

**MINUTES OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Room 142, Gerberding Hall**  
**2:30 p.m., Monday, 14 February 2005**

**Present:** Senate Chair Heath; Vice Chair Emery, President Mark Emmert; Group Representatives: Coldewey (I), Rogers (II), Swalla (III), Buck (IV), Hardy (V), Christie (VI), Welton (VII), Lam (VIII); UW Tacoma Representative Jackson; UW Bothell Representative Watts, Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn; Faculty Council Chairs: Janssen (FCAS), Erdly (FCEO), Kanal (FCET), Luchtel (FCFA), Carline (FCIQ), Boxx (FCRIB), Stewart (FCR), Schaufelberger (FCUFS), Killien (FCTCP); Special Committee Chair, Mandoli (SCFW), Fabien (SCMFA), Faculty Legislative Representative Stygall, GPSS Representative Grupp, Acting Provost Thorud, Assistant to the President Niccolls

**Absent:** Group Representative Perkins (VII)\*, UW Faculty Council Chairs: Schwartz (FCSA)\*, Martin (FCUL)\*, Seifer (FCUR)\*; Special Committee Chair Wadden (SCPB)\*, ASUW Representative Knowles

\*=excused

**Guest:** Professors Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative, Clark Pace (FCSA), Robert Crutchfield, Sociology, Michael McCann, Political Science; Helen Remick, Assistant Provost for Equal Opportunity, Dave Burton, Associate Athletic Director for Student Service Programs

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m.

**Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was **approved**.

**Approval of the minutes**

The 10 January 2005 Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes and the 27 January 2005 Faculty Senate meeting were **approved**.

**Opening Remarks of the Chair – G. Ross Heath, Faculty Senate Chair**

Today, I am **not** going to talk about bioterrorism. Instead, I am going to introduce a perennial topic that is again rising to the top of our agenda – faculty salaries. There are several reasons for the heightened interest.

Firstly, the Locke 2005-07 budget actually includes funding for faculty salary increases equivalent to the percentages negotiated by collective bargaining units last year.

Secondly, if performance contract negotiations are even partially successful, there will be significant new resources to focus on this problem.

And, finally, a number of salary-related policy questions and discussions have arisen on campus in recent months.

One of the outcomes of these discussions is a recognition that some aspects of our treatment of faculty salaries are well defined, whereas other are much less so. The areas where our policies are pretty clear are:

1. Cost-of-living-adjustments.
2. Continuing merit. This 2% annual adjustment for meritorious faculty was negotiated several years ago and is now incorporated in the Faculty Code.
3. Individual or exceptional merit, and
4. Promotions.

The remaining areas have policy guidance that is less clear or even absent. These are the areas that the SCPB is currently working to get its arms around. They include:

5. Recruitment and retention. These funds are a stopgap response to our overall weak salary position relative to our peers. Recruitment issues are pretty obvious – we have to compete at market and use whatever resources we can lay our hands on to do this. Requirements are very unit and discipline specific. Retention is more complex. Some units respond only to written offers, others do not respond to any external offers, and still others award pre-emptive increases to try to keep key faculty from even applying elsewhere. This topic also presents ethical challenges: some faculty are comfortable playing the “outside offer” game even though they have no intention of leaving; others are not. Current policy is very *ad hoc*.
6. Unit adjustments. This is the focus of current SCPB discussions. A consensus seems to be developing that if we care enough about a program to have it on campus at all, we should not allow its salaries to fall more than 20% below the peer group target. This was the basis for the 2004 unit adjustments, for example. Beyond that, there are many open questions, such as:
  7. What is the peer group and, therefore, the target salary level for each unit (particularly for units not well represented in the HECB-24)? How are quality and aspirations to quality established and factored into the target level? How should unit adjustments be allocated within a unit (across the board, pre-emptive retention, to address compression and inversion, to name just a few)? Current policy provides only minimal guidance on such questions.
8. Re-investment of differential tuition. This is a special case of unit adjustments where, because of market conditions or peer behavior, some units can generate funding beyond that available to the rest of the University. In addition to the questions associated with all unit adjustments, this item raises the additional question of how to divide the extra income from differential tuition between the originating unit and the rest of the university, particularly given the high degree of interdependence of all our programs. Current policy is opaque.
9. Use of funds from retirements and resignations. Current practice seems to fall into four categories: a) Support for up to 5 years re-employment at 40%; b) Creation of new positions (which may or may not be in the unit where the vacancy appears); c) Use of unfilled vacancies to provide operating funds (but such vacancies tend not to get increases); and d) Elimination of positions and use of the funds to support individual merit increases (which increases the workload on remaining faculty in the unit). Policies appear to vary across campus and over time.
10. Use of research and clinical funds. Some faculty members have negotiated reductions in the levels of their appointments derived from general operating funds (including a partial release of tenure), with a lesser or no reduction in State salary or obligations. The remainder of the appointment is made up with non-state funds.

