment to the standard schedule; I've asked for feedback, next few months I'll be working with the President's Council on pathway forward; I'm excited about new programs such as occupational therapy and about sharpening the mission of our academic structures – in terms of gen ed I'm asking CAA for a moratorium on new courses, intended merely as a pause; we have a gen ed subcommittee created two years ago (in response to the HLC report) that hasn't really been operational, I'm concerned that this structure work and that we have documented evidence from a faculty shared governance perspective that this structure reflects our values and the way we see the role of gen ed on this campus; it's critical that we follow the processes we put in place

ABEBE: Was input contemplated earlier in the formation of the committee?

GATRELL: Members were intentionally selected from all over, also Faculty Senate input; all additional input is welcome, feel free to share it with me or the committee

HUNG: I've received emails, people have pulled me aside to talk about it – I'll summarize [the input I've received] as a list of bullet points for Jay, so send your thoughts to me

ROBERTSON: I'd like to schedule time at our next meeting to discuss

ABEBE: That was the sense of my question, wondering if we'll have a formal response to it or not

Conversation with Stacey Ruholl, CAA Chair

ROBERTSON: We have several guests here from CAA – Sen. Stowell convened our HLC committee where we discussed reimagining how we conduct shared governance on this campus, and Stacey was a part of those conversations yesterday – on behalf of the Senate, we're grateful for all the work CAA does – if you could give us a general update on recent and upcoming items...

RUHOLL: Our primary weekly task is to review and approve course and program proposals at the undergraduate level – other objectives include forming the general education committee; we've run into some roadblocks in regard to elimination of people, we're just now getting our feet back on the ground; we received a proposal in Fall 2017 from Karla Sanders that perhaps CASL could serve as the gen ed committee but unfortunately that fell through

HUNG: Are you seeing a trend in certain areas, for example dual credit courses and online courses? As a body, when you deliberate, is frequency a factor for consideration?

RUHOLL: With regard to online offerings there was a change to our bylaws last spring, stemming from a change in CGS that allowed for online offerings to be made via executive action as long as there were no changes to the structure or learning objectives, so we've seen a huge increase in the number of executive actions to add online offerings to currently approved courses – with regard to dual credit, Rebecca [Throneburg] is leading the charge; we don't have any courses that have come through, these are dealing with courses already approved

HUNG: So if there's a decision to move courses to an online format, CAA needs to be notified but doesn't need to approve it

RUHOLL: As long as the course has been previously approved and is going to be offered in its current format, just as an online offering, we don't need to see anything besides an executive action

HUNG: Speaking from a science perspective, in our department we're concerned about lab courses and how that translates to an online format – are you aware of any successful examples of this on campus?

RUHOLL: I don't recall a lab-only course as an online offering specifically – there are hybrid courses, lecture with a lab component

WILKINSON: We did have an online course two or three years ago, I don't know which department but students had to purchase a lab kit; that's the only one I remember

THRONEBURG: We don't hear that at CAA, the conversation is with the Online Board

HUNG: So the conversation is over before it gets to CAA

THRONEBURG: We're the last stop

ABEBE: You had indicated a couple of roadblocks with regard to general education and the learning goals effort; tremendous work was done over a two-year period, both in thinking about the goals and trying to put a plan together – besides the fact that we've lost faculty, what are the other issues?

RUHOLL: That started back in 2010; we worked on developing university learning goals that could be infused across all curriculum, and then eventually moved into the general education curriculum; defining, learning how to assess, coming up with models – those learning goals are infused now in our undergraduate courses – with regard to general education we have a lot of ideas on how that needs to happen; in the meantime we want to make sure that we're getting good assessment of those learning goals; one of the roles of the gen ed committee was to develop rubrics for evaluating course proposals; when we didn't have the membership available to form the committee, that was put on hold

ABEBE: Have the deadlines been moved or postponed?

