

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 12-9-1987

Senate Meeting December 9, 1987

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 December 9, 1987" (1987). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 519.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/519>

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

December 9, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 7

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Seating of New Senator

Roll Call

Minutes of November 18, 1987

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEM: Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for Committee Appointments: Margaret Kelly, Music, Council for Teacher Education; and John Kirk, Theatre, University Curriculum Committee.

INFORMATION ITEM: Sections I and III of the Academic Plan (Deferred to January 27, 1988 Academic Senate Meeting)

Communications

Committee Reports

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.)

December 9, 1987

Volume XIV, No. 7

Call to Order

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center.

Seating of New Senator

Mr. Schmaltz introduced a new student senator, Chad Parrish, a Senior in Public Relations with a minor in Geography.

Roll Call

Secretary Roof called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Minutes of the November 18, 1987 Academic Senate Meeting

XVIV-47 Mr. Mottram moved to approve the Minutes of the November 18, 1987 Academic Senate Meeting. (Second, Williams) Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Schmaltz had no remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Williams had no remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Meiron had an excused absence.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins stated that he would respond to questions concerning "An Open Letter to the Illinois State University Community" which was distributed at the last Senate meeting.

Mr. Morreau had a series of questions. First, he stated that the University needed an appropriate forum to reiterate what was discussed in the faculty caucus. It is unfortunate that we are at the point of faculty writing to the President and the President replying to faculty. He asked about the concept in the President's statement concerning the University's Mission Statement. There seemed to be a perception that the University Mission Statement could not be changed. Mission statements have changed over time. How does a mission statement change, and who is responsible for it?

Mr. Watkins stated that the Mission Statement came out of the Illinois Board of Higher Education Master Plan IV. The statement is not different in any degree from the one articulated in Master Plan III, two years prior to that. Master Plan IV is now into its eleventh year. The Board of Higher Education has never seen fit to go back to their master plan and change it. To do that they would probably bring in outside consultants who work on such plans to try to get other mission statements. It is my understanding that the mission statement that we have was one that was even more truncated before there was some internal work done and the IBHE loosened up a little bit. They have never approached this over the period of the last decade. A number of items ought to be addressed, including the missions of the institutions and the question of the incremental budgeting. Changes have probably not occurred since 1970 or 1971.

Mr. Morreau clarified that the mission statement can change, and an attempt has been made to influence that change. His suggestion was that those attempts should be communicated to faculty, so that they could see that that change is being attempted.

Mr. Morreau went into the mission statement where it read: "with selected doctoral programs and with a strong emphasis on the discovery of knowledge." Discovery of knowledge to him represents the conducting of research for the discovery of new information. And yet, over a ten year period of time in your own report here, it cites for 1977, \$1,224,425; and for 1986, \$1,407,865. Organized research slipped 3.2% to 1.9%. He asked how the President justified that reduction when in fact the mission statement as well as the State of the University addresses have stated that we are going to progress in the arena of research?

Mr. Watkins said we should take a look at the research efforts of the University. Organized research is one aspect of that. Departmental research is another aspect of that. Between 1977 and 1986, the combined totals of those went from 4.5% in 1977 to 5.8% in 1986 in the University budget. If we attempt to divide the research budget of the University, we leave out a very important part, Departmental Research.

Mr. Morreau said it comes down to how one wishes to report that information and he felt that he was not sophisticated enough in reporting mechanisms to really discuss that well. A statement is made in the report that in fact the state of the health of research at Illinois State University is indicated by the number of the outside number of dollars coming in. This was stated by Dean Koshel in October in the graduate meeting, it was in the Pres. report, Dr. Groves put it in his report, and recently Mr. McAteer reported it. Each of these statements makes a suggestion that the University has increased its external funding. I would suggest that the University has not increased its external funding, but in fact the faculty have increased this external funding with support and facilitation from the administration. He asked if that statement, by not regarding faculty efforts, was not a very presumptuous statement?

Mr. Watkins said it was not meant to be that way.

Mr. Morreau said four different groups have used the same wording, which is assumes that this is a sign of health. This is a sign of faculty consciousness. It is a faculty research conscience that is reflected by that, faculty drive that is reflected by that. It is certainly not the administration that is responsible for that.

Mr. Watkins said he had never suggested that it was. He further stated that he had commented at Board meetings time after time, and pointed out to members of the Board of Regents what a hard-working faculty we have at ISU. The figures used in the report had been given to them by Dean Koshel, as figures which were not contract activities themselves from research. They were research dollars. Comparing the research dollars of 1977 to the amount that the faculty are bringing in now. I have never in any comment that I have made tried to assume that the research dollars were given to the institution without the efforts of faculty.

Mr. Morreau stated that that should be clarified to some of the staff who are making these reports and suggesting that the increased amount of funds that the University is receiving are in fact faculty-effort representative, rather than institution representative. Mr. Watkins said he would be glad to do that.

Mr. Morreau asked if the concept of working within an established governance process to express concerns and facilitate change is a viable alternative to the type of commentary. He agreed with this statement in concept. However, he did not think that necessarily as discussed in the faculty caucus and for the purpose of people here that in essence we have not had a shared governance system that has been wholly responsive to faculty concerns. He cited that there are committees that have reported and not been given consideration. Their priorities were not given credence and in fact comments on the use of facilities was not given consideration in the priority listing of the BOR ultimate document.

Mr. Watkins said that there was never a report that came to him that did not receive consideration. If the input gets consideration, and some alterations are made for reasons that seem to him or others to be valid, that does not mean that the input is ignored. If this body is not a representative board for faculty concerns, then the Senate should see that it becomes one. The Senate was more like that in 1977 than it is today.

Mr. Morreau asked about the document cited in Richardson's and Thompson's report that alluded to "Appropriating Operating Fund Increase and Comparative Cost Study for Illinois Public Universities". As he reviewed this, the statement that: "in the past decade enrollment has not driven the budgets of Illinois public institutions. In fact in recent years the Illinois Board of Higher Education emphasis has been the reverse, to use the budget to discourage enrollment expansion." At the same time, there is a suggestion in this report, unless I am misinterpreting, that had we reported differently as a University that in fact we would have been recommended for a base adjustment of almost a million dollars. This suggests that we lose a million dollars by the reporting mechanism and over the years we have been actually bringing students in when it has been contrary to the IBHE funding mechanism. The enrollment issue has been addressed by Richardson and Thompson, and you addressed in counter. Why has the University continued to expand enrollment in the face of an IBHE policy that says it should not, and how did we as an institution not pick up on this when Eastern Illinois University did in terms of how to save this million dollars and pick it up?