This is generally a retention strategy (either in response to an outside offer or pre-emptive). Use of this option varies widely across campus and reflects both opportunity and philosophical perspectives that vary from unit to unit. Again, there is no University-wide policy or guidance on the issue.

11. The final issue that has arisen in the context of faculty salary policy is the extent (if any) to which tuition increases should be linked to increases in the faculty salary budget. Both students and faculty have raised this question as a response to concerns that tuition increases may simply compensate for reductions in State general fund support, rather than enhance the quality of the university.

There is no simple recipe to mix and match all these issues in an optimum way or even in multiple optimum ways. I do hope however, that discussions during the coming months will explore all these issues comprehensively and openly and determine where current policy needs clarification or augmentation.

### **Report from the President – Mark Emmert**

Regarding his attendance at SEC meetings, Emmert observed that his busy first quarter sometimes made it impossible to attend meetings. He acknowledged that attendance at these meetings is important, and he will make every effort to be here.

In discussions with his Cabinet and the Board of Deans, he has stated that it is critical to engage in a process about where the University should be going over the next few years. While he does not want to do a formal strategic plan, he does want to identify a list of about ten items that we should be doing. He has asked deans to give him a one to two page list of where they think their programs should go. Concurrently, he wants to draft a brief white paper to begin discussion. The deans and others will frame a process to guide the University's development over the next few years. By fall 2005, he wants to have something roughed out that he can present to the campus community at his annual address. For example, one issue is how do we want to shape the direction of undergraduate education after George Bridges and Ernest Morris leave? How can we improve student life and undergraduate education? He will put together a small working group on that topic before filling those positions.

Emmert welcomed the suggestions that were presented in the open letter from minority faculty that was printed in the Daily. The suggestions were in keeping with his ideas for the institution, stating that he wants to advance diversity and work with Rusty Barcelo's diversity report. He agreed completely with the letter, especially that we need to be more vocal in opposition to I-200. He feels strongly about this issue personally, and he feels the University must support efforts to change this initiative.

Moving to legislative activity, the general level of legislative interest in higher education has been pleasing. The budget picture, however, got dramatically worse when the state supreme court ruled that the inheritance tax has been repealed. The state will need to pay the tax back and then they will not have those revenues for the future. Finally, the Governor plans to bring out budget proposals after the revenue reports in March.

Meanwhile, we have been working with legislators on tuition policy. They are looking at three variables: state support, enrollment flexibility, and tuition. They have determined areas where we need to make improvements. We want to make sure that if we increase tuition we will put the money where it will improve the student's education; this does

include faculty salaries. On the federal level, he noted that the president's budget poses difficulties for higher education. Some research funding is better, but not all. This is of critical importance to us. He is working with legislators on these areas as well.

