MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE April 22, 2010

Members Present: 45 Members Absent: 15

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m., by the Chairperson of the University Senate, Brien Smith.

Roll Call was taken by initialing the roster located at the entrance to TC 102.

Members Present: N. Ahmed, C. Ball, R. Bellaver, G. Crawley, Deckers, L. A. Edmonds, J. Green, D. Grosnick, M. Guntsche, C. Hall, M. Harvey, L. Helms, R. Hicks, J. Huff, R. Kanu, C. Kapinus, E. Kelly, J. Ledbetter, M. Maggiotto, D. Marini, L. Markle, W. McCune, B. McRae, P. Parkison, R. Rarick, L. Shaffer, D. Shawger, G. Slater, B. Smith, G. Stamp, F. Sun, M. Steib, D. Supa, B. Umansky, C. Walker, M. Whitlock, A. Wieseke, B. Wills, J. Yang

<u>Substitutes</u>: Irene Livshits for R. Bremigan, Joshua Coggeshall for O. Dotson, David Pearson for M. Harber, John Meiser for J. Rybarczyk, Marilyn Buck for T. King, Mark Holtzman for S. Woosley

Members Absent: B. Adams, N. Akey, K. Brophy, P. Chandler, R. Fluegeman, J. Gora, D. Haber, M. Johnson, J. Kim, M. Mills, C. Munchel, W. Sharp, K. Warren-Gordon, T. Zivney

2. A motion was made and seconded (Supa/Crawley) to approve the minutes of March 25, 2010.

The motion carried.

3. Announcements

A. Amendment Results (University Senate Agenda, 4/22/10, Enclosure #1)

The chairperson reported that all four amendments passed and will be included in the handbook as indicated. The handbook is updated each summer.

B. Nomination and Election of Jim Ruebel as Faculty Athletics Representative, term ending 2013 (Approved by Athletics Committee 3-30-10)

A motion was made and seconded (McCune/Supa) to approve the nomination and election.

The motion carried.

4. Committee Reports

A. Governance and Elections Committee – John Ledbetter, Chairperson

John thanked Brien Smith, outgoing chairperson of the senate, for his work these past two years. He reported that the committee met electronically and approved the slate of officers for senate elections.

B. Faculty Council – Barry Umansky, Chairperson

Barry reported that the Faculty Council had two meetings on April 1: Approved the revisions to the extended education policies and passed two amendments to the academic ethics policy.

University Senate Minutes April 22, 2010 Page Two

Officers were elected at the second meeting: Barry Umansky, chairperson, Dustin Supa, vice chairperson, and Ann Wieseke, secretary.

C. <u>University Council</u> – Laura Helms, Chairperson

Laura reported that the council met April 8 and sent the revised extended education policies back to the extended education committee for further revisions.

Officers were elected at the second meeting: Barb Wills, chairperson, Katie Slabaugh, vice chairperson, and Cindi Marini, secretary.

D. Campus Council - Matthew Whitlock, Chairperson

Matthew reported that the Campus Council met on April 15 and received an update on the cardinal cash task force. Plans are to have it in operation by May, 2012. They also passed the revised academic ethics policy.

Officers were elected: Mike Miller, chairperson, Kevin Thurman, vice chairperson, and Chad Griewank, secretary.

E. Annual Athletics Report – James Ruebel, NCAA/MAC Faculty Representative (Attachment #1)

The summary report is at the sign-in tables in the back of the room. There were no questions and the chairperson thanked him for his work.

- 5. Report by the Chairperson of the Senate Brien Smith (University Senate Agenda, 4/22/10, Enclosure #2)
- 6. Questions directed to the President

There were no questions as the president was unable to attend the meeting.

7. Question and Answer Period

A. A senator inquired as to whether the Teaching Evaluation Committee was going to look at the projected student evaluation online issue? Carrie Ball, a member of the Teaching Evaluation Committee, responded that the Provost's Office has asked them to provide items for student evaluations.

Since the Teaching Evaluation Committee has charge of these items (as indicated on the GANTT chart), will they have input?

Marilyn Buck reported that this committee reviewed the process for implementation. The committee chairperson is a member of the task force and it would be appropriate to take it back to the committee at any time.

Discussion and questions ensued as to whether it will come to the Faculty Council and ultimately the University Senate prior to implementation. *Marilyn responded that it will not since the implementation is scheduled for fall, 2010. She indicated that departments will be able to add their own set of evaluation questions to the online version.*

University Senate Minutes April 22, 2010 Page Three

> It was suggested that a note be sent to faculty just before it goes to students so the faculty can remind them. Marilyn thought this was a good idea and they will generate a piece to faculty reminding them that online evaluations will be sent to students the last two weeks of regular classes.

A question arose as to whether this is an option to opt out of taking the survey. Marilyn responded that students have the choice to complete the evaluation. Faculty will not know who completed them and reports will not be distributed until after the semester is complete. Students will be given a unique password, separate from their Ball State account password, to protect them from the possibility of a security breach.

9. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business

A. Student Academic Ethics Policy (University Senate Agenda, 4/22/10, Enclosure #3)

A motion was made and seconded (Crawley/Kelly) to place on the senate floor for discussion and vote.