Mr. Watkins said the first part of the question deals with monies that are made available for an institution when the institution is in instructional learning and underfunded from the state in excess of 5%. We are not outside

that envelope, Eastern Illinois University is. Their situation in terms of instructional budget as compared to students is therefore bursting out. If we get to the point where our underbudgeting deteriorates outside that envelope, then we too will be eligible for funds. Why a 5% underfunding? Simply because that is the figure arrived at arbitrarily. Another side to the coin is that addition of funds is not always made. Subtraction of funds, say if an institution is overfunded by 5%, is sometimes made. Western Illinois University had funds removed. Regarding incremental budgeting and its relationship between enrollment and funding, in his state of the university addressed, he advised that ISU begin the process of enrollment containment. That was a year ago. We have been attempting to do this. However, we need to understand that the enrollment picture of this university is the product of two years 1987 and 1988. In 1977, we had 19,049 students on campus; in 1982 we had 19,479--which does not show much growth for 5 years; in 1983, 19,817; in 1984, 19,817; in 1985 enrollment crept up over 20,000. The big jolt that we had came this year, when we were running into the problem of a budget crisis. Why did that increase come about? We went from 21,278 to 22,041--the biggest increase we have ever had. The enrollment containment project worked at the level where it was applied--that was the level of the entering freshmen students. It didn't work as well as we hoped it would. We had hoped to take the incoming sum (in the Fall of 1986 4,100 new entering freshmen). It had been our hope to bring by 3,700 new entering freshman. We utilized the statistical data that we had from the Office of Admissions and Records and cut off the registration where we thought we could achieve that, but more came. We didn't achieve 3,700, but we did achieve 3,900. Senator Klass was exactly right about this, he said simply cutting back the date beyond which you will accept admissions will not control it. Dr. Strand and the Target Enrollment Committee advised me that they thought we ought to employ a pooling process. In that process we would accept students, put them in a pool and accept a certain number of them. In the Fall of 1988, our goal is to admit 3,500 new students. Will we hit that goal precisely? I doubt it. That would be responsive of a form of human control that we do not have. But at least by the pooling process we can do far more than we are doing with a cut-off process. Cut-off processes encourage people who apply to get in just under the wire, the other process would not. A great deal has been made about the fact that we have too many students. I agree. Why do we have this problem? We have a hundred and ninety-eight fewer new students this fall. We had 177 more graduate students. This fact was commented upon very favorably by Dean Koshel in his speech to the Graduate Council. The problem we have is retention. Students simply did not leave the university in normal numbers. How continuing a problem will this be? We don't know. Is this a one-year problem or one that will remain with us. We are statistically admitting more able students. As a result more of them can and ought to complete their studies. Further, over the last several years, we have done more efficient and effective work as a university community in terms of helping students who have special needs. The HPS program, the Reading Study Skills Center, the Math Center, etc. all help students. We are doing many of the things that have been written about in the report that the university ought to be doing. We are helping students succeed. The result of that is that they do not leave the university in numbers that they have in the past. The entirety of our gain this year was from the retention of students who stay. Yes, we do have an enrollment problem. One of the rumors that persists is that the administration wishes to keep the enrollment abnormally high in order to pay off the arena, the residence halls, etc. This is not true.

We don't need as many students as we have in order to pay the things that we have to pay. We would be best served if our enrollment were approximately at the point that it was in FY86, at 20,419 students. We hope to get back to that. Will that come about next year? No. It has to work through the system.

Mr. Morreau asked what was going to be done within the system to accommodate the continued enrollment, if in fact, it does occur. What will be done within the system to assist in accommodating those numbers, for example faculty loads, etc. Will that burden be placed on faculty, or is something going to be done to provide relief?

Mr. Watkins stated that the Academic Plan, Section III, provided a PIE for the addition of a substantial number of faculty positions. We hope that funding will be available in this state to fund that request. It has a top priority with the Provost and himself. It had a top priority a year ago, because the same Program Improvement and Expansion Request had been in the budget. Because of the fact that we did not receive any additional funding, until recently, none of the PIE's were funded this last year. The fact that we had this enrollment happen to us in the fall of 1987, at precisely the time when we received no additional funds, was very bad for the school. What do we do for next year? We work as hard as we know how to work, and I'm sure all of you will too, to attempt to get an adequate budget for this university. But that is going to depend on an increase in taxes. In the meantime, we will continue to cut down on the size of our enrollment.

Mr. Morreau asked what makes 20,000 a magic number vs. say 18,000 students? Is there a system by which that can be calculated.

Mr. Watkins replied that we work as a university quite well at that number, 20,400 students.

Mr. Morreau asked if the university operated most efficiently at this number. Considering the IBHE not funding based on enrollment, 20,000 is the optimal number.

Mr. Watkins said he had stated that we operate pretty efficiently at that number. It is not optimal.

Mr. Morreau asked if a study had ever been done to see if we could operate more efficiently at say, 18,000 students? Mr. Watkins answered, no.

Mr. Morreau stated that we hope that Dr. Richardson and Dr. Thompson will join their colleagues and us in this endeavor. Two points concerning this statement regarding journalistic style were (1) "colleagues and us" assumes that this is not a we--them role, in fact that the university administrators are colleagues of the faculty. Colleagues and us does not really make it. (2) He thought by what he was seeing by the College of Arts and Sciences position statement, that they have in fact joined with their colleagues in exploring the issues of Illinois State University. It is not an invitation that needs to be extended. Rather, they have joined their colleagues. We ought to get rid of the "us" and deal with this issue together, if in fact we will try. Mr. Watkins said he did consider himself a colleague. He would accept that as a friendly amendment to his letter.

Mr. Klass said that people were talking about the enrollment figures. He felt that the fundamental problem was class sizes. That has very little to do with the actual enrollments. First of all the credit hours generated don't have much to do with total enrollments. The enrollments have gone up 10%, while credit hours only went up 4%. We seem to have a lot of students on the five year plan, taking only four courses per semester. As those enrollments increase, it seems that the response has been to increase faculty release time from teaching. He thought that the increase in departmental research is released time from teaching. This causes an increase in class sizes. Looking at the data, he observed that the number of faculty have decreased. He found that hard to believe. The number of faculty has decreased, and the number of hours of released hours from teaching has increased, and the number of graduate programs has increased. We have taken faculty out of the introductory courses and put them into the smaller graduate courses. The decisions that we have made on campus have really hurt the freshman introductory courses. We don't give salary increases to the people who do the freshman teaching, the temporary faculty. Mr. Klass stated that we were really shifting our resources out of undergraduate education. He was really disappointed to see President Watkins and Chancellor Groves say that when the enrollments go down we can shift our resources to research and public service, when we've taken resources out of education.

Mr. Watkins said that there is substantial disagreement with this point of view. Many people feel that we underfund research and that we need to put more money there. You feel that we underfund the lower division work where we are beginning to find more people in America saying that the first two years are too important to trust to graduate assistants. There are different points of view. There is ample evidence that we have underfunded research at this university. That we ought to increase research funding. It is quixotic to believe, and a rainbow that we should not chase, that we will ever become a major research university. We can become very good in selected areas, as we are now. Why is the number of full time instructional faculty down? There may be two answers to that. We may be a faculty of more part-time people. But the break comes at a moment of some significance. Let me show you what it is. In FY82, we had a tie with the 77-87 of 837 full time instructional faculty; in 1983 in mid-year we suffered a recision of nearly \$1 million dollars; the Provost area took some of that hit; in 1984, the year after that recision, we were 774 FTE; and in 1985 760 FTE; then we began coming up; in 1985 we had 786; in 1986, 789; and in 1987, 793. There may be several reasons this occurred, but one of them was the major recision in FY83. This money was never restored. The recision would have been far more difficult had we not had the ability at that point to phase out the support for bond revenue utilities, which we did. That saved us some money which went to cut our losses for that year. When you have a recision of 2% in midyear, it affects the budget the same as 4%, because half is all that is left. That year certainly affected the faculty. Mr. Watkins deferred the matter of release time to Provost Strand.

Mr. Strand commented on release time, fewer faculty, and the future. With regard to release time, there are strong differences of opinion among the faculty about this matter. As Mr. Klass is aware from a meeting last Spring when this subject was discussed, one of his colleagues has a 180 degree different opinion. We have been attempting to make whatever accommodations we could to acknowledge the three-fold mission of the University and to be responsive to research as well as teaching at the University.