He reviewed recent leadership recruitments: Patricia Spakes has been hired as the Chancellor for UW Tacoma. Suzanne Ortega is here on campus for a second interview for Dean of Graduate School. He hopes to have that search done soon. The Business School brought in four outstanding candidates for the Dean's position; however, at the end of the day, the candidates were not the best choices for the University. We need very strong and talented leadership, and he has asked that the search continue. He has met with the Provost Search Committee, which has developed an impressive pool of candidates. Their proposed schedule will bring candidates to campus sometime in the spring. Current experience around the country suggests that provost searches can be successful but that they are challenging. For example, University of Florida just put out their search for a Provost again. The provost will be his most important hire. We will wait on hiring a Dean of Undergraduate Education and Vice President of Student Affairs until after the discussions he mentioned earlier take place. A search committee has been assembled for the Dean of Architecture, and the process moves forward for deans in Engineering and Social Work.

In questions and comments, several people commented favorably on the decision to wait before appointing a new dean for undergraduate education, and made suggestions about that process. The President asked people to send him e-mails with the names of people who would have good ideas about this program.

#### **Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Douglas Wadden, Immediate Past Chair and Committee Chair (Given by G.R. Heath)**

SCPB has only met once since the last meeting. Unit adjustments were discussed and specific recommendations will be made; this topic will continue to be discussed this year. They will be looking at issues in relation to tuition levels and how varying levels affect the university budget. If you start looking at tuition waivers the amount is really small. They will have serious discussions about the tuition impact on the budget. They are also looking at how much are we spending on recruitment and retention, and the consequences of that spending.

#### **Report on Legislative Affairs – Gail Stygall, Legislative Representative**

The Council of Faculty Representatives (CFR) has done over 50 legislative visits. They will start expanding outwards next week. They have Governor Gregoire on their agenda next week. Stygall distributed a list of bills, and asked people to contact her with questions and concerns.

Hearings on the diversity bills were calmer than last year. Tim Eyman and John Carlson spoke about overcoming I-200. This year Washington State University was included in the group that said we should modify this initiative.

The budget is now the major focus. The Governor will not put out a budget until the next revenue report in mid-March. There are sizable differences in the various budget bills, and requests. The issue of raises is vexing because of the budget picture and the problems presented by giving them selectively. The House subcommittee on K-12 is likely to make a proposal about funding.

The performance contract has become the "performance agreement," and it is likely to appear on a budget proviso. There will be a list of performance indicators. If it comes without legislation, there will be no protections for faculty. The CFR is watching that carefully, and working to put faculty "at the table" on this issue and any other that concerns higher education.

In response to questions, she noted that there is a distinction between cost of living adjustments sought by most state employees and funds for merit increases for faculty. They are wary of having faculty funds tied to various quantified targets. Second, there have been some discussions about student conduct issues in the neighborhoods surrounding the University, but the hope is that these concerns can be resolved in neighborhood discussions rather than by legislation. The rate of incidents is dramatically lower this year compared to last year.

### **Report from the Secretary of the Faculty – Lea Vaughn**

After distributing a list of current council issues, Vaughn announced that the first directive on Faculty Senate Elections has gone out. The current Class A legislation has a return date of February 17. She encouraged Council Chairs to seek new members for their councils before the February 28<sup>th</sup> nomination deadline.

### **Nominations and Appointments – Secretary of the Faculty**

The Secretary of the Faculty oversees the operations of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Councils, and manages the faculty's adjudicative proceedings. He or she records meetings of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee, supervises the work of the Senate Office staff, and takes an active role in attempts to resolve collegial disagreements before they invoke formal adjudication. Of singular importance to this pivotal university position, the Secretary of the Faculty guides and oversees additions and changes to the *University Handbook*, and particularly to the *Faculty Code*.

