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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

Chairperson Sutherland called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

ROLL CALL

The Chairperson asked for the roll call. The roll call produced a quorum.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR AND SEATING OF SENATORS

The Chairperson announced that there was a resignation and a subsequent seating of a replacement, and also the seating of a member from the College of Education to replace Donald Kachur, who had resigned previously. A motion (Mr. Henry, Mr. Roderick) to suspend the rules for consideration of the resignation and the seating of new senators was approved. The Chairperson read a letter of resignation from Roger Champagne. Mr. Willard Moonan, the runner-up in the last Senate election, was seated as an Academic Senator to replace Mr. Champagne. The Chairperson also announced that Mr. Ronald Laymon would be seated for Mr. Kachur. A motion (Mr. Madore, Mr. Taylor) to accept the resignation of Mr. Champagne with regret and to approve the seating of the new senators was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Sims asked for a correction in his remarks in the Minutes regarding the Union Board membership. He stated that Donna Peak should have been listed as a holdover member. A motion (Ms. Stone, Mr. Sims) to approve the minutes as corrected was approved.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

President Budig read a letter from the Community Advisory Council which he then distributed to the members of the Senate. (See appendix) President Budig also read a letter regarding the need for improved communications about the budgeting process. He asked that the Senate choose one of its members to serve as a budget information person in order to better communications. (See appendix)

President Budig asked for a short executive session of the entire Academic Senate at this time to report on two significant personnel matters. A motion (President Budig, Mr. Young) to move into executive session was approved. The President then shared with the Senate some personnel appointments which would be forthcoming.

The Senate returned to open session. The Chairperson thanked the President for his comments, and explained for new members of the Senate that the Community Advisory Council was a broadly representative group of fifteen community persons in no way affiliated with ISU which had been created through implementation of a recommendation of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Community and Campus Programs. The Chairperson requested that the President distribute to the department chairpersons the President's letter on the Community Advisory Council. He then commended the President for the decision to add a Senate member to the budgeting process as an information liaison person; it would seem to be a very constructive decision.
REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

Mr. Arnold said that he was proud of the Senate’s work thus far and wished everyone a happy summer vacation.

ACTION ITEM

1. Appointment of Student Members to the University Forum Committee

Ms. Frankland noted that all the members on the screening list had been screened by the screening committee. In answer to a question, she stated that this was the same slate which had been submitted at an earlier date but was the student list. A motion (Mr. Henry, Mr. Plantan) to approve the appointments to the Forum Committee was approved.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Spring Meeting of the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities (AACMU)

The Chairperson stated that the first information item had been placed on the agenda by the Executive Committee. The second item concerning the new and expanded program requests had been placed on the agenda by the Chairman on his own discretion due to the pressure of time.

Mr. Hill, the faculty representative to the AACMU, was invited to the table to discuss the spring report. Mr. Hill asked the Senators to consult the report which had been distributed to the Senate. He stated that he would entertain any questions on the report. A question arose as to the purpose of the AACMU. Mr. Hill explained that the AACMU is a consortium since it is easier to get funding that way. Mr. Tarrant questioned the cost of membership in the AACMU. Mr. Hill responded that membership costs about $12,000 a year, but that the University gets benefits far exceeding that amount.

The Chairperson stated at this time that the Senate will be electing a new faculty representative to the AACMU in the near future. Mr. Plantan asked that biographical sketches be circulated of any nominees for this position. The Chairperson explained that at the last Executive Committee meeting the press of business had prevented that body from considering nominees. The Chairperson stated that when a person makes a nomination he should provide a biographical sketch of the person nominated. The Chairperson stated that anyone who made a nomination from the floor would also have to provide information on the nominee. The Chairperson stated that there was some leeway in the filling of the vacancy since Mr. Hill’s term did not expire until June 30. He stated that this discussion would serve as official notification that nominations are now open for that position. The Chairperson thanked Mr. Hill for his comments about the AACMU Spring Meeting.