RUHOLL: They weren't formally approved

THRONEBURG: In 2014-15 we had the gen ed committee, we had a model we thought we were going to approve at the end of 2015, we went around to the 16 committees; in March 2015 Faculty Senate said we want a referendum to ask the faculty to vote if they support this or not; we had three years of work with 60 faculty, multiple reports, and then what was the outcome; we had faculty attrition, but if people were aggravated enough that [Senate] felt the need to put a vote out to faculty, that was disheartening; Faculty Senate didn't do it, but the threat of it; we made our best effort of shared governance, inviting input; so we didn't approve it in Spring 2015, one of the reasons was if Faculty Senate is so concerned, then we'll wait – we developed more materials; core learning goal leaders and faculty volunteers from CAA kept working on it in that regard, so we could say 'this is what it would look like;' we worked out more kinks – last year CAA looked at it again, Karla Sanders took it around to campus (the 2015 model with small tweaks); it didn't get approved until last April – it's officially approved now, but it will be a matter of bodies – when you're talking about committee restructuring... we worked so hard, we had to go to 16 different places to keep everybody informed of every step; I believe there may be a more efficient way to organize the academic bodies – if you look at other state universities, many have faculty senates with 36 members or 56 members; a set of them (maybe 20) are the curriculum bodies, they do the assessments – think about a course proposal: you have a lot of stops, now we're talking about a gen ed stop on top of it; you need assessment experts around the table, but maybe not so many voting; whoever has approval needs to be part of the planning process

ECKERT: What Karla Sanders took around, which had a timetable, is not active at the moment?

THRONEBURG: The schedule was going to be foundational classes this year

ECKERT: So, that is on schedule?

THRONEBURG: Who is going to take the lead on it? CASL had learning goal leaders in it, but then they had 75% new members and didn't feel that they had the expertise – at our last meeting [we acknowledged that CAA] needs to take the lead, so Thursday we'll be going again with the gen ed stuff; we've got to get a timeline, clear expectations – dual credit has played a role in this as well, several learning goal leaders are also leading this dual credit effort; it's hard to say what is the biggest priority right now and how much can you handle – HLC is expecting something so we have to turn back to gen ed

GATRELL: The learning goals are part of our broader commitment to HLC in terms of the Open Pathway project

STOWELL: It's an informal commitment

GATRELL: It's the only project we have as part of that; I want to make sure that after 2019 we're in the best position we can be for reaffirmation; it impacts every student learner on this campus, it speaks to student success and outcomes; it is a challenge and commitment on behalf of the committee to make sure our students thrive – learning outcomes is where reaffirmation and accreditation is today

ABEBE: We seem to conflate two issues: we want to do things efficiently, but we also plan to do things better; those two [things] are not the same in my mind: one is a moral issue, the other is a productivity issue – from the point of view of doing things better, it's essential for people to know what they're doing, to conceive an idea and try to make it happen; from an efficiency point of view there are other issues that administration and all of us are going to be concerned [with] –

most of the time when our discussions take place at the Senate, it is with both of those ideas – from a shared governance point of view, efficiency is very necessary; from the point of view of the service that we provide for our students, doing things better – we have to find a way to combine those two; the conversation begun here during our last meeting was in that vein ... a new way of looking at things, for example, shared governance – we bargained for a new person [i.e., the provost] to come in and challenge assumptions; that's what we ought to be doing, looking at things from different perspectives

GOSSE: Do we have any idea what percent the learning goals are embedded in our current course offerings?

THRONEBURG: We did a learning goals study, huge amounts of syllabi review; reports are available on the learning goals site – before we proposed the five-year plan, we did a 2012-13 study of the practices on campus; we surveyed faculty about what they were teaching and did syllabi review to gather information

GOSSE: Participating in the learning goals group changed the way I communicate with students – I'm wondering if that's ongoing

THRONEBURG: One of the stumbling blocks is that our standard model syllabus is basic content; you can't tell from that level of description in the assessment section, you can't see where there's explicit instruction in writing or quantitative concepts when content is listed for 16 weeks – what you'd like to see in a model syllabus is: here's the days I'm going to talk about writing skills, and here's the assessment I'm going to use; that would be an extra level of specificity asked for in a model syllabus, where there's planned time for teaching – it's important to get the information out to the instructors so they have the tools – we have a lot of resources developed; one of the first steps is going to have to be what does the proposal look like; there may be a proposal form, something that asks for more specificity so you can see the instruction and assessment of the learning goals

GATRELL: CAA is doing impressive work in learning outcomes; the curriculum review on this campus is some of the most sophisticated I've seen; the work done on that committee is important and reflects a culture of assessment and learning that is unique here – we need to have a faculty member lead and serve as a liaison for general education; it can't be service in the classic sense – make sure it's faculty-driven – I do not want to change gen ed, I just want to be able to deliver on what we promised HLC

