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Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.
CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Edwards convened a special meeting of the Academic Senate at 7:02 p.m. in the University Union Ballroom with 43 Senators present.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

A motion was made (Baker-Bickel) to accept the following resolution:

Be it resolved that action on recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6 on Academic Administrative Organization as contained in Dean Helgeson's statement (March 15) be postponed until the Academic Planning Committee and other appropriate standing committees within the Academic Senate and the University have had time for careful review of pertinent matters regarding academic planning, university governance and new opportunities for inter-departmental cooperation. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, having implemented this resolution, shall report back to the full body of the Senate on recommendations 3, 4, 5, and 6 no later than November 1, 1972.

(Co-sponsors):

Stephanie Amster
Paul Baker
Patti Bickel
Pete Black
Frank Chadwick
Ira Cohen
Jan Gillett
Connie Haig
Robert Hathway
Charles Hicklin
Jan Janulis
Fred Kagy
Stanley Kane
Normand Madore
Mike McConnell
Mike McGuckin
Arthur Merrick
Coenraad Mohr
Robert Pierce
Max Rennels
Mike Schermer
Phil Steffen
Dan Sullivan
Robert Sutherland
Patrick Tarrant
Sherra Williams

Dean Helgeson reported that he appreciated the spirit of the motion; however, he stated that the President did not agree that Item #3 should be postponed. Item #3 is the recommendation that four colleges be organized instead of five. Dean Helgeson felt that the budgetary reductions of the Board of Higher Education precluded the postponement of the college reorganization plan. Dean Helgeson discussed the recommended budget reductions released from the Board of Higher Education. (A copy of these budget reductions is appended to the Minutes.) The question was raised as to whether these figures were taken from the Board of Higher Education's Executive Director's Report #103 or whether they were adaptations or interpretations of that report. Dean Helgeson stated that he believed these figures were the same.
The question was raised as to what savings would be made by the rearrangement of colleges. Several Senators stated that they understood that an agreement was made at the last meeting that figures or possible savings would be made available at this meeting. Dean Helgeson stated that the operation for all the college offices was approximately $400,000, and he stated that he could not be concrete about specific savings in the readjustment of college offices. Dean Helgeson stated that the actual savings would depend upon where the personnel would be reemployed after being relocated from Deans' offices.

It was reported that the Executive Committee had discussed the problems of savings quite extensively Tuesday afternoon with the President, but that specific savings had not been discussed at that time. Several Senators engaged in discussion of the relationship between the physical location of the Deans' offices after reorganization and their present physical location and the relation of this location to the number of assistants which would be reduced in the process of cost-cutting.

The question was again raised as to why the Senate was not furnished with some estimates of the savings from the reorganization or the reduction of colleges. Dean Helgeson again stated that he would not speculate on specific reductions as they pertain to specific colleges; to do otherwise would be to raise unnecessary anxieties. Several Senators still objected to the failure to furnish specific cost reduction estimates associated with the reorganization of colleges.

Questions were raised as to whether or not there was a possibility that costs might actually increase, even though we had reduced the number of colleges. Several pleas were made to keep the present college structure for at least another year in an attempt to reduce costs by other means.

Disappointment was expressed by some Senators as to why other alternate proposals were not presented to the Senate for effecting savings in that all of the cost reductions seem to center upon the elimination of a college. The discussion turned to the fact that ISU was taking a distinctly different approach to budget reduction than her sister institutions. While some other institutions in the state were approaching the cuts across-the-board, ISU is reorganizing the academic structure to effect the required reductions imposed by the Board of Higher Education.

A position paper from the College of Business was cited extensively to justify the need for keeping the present collegiate structure or at least a College of Business. Such benefits as better placement, better recruitment of students, improvement of programs, planning curriculum, etc., was cited.

Senator Kane distributed an information item for the Minutes, including a statement by a consultant who had been hired to evaluate the Philosophy Department (copy attached). The chairman was asked whether or not other motions dealing with Items #1 and #2 in the statement, that is, the statement of principle and the statement about departments being operational, might be introduced at a later time. The chairman stated that such motions would be in order.

A motion (Cohen-McGuckin) to close debate passed unanimously.

Motion III-154 (Baker-Bickel) passed on a vote of Yes-34, No-2, Abstentions-7.
A motion (Koch - Cohen) that the Academic Senate approve recommendations 1 and 2 on page 4 of Dean Helgeson's March 15 memo to the Academic Senate was introduced.

These recommendations are:

1. The eight statements of principle presented in the study group report should be operational guidelines on academic administrative structure.

2. Departments should be the basic operational unit of the University. The University should decentralize operations while centralizing planning. The University should have two operational and budget levels, not three as at present. Colleges should continue to exist for external visibility and college deans should have all-University functions so that they will represent both the interests of their departments and the University.

A motion to substitute (Mohr - Kane) was made. (See the entire resolution, as appended.)

