

Spring 1-27-1981

Senate Meeting January 27, 1981

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting January 27, 1981" (1981). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 474.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/474>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

January 27, 1981

Volume XII, No. 9

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Discussion of 1981-82 Budget

Adjournment

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.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

January 27, 1981

Volume XII, No. 9

Call to Order

A special meeting of the Academic Senate, convened at the request of the Provost, was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 4:05 p.m.

Roll Call

Secretary Kohn called the roll and declared that a quorum was present.

Discussion of 1981-82 Budget

Mr. Cohen recognized Mr. Hirt, Chairperson of the Senate Budget Committee, who reported meeting with David Strand, Vice President for Business and Finance; Leon Boothe, Provost; and Warren Harden, Associate Vice President and Director of Institutional Research. Following these discussions, the Budget Committee had met with the Provost and the Vice President for Business and Finance and decided to recommend that raises for faculty and staff be at least at the 10.5% level recommended by the Board of Higher Education. This might necessitate reallocation of internal budget lines, because the 10.5% raise was calculated on a 90% base of the University's 1980-81 budget. In actual new money, this would amount to a 9.45% raise. In previous years, the base on which budgets were funded was usually 95%, a more workable figure, allowing for normal turnover to make up the difference. While the budget still had to go to the legislature and the governor, it seemed likely that the 90% base figure would prevail. This placed the administration in a difficult position since the Board of Higher Education recommendation left the University \$420,000 short of the money needed for the 10.5% raise. This money would have to come from other lines in the University. While other universities in the state had more funds from which to cut in order to make up the deficit through internal reallocation, Illinois State University was the "leanest of the lean." The Committee had considered recommending a lesser raise, but finally concluded that it would go with the 10.5% figure, with money coming from other sources within the University. It was noted that faculty would suffer if this meant cuts in indirect instructional funds such as travel, equipment, or printing. There had been a good exchange with the administration with general agreement on cutting non-academic areas more than academic ones. Decisions about where to cut were not discussed by the Budget Committee. In conclusion, Mr. Hirt noted that the Board of Higher Education had recommended the following increases in other lines: 8% for other operating costs; 17% for utilities; 9% for salary increases for certain high level administrators. The Budget Committee was recommending at least a 10.5% increase in salaries for faculty and staff.

Administrators' Remarks

Mr. Watkins spoke of the difficulties in communicating clearly to the University community the current status of the budget which had to go through so many stages. In early fall, the Board of Regents had approved a 14% raise, along with \$21 million in capital funds. This was reported in the press. The Board of Higher Education, in December, had reduced those figures to the 10.5%

raise (on a 90% base) and \$4 million in capital expenses. A member of the Board of Higher Education had characterized the 90% raise base as a way to reduce staffing, through layoffs and through not filling vacancies caused by retirement or resignations. The legislature and the governor have the final say on the budget. Right now we were waiting for the Governor's message to the Board of Higher Education scheduled for February 3. The final amount of the budget was unknown at this time. The 90% base seemed firm. The increase figure for utilities was the surest thing at the moment, although it was 1% less than needed. In order to provide the actual 10.5% increase, sacrifices by all would be necessary. In proportion, less would be taken from instructional than from non-instructional areas.

Provost Boothe reported that the problem of making the decision on where to cut would be made by the Budget Team on February 4, at which time it would have had input from the Council of Deans. The operative rationale called for selective cuts, not across-the-board, nor in single areas (i.e. equipment). Once the will of the Senate was known and advice from the Council of Deans was received, decisions would be made. He pledged to take a hard look at where cuts could be made in terms of the long-range financial situation of the University. Review procedures would be established to accomplish this. He reiterated that it was not presently known what the governor would do.

General discussion followed. Questioned by Mr. Hicklin on enrollment, President Watkins said that it had been generally agreed that there would be a freeze on enrollment of freshmen as of March 1, 1981. The anticipated enrollment diminution had not yet caught up with Illinois State. The increase of 143 students over last year was the result of a higher retention rate, not an increase in freshman enrollment.