HUNG: If you look across our peer institutions, they have something similar to an office of learning and scholarship; on our campus it's diffused into CASL and CAA and CGS – as a point of attracting new faculty, that's something we're lacking as an institution; we can't point to a central office – I agree with our Provost that there needs to be a formal position that has the scope of looking at academic progression

GATRELL: It's also important that it should be similar to Newton Key's role in Faculty Development; it has to be a faculty member

STOWELL: Having been involved in some of the work that was done, I see great value in the learning goals being infused into the curriculum; just the elevation of the syllabus and the expectations of students after going through this model syllabus process was enlightening; it had an impact on the quality of our academic offerings – we've run into a roadblock with personnel; people who have the passion for it are already doing valuable things on this campus – we've started to have some discussion among the major council chairs, to think about efficiency and unification; we've done a little peer checking: our Faculty Senate is unique among all public institutions in Illinois, in some locations even course approvals go through faculty senate, in other places it's just new programs – I do not want to add another layer of approval that could slow things down; why do we have college curriculum committees, what if we freed up those 40 people and used them in some other way – potentially a supercommittee with subcommittees: CAA would be part of Faculty Senate, then we'd have Faculty Senate approval unified going to Administration – recognize that CAA is a very demanding service opportunity – there are solutions, we're just at the beginning of brainstorming; continue to have these discussions over the course of this semester so that by next year we can start a plan of implementing – I'm co-chairing a committee to submit a comprehensive report to HLC due June 2019, I'd like to have some evidence that we're moving in a direction to respond to concerns provided by the site visit team back in 2014 related to the lack of interconnectedness among the major committees on campus; that would include a comprehensive look at shared governance and how we communicate with other committees and their membership – we've lost 30% of our faculty over the last few years, including key players in the learning goals – we have 26 vacancies in university councils up for election this spring, so I'm mindful of the numbers and the workload and capacity

HUNG: I agree that we need to look at new structures; I suggest that these conversations take place regularly but outside the Senate sessions because it would be too rushed to hold those conversations while conducting Senate business – my second idea is we don't do a thorough job of institutionalizing new faculty, we don't imprint EIU on them as strongly as we could; if we're going to have learning goals, we should tell new employees [*describes presenting it during their orientation as something expected of faculty*]; if we set that up better, we might see better responsiveness to adopting these standards and rolling these assessment elements into courses because if they know this is an institutional expectation, it's easier for them to accept it and adapt it as part of their teaching; one suggestion is for CAA and/or Faculty Senate to work more closely with Faculty Development, which organizes the new faculty orientation; in the last two years they've offered syllabus workshops to new faculty, that could be a starting point for involvement; one of the challenges

with these learning goals is consistency throughout our institution, we need wide-scale adoption and implementation, we need to start early with new faculty and build institutional culture

BRUNS: It's important to devote time to discussing this issue, but those discussions have to happen at Faculty Senate, and also to a lesser degree in the various committees; squeezing it in, but who has time for another meeting – I was on Faculty Senate when [the proposed referendum on the model] happened; it was unfair because you had done a ton of work; we have to assume our colleagues are intelligent and capable; I'm not interested in a situation where Faculty Senate is continually overriding committees, I'm interested in a situation where Senate knows what committees are doing and, if an issue comes up, can ask for more information or clarification at that time – not every member of the councils has to be on Senate; maybe just the Chairs could also be Senate members, to keep us informed and take questions back

HUNG: [*to Ruholl*] From your perspective and experience chairing CAA, do you have ideas for Faculty Senate on how we can improve the functioning of CAA?

RUHOLL: Communication could be better in both directions, just posting minutes isn't always enough; that doesn't stop us from attending and participating in each other's meetings; keeping an open mind and working together; we got on the defensive after reading the minutes from the November 14 meeting, it's hard to read in text what the intent was – I agree that if all it's going to be is an override, that's not going to go well, but if we work together and have membership or at least participation in the meetings, that will be a smoother transition to a better, more efficient governance structure

Approval of Minutes from January 9, 2018

Motion to approve by Eckert, seconded by Hung

Discussion: none

Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Wharram) – motion carried

Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: To recap how we concluded yesterday's meeting, I'm going to reach out to all of the Council of Illinois University Senates leaders to ask for a concise summary of shared governance at their universities, how faculty senate is constituted, how involved are they in the curricular structure, so we have a better idea of possibilities – as we move forward I'd like to consider Sen. Stowell's idea about the college-level curriculum committees; there's a way to be more streamlined where we wouldn't sacrifice a lot of quality if we have representation at the Faculty Senate level and we have departmental representatives looking at curriculum

ABEBE: As long as the DACs reflect those things – incentives matter – DACs require committee participation; if we can match it, I think we'll be fine

HUNG: How big are the college curriculum committees?