The *Faculty Code* procedures for the appointment of the Secretary stipulate that the Secretary is appointed by the President for a five-year term. He or she will be selected by the President from a list of at least three nominees submitted by the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

A nominating committee was appointed consisting of Ron Dear, James Gregory, John Junker, Janet Primomo and Miceal Vaughan. The committee has proposed the following three candidates for the position, in alphabetical order:

Donna Kerr, Professor, Education  
Sandra Silberstein, Professor, English  
Jan Sjøvik, Associate Professor, Scandinavian Studies

This list was **approved**.

## Reports from Councils and Committees

### a. Follow up on Policy Regarding the Acceptance of Transfer Credits, Donald Janssen, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Janssen distributed a handout describing the legislation (approved 24 January 2005). As requested, they have communicated with the advisors on the Seattle campus about the new limits. The Registrar's office has started to contact specific students on the campus that have a large number of undergraduate credits that can count toward degrees.

FCAS is now looking at a definitions of upper and lower division courses. Last defined in 1975, FCAS has reaffirmed this report and are working to make it more widely accessible and visible. They are also now determining guidelines for upper division credits. Finally, they are trying to develop guidelines for when new programs are submitted. They want to have guidelines for specific areas, instead of a university standard.

### b. Letter to the President, Brian Fabien, Chair, Special Committee on Minority Faculty Affairs

Brian Fabien made some comments on faculty of color letter (*see agenda*) that was published in the University Daily. It was put together by 100 faculty on the campus who feel quite strongly about diversity issues. The number of minority faculty on this campus is low. The tenure track number of minority faculty is small, although there are more minority faculty lecturers. The University says they "feel our pain" but faculty await some concrete action. Thus, the letter made four suggestions:

1. Implement cluster hiring
2. Fight I-200, and he is pleased that the President is going to do this.
3. Create Faculty Advocates for all junior faculty.
4. Reinstate the presidential faculty development fellowships. (This program was for all faculty.)

They recently had a meeting with Rusty Barcelo (Vice President for Diversity), Helen Remick (Ass't Provost, Equal Opportunity Office), and Johnnella Butler (Asso. Dean, Graduate School & Associate Provost). They would like to see a vision of what the President wants to see as a hiring process.

Dina Mandoli, Chair, SCFW, is interested in pursuing mentoring issues and she wants to partner with SCMFA on this issue. Members of SCFW have also discussed creating an advocate system. Similarly, Prof. Swalla (Biology) has been involved in the Advance Program and has found it very interesting and useful in reviewing diversity issues in different departments, and exploring the nature of bias.

## Information: NCAA Recertification – Patrick Dobel, Faculty Athletic Representative

Heath introduced this topic, noting that the review takes place every ten years. Dobel began by noting that this process begins with a self-study focusing on:

1. academic integrity
2. governance and compliance and
3. equity issues

He has organized the report process by appointing three subcommittees to examine each topic. The process takes approximately 1 ½ years to complete. The NCAA mandates a format for and areas to be covered in the report. At Heath's suggestion, Prof. Schwartz, Chair, FCSA, and Prof. Pace, co-chair, have read the draft reports and supplied copious and useful comments. Thus, someone on the faculty has reviewed the entire report. This is important because part of the report requires that the report be subject to open forums. Last time, public and faculty comment forums garnered four attendees. This time, Dobel wants to be certain that senior faculty leadership review the report.

Each chair of a subcommittee presented a brief report. The plan is to put the report on the web for feedback, and on April 14th the final report as submitted to the NCAA will be public. Next fall, a team will visit the campus to review the program, and to meet with faculty and the President. The final outcome will be a report that may include recommendations to maintain NCAA membership.

### Reports

a. Prof. Crutchfield (Sociology) – Chair, Subcommittee on Academic Integrity: The committee has representation from the Tyee Club, faculty, students, and the Athletic Dept. They have interviewed staff and coaches as well as conducted focus groups with various student athlete groups. Their conclusion is that we are doing a “pretty good job” in working with our students, especially when viewed against the recommendations in the 1997 report. We have fulfilled most of those conditions. We are second in the Pac 10 after Stanford for graduation rates.