Mr. Brickell asked what turnover rate could be expected next year and was informed that it was difficult to predict at the moment, and no turnover dollars had been budgeted for fiscal 82. The rate of turnover in Civil Service during the last five months was one-half of what it was a year ago, making a significant impact on this year's budget. During the current budget year, a savings of \$175,000 and \$125,000 from turnover in faculty and Civil Services lines, respectively, was budgeted. The actual figure for the first six months was closer to \$50,000. The state of the economy had made it difficult for people to relocate. If the 10.5% figure was implemented, failure to fill some positions would be possible, but no permanent faculty cutbacks were anticipated. President Watkins said this was not the first time a 90% base had been used, but he hoped it would not continue since it would result in further budgetary erosion. The recent 95% was so much more realistic.

Mr. Hirt reminded the Senate that "operation bootstrap," a plan for improving salaries which was approved by the Senate last year, remained intact and these increases would be in addition to what was allocated for FY-82 salaries.

Mr. Watkins noted that New and Expanded Program Statements (NEPRS) and Special Analytical Studies (SAS) were mechanisms designed to bring new money into the budget. Of those submitted for 1982 by Illinois State, only one NEPR was approved by the Board of Higher Education, \$350,000 for improvement of undergraduate instruction. One SAS, \$272,000 for repair and maintenance, was approved. These amounts would not be used to make up the deficit.

In response to questions by Mr. Friedhoff and Mr. Tuttle, figures were presented

(see appendix) showing specifically how the cuts needed for reallocation would affect the various administrative areas of the university. The Provost's area, by far the largest, would be cut by the smallest percentage, .7% of the 1981 budget.

Ms. Gowen wondered who would make the final decision. Mr. Boothe replied that the Deans would best know where cuts could be made in their various academic areas. Recommendations would be forwarded from the Deans to the Budget Team where the final decision rested. The President commented that he would approve the Provost's recommendation, based on input from the Senate, the Council of Deans, and the Budget Team.

Mr. Friedberg asked about the economic and political ramifications of decreasing enrollment. Would there be a savings, and how might a self-imposed cutback in enrollment by the University be politically accepted? Mr. Harden said that the cost of educating a student at Illinois State was \$68 per credit hour. A decrease of 100 students would save approximately \$150,000. Mr. Watkins responded that ISU was a state institution, and there were examples of state schools whose base had been lowered when there was a significant reduction in enrollment. He further pointed to the negative effect on bond revenue projects that could result from decreased enrollment. Mr. Cohen said the savings would, in effect, be the cutting of approximately five faculty positions. In response to a question by Mr. Hicklin, it was noted that the University was not significantly dependent on federal grants.

Mr. Woodson asked for clarification on the "doctrine of equality" that was the basis for budget cuts, and Mr. Watkins noted that it was the intention to maintain, as much as possible, the support of classroom instruction, again pointing out that the Provost's area was proposed for the lowest percentage decrease. Ms. Rich asked if there were specific plans being made to help the University community overcome the "crisis mentality" that seemed prevalent. What could faculty do to help solve the problem? Mr. Watkins said it would be helpful if people could learn more about the budgeting process and realize that figures proposed in late fall could be drastically changed by the time July 1, the new budget year, arrived. This was a process required by the state and quite difficult to understand. Mr. Boothe noted that Mr. Strand would be keeping the University community informed on budget matters.

Mr. Henriksen asked about the source of funds for athletics, if they came from academic-related monies. He was informed that only salaries were so funded. Increases must be sought in other areas (i.e. gate receipts, fund raising, etc.).

Mr. Schmaltz wondered how other universities were handling this problem and Mr. Boothe suggested they were dealing with it in much the same way, with funds being reallocated internally. Again, relating to the question of enrollment, Mr. Harden noted that the University did not automatically save money when enrollments decreased.