ECKERT: One member from every department in CAH

HUNG: Are they the departmental curriculum chairs? If not, maybe they should be the same person

HUGO: That's how it is in our program, I'm the chair of the department committee and I serve on the college committee; it's the same for the School of Business and the School of Technology

ECKERT: I served last year on our college curriculum committee, and I'm chair of our department committee, so it's not the same

HUNG: The DAC is each department's property, so if we want to see changes, we need to have conversations on a peer to peer level; the time to get the departments to rethink that part is now, because after the new contract is ratified there's a window of time when the DAC can be altered

STOWELL: Some departments place university service at the top of the list, others place departmental service at the top

ROBERTSON: A politely-worded call to departmental colleagues on campus to make sure that university-level service is placed higher than departmental service in DACs – departmental service is important, but the university is a higher level of service, if we can encourage our colleagues to have that reflected uniformly across campus

OLIVER: With oversight of the curriculum and new programs being considered, I have a colleague in Computer Science who's concerned about this issue because the School of Technology had a Computer Information and Technology major approved, and there seemed to be significant overlap [with the computer science major] – we need to keep at least some level of university-wide oversight to avoid this type of duplication, because these programs (in two different colleges) are competing for similar students

BRUNS: That was approved by CAA

OLIVER: Apparently so

WHARRAM: That's true of graphic design as well, between Art and Technology

BRUNS: Those issues should be brought to CAA – something in the review process missed that the new proposal is very similar to an existing program

OLIVER: It's in place now, this happened within the last five years; it's just an example

STERLING: That's what the college curriculum committees do; if we reorganize the way things work, we have to make sure somebody can still perform that function – there have been many times when one department has a proposal that would have a significant impact on another department; if it hadn't had to go through the college curriculum committee where a departmental representative was there to listen to what was going on, we wouldn't have known about it until it reached CAA, or was approved by CAA – we have to do a better job of letting departments know about substantial changes that might affect them; we do a fairly good job within colleges, but not across

STOWELL: Let the assistant dean play the role of looking for overlap at the college level

BRUNS: Is there a timeline for course proposals? [*receives several replies that no, it's continual*]

GOSSE: There's a deadline for the [course] catalog each semester

HUNG: There's a timeline for different stages of the process, working back from the catalog deadline, but courses can be proposed anytime

ROBERTSON: Moving on to the CUPB report from January 12... we are now past the tenth day; Josh Norman reported that we should expect a positive press release, which I have not yet seen – unofficial numbers as of Jan. 11: in Spring 2017 there were 772 new freshman class enrollees, in Spring 2018 there are 1,102 (contrary to what usually happens, we are up from Fall to Spring by 36%); we have 3,840 new admits for Fall 2018, year-to-date up 46%

WILLIAMS: Any explanation for the Fall to Spring increase? Did students delay coming until Spring?

ROBERTSON: We had a good number of transfers, up 49% over last year

STOWELL: Somehow we have to count dual credit, and my understanding is that they're counted as new freshman

ROBERTSON: Graduate applications are up 35%, grad admits are up 43%; international undergrad applications are up 94%, international grad applications up 39% – regarding university advancement, in November 2016 the university investments' market value was at \$72 million; in November 2017 that had grown to \$81 million (not counting the \$2 million in advancement fundraising dollars that came in between July and December 2017); good news because it means more scholarship funds available (incremental increase) because those monies have grown – other news from Josh Norman: hopefully you've all seen some advertisements out there, I'm starting to see some banner ads when doing Google searches, also a gigantic EIU billboard in the St. Louis area

WILLIAMS: One of our ads popped up while I was looking at CNN

ROBERTSON: One came up on the New York Times

HUNG: Is the increased application rate because we're accepting more students, or is it because more students are applying?

ROBERTSON: The implication seemed to be that with more people applying, we were going to accept more, but the inevitable barrier comes at the State Dept. level, we don't know how many will be able to enroll

HUNG: That's out of our control, we can only accept qualified students and hope they can get their visas approved – now that CUPB is aware of this, what are we doing to prepare for taking in a potentially significantly higher percentage of international students? OISS is still understaffed – how are we handling visa applications and international transcript translations?