One of the things which had happened that has resulted in fewer faculty positions, in addition to what President Watkins has indicated, is that the Provost Office each year asks Deans to submit a proposed staffing plan of how they would divide the positions in their college in three categories: tenure track; non-tenure track; and administrative/professional. We have found in the last few years several departments which have begun shifting certain functions of faculty to administrative/professional positions. Academic advisement is a good example of that, where departmental faculty and department chairs have recommended to the deans and the deans to us that there be a conversion of the faculty lines to administrative/professional lines so that the faculty members do not have to perform certain types of functions so they will have more time available for teaching and research. As part of the Program Improvement and Expansion Request Process, funding in some cases, on the recommendation of the IBHE, has led to additional support positions rather than faculty positions. We have a myriad of requests that include new faculty positions as well as support positions. We do not have control over which of those are recommended for funding by the Board of Higher Education. We can indicate to the IBHE what our priorities are, but many times they have other priorities which they recommend. There have been new positions which have been funded in the administrative/professional areas which appear to be a growth in administrative positions when in fact they are academic support positions.

I would like to go back to the 1982-83 recision and point out another complication in that process. By surrendering the bond revenue dollars as we did as part of avoiding making deeper base adjustments, we surrendered nearly \$500,000 which was intended for equity adjustments for faculty salaries and lost that flexibility. Because it was felt at that point that the decision was not made by the administration, but as a recommendation of the Needs and Priorities Committee upon which faculty members sat, we felt it would be better to surrender those dollars than to cut into the bone and marrow of the University and surrender additional faculty positions, so we complicated our lives in another respect in that regard by making that decision. Finally, responding to what we are trying to do for the future. When I talk about our future, I have added an additional equation to the scenario. The President and the Chancellor have said this as well. When I talk about reducing enrollment, I also add in there reducing the non-tenure track faculty, and then reallocating resources for instruction where the needs exist in the undergraduate and graduate level and for research functions of this university. As a part of my scenario, I am talking about the process that would allow us to address some of the concerns about the undergraduate instruction.

Mr. Klass said that one of the reasons listed in the document about reducing enrollments was to fund more research. He saw an article in the ISU Report recently where President Watkins said as we reduce enrollments, we can devote more of our resources to research and public service. He wondered what the public service involved. Chancellor Groves said the same thing: we have to shift our budget to research and public service. It seemed to Mr. Klass that we should state that public service is our lowest priority. Or else that education is the public service that we perform.

Mr. Watkins said that in general that was our three-fold function.

Mr. Klass asked why we had PIEs for public service, that the Board might pick and fund. We should state that public service is our least priority.

Mr. Strand said that as an outgrowth of the program in the College of Business there is a feeling within the College of Business that economic development is part of a mission for that college that can help the state of Illinois. Economic development falls under public service by most definitions. That is one of the reasons why public service appears as part of the PIE. There are also other examples.

Mr. Shulman asked if the President could tell senators how much of the Fell Hall Remodeling space would be used for classrooms and faculty offices.

Mr. Watkins went through the Fell Hall square footage: total space assigned to the Department of Communications would be 22,844 nasf; the Office of the Provost, 12,810 nasf; Classrooms, 5,000 nasf (9 classrooms). The breakdown of the Communication Department included: Administration & Staff, (48 faculty offices and 2 administrative offices, 2 advisors offices, one faculty advisory area, one library, one conference room, student records and machine room, graduate assistant offices), 10,143 nasf; Audio/Visual Student Center, 3,150 nasf; Instructional Laboratories, 5,254 nasf; TV 10 facility, 4,300 nasf; Nine Classrooms totalling 5,000 nasf; (five of the classrooms will have 40 stations, and one will have 30); Academic Advisement Area, 6,530 nasf; High Potential Students Program and Special Services Program which are tutorial and academic in nature, 3,660 nasf; International Studies, 2,670. This will free up areas in other parts of campus which can be reassigned.

Mr. Shulman said that it was his understanding that both NIU and SSU are building new science buildings. It was also his understanding that the Facilities Planning Committee rated a new science building at ISU as number one. How is it that when it went to the Board of Regents on June 19th, the science building became number five.

Mr. Watkins said that the Board of Regents sent forward to the Illinois Board of Higher Education the Addition to Farraday Hall for NIU, and a Health Sciences Building at SSU. He did not know at this point what would occur with the IBHE recommendations. He assumed that they would get on the priority list right away. He was not privy to that information. With regard to the Normal Community High School and the new science building, additional recommendations came to him from Harold Burns. He talked with Harold about it and said he thought they were making a terrible mistake if we do not prioritize higher NCHS which has 139,000 net assignable square feet. He reminded everyone that we were not talking about some worn out, kicked to pieces old building, and we were not talking about going to it without a total renovation. We were talking about a building which had a tremendous amount of square footage, plus 18 acres of land adjacent to our campus. We are talking about a building which when renovated will give us 139,000 net assignable square feet with space for a variety of departments. If that alternative does not become available to us, we will go back and for the same cost we will build a science tower of about 30,000 nasf. This would not eliminate some of the other space problems on campus. We have not eliminated that as a consideration. It is our hope that we will receive the remodeling money for the Fell Hall project this year. It is pretty easy to denigrate projects of this sort if one does not see how well they can be done. The people in the Department of Music would be pleased to show you how well Cook Hall Remodeling turned out.

The proposal for the enclosure of the first floor of DeGarmo Hall is in the works. That space would be used for Psychology. Finally, we hope that Normal Community High School will be funded. We see that as an opportunity that will not come our way again.

Mr. Shulman said that this would have saved quite a few problems because when it was presented to the Board of Regents, he jumped on a couple of the members of the Facilities Planning Committee because of the way it was ranked. He was not in any way questioning the authority of the President as the Chief Operating Officer of the University, but he felt that the plan as it came out should have said it was his ranking, and not that of the Facilities Planning Committee. Mr. Watkins said that the material was sent back to the Facilities Planning Committee. Mr. Shulman said they never had a chance to discuss or change it.

Mr. Morreau asked if the faculty in the sciences involved in the decision that Normal Community could in fact be renovated to serve their purposes and needs for research and instruction? Mr. Harden said that the sciences were not going into Normal Community High School. If you look at the Capital Budget Program Requests, they explain it. Normal Community had never been designated for the sciences.

Mr. Morreau asked what would happen to the 18 acres surrounding NCHS? Mr. Watkins said at this point no decision had been made about that. It could be used for parking, recreation, future expansion. Mr. Morreau asked if the intent was to create parking for the arena. Mr. Watkins said that had not been determined. Mr. Harden said there were already 310 existing parking spaces at the south end of NCHS. Mr. Watkins said that a parking facility is a possibility. It would be looked at, and had not been ruled out. They would not do anything that would be a parking facility just for the arena. If parking was created, it could be used for the people using the Normal Community building. It could be used for parking for any new facility that was built. Mr. Morreau asked if it was not the intent at present. Mr. Watkins said no determination had been made.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked about an issue raised in the letter from the College of Arts and Sciences Council. Under "University Governance, roman numeral III, on Page 2 of the Arts and Sciences document, a couple of things are of concern: "In the last few months two issues have created an air of grave uncertainty about the status of Illinois State University within the Illinois system of higher education. The first is the possibility that Northern Illinois University will win approval in Springfield for a bill creating its own independent board of trustees. The second is the widely-discussed proposal (I presume this means the Somit proposal to have U of I, SIU, and NIU in the top tier of research oriented schools; with every other institution in the state being in the second tier) to restructure the entire system of higher education in Illinois into a two-tiered structure." Question 7 on Page 4, reads: "Will the University oppose any of the proposed governance changes that would diminish Illinois State University's capability to develop graduate programs and to enhance research potential on this campus?"

