

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 3-7-1990

Senate Meeting, March 7, 1990

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, March 7, 1990" (1990). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 563.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/563>

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.

CORRECTIONS TO MARCH 7, 1990 ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

JOHN DOSSEY

Page 9, Bottom Paragraph: Our committee based our analyses on two sets of external information and a study of the internal budget data for the Athletic Department for the years 1985-1989, plus university projections for the program through 1994.

A comparison of ISU Athletic Department finances and data derived from programs at a set of comparable NCAA institutions and a set of public institutions in the Missouri Valley/Gateway conferences indicated that ISU's athletic program, on a percentage basis, raised a greater portion of its budget through fund raising and department generated funds. On the other hand, it derived a smaller percentage of its income through tuition sources.

Table A in the report shows a projection of department income sources through 1994 using the following selective percents of income sources: 23% - Income Fund; 40% - Student Fees; 17% - Department Generated Funds; 13% - Fund Raising (RESF); and 7% Tuition Waivers. These percents, for sources, reflect the 1988 portions of the Department's budget and appear reasonable in comparison with comparable institutions. The projections result from application of these percentages to the Athletic Department's projected budget for the years indicated. When compared to the sources the Department projects for its income. These projections indicate that the proportion expected from student activities fees does not maintain pace with the levels projected by maintenance of the 1988 proportions within the Department's projected budget. These analyses led to the recommendations made in the financial portion of the report.

Page 12, end of Paragraph three: These comparisons are not always possible due to different university accounting systems and differences in public/private income sources. If fine distinctions are to be made, the comparisons would be between only two or three schools.

Page 12, sixth paragraph: There are private institutions in the NCAA data. In the comparison data from the.....

Page 15, seventh paragraph, mid-page: The figures for the 1994 projections were based on financial data from the Athletic Department's Long Range Plan and budget data from 1984-1989.

John Dossey (Continued)

Page 23, top of page: We are looking at the total departmental projected budget figure dissected by 1988 income category percentages. The Department's overall budget total is built on a 5% compounded rate of growth.

Page 23, third paragraph: Yes, the dollar amount projected is predicated on a balanced budget.

Page 26, fourth paragraph: ".....that." We argued that these should not be an increased use in the funds derived from the income fund.

Page 30, ninth paragraph: ".....tonight." If you took the total amount projected each year (89-94) and factored it by the suggested 1988 percents on page 10, you get the figures indicated by the unshaded bars. The underlying model for the total is based on approximately a 5% compounded growth model. This will lead to an overall doubling of the budget in approximately fourteen years if the rate is maintained.

Senator Arlan Richardson

Page 19, sixth paragraph: Of the people who are coaches and trainers who are paid by the income fund, what per cent are on 12 month contracts?

Page 28, seventh paragraph: I am not sure that this survey is done that way. These data were obtained from professionals in higher education.

Page 29, eighth paragraph: Although this was true several years ago, it is not currently true. The ranking of the universities was based on other parameters than ranking by Presidents, for example graduate rate, faculty teacher ratio, instructional budget per student, and the quality of the student body as determined by the percentage of the freshmen students who graduated in the top 10% of their high school class.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 7, 1990

Volume XXI, No. 13

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of February 28, 1990

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:**
1. Approval of Nominations of Two Senators for University Studies Committee
 2. Approval of the Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for an M.S. in Geo-Hydrology
 3. Approval of Appointments of Faculty Members to Academic Senate External Committees

INFORMATION ITEMS: None

Communications

Resolution: To commit the Athletic Strategic Plan to the Senate Budget Committee and the Student Affairs Committee with the instructions that it be revised consistent with the Sense of the Senate Resolution passed March 22, 1989 (Be it resolved that the administration present to the full Academic Senate in September 1989 a plan for the following: phasing out the use of the income fund (tuition dollars) for inter-collegiate athletics.) and that it be resubmitted to the Senate for its approval by October 1, 1990.

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions 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)

March 7, 1990

Volume XXI, No. 13

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Secretary John Freed called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 28, 1990

Senator Ritt: Correction on Page 11, first paragraph, second sentence should read: "We are talking about "partial" differential equations....."

Senator Tuttle: Page 19, sixth line from the bottom in the last paragraph, add not. Sentence should read: "It certainly, but not necessarily, implies that they would not have to have every vote go the way they wanted it to go.