In discussing this motion, Senator Mohr alluded to the petitions which had been handed to the chairman from various departments. The chairman announced that the petitions would be on file in the Senate office. Senator Mohr contended that there were at least 1,000 names on the petitions. The point was made that the proposed restructuring by the Hubbard Report would result in lack of a viable planning structure for academic decision-making. Others made the point that departmental disciplines could exist in a variety of college structures.

Expanding on the substitute motion, the point was made that the decision-making process would be centralized. Some Senators contended that hiring at the central administrative level would raise costs. Dean Helgeson stated that cost cuts were already being made and had been made in central administration, as far as the Dean of Faculties office was concerned.

A motion to close debate (Vowell - McConnell) was made. It passed unanimously.

A motion (Mohr - Vowell) which called for a secret ballot was made. The question of whether or not the move for a secret ballot is debatable was raised and referred to the parliamentarian, who ruled that it was not debatable. The motion for a secret ballot failed.

The motion to substitute (III-157) failed by a vote of Yes - 13, No - 23, Abstentions - 5.

A motion (Kane - Rennels) to divide motion III - 156 into two parts and vote on recommendations 1 and 2 separately failed on a voice vote. Senator Kane requested a show of hands. The vote was Yes - 11, No - 17, Abstentions - 8.

The question was raised as to whether or not the eight statements in the Helgeson memo were the same as in the original Hubbard Report. Mr. Hubbard stated that they were very close. This point was clarified by Senator Koch, who stated that statement #1 referred to the original Hubbard Report and the statements contained.

The question was raised as to whether or not the restructure of colleges would mean that the Deans would be physically moved to Hovey Hall. Senator Hubbard, in response, indicated that this was an administrative matter and that the planning committee had not intended to deal with it. Dean Helgeson explained that the academic planning of various college levels.
departmental levels, and university levels would not be destroyed by this reorganization plan which had been proposed. Dean Helgeson pleaded for a separation of the problems of governance from the problems of administration in the reorganization of colleges.

The question was raised as to whether or not the Academic Senate would be able to deliberate on the shifts of the various departments from one college to another. Dean Helgeson stated that this was a policy and a matter that would come before the Academic Senate.

A motion (Gillett-Williams) to close debate passed unanimously.

Motion III-161 passed on a vote of Yes-23, No-15, Abstentions-5.

The secretary explained that only roll-call votes on substantive matters would be recorded for the Minutes, and several Senators requested that their votes be recorded on Motion III-167, the motion to substitute, made earlier. The chair ruled, after consulting with the parliamentarian, that an informational vote would be recorded for the Minutes by those Senators who wished to be recorded voluntarily.

A motion (Plummer-Cohen) was made to appeal the ruling of the chair that an informational record vote could be taken on the substitute motion (III-167) made earlier. The motion to overrule the chair failed. A record informational vote was taken and is attached to the Minutes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Actions of the various committees were reported as follows:

Mr. Koch and Mr. Madore were elected co-chairmen of the Faculty Affairs Committee.
Mr. Kane was elected chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee.
Mr. Clemmons was elected chairman of the Administrative Affairs Committee.
The Rules Committee and Student Affairs Committee have not elected chairmen as yet.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Cohen requested that all Senators look at the proposed changes to the Green Book and get comments to him or members of the committee. He warned the Senators that serious changes were being contemplated in the Board of Regents' policy.

A motion (Koch-Gillett) to adjourn at 9:55 passed unanimously.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary

CRH/bw
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOICE VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amster</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td>155 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>158 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickel</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>159 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>160 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calef</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P N Y</td>
<td>161 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td>162 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemmons</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td>163 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuehrer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathway</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janecke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janulis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y P N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madore</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuckin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennels</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schermer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y P N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y N P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgeson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y=Yes  N=No  P=Present
Analysis of the Budgetary Decision Alternatives at Illinois State in Preparing the 1972-73 Operating Budget

Areas in which Budget Reductions are Recommended by BHE

**Academic Areas**
- Dept. and College Overhead: $396,935
- Extension and Public Service Overhead: $5,892
- Elimination of required physical education: $344,939
- Elimination or reduction of other academic programs: $200,000
- Reduction in teacher education: $107,400

**Student Service Area**
- Student Services Overhead: $136,646

**General University Administration Area**
- Reduce Computer Services: $262,000
- Reduce General Administration Overhead: $124,975
- Reduce general administration expense: $91,700
- Reduce operation of existing physical plant: $95,261

Sub-total: $1,765,748

Total Budget Reduction Required
(includes non-recurring items, student aid, and refunds of $830,891): $2,596,639

Areas in which Budget Increases are Recommended by BHE

**Areas in which Funds Must be Used in Order to Receive Them**
- Fixed—New Programs: $164,549
  - Expanded or Improved Programs: $735,146
- Operating Cost Increases: DeGarmo and Art Building: $294,431
- Total Committed New Money: $1,194,126