The first revision pertains to second offenses. The review committee is seeing more of these because a majority of the cases are not reported because they were resolved in class. Now, a faculty member has to send a letter if a punishment is imposed. After a second offense, there has to be a hearing. In most cases, the faculty member hasn't any idea there has been a first offense. A process needed to be implemented.

The second revision is a new process for multiple-offense reviews (7.4.5) so there is no double-jeopardy.

A question arose pertaining to 7.4.3. This is not on today's agenda; however, the entire document is to be thoroughly reviewed next academic year, at which time these concerns can be brought forward.

11 Other Items

11. Other items		
There were no other items.		
The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.		
Brien N. Smith, Chairperson	Carolyn Kapinus, Secretary	

/mt

Report of the Faculty Athletics Representative to the University Senate

To: **University Senate**

Athletics Committee, Provost King, President Gora

Date: April 22, 2010

From: James S. Ruebel, Faculty Athletics Representative

The Faculty Athletics Representative position is mandated by the National Collegiate Athletics

Association for each member institution (NCAA By-Law 6.1.3). Specific duties vary from campus to campus, but focus on the three areas of academic integrity, institutional control (compliance), and student-athlete welfare. Appended to the end of last year's report was a Mid-American Conference "best practices" document that describes the typical duties of the FAR in the Mid-American Conference. This document is available to anyone who wants to have a copy.

NCAA Issues:

Governance:

2009-2010 was the second year of a restructured governance system for the National Collegiate Athletics Association. The new structure may be reviewed at http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?ContentID=22. In principle, the new structure should have guaranteed a faculty voice in all governance areas, called Cabinets or Councils. In practice, because of the nomination and selection process, faculty representation in this first cycle was concentrated in a few areas (like the "Academic Cabinet"), with minor representation on (for example) the Legislative Council or Leadership Council. The Division 1a FAR group has lobbied strenuously to redress this imbalance. Some progress has been made. (The MAC has a representative to the Legislative Council in Susan Lipnickey, FAR at Miami-Ohio.)

<u>Legislation</u>: There are numerous pieces of legislation in the pipeline. In some cases, proposals seem designed to chip away at the academic reforms inaugurated several years ago, and the FARs lobby local campuses to avert these attempts. All proposed legislation is reviewed at the annual meeting in the Fall of the Faculty Representatives (FARA), prior to the NCAA meetings in January (http://www.farawebsite.org/). FARA highlights those proposals that have potential impact on studentathlete welfare, academic reform, or budget.

Personnel: The process for replacing former president of the NCAA Myles Brand is well under way, but no news about his successor has yet been released. The FARs have lobbied for an academic in the mold of Dr. Brand, rather than – say – a business professional.

Mid-American Conference Issues:

Dr. John Steinbrecher is completing his first year as Commissioner, replacing Rick Chryst. There have been numerous personnel changes and other forms of reorganization in the MAC office.

The MAC is completing a year-long strategic planning process, which will guide the conference office on priorities for action as well as focus the conference on specific goals. The plan should be finished after the May, 2010 MAC meetings. I have been involved on two sub-committees for the strategic plan, "Student-Athlete Development" and "Branding and Exposure."

Ball State received the Mid-American Conference Institutional Academic Achievement Award in 2010 (BSU was #2 in 2009), which is based on a uniform GPA calculation among all conference schools. The award reflects the GPA of all student-athletes for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Ball State Issues:

Ball State's two-year NCAA probation would have ended in October and the university formally requested release from probation at that time; the NCAA has not yet responded to that request. This probation arose from the problem with improper purchases of books by student-athletes over several years. Ball state is currently under investigation by the NCAA for alleged violations in Women's Tennis. These violations were self-reported by Ball State but could still result in an institutional penalty because they occurred during the probationary period. A hearing was held in Indianapolis on April 16; the NCAA infractions committee will release its findings in 6-9 weeks.

Student-athletes who are graduating or who have exhausted their eligibility have always gone through an exit survey process. This year, a survey form has been developed by the Athletics Department that allows sophomore student-athletes to provide feedback on their athletics experiences and the coaches. This process is analogous to course evaluations by students in other respects, but is not confined to a single experience. The process was scheduled for last year but was delayed for technical reasons. The process will be assessed following this year's results, which should be available soon.

Ball State athletics is also engaged in a strategic planning process for the department. The plan is in a late stage of development but I do not know when it will be finalized.

The Gender Equity Sub-committee has been working all year to review distribution of resources in athletics and to evaluate progress toward gender equity. Minutes of the committee's work may be available next week at the final meeting of the Athletics Committee.

The Athletics Committee remains concerned about understaffing in academic advising for athletics (one academic advisor). This position is critical to verification of progress-toward-degree and continuing eligibility, both of which are areas in which the NCAA routinely audits institutions. At critical times of the year, verification of continuing eligibility must be certified in an extremely tight time period before the teams in question can practice or compete. The review is complicated and should not fall upon a single individual. Errors can have impact on scholarships and can result in fines against the institution.