Senator Mohr: Page 29, eighth line of first paragraph should read: The data did not seem "fatally" flawed in the body.... About two thirds of the way through the paragraph, sentence should be corrected to read: "As you will note, temporary faculty have much higher student seat load than tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Senator Goldstein: Page 11, third paragraph, after first sentence add: "When this happens, there is typically a reaction on the part of Ph.Ds.

XXI-92

Motion to approve the Minutes of February 28, 1990 as corrected by Rendleman (Second, Ritch) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Schmaltz: I would like to thank senators for their efforts this past year. Especially, the committee chairs who have done a tremendous job. Thank you for your help and support.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Scott Rendleman: This being the last meeting of the Senate, I would like to say that I will always remember my experiences on the Academic Senate. I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee and the Executive Committee for the valuable things I have learned through participation on them. I would like to thank Mary who helped me keep my feet on the ground. I would like to thank Len for his wit that always helped put things into perspective. I would like to thank the student senators who have done an excellent job this year in attending and participating in meetings. I would like to thank the entire Senate for a tremendous learning experience.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Dan Schramm: I would like to introduce my elected successor, Terrence Sykes. He will take office at the next SBBB Meeting, Monday, March 19th. I would echo Scott's remarks and thank everyone on the Senate. In closing, I would like to urge senators to continue research into having students represented by College.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Who is currently the SBBB Chair?

Senator Schramm: I am.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace: This being the last Senate meeting, I have Certificates of Appreciation for Len and Scott which I will present to them during the break.

At the last Senate meeting, comments were made alleging that the President was intentionally pushing aside shared governance, manipulating faculty and students to create documents that pleased the administration and informing but not involving the Senate.

I believe the record of the last year and a half demonstrates a high degree of involvement by the administration in shared governance. There may be differences of opinion among individuals regarding the definition of shared governance and the appropriate scope of University participation in creating new ideas, presenting concerns, giving advice and making recommendations. Shared governance includes elements of planning and involvement of a broad-based University constituency as well as an official recommending and approval process. University governance should involve, as significant participants, a broader group of people than simply the faculty members of the Academic Senate.

I am not aware of any action that the administration has taken this year which required and did not have appropriate formal consideration by the Academic Senate. If such an example is available that contradicts this statement, it should be identified.

The examples given at the last Senate meeting of the administration pushing aside the concept of shared governance dealt with University planning. I would note that the ISU Constitution allows for an administrator or the Academic Senate to form committees to initiate studies of University interest.

During ISU's last reaccreditation by the North Central Association, the University received negative comments on its institutional planning. The President has a major responsibility to correct this noted institutional deficiency before the next reaccreditation occurs. The strategic planning process, as a long-range planning process, can be the basis for the University's response to the last North Central Accreditation Review Report.

Since the minutes of the past Senate meetings contain much commentary on the strategic planning process, I wish to make three points:

1. The strategic plan consists of the Vision Statement, a plan from each College and eight reports on special topics.
2. If a show of hands were requested of those senators who have read the whole report -- that is, the Vision Statement and all college plans and eight reports, I would be very surprised if 25% or more of the Senate membership could reply affirmatively.
3. Statements have repeatedly been made by the administration for over a year that implementation and budgeting of strategic planning outcomes for planning and budgeting would involve the existing University processes.

One of the major planning documents of the eight included in the strategic planning process is the Athletic Strategic Plan. A Sense of the Senate Resolution was passed last year with 19 positive votes out of a Senate membership of 49 persons. The concept inherent to this motion was significant to the future of the University. Yet, it did not receive consideration by the Athletic Council or the next step in the Senate process -- the Student Affairs Committee. I believe that the Athletic Strategic Planning Report to be discussed tonight is the most extensive review of athletics ever conducted at ISU. In addition, the committee was repeatedly told that they could

have access to any information or data they needed. A prominent member of the Senate, a critic of the Athletic Program at the time of the Senate Resolution, who was among the "manipulated ones" on the Task Force could and should correct me if I am inaccurate.

Upon completion of the Athletic Report by the Task Force in November, it was sent to the Athletic Council for review and recommendations. I met with the Athletic Council as did other administrators to answer their questions on the work of the Task Force. The report was also sent in November to the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Academic Senate Budget Committee, the Academic Senate Student Affairs Committee, the SBBD, the Athletic Council and other University groups.

I feel that these planning activities for athletics and for long-range planning were needed by the University, were appropriate for the President to organize and in no way constituted a negative intent or action to reduce shared governance at ISU. I would also note that nothing was preventing the Academic Senate from initiating a long-range planning study for the University or an in-depth study of athletics prior to these studies being initiated by the President.