2. Consideration of New and Expanded Academic Program Requests

The Chairperson turned the floor over to Chairperson Chesebro from the Academic Affairs Committee for presentation of the new and expanded academic program requests. Ms. Chesebro asked Dean Rives to explain the urgency of the situation in terms of the timetable for action. Dean Rives explained that we are operating under a new system of approval which required us to submit any new programs only at the time of the budget submission to the Board of Regents. In the past we have been able to submit programs at any time that they have moved through the approval process. This change has created some problems. Dean Rives stated that steps have been taken to prevent the reoccurrence of such problems with the time tables by
changing the internal deadlines for proposals. Ms. Chesebro said that she would report for the committee on these programs and would later on move that these programs be advanced to action item stage. Chairperson Chesebro reported that the Academic Affairs Committee recommended the approval of the four undergraduate programs. Ms. Chesebro reported that the Master In Business Administration had been approved unanimously by the Graduate Council. She stated that the Academic Affairs Committee recommended approval of this. Ms. Chesebro reported on the deliberations on the Doctor of Arts in Economics degree and reported that the Graduate Council was less than unanimous on this degree. She noted that representatives from the Graduate Council were present to explain their deliberations. She stated that the committee felt some questions about this program and desired additional information on the proposal. The recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee on this proposal is that the Senate authorize the Executive Committee to act upon the recommendation after a positive recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee.

V, 115 A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Gavin) to advance consideration of these new and expanded program requests to action item stage was approved. The Chairperson noted that these proposals were now at the ACTION ITEM stage.

a. Anthropology. The Chairperson invited Shailer Thomas and Edward Jelks to the table to answer questions on the Anthropology proposal. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Baska) to approve the program in Anthropology was made. Mr. Thomas, Chairman of the Sociology-Anthropology Department, stated that this proposal splits into two majors the existing major. It was asked if there would then be two separate departments with two separate chairmen. Mr. Thomas stated that the department would continue as it is presently structured. Dean Rives stated that he had sent a letter to the Senate concerning each of these programs and that this letter would serve as his remarks on the program. The motion to approve the new major in Anthropology was approved.

b. Office Administration. The Chairperson invited Warren Perry, Chairman of the Business Education Department and Lee Dohleman to the table to answer questions on this program. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Ficek) to approve the major in Office Administration was made. Dean Rives stated that this proposal would simply recognize what in fact is happening to our graduates in business education and would exempt those graduates from the professional education requirements, substituting other courses in business for these hours. A large number of students have expressed a desire for this program. The motion to approve the program in Office Administration was approved.

c. Agribusiness. James McBee, Chairman of the Department of Agriculture, was invited to the table to discuss the proposal for a major in Agribusiness. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Quane) to approve the major in Agribusiness was made. Mr. Smith asked what plans the department had for integrating social concerns in the agribusiness curriculum; for example, concerns of the migrant workers. Mr. McBee stated that at the present time the Department did not spend too much time on the social issues. Mr. McBee stated that agribusiness did not mean corporate business; he stated that he did not see the disappearance of the "family" farm in the near future. The motion to approve the program in Agribusiness was approved.
d. Multiple Arts. Mr. Sutherland invited Gary Sudano to the table to discuss the proposal in Multiple Arts. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Roderick) to approve the program in Multiple Arts passed.

e. Master of Business Administration. Peter Couch was invited to the table to discuss the proposal. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Ficek) to approve the program was made. Mr. Koehl asked why in this time of paper shortage it was necessary to hand out such a long proposal using such a great amount of paper. Dean Rives explained that the program at the graduate level had to be in greater detail. He explained that the external pressures for the degree required a much longer proposal with more detail. Mr. Hicklin asked the Dean in what way we were exempt from the Board of Higher Education pressures against the MBA as had occurred in the Chicago Circle situation. Mr. Couch stated that we were primarily dealing with part-time employees and that we were exempt from the prohibition that had been placed on the Chicago Circle MBA program. Mr. Taylor asked if there was a switching from the M.S. to the MBA. Mr. Plantan stated that the Department was not switching but would be keeping the M.S. Mr. Young asked for a delineation between the M.S. and the MBA. Mr. Couch explained that the MBA was a very general type of terminally oriented degree, while the M.S. was a more specialized degree. Mr. Madore asked what was the next step in the approval process on this degree. Dean Rives stated that the proposal would have to go both to the Board of Regents and the Board of Higher Education for approval. Mr. Woods pointed out the letter from General Telephone Company citing their present relationship with SIU. Mr. Woods asked if this was an indication that General Telephone Company would prefer to deal with ISU. Professor Couch explained that it was hoped that ISU would eventually be able to serve organizations such as General Telephone with local programs. In answer to a further question from Mr. Woods, Mr. Couch explained that most people taking the MBA come from backgrounds other than business. Mr. Smith asked if the social aspects were included in these programs. Mr. Couch explained that there was no specific course in this but in at least half a dozen courses there were occasions for the subject to be discussed. The motion to approve the MBA was approved.