Mr. Watkins replied: "Absolutely." The Board of Regents which represents the three universities with the concurrence of the three presidents has taken the position of being opposed to the proposition for separating the institutions. The proposition for a separate board for NIU has been around for as long as I have been around, perhaps longer. The proposition was

followed up with the General Assembly. Phillip Rock has indicated that he is opposed to legislation for this. The legislators who favor it are a small group. The only two I know of are John Countryman and Pat Welch. Can that proposition fly? The Board of Regents has very specifically instructed all of us to speak against it. Regarding the Somit proposal-- Dr. Somit was former president of SIU, Carbondale. He is now a professor there. As Jim Furman said in his article, he questioned the motive for the Somit proposal. Maybe the separation of the current SIU system into two systems: SIU, Carbondale, and Edwardsville. This corresponds to the state universities system in California. SIU and NIU are much more like ISU than they are like the University of Illinois. Sometime back NIU managed to obtain the failed law school of Lewis University and they used their mission statement to get an engineering school. I don't think this proposition has any possibility of passing. He could not see any particular thrust in higher education in Illinois at this time to spin our wheels tampering with system configurations. We've got a great deal more urgent agendas such as appropriate funding for state universities. He has not always agreed with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, but splitting it up into that configuration isn't going to solve the basic problem which is that Illinois is not making a sufficient commitment to higher education. According to statistics from the Center for Higher Education which were given to me by Dr. Ed Hines, a year ago we ranked 35th out of 50 states in the United States in per capita support for higher education. The figure this year indicates that Illinois ranks 9th in per capita income, but not ranks 44th out of 50 states in per capita expenditure for higher education. In the per cent for average increase over ten years, Illinois is tied for last place with West Virginia.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked about the second proposition. We have heard the President's personal view of the Somit proposal. Is it ISU's policy to oppose the Somit proposal? Does the Board of Regents have a policy about the Somit proposal?

Mr. Harden said that the proposal has the universities grouped incorrectly. Northern, Southern and ISU are the most alike.

Mr. Sutton as student regent said that we are faced with a double-edged sword. High enrollment is detrimental. Our main goal is to educate and graduate students. Retention rates are working against this normal progression. He was glad to see the Academic Senate being used as such an open forum.

Mr. Insel asked President Watkins about data included in the Richardson and Thompson letters concerning the RAMP document figures which indicate that we do have a problem with high enrollments.

Mr. Watkins stated that consistently high enrollments do cause a problem. RAMP is an acronym for Resource Allocation Management Program document.

Mr. Insel asked if any effort was being made to do anything.

Mr. Watkins said yes, that effort was being made. Mr. Strand added that one of the highest priorities in PIE's (Program Improvement and Expansion Requests) was for additional faculty positions. Dr. Jack Chizmar who was in the Provost area and now works for the Vice President for Business and Finance, is addressing this problem. He has indicated through his version the number of faculty positions which are needed. The PIE's priority is to get those faculty positions funded.

Mr. Insel asked how ISU got into this position?

Mr. Harden said a basic crucial period was 1969-70. Prior to that time cost studies drove everything. You made an estimate of your enrollment and lower division and upper division; and they took the cost study multiplied the credit hours generated, and that was your budget. Now that worked fine if you remained stable. We had a change in the officers of the IBHE in that period where we went to Dr. James Holderman, who believed in program budgeting which is the initiation of RAMP (Resource Allocation Management Program), and the IBHE took that approach. At that period of time (1969-70) we had our largest enrollment growth. We fell behind, and when IBHE took the new approach we were never able to get caught up.

Mr. Watkins said unless there is a shift in philosophy in higher education funding, this process will not work. The state of Texas does it differently. They have a more complicated formula. But it is responsive to credit hours generated. Your budget can be figured out in terms of simple multiplication. The President stated that he had undergone oral surgery that day at 4:00 p.m., and would like to finish up shortly.

Senate recessed for 10 minutes at 8:28 p.m.

Mr. Kirchner directed his comments to Dr. Strand. Some of his colleagues at NIU who teach in the same field tell him that they teach two courses per semester and in some cases two courses one semester and one course the next semester. ISU is one of the few if not the only remaining institution to require 12 hour teaching loads as basic teaching loads. Other universities have gone down to nine hour loads. Is this in the plans for the future to get our loads down to nine hours so instructors can do more research.

Mr. Strand was not familiar with the data regarding NIU. Nor was he familiar with the data that indicated that ISU had the heaviest teaching loads. He would be happy to look at that and respond at a later date. He had two comments about the teaching load at Illinois State University. One point was that we do not talk about a 12 hour teaching load, but a 12 hour adjusted load. Some of the data that we prepared last Spring to send to the University Research Committee indicated that the teaching load for tenure track faculty at that point in time was not 12 hours, but was considerably less than that. There is a difference between a teaching load and an adjusted load. The adjusted load can be figured in a number of ways. The enrollment containment process and the Program Improvement and Expansion Requests would bring to campus up to 66 new faculty positions and ways in which we can make more substantial adjustments for faculty. Yes, it is a very definite objective of the University to try to address teaching loads which are too heavy and student credit hour production that is too high.

Ms. Mills asked the Provost a question about enrollments. In the column that the President wrote in the ISU Report back in November, it became very clear how we are suffering with the increased enrollments, how we are generating income fund money and as a result that could be used to reduce our general revenue appropriations. In a sense we are being penalized because that money is being used elsewhere, we are losing that because we are generating tuition income. We see that we have been underfunded essentially since 1969-70, we've seen our faculty lines reduced since 1983's rescision, they have been coming back up but have still not reached our level we had in 1982, we've had

an enrollment problem for a long time, and it has gotten to be very obvious and more critical in the last couple of years; but what has been the philosophy that has guided this? When the enrollment containment strategy was developed, what attempts were made to tie that to the academic planning process, to get input from faculty, to take into consideration the concerns of faculty, to use this as an opportunity to improve the caliber of our student body, etc. instead of using the formula that was used last year.

Mr. Strand said we have been working through a number of University committees to get the reaction of committee members both formally and informally as to what has been happening. The Academic Standards Committee for example has been addressing and monitoring the performance of students at the university and as you are aware there have been adjustments made in the admissions standards of the university over the past few years. These adjustments have come through the Academic Senate. We have as part of the enrollment containment process also made qualitative decisions about trying to improve the quality of students coming to the campus while also acknowledging the importance that exists to make sure that access is provided for certain types of students with needs, including minorities, honors students, talent grant students, adult learners, etc. We have set for ourselves certain limits for the number of new freshmen and have reaped the benefits of plans to improve retention of students from a number of initiatives such as supplemental instruction programs. A number of faculty participated in identifying those courses which had the highest rate of failure or sub-standard performance by students, and working through the department chairs and college deans have instituted some means by which sometimes three-hour courses are meeting five times a week, and other initiatives which are meant to improve the potential rate of success of our students. That is another way in which we have looked at the quality of our students and how they can be more successful. Along the way it has complicated the admissions process, because they do not leave the university. We have also tried to set realistic targets for enrollment. At a time when demographics say there are fewer students graduating from high schools, and the pool of students applying at public universities is smaller, there should be fewer students who want into the university. What has happened here, which is both a blessing and a curse, is that more students have selected Illinois State University and have turned their backs on some of the other private and public universities in the state. As we have attempted to monitor the enrollment process, we have kept the door open for minority students, for honor students, and for talent grant students, and adult learning/reentry students. Those students falling into those categories have exceeded the predictions for those particular groups, and we are going to be talking about additional ways in which we can monitor that process on the Target Enrollment Committee. There have been a series of mechanisms in place by which we have sought input on the various committees and positions. The Target Enrollment Committee has set certain expectations that will be projected. There will be some faculty members added to the Target Enrollment Committee, so that there will be faculty input on that level. A process will be developed to identify those members.