Another important part of shared governance is for the President to meet with and hear from faculty, students, chairs, deans, civil service and A/P staff. In addition to meetings with student groups, civil service and other staff-oriented groups, the President visited every academic department last year and is in a second cycle of departmental visits this year. Involvement and participation of many campus individuals and groups is an important part of University governance considerations. It does not detract from the formal approval or recommending aspect of the governance system.

It is indeed unfortunate and unfair that ISU faculty, students and staff who have devoted much time in an honest effort in planning to improve this University have been characterized in the Senate as having been manipulated. This statement underestimates and denigrates the intelligence and capability of these good people who volunteered a substantial amount of their time.

Senator Richardson: When the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee was formed, questions were brought up as to Senate representation. If you look at it from the Senate's standpoint, we are upset by this issue because in the Minutes of the March 8, 1989 Academic Senate Meeting, you stated: "The whole report will come back to the Senate in the Fall." It would come to the Senate for input.

President Wallace: I did not think it was up to me to dictate what the Senate was to do with it. There were thirteen members on the Strategic Planning Committee and four of these members were senators.

Senator Richardson: I assumed that this would come to the Senate in the University Strategic Plan and I planned to bring my questions forward at that time. However, we found out several weeks ago when the University Strategic Planning Committee met with the Senate that the issue of spending on athletics was not discussed by the committee. I would like to ask the Chair if he would have asked the Committee to give its report to the Senate, if I had not requested this action?

Chairperson Schmaltz: No. After you asked about the report in January, the Executive Committee decided to have the committee give their report.

President Wallace: The Athletic Council was studying that report. It was some time from November to January, and since the Athletic Council was studying the report, I thought the Senate had received it.

Senator Zeidenstein: The report is on tonight's agenda as a communication. Will this body be allowed to ask questions about it? Can we pretend that it is an information item?

President Wallace: I had nothing to do with how it was presented on your Agenda. The Senate can do whatever they want to with it.

Senator Walker: As Chair of the Budget Committee, I did not ask the Budget Committee to look at the report. The only official copy of the report that I received was as a member of the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee.

Senator Richardson: After the presentation of the committee report on November 27th, several questions were raised. Did the committee consider the questions? Is the committee disbanded or is it still functioning?

President Wallace: The committee is not meeting any longer. However, they are present tonight to present the plan. They could reconvene if necessary.

Senator Richardson: One of the committee members told me it was disbanded in November and they never considered any of the questions raised when the report was given in November.

Senator Tuttle: We looked at a plan for the Strategic Vision. Is that document going to come back as a whole document? Part of the document will come through the Senate as Budget

processes. What we received was a preliminary draft. Will we be given a chance to review the final document?

President Wallace: The Strategic Planning Committee met yesterday and did some revision. Jack Chizmar is re-typing the document at this time. If the Senate wants, we could send it to the Senate again. The committee is adding a one-page summary of each of the eight strategic plan reports from the colleges. The revised vision statement and the eight one-page executive summaries will be included in the plan. For example, the College of Applied Science had four themes and the summary shows what they are doing with them.

Senator Tuttle: That would be very helpful. Does the Senate give its endorsement or non-endorsement to this plan to add legitimacy to it?

Senator Goldstein: At the meeting when we discussed the Strategic Plan, there was considerable concern about how the themes would be prioritized. Is the committee doing this?

President Wallace: The committee voted yesterday not to prioritize these.

Senator Alstrum: I have a question about the Senate resolution President Wallace referred to as only receiving nineteen votes. Will the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee ever take that resolution into consideration?

Senator Wallace: The committee is present this evening to discuss their report, it would be better to address that question to them.

Provost David Strand requested an Executive Session.

Senate reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

Vice President for Student Affairs Neal Gamsky had no report.

Vice President for Business and Finance James Alexander: I received a communication from the Budget Committee concerning the costs for consultants. I am not prepared to respond tonight, but ask if I should respond to the current committee or the newly formed Budget Committee later. I wanted to state for the record that I am not avoiding your questions, but have not had time to prepare a proper response.

Senator Walker: I think you should respond to the present committee.

Senator Mohr: Since this committee will go out of business shortly, the information needs to be documented and taken up

by the new Budget Committee. I would suggest sending a copy of your report to both committees.

Senator Walker: Both committees can take this under advisement.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Nominations of Two Senators for University Studies Committee

XXI-93 Senator Newby: The Rules Committee was asked to forward two nominations of Senators for the newly formed University Studies Committee. These nominations will be forwarded to the Provost, and one nominee will be selected to serve on the committee. Rules Committee nominates James Alstrum, Foreign Language, and Paul Walker, Agriculture. (Second, Rendleman)

Motion carried on a voice vote.