There are some troubling concerns, however, on the horizon. They believe a committee needs to be established for special admits to the department that would guarantee faculty involvement in the admissions process. They are concerned that the good work of Student Athlete Academic Services could be undercut by a rising gap between the admissions index of special admits and those of regular admits as our admissions standards rise. There is a group in the Athletic Department studying this. Our current graduation rate is the result of a number of dedicated people who work with the students, but some of these people are leaving. These people contributed above and beyond to the program. Another issue is that some student athletes have learning disabilities, but the department has only one person who can provide students with help; thus, there is need to hire one more person. Also, we need a better qualified staff of tutors, perhaps graduate rather than undergraduate students.

Finally, there is a need for regular monitoring of academic services from outside of the department. That was recommended in 1997 but it really has not happened. One proposed mechanism would be to have a director who reports jointly to the Athletic Director and the Dean of the Undergraduate Education. Student athletes suffer from their dual roles. While faculty are generally understanding about the requirements of their full time commitment, scheduling can be very difficult. They are recommending more flexibility for coaching and practice schedules. Finally, services such as the science student center, which students really liked, have been closed down during the remodel of the boat house and invention of CLUE. In this case, a different scheduling approach may be what would work here.

During questions and comments, Prof. Mandoli noted that many student athletes have to deal with negative comments and stereotypes from other students. She notes that most athletes have excellent time-management skills and wonders whether a way to improve their reputation and self-esteem would be for them to tutor other students. Crutchfield

noted that one of the students' criticisms is that athletes get too many benefits compared to other students. Many non-athlete students do not understand the nature of the time commitment that students make to athletics. The perceptual problem is far greater with other students than with faculty.

Pace spoke to the two separate bridge programs for entering students. Currently, the programs are separated and that may be justified but wondered whether more follow-up study is justified. This might make athletes more of a part of the campus. Second, regarding re-instatement of math and science center, he asked whether there is any study that shows that their scores have dropped since they started using the CLUE center. Crutchfield replied that as to the bridge programs, there were actually fights between students before these programs were separated, and they want there to be a little more study of the issue. Regarding the math/science issues surrounding academic support, the committee has only the students' comments. It appears that students may have become dependent on the one person running the program so that shifting to CLUE may be better. He noted that Ass't. Dean Chernicoff is familiar with these issues and could coordinate the programs. If the center re-opens in the boat house, he feels it should be open for all students. Pace then noted he would like to see more faculty oversight in this process, maybe by including the Faculty Council on Student Affairs and not just one faculty administrator in a reporting role. Heath agreed with this idea and suggested we set up more places for faculty input and oversight.

Dobel addressed four points raised by Pace:

1. Admissions standards: Regarding raised admission standards and high risk entrants, he noted that FCAS and the Admissions Office have been working on a new process that will go to ACIA that will involve more faculty input for high risk students.
2. They will be studying whether and how high risk students distribute into majors because there may be "soft" majors where these students tend to cluster.
3. Each year, the number of interventions needed for students in high demand majors go up as faculty members increase their demands. Many students feel they have been forced to choose between academics and athletics, and that some faculty are suggesting that "you can't be both." This issue needs to be out on the table and discussed; perhaps the FAR could attend the new faculty orientation also so that new hires are aware of student athlete issues. This is a serious problem for our better students. Emmert noted that this is an unintended consequence of the NCAA "carrot and stick approach", which encourages easy majors so that students meet the graduation requirements. While the reforms were for underperforming athletes, it may also hurt high performing students in highly demanding majors because there will not be an extra semester or quarter to make up the work.
4. Finally, as the Undergraduate College reorganization is considered, there may need to be thought given between sharing resources between the Athletic Department and the College.

b. Prof. McCann (Politics): Chair, Subcommittee on Governance and Rules Compliance – This committee also has widely based representation, including regents, students and faculty. They have pursued their charge largely by conducting numerous interviews with Athletic Department staff and reviewing documentation, including two reports (Wallis Report – Culture of Compliance prepared for former Pres. Huntsman; Compliance Group Report initiated by former AD Hedges). The committee has focused on questions that are about

structure, process and procedure. First, they had to deal with some high profile events that occurred in the last several years. Their focus, however, is overall structure and process rather than individual actions, and considering the policy directions at the University.