f. Doctor of Arts in Economics. Bernard McCarney and Charles A. White, Dean of the Graduate School, were invited to the table to answer questions on the Doctor of Arts in Economics degree. Ms. Chesebro stated that the Academic Affairs Committee felt that there was more information needed on this particular program. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Quane) that the Academic Senate authorize the Executive Committee to decide whether to forward this proposal to the Board upon the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee was made. Mr. Young stated that last year at the same time the Doctor of Arts degrees in History and Mathematics had gone through a similar procedure in terms of contingency approval. Mr. McCarney explained the rationale for the Doctor of Arts program and explained the problems associated with the Doctor of Arts in Economics. Mr. McCarney stated that the real problem was with the reallocation of resources within his department. Mr. McCarney stated that the review of this proposal so far has dealt mainly with the reallocation of resources rather than with the substance of the program. Mr. McCarney stated that the DA was primarily for practitioners of teaching, but in the case of the DA in Economics this program was extended to non-teaching personnel. Mr. McCarney stated that by the time a program gets to the Academic Senate there has already been a reallocation of resources and that the vita of the personnel involved demonstrates this. Mr. McCarney explained that such resource allocation is constantly taking place. He described this program as complementary to undergraduate education.
Charles White, Ray L. White, Evelyn Rex, Clayton Thomas, James McBee, Paul Mattingly were present who had been involved in the Graduate Council decision. Mr. Thomas stated that the Graduate Council had approved the program and that the real problem was not in regard to resource allocation. The question which was raised was the research focus of the DA proposal. The Council had become satisfied that the research dimension of the DA proposal was not identical with that of a Ph.D. Mr. White stated that the assumption of the Academic Plan was that we would use current persons rather than hiring new persons. Dean Helgeson stated that Mr. White's conception was erroneous. The assumption was that no new money would be needed for the program. This does not necessarily mean that no new people would be hired. This is a matter of internal versus external budgeting. Dean Helgeson stated that reallocation of resources occurred every year. Declining enrollments in certain departments, resignations and retirements allowed reallocation. He stated that this was particularly true when some one retired at a high salary level and was replaced by a new person at a lower salary level. It was stated that several departments had built themselves up to doctoral strength before the new master plan reduced the chance for such degrees. Mr. White asked what would be the damage to the proposal if we presented it without noting that we would hire additional personnel. Dean Helgeson noted that there were two audiences - the internal University audience and the external agencies which approve the program. He noted that the proposals for a doctorate program are in considerably less detail than they once were. Mr. White asked since the academic proposals and the budget are so interrelated what group would look at both budget and academic programs. Dean Helgeson stated that the process begins when the proposal for a new program goes before the Academic Planning Committee. He explained that in the future both students and faculty would be much more aware of the costs of academic programs. He stated that at some point one must trust the administration to make the proper adjustments to carry out the academic plan within the budget process. Mr. White recommended that this program be passed tonight with the deletion of the new positions. Mr. Taylor stated that perhaps we needed some idea of where this "mysterious" money comes from for new programs. Mr. Gavin pointed out that if Mr. Taylor had been at the Academic Affairs discussion last night he would have heard a discussion on this. The money has already been allotted and the people have been found without another department's funding being cut. Mr. McCarney pointed out that the economics department would have to go out and hire people even if they didn't have the program. Mr. Hickrod stated that he had been tempted to resist the reduction of the residency requirement for the doctorate degree to one semester. He stated that this would put considerable pressure on departments to reduce the residency requirements for the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. Mr. Reitan made a plea for the proposal in light of the importance of the Doctor of Arts degree for ISU. He asked the President to make some appropriate remarks about the role of the Doctor of Arts and its importance to ISU. President Budig stated that he had some very strong feelings on the Doctor of Arts. He stated that one of the important points was the importance of timing the academic proposals. We have a commitment from the BHE that ISU along with Chicago Circle would be two of the institutions moving into the DA programs. Dr. Budig stated that we have been moving to that area and that we are at the critical point because we have a receptive BHE for Doctor of Arts programs. This may not be the case indefinitely, especially since the new master plan is being
explored for the state. We have been supporting these four areas and are working with community college leadership who have given strong support for these programs. Dr. Budig expressed his hope that the Senate would act with dispatch on these programs. Mr. Henry raised a question as to why there were seven abstentions on the Graduate Council. Dean White spoke to the point of the vote of the Graduate Council on this program. He stated that it was not quite as stark as it sounded. The no vote was based on the assumption that the masters degree program was not strong enough on which to build a DA program. Dean White stated that the seven abstentions did not represent necessarily an unfavorable vote. He explained that it was the first time that this particular group of people had met as the Graduate Council. The Curriculum Committee had been meeting on the DA in English until the Board staff indicated that the Economics degree should be considered before the English degree. This created a shortage of time in which to consider the DA in Economics proposal. Mr. Rogers asked why it is a Doctor of Arts instead of a doctor of science since economics is a science. Mr. McCarney explained that Doctor of Arts is a general rubric for what is being offered for practitioners. The only other Doctor of Arts in Economics degree is at Lehigh University. Mr. Moonan stated that the purpose of the program is to train further those who are already teaching. He asked how successful the program would be in maintaining the requirement of previous teaching experience in view of the pressure that might be brought to get into this program if it was viewed as being desirable. Dean Helgeson stated that we might have to reassess the requirements after the experimental period. Dean Helgeson pointed out that the Board of Higher Education had originally asked Chicago Circle and ISU to get into the Doctor of Arts program on an experimental basis. Dr. Young stated that this plan had been in the offing for some time and that it would be a costly mistake to pull back now. President Budig stated that he was confident after speaking to the junior college personnel that we would be able to place the people who graduated from this program. Mr. Kolasa stated that he was in the economics department. He contended that there was strong enthusiasm for this degree in the department and that the students were already reaping the benefits of this increased enthusiasm in the form of increased interest on the part of the faculty. He noted that many students have stated that they would be interested in returning to ISU for additional work because of the presence of this degree. Mr. Taylor asked if Ms. Chesebro would be willing to make a motion for immediate adoption of this program. Ms. Chesebro stated that since this was a motion developed by the Academic Affairs Committee she would be reluctant to move this. Mr. Woods raised questions about what additional courses would be offered. Mr. McCarney stated that there was no pressing need for new courses. Mr. McCarney explained that there would be a common core to all the doctor of arts programs in the higher education sequence offered by the Curriculum and Instruction department. The Senate at this time adjourned for a short recess.