Ms. Mills understood about the problems with retention. Her concern was that this is a time when there ought to be a dialogue about how we can take advantage of a problem, which is we have a lot of students who want to come here. She had raised the question last year when they were talking about course specific requirements. We were not looking at ways to raise the standards for general admissions. There will be exceptions for honor students, minorities, etc. What we need to do rather than setting a cut off date for admissions is to start talking about how we can increase our standards for

quality students. She was glad that they were going to put faculty members on the Target Enrollment Committee who could express their views. We need to take advantage of the opportunity to be more selective.

Mr. Strand stated that one additional step that would be taken is that starting in the Fall of 1989, the entire freshman class will be pooled by department and college. We have been talking with college deans and department chairs and others about the number of freshman that should be admitted and the standards that should be applied by those departments which will allow them to bring in the best students available and yet acknowledge access to disadvantaged students. That will be another dramatic shift and will involve considerable discussion on the part of faculty within departments as well as the college deans. There will be a mechanism of monitoring at the department level.

Mr. Shulman spoke for his colleagues in Felmley Hall as to obtaining more and safer space for the science faculty -- were we talking about the time frame of five years, ten years, or one hundred years?

Mr. Watkins deferred to Dr. Ed Anderson to answer this question. First of all in terms of additional space, as we look at space needs on campus annually, we review a formula of required space in the sciences. It is quite evident that many departments on campus are short of space. In the case of Felmley Hall, should we have the privilege of acquiring the Normal Community property, we have two alternatives. In the long-range facilities plan it has been projected that a possibility of renovating McCormick Hall might address that problem. Another element might be the relocation of the Health Sciences Dept. which is near Felmley to NCHS which might provide additional space. These alternatives have to become projections in terms of a long-range plan. They are not cast in concrete. However, I think those possibilities speak to the future. In terms of a short term plan, as recent as this afternoon, the two chairs of Chemistry and Biology and Dr. Shulman met with the new Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance, to begin to seriously consider how we could address safety and environmental conditions in Felmley Hall. He was confident that as a result of this meeting there will be some active investigation and hopefully we can move towards increasing a more safe environment and more possible future space.

Mr. Klass said that in the President and Provost letter they had spoken of shared governance. Since he had been on the Senate, he had heard each of the administrators argue for limiting the jurisdiction of the Senate. On other issues there had been important matters that had come to the Senate only as information items, that we don't approve. There are a whole series of things that are not brought to the Senate at all. We never talked about the arena here. We have never addressed temporary faculty policies here. On three topics, he would like them presented for the advice and consent of the Senate: our new admissions target enrollment policy; the recommendations of the instructional committee that has just been appointed; and the list of PIE priorities (ranking by priority). He wondered if these matters could be brought to the Senate for advice and consent.

Mr. Strand stated that in regard to non-tenure track faculty, that topic had been under study in the Faculty Affairs Committee for the past two years. It came to the Senate, and was referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee as the appropriate Academic Senate Committee to study this issue. That Committee was close to reporting out last Spring, and for reasons that he was not aware of did not do so. That issue was in a committee and we are awaiting a report from them.

Dr. Strand stated that the University Teaching Committee, which is a new committee is a committee which was established because of concerns expressed by this body about what was perceived by some to be a second class citizenship assigned to teaching functions. The members of that newly-constituted committee have come from a group of individuals who have received various types of recognition on campus as outstanding teachers. That committee will begin its work shortly after the start of the second semester, and there is no reason why we cannot have periodic reports from that committee. Mr. Strand stated that the arena did not fall under his purview.

Dr. Strand said that it had been the feeling of the people in the Provost's Office and those preceding his arrival on the scene, that we bring to the Senate the admissions criteria and specific policies published in the catalog which govern the admissability of students. We did that as late as last Spring when we brought in a three-fold package charting the transition from the present process to the course specific admission requirements. We felt that the implementation of those is an administrative function which has been entrusted to the Target Enrollment Committee and we will be adding some faculty members to that committee. It is a process which persons have a difference of opinion about what should come before the Senate and what should not. We have felt and never been challenged up to this point, that the Target Enrollment Committee's operation should come before the Senate. We can discuss the recommendations of that group. A hearing of this might take considerable time, but it could be done.

Regarding the PIE's and their ranking, Dr. Strand said that we at this time engage in an administrative process that ranks the PIE's as they go off campus. That ranking is used by the Board of Higher Education, but not always respected by the Board of Higher Education in its ranking process. We had the discussion this morning in the Dean's Council about the advisability of seeking broader input from various groups in the ranking of PIE's as they move through the process to see what different persons perceive to be the priorities of the institution and if it be the wish of the Budget Committee of this body to engage in this process and to provide input into that, there is certainly no objection to that. We have to keep in mind, however, that the PIE process is something that occurs at a time when the Senate is not actively around, and we do not have control over that calendar. There are some logistical complications.

Mr. Klass asked if the administration would be opposed to the Senate ranking the PIE's according to their own priorities?

Mr. Strand said he would not be opposed to that as one piece of input, but he did not believe that the Senate ranking would be the ultimate institutional ranking because there are factors that sometimes intervene at a late date where we get messages from the Board of Higher Education or from the General Assembly about what is going to be appropriated within the year. There is not time to come back to the Senate with the Budget. Knowing what the Senate thought about the priorities of the PIE's would not be a problem.

Mr. Klass asked if the administration would object to the Senate approving or disapproving the Target Enrollment Plan.

Mr. Strand stated that an advisory recommendation from the Senate would not be a problem. However, a mandate from the Senate would cause a problem. The Senate is not charged with the administration of the University and the

consequences of that process. To have the reaction of the Senate to what is projected by the Target Enrollment Committee is not a problem.

Mr. Morreau wanted to alter a statement that he had made earlier in the evening. In reviewing the document, he saw that the statement was not quite that the University assumes full responsibility for grants obtained by faculty. After talking with Dean Koshel, he suggested that the term "the University" represents the "faculty" would be better. Mr. McAteer was not quoted correctly in the paper, and apparently is not going to retract the quote attributed to him. Mr. Morreau suggested that there was a communications error in this case as contrasted to deliberate intent. What he proposed was that when the University discusses the grants program at the University, that in fact they should always make a point to indicate the amount of resources that are brought in by faculty effort and emphasize the faculty efforts because we recognize that it is our faculty who are doing these jobs.

This is the first time, and this reflects on the faculty caucus as well, that the Senate is acting as a Senate. It is very positive to see questions being addressed and answered on the floor of the Senate. Perhaps it would be possible to schedule a public forum four times a year at which faculty members could meet with administrators and address the questions and talk about the issues. We need to address these questions, get responses, dispell rumors, and achieve action in the system.

Mr. Watkins thought this was an excellent suggestion. As we look toward that as a possibility, it would be helpful if one could have some idea of the areas to be covered in order to prepare. If you come in cold, it is difficult to comment on the questions which can be very involved. It might be possible to relate to some type of situation where general areas of concern could be identified and be the subject for that evening's discussion.

Mr. Morreau asked: If the position papers that have recently been forwarded to faculty were forwarded to the President's office, would he be willing to arrange a meeting of the faculty aside from the Senate to address those issues as a forum as contrasted to print?

Mr. Watkins said, of course. He would prefer a meeting like that, and thought it would be much more productive than a debate in print. It would allow more people to ask questions. All sides of an issue could be reviewed.