**Areas in Which there is Some Flexibility in Funds**
- Salary Increases: $857,657
- Enrollment Increase Money: $470,280
- Voluntary Physical Education-Recreation: $93,750
- Replacement of teacher education: $95,156
- Total: $1,516,843

Sub-total: $2,710,969

Total Budget Increases
(includes non-recurring items, student aid, and refunds of $836,530): $3,547,499

Net Increase: $950,860
The following recommendation was made by one of two external consultants who visited I.S.U. on March 7-8, 1972, at the request of President Berlo, to make an evaluation of the program of the I.S.U. Philosophy Department. The consultant is Hugh Petrie, an associate professor of philosophy of education at the University of Illinois in Urbana. It should be noted that Professor Petrie teaches in the college of education at U. of I., and hence cannot be accused of having a proprietary interest in a program or a college of arts and sciences.

"... I would recommend most strongly that the department marshal every resource and every argument at its command to try to chart its course as a part of a more or less traditional liberal arts program. This effort should be infused to be sure with the vision of revitalizing and renewing the traditionally conceived role of the liberal arts in contributing to the development and dignity of individual human beings -- the students. The main reasons for this position are two. First, given the history and present context of ISU, the somewhat uncertain advantages of a radically new organizational structure do not seem as if they will obviously contribute more to the development of students than a revitalized classical liberal arts program. This seems especially true given the enormous cost in human terms that such a reorganization is likely to exact at ISU in its present state. Almost everyone we met is extremely unsettled and morale is low. Secondly, the retention of a revitalized liberal arts program within an institution committed as a whole to experiments in education can serve a most important control group function. It can provide a base against which to measure the success or failure of other experimental programs. Indeed it will also be experimental in its own right, attempting to see if the overall goals of the university might also be able to be met under a classical organization."
Motion III-157

Whereas the organizational structure of the University should be arranged so as to maximize meaningful contribution to academic planning and decision-making on the part of those most closely involved in the academic operation of the University, namely the faculty and students;

Whereas such an arrangement requires decentralization of academic decision-making rather than increased centralization;

Whereas acceptance of the eight statements of principle of the Hubbard Report in toto will centralize planning in the University and thus reduce the extent and effectiveness of student and faculty participation in academic decision-making in the University;

Whereas no convincing justification in terms of sound educational philosophy is offered for the elimination of the colleges as a distinct administrative level;

Whereas many students and faculty fear negative academic and governance impact from loss of college offices;

Whereas the stated purpose for changing the academic structure of the University is to save money and there is nothing in the report to show how or to what extent the proposed changes will effect these savings;

Whereas there are many alternative ways of reducing administrative costs than those proposed in the Hubbard Report and Dean Helgeson's statement; and

Whereas the number of administrative levels could also be reduced by elimination of some of the administrative officers and units in the Offices of the Dean of the University and the President, hence shortening the chain of command and reducing cost, but without diminishing the present influence of students, faculty, departments and colleges on academic decision-making;

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate rejects the elimination of colleges as a distinct administrative level and urges that other methods be found to reduce administrative complexity.

Be it further resolved that any future proposals on restructuring the University submitted to the Senate include: (I) an assessment of the impact or effect of the proposed changes on educational effectiveness of the University; and (2) estimates of cost savings and an evaluation of the alternative of reducing costs by simplifying administrative organization at the top levels of the administrative structure (the Offices of the President and Dean of the University).
A PETITION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Because the educational philosophy behind the administration's March 15th recommendations for academic reorganization has not been explicitly stated nor adequately discussed by the Illinois State academic community,

Because the adoption of the recommendations at this time would precipitate deep and widespread tensions and uncertainties in the faculty and student body of the University, which would be extremely destructive of their personal growth and development,

Because the adoption of the administration's recommendations may have very heavy non-monetory costs such as disruption of present programs, loss of valuable personnel, and loss of stature and prestige for the University and its programs, and

Because the March 10 section of the Hubbard committee report regarding revised governance structure is intimately related to the proposed reorganization and because the Senate has had altogether insufficient time to study these effects and relationships

Therefore the undersigned members of the faculty and student body of Illinois State University strongly urge that the Academic Senate promptly advise the President and the Dean of the University to:

1. Retain the existing five-college structure for the present.
2. Proceed to Investigate the advisability of relocating departments in colleges.
3. Proceed to discuss the desirability of restructuring present departments.
4. Accomplish the mandated savings in administrative overhead by economy moves within the present organizational structure of the University.
5. Proceed to University-wide discussion of our educational philosophy including such issues as the concept of departments and colleges, authority and responsibility of organizational units, and the advisability of changes in the governance structure of the academic organization.
6. Request that the Academic Planning Committee of the University assume responsibility for the conduct of these discussions and investigations.

(959 signatures were received)