The Senate was called back into session after a short recess. A substitute motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Gavin) that the Senate approve the Doctor of Arts in Economics degree was approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Kolasa reported for the Executive Committee. Mr. Kolasa read a letter from Mr. Kaiser to the Union Board stating that non-University students would be kept
out of the Billards/Bowling Center on Friday and Saturday nights. Mr. Kolasa noted that during summer school the Senate would probably be short on members and he urged all members to make an effort to come in to attend the meetings. Mr. Kolasa stated that the Executive Committee wished a pleasant summer break to the entire Senate. The first summer meeting will be on June 26. The July meetings are presently scheduled for July 10 and July 24. Ms. Stone stated that she would be in favor of weekend meetings instead of Wednesday nights. Mr. Kolasa suggested that she refer this suggestion to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Mead reported for the Administrative Affairs Committee. He reported on the results of a questionnaire that had been sent out by the Committee regarding department chairperson evaluation. Mr. Mead stated that an open hearing would be held on this matter and that the entire University community would be invited to this meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the Student Affairs Committee has had two meetings since the last Senate meeting. At one meeting the Committee had discussed Placement Services. Present at that meeting were Parker Lawlis, Director of Placement Services, and Neal Gamsky, Dean of Student Affairs. Chairperson Sutherland also spoke to the SAC to explain the questionnaires that had been sent out about the student records policy. The Committee will be evaluating these questionnaires this summer. The SAC had discussed recodification of the Union Board. One recommendation was that the University Union employees not vote on matters concerning the University Union in their areas of concern. Members of the Board stated that they would comply with this regulation. A proposal that the Entertainment Committee be expanded to twelve members was discussed. It will be presented to the Executive Committee at its next meeting to be put on the agenda as an action item. In the meantime, the Committee had instructed the Entertainment Committee to screen extra alternates to fill out the committee until recodification could take place. The Committee will submit a proposal for change in SCERB Bylaws be submitted to the Executive Committee soon. A question was raised about the Student Association withholding funds for the Union Board. Mr. Chamberlain called upon Mr. Arnold to explain the reason why the funds were withheld. Mr. Arnold explained that these funds would be withheld until the closed membership of the Union Board was changed. Mr. Sims explained that the Apportionment Board had reached a tie vote and had referred the situation to the Association Assembly. It was reported that the question of holdover members on the Union Board had been referred to its policy committee. Mr. Chamberlain also reported that two faculty members need to be appointed to the Union Board and asked for appropriate action on this matter. Mr. Chamberlain welcomed Mr. Laymon to the Student Affairs Committee.