Mr. Morreau asked if, say, Lanny Morreau, wanted to discuss issues of faculty salary, and sent in a paper to arrange for a forum to discuss that question, could the President set up a block of time for faculty to address issues?

Mr. Watkins said, yes. To the best of our ability we would try to explain what the situation was vis a' vis salaries, how the ASPT process works at this university, and where we stand in regard to our funding. There aren't many particular areas of this university that we wouldn't be willing to discuss. The other side of the coin is that we will not always achieve unanimity of agreement.

Mr. Morreau said that was not the issue. The issue was that there was an open communication link that involves faculty at large with the administration and the administration as a collective set with the faculty and the issues can be discussed. The faculty could still walk away saying I don't agree with you. Or you could walk away saying, I don't agree with faculty. But that forum does not exist at the present time. Mr. Shulman said he could always ask any question he wanted, as an individual. Mr. Morreau said there are collective issues.

Mr. Watkins suggested that the appropriate type of forum should be organized, and should not be conceived as a confrontational event. It should be an opportunity for faculty members to ask questions, and we cannot always give reassuring answers.

Mr. Morreau said that something happened in Senate tonight that the student regent was wise enough to point out. Faculty were discussing issues, responses were being given to those issues whether he or anyone else agreed with them, and faculty at large were getting involved in a process that perhaps could be reiterated at a place without the formal rules of the Senate which say that you have to put everything in question form as contrasted to dialogue which is quite inhibiting.

President Watkins excused himself at 9:12 p.m. because he had had oral surgery that afternoon.

Mr. Belknap directed his question to Provost Strand. It concerned faculty teaching loads at ISU. He either did not understand the previous response to Sen. Kirchner's question, or was unhappy with it. As he understood it, the policy at ISU is that faculty are accountable for 12 points. Generally enough, he understood the concept of adjusted load, and that it could be used for research. He was talking in the concept of departmental level of adjusted load. He understood that faculty could apply for released time for research. He understood that within adjusted load is the idea of indirect instruction, and also the release for administrative duties at departmental levels, etc. He was of the opinion and belief that if we are seriously going to pursue commission to enhance and advance scholarly productivity at ISU that something should be done in a more university-wide, policy related type of statement, that will clearly indicate that research is serious and not at the level of the department through the adjusted load idea. He thought there was a sizeable problem here. From within the Provost Office has there been discussion, has the idea been entertained, to reduce the policy of 12. to a 9. For example, a classification of faculty that might fall within full-time graduate faculty or those persons who would be considered full-time graduate faculty, their full-time point load would be 9. rather than 12., clearly indicating that research is a priority and it ought to be the full-time graduate faculty doing it. Another question would be in regard to the DFSC regulations, and the potential of the DFSC within departments to recognize their faculty within their department for either being a class of faculty that perceives their faculty role in a more research type of role than a teaching faculty would and therefore would the DFSC have the flexibility to recognize such groups of faculty. That faculty themselves can interpret their own role, be it research orientation or research emphasis or teaching emphasis -- move this to the DFSC, then the department chair, and then on to the college. It seems to me that if we are going to seriously pursue enhanced scholarly productivity, we are going to have to do something about a 12. accountability of faculty and approach it more seriously than the idea of an adjusted load at the department level.

Mr. Strand responded to the second question first; the matter of the DFSC and the ASPT process fitting the research process. There is sufficient latitude in the current ASPT document to enable departments to do precisely what you are describing and some departments have done that. That is there and is available if a department wishes to use the ASPT document to allow faculty members to qualify for exceptional merit through a variety of groups or a combination of several functions. If you would examine

the DFSC documents across the departments on campus, you would see a wide variation in the manner in which that is done. It is an option that is available to departments. In regard to the overall teaching load vs. research function, I have found and this has been discussed with the college deans, that it is not wise to come up with a standard division to which all colleges must adhere. It is better to recognize the individual differences of departments and colleges, and let them work on this. There is also a feeling on the part of the deans, and reflected in department chairs as well, that it would not be wise to say across the board that all faculty should have a 9 hour teaching load. There are some members of the faculty who have expressed to their chairs the fact that they do not wish to be actively involved in research to the extent that they want to be held accountable for it in the same way that others who wish to be involved in research and have that equated as part of their evaluation process. There are some members of the faculty who are more happy to continue with a 12 hour teaching load and not be held to research productivity while other members of the faculty would be happier with a 6 hour teaching load and a higher research expectation. Once again, we felt that that should be a departmental prerogative as opposed to an across the board standard to which everybody is held. I have accepted those messages which are coming from department chairs and college deans. It is a topic that is being actively pursued at this point.

Mr. Belknap said there are still full-time graduate faculty who are teaching 12 points. It seems to me that those are the people who are looked for at this University for leadership in scholarly productivity, and to publish, but without recognizing through released time for those persons involved in that to become more involved and to exercise that leadership. It seemed loosely structured and directed to him.

Mr. Strand admitted that the example cited is not one which we can be proud of. It is a circumstance which he could not address specifically because he did not know the department or the individual and did not wish to have them identified. It is that type of situation that we are trying to work ourselves away from. He did not know what factors would come together to replace this particular circumstance in the professional life of the individual involved, but they were trying to remedy such things.

Mr. Belknap said as long as the deans supported the process that we currently have, then he presumed that the Provost would not seriously entertain the idea of 9 points being a full-time teaching load at this university, across-the-board.

Mr. Strand said based on what he was hearing from department chairs and college deans, he could not at this point in time say that a 9 hour across the board teaching load would be the appropriate way to go for this university. He was hearing from a number of people, including some faculty members, that that would be a mistake. It would not be to the best interest of some individuals in some departments.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked Provost Strand if some students who were not admitted in the Fall of 1987 (they were eligible, but were not admitted because of a cut off) were sent letters allowing them to re-apply to the University in the Spring of 1988 with the understanding that they could possibly face limits on space. If we are talking about Fall of 1987, I am with you 100%.

Given the enrollment problems from retention, where would any spaces come from in the Spring semester? Why should there be any spaces? If the idea is to reduce enrollment, then why encourage or allow students who were cut off in the Fall to apply in the Spring? Where would those spaces come from?

Mr. Strand said that we should bear in mind the scenario of a year ago, Fall Semester 1987. We took some steps to reduce the size of the freshman class, the most dramatic steps the University has ever taken. We could have overcompensated, could have come up with 3,000 instead of the 3,700 target. We needed to make sure that there was some sort of escape mechanism in case the process that was put in place so far over-corrected itself that we would put ourselves in a downward spiral that was more severe than would be desirable. You might say, what's wrong with 3,000 freshman? We can take 3,000 freshman for three or four years. But when you start factoring out, in modeling, what 3,000 freshmen will do over five or six years, you have very dramatic effects on enrollment that might not be what we want. You have to recognize that the cost study has a penalty factor for certain levels of funding which are below a 5% factor in the equation. We wanted to give ourselves some sort of mechanism by which we could compensate if the number dropped precipitately. We sent out those letters indicating that they were not eligible in the Fall of 1987, but if they wished to be considered for the Spring of 1988 they could do so again on a space available basis. We then as we were watching the Spring 1988 enrollment pattern develop recapped Spring Semester 1988 admission as of a particular date. Recognizing that when we get into the entire pooling process we are not going to be capping by date, we are going to be capping by department and college across the campus, much like the University of Illinois' process. We have capped enrollment for the Spring Semester 1988 in terms of new student admissions at the undergraduate level and are using that as mechanism to try to control that process. Why do we admit any people at midyear? Because we generally have a reduction in enrollment as a result of students who graduate or transfer. It was felt that a minimal level of new admissions would not be detrimental to the process.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked what "cap by date" meant. He understood a cutoff by number, but what did cap by date mean? Does that mean that you no longer accept people that apply after that date, or that you no longer accept people past the number achieved on that date? Or does it mean something else?