Another complication to compiling their report has been the fundamental transformations that have taken place in the University Administration as well as in the Athletic Department. For example, there is a new compliance chief, John Morris, who has changed the structure of the department. They are trying to capture that dynamic in their report.

They have concluded that nearly all of the 1997 recommendations were followed up fairly quickly and effectively. Overall, the compliance effort was working fairly well, with a staff committed to rules compliance. At the same time, there are two weaknesses: inadequate formalization of the distribution of responsibilities in terms of daily oversight of the program which affected the FAR and the ultimate reporting authority within the University administration. Also, some lack of clarity about the role of the FAR developed prior to Dobel's appointment. The previous FAR had become increasingly involved in compliance on a daily basis which limited his effectiveness to be a check on this process. As a result, there were blurred lines of authority and accountability. This was also complicated by a climate or attitude that was reactive rather than participatory or pro-active. Recently, there has been change in leadership structure at the University and within the Athletic Department, and a greater willingness to be pro-active. New efforts to nail down accountability, develop clear reporting lines, and clarify lines of authority and reporting in compliance are emerging quickly. The report focuses on these changes, which are organizational, not just in terms of personnel, and most of those have been positive changes.

Their recommendations are several:

1. The FAR position, redefined as the independent representative of the main campus and President because independence is crucial, currently has its funding split between Athletic Department and President. The committee believes the funding should come only from the President and that the support of that position should be increased given new responsibilities.
2. Staff decision-making regarding financial aid and eligibility needs to be addressed. The issue is that the primary decisions are made primarily by staff coordinators in the Athletic Department in coordination with people on the main campus. The committee is suggesting that there is reason to look further at this arrangement to see if staff authority should be moved entirely to the main campus so that primary decision-making authority would be on main campus. Part of this recommended change is to avoid the appearance of impropriety but it would also make the program more connected with the faculty and non-athlete students.
3. Some questions about the activities of booster groups that support these various sports, both revenue and Olympic, have arisen. There is a need for education and monitoring, especially where the groups are more informally organized. This latter form of organization is more typical of the Olympic sports.

In discussion, Pace noted that he is troubled at where the bar is set on compliance issues because this does not always look out for the welfare of the student. Compliance becomes the sole measure of success rather than the welfare of the students. McCann reported that he thinks it is appropriate that the compliance team focus on compliance, and that many of the issues Pace raises are the focus of the staff in the academic program so that the energy comes from elsewhere.

Emmert, noting that this is a great question, stated that we want our culture of compliance to follow all of the rules of the governing body. But, we also need to ask if we are doing everything we can to be supportive of the student athlete. Referring to his experience at LSU, he described a situation in which there were some violations at the academic center. LSU did a great investigation and got to the bottom of it. The bottom line was that the academic support person was doing a great job but the support paradoxically also violated the rules. The NCAA rules are inordinately complicated and contrary to what a rational person might want to do for a student to help them to be successful. Given this, we have a constant dynamic tension where we are following the rules to the letter of the law and still trying to understand how we can best serve the kids. His view is that we do this by establishing a culture that says we will support these students within the domain of the rules, and establishing good leadership and structures. It is a very difficult balance.

Dobel added that there are two dimensions to this issue. One is the student as a holistic person. These students are not slackers. But, some students were becoming overly dependent on the support services provided. Student academic services met and reorganized focusing on creating services that develop independent student learners. The next project is a re-organization of the student life department based on best practices at other universities. They are trying to coordinate these efforts so that students get help in a timely fashion and that programs work together rather than as an individual "silo." Heath said that part of coalition goal is to go after the crazier rules that are self-defeating so there are many forces at work.