ECKERT: Students usually have to handle that themselves; it's the individual student's responsibility, the university will not provide a translation

HUNG: But you have to approve it and make sure they're doing it correctly

BRUNS: In Vitalization Workgroup 3 we were told that Admissions has to take time to interpret transcripts for foreign students

ECKERT: In that sense you have to interpret transcripts from community colleges; you don't have to translate, just compare

HUNG: One of the things holding up our graduate applicants is that OISS is overworked and not on time in processing applications, and one of the holdups is transcripts from different countries need to be converted to American equivalents, so someone at OISS has to do the paperwork before candidates are given to the graduate coordinator for selection – my concern is that we're seeing an increase in applications from overseas, so what are we doing to prepare to accommodate these students once we've accepted them?

BRUNS: Executive Committee should bring this up at a meeting with Jay

HUGO: It's already being talked about at International Education Council; no money to hire but they are aware

BRUNS: If we're missing getting students here because we don't have staff to process the paperwork...

ROBERTSON: We should discuss a couple other items from CUPB: I'd like us to consider a Faculty Senate call to our colleagues encouraging all faculty to try to attend a commencement every year; the university community would like to see a broad representation of faculty on a more regular basis at commencements

WILLIAMS: Who's going to pay to rent or buy the gown?

ROBERTSON: The cost of gown was the sticking point when I left the meeting

WILLIAMS: In terms of pageantry it's better if we wear our school colors – if they want us to come, what can they provide for us?

ROBERTSON: It was mentioned that the university provides an affordable rental option; people are required to go every year at some other universities, our administration is not interested in compulsory attendance; I suggested sharing information in a more streamlined way; maybe we can discuss putting out a call at another meeting – University Advancement is having conversations, so a question came up at CUPB: Is it appropriate for the Distinguished Faculty Award to be given at Commencement, or should Commencement be only student-centered?

HUGO and WHARRAM: No opinion

HUNG: Where would it be presented then?

GOSSE: Commencement is a university celebration...

OLIVER: On the surface those two items seem to contradict each other: Come to commencement, but we're going to remove the historical, traditional element of honoring the DFA

HUNG: I don't know what they have in mind, but I would argue that recognizing distinguished faculty is part of becoming a college student

ABEBE: An alternative would be to have [the DFA] with the Laureate at Convocation – lots of universities do it at commencement, but here we have a tradition of honoring students only – so, I don't care

HUNG: A move to convocation would be okay, but I would hate to see it extracted away from a venue where students have exposure to it

STERLING: How about the Mendez Award?

ROBERTSON: It was not mentioned

ABEBE: We had agreed that you would raise the issue of administrative evaluation

STOWELL: We haven't had a meeting since

ROBERTSON: The last item is that I was requested to attend a University Naming Committee meeting, being convened tomorrow at 4:00 p.m.

Committee Reports

Elections Committee (STOWELL): Minimum of 26 position vacancies on university committees and councils; I am confirming with committee chairs to see if there are additional unforeseen vacancies – vote around Spring Break in March

Nominations Committee (OLIVER): The second communication from Larry White regarding Jeanne Okrasinski's service as IBHE Faculty Council alternate; she questioned whether she was still eligible to be identified as an alternate; reviewing Senate bylaws, my interpretation is Faculty Unit A, Unit B, and Chairs; so yes, she is eligible unless wants to remove herself from that position; I'll respond to Larry – other than that, we need to identify faculty who will be rolling off at the end of this semester and start to populate our list of nominated position vacancies for Fall

Faculty-Student Relations Committee (BRUNS): There was no Student Senate meeting; I'll be attending the one tomorrow night

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee (HUNG): No report

Awards Committee (HUGO): DFA nominations are due on February 23; all reviewers have been added to the committee except for the President's pick, waiting to hear back on that; committee members have until March 8 to submit their vote to me; we'll come to a decision on the recipient on March 9, then Faculty Senate will vote to approve on March 20

Faculty Forum Committee (ABEBE): Forum is scheduled for February 13; presenters will be Billy Hung, Bailey Young, Jeannie Ludlow, Jay Gatrell; Sen. Young has approached two state senators: one has declined (Bennett), one has not yet responded (Rose); Provost had agreed to provide refreshments but I decided not to take up his offer because of the 3:00 p.m. forum time – hopefully the paper will publish a few things about this