Mr. Strand said that last year and this year we used particular dates when we announced that we no longer consider people for admission for a subsequent academic period in spite of the fact that they may meet admission criteria. We have set those dates based on historical patterns of the percentage of yield that a number of applications will translate into actual enrollment during the fall semester or spring semester. Generally speaking, about 42% or 43% of students who apply for admission actually enroll for the period that they have requested. That is true for fall admissions. Because we have not been pooling our students by college or department and college, we have capped by date. Starting with the fall semester 1989 we will cap by college and department, which will allow us to have much more precision in the capping process than we do when we have to cross the entire university line. Bear in mind that the State of Illinois does not require an application fee for students who apply for admission. You have students who are submitting multiple applications to two, perhaps, three schools. We have used

the historical data that has been available to us to best estimate where we will cut off the process and as the President indicated earlier as we prepared for the fall semester we thought we were in pretty good shape as far as containment. The contaminant to this process was the increased percentage of students from last year who decided to return which indicated that we went up in enrollment instead of down as the new student enrollment indicated.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if there was ever a time when a number became the cutoff line. When ISU has received X number of applications that have been approved.

Mr. Strand said that was what we would be doing starting next year. The people involved at the high school level do not have the date in advance of the cutoff. When they do not have the date, you have a circumstance in feeder schools that will bring very negative results to the University.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if numbers of warm bodies coming on to this campus would be involved in this cutoff campus.

Mr. Strand answered yes, numbers coming onto this campus by department and by college. Keep in mind that the departments and colleges will still have to factor in what proportion of those people who apply will appear on the scene. Those departments may decide that they want to come up with their own proportion and deviate from university standards. Then the departments will live with the consequences. It will not be a central administrative decision.

Ms. Kreps stated that there were documents such as the College of Arts and Sciences Council newsletter and a second letter by Drs. Richardson and Thompson that had been circulated to some senate members but not others. Most students did not receive either of these communications. If the Senate was to be shared governance, students should be included in mailings.

Mr. Schmaltz said the College of Arts and Sciences letter had been received by senators that morning in campus mail.

Mr. Bulgrin stated that the letter from Arts and Sciences was addressed to: Members of the Academic Senate, indicating that it was sent to all senators. He asked Mr. Strand how the pooling process would deal with unclassified and general student majors. Also, have they taken into consideration that most students do change majors.

Mr. Strand said that the process that he was alluding to takes on some very complex dimensions. There will be people from this body sitting on the Target Enrollment Committee who will wrestle with some of those questions. One of the options is to force students to make a choice, even if they are undecided. The other is to reserve X number of positions for spaces for unclassified general students. Another connotation to this process is that shifting majors will become a much more complicated and heavily monitored process than it is now. Right now there is very little consequence if you change majors. When we go to the pooling process, and departmental quotas, students may find that if they change their majors after they get here, they may not be able to get into their new majors at the time that they wish.

There will be obstacles that will preclude that, depending upon how completely the quota in the department has been met. This will be part of the myriad of questions that will have to be raised and answered.

Mr. Bulgrin clarified that if a sophomore decides to change his major from marketing to history, he might be placed behind new students to the university already in that major. Mr. Strand said that was possible. Departments would set their own criteria.

Mr. Morreau had a few comments for wrapup. He agreed that the University could not dictate departments their unique individual needs. However, it would seem to be the responsibility of the administration to make sure that assignments are equitable. It would seem that a standard could be established in the Provost office to say that a doctoral student counts so much for a load in one department and so much in another. That kind of thing should be uniform. It seems that a doctoral student being advised say in Special Education should be equal to a doctoral student being advised in the department of Sciences. That should count as a load all across campus. At the present time that is not being done. He made a statement concerning the fact that Illinois as a state is 44th in per capital expenditures for higher education. At the same time, the Senate a few weeks ago endorsed our undergraduate students going down to Springfield to protest our legislature and our Governor to indicate that they would like them to change priorities at a time when they are underfunded and weighing such programs as mentally ill, health, aged, child abuse, handicapped persons, etc. And at the same time we didn't suggest to those students that they should go over to Hovey Hall and ask that priorities be reappraised within the University: that perhaps sports are not as important as academics; that perhaps certain buildings that are being renovated are as important as academics; and we did not make that commitment. I think the University has to have a mechanism by which priorities have the involvement of faculty as well. As we have heard tonight about capital expenditures, enrollment, etc., but all those things only say that you need to reappraise your priorities and reallocate internally to accommodate those things to come up with a reasonable outcome.

Mr. Wagner said that this was great to have communication between faculty and administrators. However, this discussion could go on for a long time, and students have final exams this week.

Mr. Wagner moved that the discussion be ended and that some type of forum be established.

Mr. Schmaltz said that a motion is not appropriate during Administrators' Remarks.

Mr. Mottram asked if Mr. Strand would indicate if the faculty members of the Target Enrollment Committee be members of the Academic Senate. Mr. Strand said that if the Senate so indicated, they would be senators.

Ms. Kreps added that a student or two should also serve on this committee since students would be affected by their actions.

Administrators' Remarks (Continued)

Mr. Strand thanked all the faculty members who attended the faculty caucus preceeding Academic Senate meeting tonight. He felt the dialogue had been constructive and helpful and had provided ideas how to approach various topics. He looked forward to additional opportunities for discussion in the future. The Provost Newsletter distributed last week mentioned that he would be holding a faculty meeting during the Spring Semester.

Mr. Strand reported that the College of Education Dean Search Committee was back in place with its original members. The five finalists that had been announced in November will be interviewed between the latter part of January and the middle of February. We are well on the way to bringing the search process to a successful conclusion. There were some questions last time about the Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action laws and policies which govern what happens in search procedures. He had supplied members of the Senate, with the assistance of Mr. Goleash, a number of pages of the University, Board of Regents, and State and Federal acts on which the policies were based. Much of what the Senate has received goes back to the 1970's and the Senate played a very active role in shaping the response to these policies. He would be happy to answer general questions, however questions of a legal nature should be submitted to him in writing so that the University Legal Counsel could assist him with an answer.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the documents, particularly the EEOC document, were current? He saw no dates on them, and wondered if they were current? Mr. Strand answered, yes, to the best of his knowledge. The documents were taken from the most recent volumes of State and Federal Acts that the government uses.

Mr. Zeidenstein requested his colleagues on the Senate to retain their documents for future use.

Mr. Klass said that the Provost's document indicated that the words "protected class" emerged from the law. He had read through the documents and did not see the phrase "protected class" in any of them. He found it an offensive, unconstitutional phrase, and thought it should not be used unless it was actually found in the law.

Ms. Roof said the phrases referred to come from case law that builds around these statutes, not from the statutes themselves.

Mr. Strand said they could seek clarification from the University Legal Counsel.

Mr. Klass said that Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act forbids the use of certain classifications based on race.

Mr. Strand cited an example where this occurred in the Illinois Human Rights Act Chapter 68 reference, where it says that: "to assure that all State departments, boards, commissions and instrumentalities rigorously take affirmative action to provide equality of opportunity and eliminate the effects of past discrimination in the internal affairs of State government and in their relations with the public." There are some references to past discriminations which would seem to fly in the face of the other civil

rights act. There are a number of references in the federal and state acts which indicate that there should be an aggressive attempt to overcome previous acts of discrimination.