XII-62 At this point, Mr. Hirt moved the following "sense of the Senate" resolution:

It is a sense of the Senate that faculty salaries should be at least the amount designated by the Board of Higher Education (e.g. 10.5%) and not the amount multiplied by a 90% base.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kohn.

Mr. Tuttle, while supporting the resolution, noted that it was useful to be apprised of the economic and political situation, but an issue that had not been specifically enumerated was that the quality of instruction would decrease. This was the reality that would affect students and faculty. He urged the preparation of a statement that should be forwarded to the Board of Regents, the Board of Higher Education, the legislature, and the governor. Mr. Cohen said he would appoint a committee to draft such a statement. Mr. Henriksen said he would have to oppose the resolution without knowing where specific cuts would come from, and what the ultimate cost to each unit would be. More information was needed before a decision should be made by the Senate. Mr. Shulman noted that he was experiencing mixed feelings, not knowing how to vote when specific information about the exact cuts was not known. Mr. Hirt said it boiled down to smaller salaries or more indirect funding--it was a matter of direct versus indirect funding. It was felt that indirect costs were, perhaps, easier to regain in the future than were salaries. The strategy to be used seemed appropriate for now, but further down the line some hard decision might have to be made. Finding resources for the 10.5% increase in salaries won't be easy, but it could be done this year.

The motion passed on a voice vote. There were no negative votes, but one abstention was noted.

Mr. Cohen recognized Mr. Tuttle who announced that the Administrative Affairs Committee would meet briefly following the adjournment of the meeting.

Adjournment

XII-63 On a motion by Ms. Rich (seconded by Mr. Schmaltz) the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m. The motion carried.

For the Academic Senate,

Walter Kohn, Secretary

IC:WK:pch

NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOTE							VOICE VOTE		
		Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion #	Motion No.	Y	N
Anderson	P								62	x	
Balbach	P								63	x	
Barton	Ex.										
Boothe	P										
Bowen	A										
Brickell	P										
Brown	P										
Cohen	P										
Crafts	Ex.										
Fernandes	Ex.										
Friedberg	P										
Friedhoff	P										
Gamsky	P										
Gowen	P										
Grever	P										
Hemenway	A										
Henriksen	P										
Hicklin	P										
Hirt	P										
Holmes	A										
Koerselman	P										
Kohn	P										
lh	A										
Madore	Ex.										
Metcalf	P										
Morris	P										
Murphy	P										
Newby	P										
Polan	A										
Ritch	P										
Rosebery	P										
Sam	A										
Schmaltz	P										
Schoenbein	Ex.										
Schwalm	Ex.										
Shulman	P										
Sigler	P										
Sloter	P										
Spoor	P										
Strand	P										
Tuttle	P										
Varner	Ex.										
Watkins	P										
Weller	A										
Wieczorek	P										
Wolak	Ex.										
odson	P										
Young	Ex.										
Zunker	P										

Ex. = excused

	<u>BOOTHE</u>	<u>GAMSKY</u>	<u>GODFREY</u>	<u>KERN</u>	<u>MORRIS</u>	<u>STRAND</u>
\$ of ISU FY81 Operating Budget	\$34,270,944	1,410,915	561,321	1,258,489	1,474,317	7,168,594
% of ISU FY81 Operating Budget	74.27%	3.06%	1.22%	2.73%	3.19%	15.53%
Adjusted % of ISU Operating Budget	62.71%	5.80%	2.87%	3.67%	5.80%	19.15%
% Increase/ Decrease with above adjustment	-11.56%	+2.74%	+1.65%	+0.94%	+2.61%	+3.62%
\$ reduction FY82 compared to FY81	\$ <u>235,583</u>	<u>21,783</u>	<u>10,783</u>	<u>13,783</u>	<u>21,783</u>	<u>71,954</u>
Above \$ reduction as % of FY81 base	.7%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%