The Chairperson stated that Mr. Moonan would be appointed to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Smith reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. He stated that a memo had been received from the Economic Well Being Committee concerning changes in the University Retirement System. The Committee also had considered a resolution asking the legislature to fully fund the University Retirement System in conformity with federal law. The Committee also looked into the University handbook and added a section on faculty redress procedures.

Mr. Gavin asked for information about when the various committees would be meeting. Mr. Gavin and Mr. Allred commended Mr. Kaiser on acting on problems that had been aired at the gripe session on the University Union.
A motion (Mr. Koehl, Mr. Henry) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amster</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baska</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlanga</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesebro</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickrod</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehl</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolasa</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laymon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberta</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madore</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reitan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennels</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinbach</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgeson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE:
- Motion #
- Motion #
- Motion #
- Motion #
- Motion #
- Motion #

VOICE VOTE:
- Motion No.
- YES
- NO

Motion No.:
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
Members of the Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Dear Colleagues:

Last week we met with the Community Advisory Council at its request to discuss the concerns of this group relative to University activity in the area of community service. A copy of the statement made to the group is attached for the information of the Senate.

The Senate also will be interested in the following questions raised by the Community Advisory Council during our discussion:

What can the University do to make it easier for adults and senior citizens, particularly those with low incomes, to enroll in University courses?

What are some of the specific faculty research and instructional development activities which are related to community service?

What is the University doing to recruit students from among minority groups other than Blacks?

Is the University making an effort to utilize senior citizens?

Does the University support the development of student-initiated community service projects?

Would the University help support a "clearinghouse" operation for the purpose of providing information about the availability of community social and other services available to persons in need of such services?

Is the University making an effort to equate life and work experiences with academic credit?

These questions are indications of the concerns of a group of representative citizens of the community about the role of the University in community service and therefore will be of interest to the Senate. The questions are the direct concern of Dr. Francis Brown and the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service, but they also are questions which should be addressed by the entire academic community.

Respectfully,

Gene A. Budig

Attachment

cc Dr. Francis Brown
At a time of very tight budgets, Illinois State University has been able to provide some increases for research and public service activities. Our basic responsibility must remain insuring a high quality instructional program. In my judgment, however, it will be possible for us to do this and still continue to make advances in the related areas of research and public service. In fact, faculty-student involvement in community service activity can strengthen our instructional programs. The expanding area of community internships provides an example of such mutual strengthening and interaction.

Let me trace for you briefly what we have done and what we plan. First, as you know, we have added a professional staff member to the Office of Continuing Education and Public Service. At a time when we are cutting back administrative positions, this is a significant addition. Second, the University has increased its commitment to research this past year. Research and public service activities, as you are aware, are integrally related. Many of our faculty research activities are related to community service for University. research has always been a form of public service. Third, the University devoted a significant amount of its innovative funds to a Community Studies project, which attempted to identify legitimate community service activities for University participation. Some of these activities are now being implemented. We are now, for example, devoting Foundation resources to increasing opportunities for our students to engage in internship activities in the community.