Emmert complimented the work done in the report, and stated that he has been trying to make the linear connection from student to coach to administrator to president so that there is a tighter, clear line that assures responsibility and accountability. For example, the Athletic Director now sits in cabinet. He asserted that we are better structured now. Concluding, McCann noted that the recertification process is a pretty bare bones activity, and this part is very legalistic. The committee has gone beyond this, but what is required by the NCAA is very limited, and does not really allow us to ask some of these important questions about integration. We will have to do that on our own.

c. Ass't Provost Remick – Co-chair, Sub-com. on Gender Equity and Student-Athlete Welfare - Again, this committee has a widely based membership. Its purview overlaps with federal laws so they looked not just at NCAA rules but federal and state mandates for gender equity. This is complicated in Washington because sports are governed not just by Title IX, but, because of law suit against WSU, there is a very precise ruling on gender equity in this state that does not allow for gray areas. The committee also considers minority issues under Title VI of 1964 Civil Rights Act as another area of overlap. Former AD Hedges did a superb job of creating an expectation of gender equity in all programs. The difference from her predecessor, Mike Lude, was remarkable in all areas: publicity, equipment, etc. Given Hedges multiple improvements, the job of the committee was easier on this review. Under state law, concern focuses on participation rates with the expectation that 51% of the athletes should be women (reflecting undergraduate enrollment). Currently, we are at 48-49% so we are almost there, and are one of the best in the state at complying with this expectation. In the future, we might be able to reach 51% by tinkering with squad size or other factors such as adding or cutting sports. The University is expected to have rolling five-year plans for reaching compliance. Given the arrival of a new AD, the committee suggested that he should have a year to develop his plan.

The committee assessed student views by sending out a questionnaire to student-athletes with about a 25% return. Regarding minority issues, there was only one negative

comments; the rest were positive. Unfortunately, some of the 1997 recommendations were tied to one person and since that person has left, some of the follow-through is still an open issue. As it pertains to student welfare, one notable response was that 28% of those responding felt that treatment of athletes needed to improve in the academic units. The questionnaire also contained NCAA-mandated questions about sexual orientation, and it appears we need to do some work in this area with the students. Basically, there are too many comments made in jest that could be a barrier to participation for some students. Also, the dynamics tend to be very different in women's teams versus men's teams.

Another area of concern is the treatment of learning disabilities. Remick observed that there are four disability offices on campus and they have started some efforts to get the four offices together. But currently, the work of those offices is not coordinated and this creates difficulties for students.

Another topic of concern is religion, especially post- 9/11. A small minority of students expressed varying concerns. Some felt that religion should be part of the program while another group felt that there was too much religion. Staff also expressed this latter opinion.

During the discussion, Janssen asked about the academic problems with departments. He suggested that it might be better if the Athletic Department were to send a note to the professors of student athletes. Remick said that one of the skills we are trying to teach the students is to take responsibility for these things; this has come up with disabilities also. Nonetheless, it is not clear if it should rest with the individual or centralized. Mandoli, noted that mentoring questions have also arisen in SCWF meetings, suggested that it we may need to teach students how to ask for help. She also noted that this is a problem for all students, not just athletes.

Dobel expressed his thanks to the chairs of the committees as well as to Dave Burton, Asso. Athletic Director and liaison to the NCAA for coordinating this work. These reports are taken seriously and the helpful comments today will lead to changes in the final report.

### **Announcements**

None.

### **New Business**

The agenda for the 3 March 2005 Faculty Senate meeting was **approved**.

### **djournalment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

SUBMITTED BY: Lea B. Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty

APPROVED BY: G. Ross Heath, Chair, Faculty Senate