Mr. Klass asked if the University was prepared to admit that it ever discriminated against anybody. Mr. Strand said that he did not have an answer for that question.

Mr. Shulman pointed out that this was final exam week, and individual questions about laws could possibly be directed to the Provost in private.

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, Warren Harden, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

Rules Committee Recommendations for Committee Appointments

- XVIII-49 Mr. Belknap, Chairman of the Rules Committee, moved approval of the Rules Committee Recommendations for Committee Appointments: John Kirk to fill a vacancy on the University Curriculum Committee; and Margaret Kelley to fill a vacancy on the Council for Teacher Education. (Second, Williams). Motion carried on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Sections I and III of the Academic Plan

- XVIII-50 Ms. Kreps moved that the Senate defer Sections I and III of the Academic Plan to the January 27, 1988 meeting. (Second, Comadena)

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if there was a particular deadline that would be affected by this.

Mr. Strand said it would not be a problem as long as the Senate recognizes that it is coming to the Senate as an information item. It could be discussed at three subsequent meetings. We are in a situation where it will be forwarded to the Board of Regents staff in a tentative state. Dr. Batsche had indicated that it would not be a problem to consider the Academic Plan at the three consecutive meetings starting on January 27th.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if the Senate did not consider this as an Action Item after it was presented as an Information Item? The answer was, no.

Mr. Klass stated that he understood that this document goes to the Board of Regents as a draft copy on January 7th. Section I of the current mission statement makes a major change in the statement on what ought to be the primary goal of this University, having to do with undergraduate education. He suggested doing something to avoid having this new wishy-washy goal becoming a part of our mission statement. He did not know how to accomplish this. There is a fundamental change which he thought the Senate should address before going to the Board of Regents.

Mr. Wagner clarified the point that the Academic Senate cannot change the Academic Plan, it just acts in an advisory capacity. Mr. Strand said that if the Senate recommended a change, that change would be referred back to the Academic Planning Committee for review.

Mr. Shulman suggested that if it was just an editorial or clarification change in the statement, couldn't we just go back to the old wording. New wording seemed ambiguous.

Mr. Strand said that neither he nor Dr. Batsche could take unilateral action without consultation with the Academic Planning Committee which had spent many hours on this plan.

Mr. Shulman suggested that the Senate could pass a Sense of the Senate resolution and postpone the rest of the Academic Plan.

XVIII-51 Mr. Shulman moved a friendly amendment to move a sense of the senate motion about what the Senate wished to change in Section I. Ms. Kreps stated that the Senate was given the opportunity to submit changes in writing. She did not think the friendly amendment was necessary. Mr. Shulman withdrew his friendly amendment. Ms. Mills did not think that one statement could be considered without being in context with the other statements in the whole document.

XVIII-52 Mr. Zeidenstein asked if Ms. Kreps would accept as a friendly amendment the wording to consider Sections I and III on January 27; Section II at the February 10th meeting; and Section IV at the February 24th meeting. Ms. Kreps accepted this as a friendly amendment.

XVIII-53 Mr. Wagner moved the previous question. (Second, Feaster) Motion carried by 2/3 roll call vote. (27 yes - 4 no)

Vote on Sen. Kreps motion carried on a voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Klass was given the opportunity to answer questions about the athletic budgets he had presented at the last meeting. There were no questions.

XVIII-54 Mr. Klass moved a Sense of the Senate Resolution: Resolved, that it is the highest priority at Illinois State University to provide the highest quality undergraduate education of the universities in Illinois. (Second, Zeidenstein)

Mr. Klass said this motion should be sent to the Academic Planning Committee. It is essentially the wording of what used to be the first goal in our mission statement. He read from a statement by Kenneth Shaw at the last graduation ceremony: "A quality undergraduate institution remains the cornerstone on which this institution rests, a fact widely known and appreciated by your employers, and students. It was heartening to note the new academic plan recently adopted by the Board of Regents assures that the highest quality undergraduate education will continue to be the major priority well into the future." He felt his resolution would indicate to the Academic Planning Committee that this was the mission of ISU.

Ms. Roof suggested not using quality as an adjective. Mr. Klass said he would change the wording to "best".

Mr. Strand said that the motion that had been passed, deferred consideration of the Academic Plan to January.

The Chair ruled Mr. Klass's motion out of order because it violated a motion that the Senate had just passed.

Mr. Klass challenged the ruling of the chair.

The Parliamentarian said to appeal the ruling of the chair required a second, it is not amendable, and a majority in the negative would overturn the chair's ruling.

Ms. Mills stated that what is going to the Board of Regents is a draft copy and it can still be amended through the middle of February. She thought that the Mission Statement should be talked about as a whole. The Academic Planning Committee wanted other input, and she hoped that the Senate could discuss this document as a whole. It could be discussed at the January 27th meeting and still meet the deadline.

Mr. Shulman said that the Sense of the Senate motion did not refer at all to the Academic Plan. It simply made a statement about undergraduate education.

Mr. Schmaltz said that Mr. Klass stated that this motion should be communicated to the Academic Planning Committee.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that according to the Bylaws and the Blue Book which expresses the Bylaws, all external committees are creatures of this Senate. This body created those committees in the past, as well as their functions, and the Senate is superior to them. Deja vu I, whatever we want as a Senate has to go back to them through the process and time; Deja vu II, only a draft is going, (where have I heard that before) the draft can be changed later. We go through these stages because of time constraints, because committees that this body creates are proceeding as superior beings to this body. You wonder why we go through these kinds of things---what other choices do we have?

XVIII-55

Mr. Kirchner appealed the chair's ruling. What had been approved as a motion was the deferral of Sections I and III as Information Items. They are not being offered as Information Items. Sen. Klass's sense of the senate resolution is not bringing forward those things as an information item. (Second, Klass) Chair's ruling was upheld by a 19/13 roll call vote.

Mr. Klass stated that he had sent revised Bylaws to the Athletic Council, and the Executive Committee had forwarded them to the Student Affairs Committee.

Mr. Belknap advised the Senate that Keith Stearns, an elected alternate, had replaced Ray Bergner on the Academic Freedom Committee.

Ms. Liedtke stated that rumors were circulating regarding salary adjustments to administrators in the Spring Semester, that faculty members did not receive. She thought it appropriate to help dispel rumors to have the administration report on this. Could this be answered next time.

Mr. Klass asked why the list of salaries in the Library were not as current as other lists.

Ms. Mills expressed a concern by College of Business faculty regarding the closing of the computer center for the entire Christmas shutdown period. It caused a hardship on faculty members who wished to continue research.

Mr. Harden stated that the usage was so low that it could not be justified to keep the center open.

Mr. Strand suggested that Sen. Liedtke's question be answered in a faculty caucus since it involved personnel.

The Parliamentarian stated that is a meeting of the faculty of the Senate under the ASPT document; a caucus is an informal group that is an open meeting.

Mr. Strand suggested that if there were objections to a faculty caucus, then the matter should be discussed in an executive session of the Senate, and not at an open session.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - no report.

Administrative Affairs Committee - no report.

Budget Committee - no report.

Faculty Affairs Committee - no report.

Rules Committee - no report.

Student Affairs Committee - no report.

Joint University Advisory Committee - Ms. Roof announced that JUAC was in the process of preparing an advisory statement on research to present to the Board of Regents and she invited interested faculty to give her their comments, suggestions, concerns, etc. to be considered in the process.

XVIII-56

Mr. Shulman moved to adjourn (Second, Zeidenstein). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 10:48 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUDITH A. ROOF, SECRETARY