The University is also deploying its staff and resources progressively more into the community. We have always done some of this, as for example with our speech and hearing clinic. We are beginning to do more of it, particularly with our clinical teacher education centers in Peoria, Joliet, and Rock Island. These centers furnish not only teaching
opportunities for our students but also in-service education opportunities for teachers in
the area. Our students in these centers are also engaging in community social service activities.
Please remember when we talk of these matters that Illinois State University is a State-wide university. Its community services activities take place throughout the State and not just in the Bloomington-Normal community. We are doing the same thing in Special Education in Lake County and in Peoria. In the future, progressively more of our resources and personnel will be deployed into the community and region. But remember we are doing a good deal of this right now.

The University's commitment to community service is demonstrated also in our 1975-76 budget request for new and improved programs. Some of the new programs we are proposing to develop are themselves aimed at important community needs. A good example of this is the proposed new major in Early Childhood Education, which will prepare persons for such important community services as day care centers. But other of the proposed new programs for 1975-76 are also aimed at filling community needs, particularly the Applied Computer Science major, Agribusiness major, and MBA (Master of Business Administration) program. For 1976-77, we will introduce a separate undergraduate major in social welfare and an interdisciplinary major in urban studies. Masters programs are also planned that year in both Corrections and Recreation-Park Administration.

Our program improvement budget request also includes a specific item for Continuing Education to aid us in offering more off-campus short course and non-credit experiences. A proposed School Finance Legislation Research Center will allow us to expand significantly our public service activities in this important area. Similarly, a Business Professional Development Program request will allow us to serve persons employed in business and industry in the Central Illinois area in new ways. A Cooperative University-Mid Central Association Research and Development Center for Education of the Handicapped, if
approved, will create important new opportunities to expand our Special Education services even further into the community. And, finally, additional funding requested for Dr. Pohlmann’s Census Users Center will allow the University to also expand the use of census data to additional users in the area. Rather than attempting to explain each of these programs in detail, we are leaving a program write-up for you to study in detail.

As we continue to concern ourselves with enrollment, it is obvious that the University—as any alert university in the seventies—must expand the numbers of adult students we serve through regular and continuing education classes. There are still other areas we must explore—the appropriate role of the University, for example, in serving the needs of senior citizens. This Advisory Council, it is our hope, can be the basic agency through which community needs are identified so that the University can move even closer to fulfilling a meaningful public service role. For my part, let me assure you that the University will take quite seriously its obligations toward adult and continuing education and toward expanded public service in the years ahead.

What can the Advisory Council do constructively to aid the University? Let me close by giving you a copy of the University’s five-year Academic Plan. It would be useful if the Council would review the Academic Plan and give us the benefit of your insight into where community service activities could reasonably be integrated into the future plans of the University. We will look forward to your thoughts on this. As you look at this problem, we ask you to remember that the University’s basic commitment is to instructional programs and, therefore, a key question for us is always how community service activities can strengthen our instructional programs. The University is not a social service agency; but it does legitimately engage in public service activities which strengthens its basic mission of preparing persons for a lifetime of meaningful community service in their chosen professions.
Members of the Academic Senate  
Illinois State University  

Dear Colleagues:

Attempts have been made to inform concerned persons and groups about budgets—both the process of development and the external status of budget proposals. The General Revenue Budget Advisory Committee has met on a number of occasions since last June. At three of these meetings, the chairman of the Budget Team has been present to keep the Committee informed of matters pertaining to allocation of faculty positions.

Despite these efforts to provide updated communication, some questions about budget proposals and processes still remain. In order to bridge the communication gap, we suggest that the Academic Senate take the two following steps at an early date:

1. Bring the General Revenue Budget Advisory Committee to full strength by filling the student membership vacancy.

2. Choose one of its members to serve as budget information liaison person. This person would meet periodically with the General Revenue Advisory Committee and with the Budget Team and would report to the Academic Senate. If the Senator acting in this liaison capacity desires, representatives of the budget groups could also be asked to report to the Academic Senate.

The above steps are suggested as interim measures to promote wider information and understanding. Longer range proposals for promoting communication regarding budget matters will be forthcoming after the permanent college deans have been on board and have had an opportunity to study the internal budget process.

Respectfully,

Gene A. Budig
STUDENT APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY FORUM COMMITTEE

Rodney Harris
Lori Frankland
Andy Monteleone
Jim Thorp
Nchewi Imoke
T. Blanca Urbanski
Jon Carl Radford

Alternates:

-Paulette Bryan
Gary Duehr