Budget Transparency Committee (STERLING): No report

BRUNS: We rarely hear from this committee; EIU is now spending more money on advertising than in the past; when it was announced at Faculty Senate that most institutions spend 1-2% but EIU spent 0.3%, what immediately came to mind was 'why did that never come out before'

STERLING: The budget is so big and has so many elements, we can't talk about everything – if [marketing expenditures] are something you'd like us to have a conversation about, we can easily look into it and come back with a report

ABEBE: It becomes an issue only when you have an enrollment decline

HUNG: To flip it around, we have an enrollment problem because we treat advertising like it's only an issue when we have a declining enrollment

STERLING: For most of EIU's history the administration would decide how many students we'd want for the following year and adjust the application cutoff date in order to hit that number – the initial decline from 12,000 to 10,000 was okay; it wasn't until after the disaster had already occurred that administration started thinking maybe we need to do something about it

BRUNS: Those days are gone, we should be looking more closely at a lot of these things

OLIVER: Maybe investigating if it's possible to determine a correlation of investment increase and return on investment

BRUNS: In this era of reduced state support and declining enrollments, where we spend money is a huge question, so Budget Transparency should be the most active committee

ROBERTSON: That is the function of CUPB

Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics (ECKERT): No report

STERLING: Has the President said anything about what he's going to say about athletics on Friday?

ROBERTSON: He said he's continuing to look at the issue

OLIVER: [*to Cash*] back to Nominations, I received an email from a colleague (Anna Cromwell) who volunteered her services to the Student Government External Relations Committee and the Student Fee Review Committee; she indicated that neither of those committees had been meeting; do you have a recommendation on a point person to refer her to

CASH: That would go to our Speaker, Will Outzen – either tonight or next Wednesday we're going to appoint our new committee chairs (we appoint new chairs each semester), I can let you know who

OLIVER: Does the fee review committee only activate if there's a proposed student fee increase? Which there is – our representative has not been invited to any meetings

CASH: The person in charge of that also just graduated; we weren't at quorum last week

OLIVER: So I refer our colleague to the VP of Student Affairs to find out more

STOWELL: I was in the same boat – I would approach Lynette Drake

CASH: I'll talk to our Speaker and keep you updated

Vitalization Discussion

HUNG: Have people thought about what to do with it?

STOWELL: I think we should table it while we're looking at other restructuring; I like the idea, but I'm not sure where it would fit in

BRUNS: There's a real need to be responsive as an institution; I think of it as a strategy group, how do we remain a vital institution - there's a need for a committee to do just that, not assessment or anything else – I think it's worth further discussions that don't have to happen today

ROBERTSON: I would concur with that; we have a lot of committees to begin with - one thing we could consider, moving forward, we could phase out the *Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics* and phase in a standing committee to look at these kinds of issues - within existing number of committees, transition to something that's more forward-looking than watchdog

BRUNS: I move that we table the discussion until next meeting

ABEBE: I second

OLIVER: The biggest concern with athletics is the amount of revenue needed to support it; if we keep the Budget Transparency subcommittee active, they can still keep an eye on it - they're our partners/neighbors/friends on campus, but are they receiving more of a share of the revenue pile than they deserve to keep their programs afloat

STERLING: They're receiving a fee increase, at this week's Board of Trustees meeting

ROBERTSON: 24 cents per credit hour

HUNG: 16 credits = roughly \$4

ECKERT: Per student

ROBERTSON: The Music department is one of the beneficiaries of GIA, scholarships are distributed to music students, but I believe the primary beneficiary is Athletics

OLIVER: [*to Budget Transparency*] keep us posted on how much of the GIA is going where

ABEBE: If the Executive Committee could get together and give us a blueprint of ideas including what was discussed with CAA, that would be beneficial - then we could have a discussion and see your vision of what the committee structure ought to be

ROBERTSON: At our next meeting in two weeks Anita Shelton, Dan Crews, and Dennis Malak will be joining us to speak about the upcoming tenth anniversary season Doudna celebration – [*recaps list of other upcoming guests*] – David Boggs (CGS Chair), Danelle Larson (COTE Chair), Stacey Ruholl (CAA Chair), Jeff and I were the people in the meeting yesterday - we'll try to provide a concise summary of that

ABEBE: [*to all*] Please post these [forum flyers]

Session adjourned at 3:47 p.m.