2. Approval of the Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for an M.S. in Geo-Hydrology

XXI-94 Senator Taylor: As Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, I move approval of the M. S. in Geo-Hydrology (Second, Jurgel).

Senator Ritt: At the last meeting we discussed possible changes in wording. Have those changes been incorporated yet?

John Foster: Because of the shortness of time (only one week), the changes in the wording of hydro-dynamics have not been attempted yet. They will occur in the document before it leaves this campus.

Motion on the approval of the M. S. in Geo-Hydrology carried on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS (NONE)

COMMUNICATIONS

ATHLETIC STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Members of the Committee: Thomas P. Wallace, Chairperson
D. Scott Rendleman, Student
Dan Schramm, SBBB President
Scott Williams, Student Regent
Dan Hackman, Jr., Student
Claude Graeff, MQM
Susan Smith, SASW
John Dossey, Math
Paul Walker, Agriculture
Thomas Ryan, Dean, Coll. of Educ.

Mary Ann Webb, Alumni
Joe Warner, Redbird Educ. Fund
Donna Jo Workman, HPERD
Al Otto, Math (Athletic Council)
Ron Wellman, Athletic Director

Paul Walker: Each committee member submitted questions to Susan Kern. She compiled all of them and distributed them to the entire committee.

President Wallace: The charge to the committee was: "The Athletic Strategic Planning Committee will review all internal and external studies of ISU athletic programs currently being conducted. After examination of all issues, analysis of all information and employing external consultants, the Committee will prepare a status report for the University community. The report will address funding levels, governance structure, student academic performance, support services and competitiveness of the ISU athletic program. Further, the Committee will compare ISU's cost as well as performance paying particular attention to the recommendations to strengthen individual programs, attendance and donor support will be addressed.

The committee categorized its findings and recommendations into six broad areas: Scope of Program, Finance, Governance, Facilities, Performance, and Communications and Image. Under each area of study the committee identified specific questions around which the recommendations were made. For example, under Scope of the Program questions included: (1) What is the appropriate mission of athletics in relationship to the overall mission of Illinois State University? In answer to this the committee concluded that: the intercollegiate athletic program is an integral part of the total university. It exists to complement the mission and enhance the overall environment of ISU. It supports goals in the University Mission statement by: providing co-curricular activities, programs, and services that augment the formal education of students and maximizes their involvement in the educational process; and it provides access and services for special populations including minorities and students with special talents. Other questions considered were: What is a broad-based athletic program? How important is a broad-based program? etc.

The Finance Committee was composed of: John Dossey, Chair; Claude Graeff; Dan Schramm; Paul Walker; Donna Workman; and Larry Lyons.

John Dossey: Our committee studied two basic sets of data: the ISU Athletic Department's Long Range Plan, and other ISU data which included histories of the income fund, student fees, booster support, receipts and tuition waivers from 1985-

1989, and secondly, Missouri Valley Conference Financial Support Comparison Data, and comparisons with Gateway Conference and other Illinois State institutions. Appendix E contains the financial reports. (Explanation of financial reports.)

We found that the NCAA, Gateway Conference and Missouri Valley Conference data comparisons showed ISU's strength in terms of money from fund raising and departmental generated revenues. 1988 was roughly typically short on student fees. The department's long range planning document gave two pictures of finances in the future.

Table A shows a comparison of projected revenue sources: 23% from the Income Fund; 40% from Student Fees; 17% from Department Generated Funds; and 13% from Fund Raising (RESF); and 7% from Tuition Waivers.

Table B shows an analysis of projected revenue accounts at FY88 proportions. The committee had three findings and recommendations:

1. That current levels in proportional funding of the athletic department be maintained. Such a policy requires immediate attention to closing the widening gap between the proportional share and actual contributions from student fees. Any shortfalls should come from student fees which allow students input in funding decisions before income fund money is considered. Funding decisions should take into account the politically driven financial realities within the state which may alter idea proportional funding levels.
2. The current mix of contributions appears appropriate. The committee recommends that any new initiatives be covered by generated funds.
3. Regarding a crisis management plan, the Athletic Director will develop recommendations and communicate them as a department recommendation to the Athletic Council and the President. The Athletic Council can either concur or present a separate written recommendation to the President. The President of the University will make the final decision.

The State of Illinois Legislative Audit Commission audits the funds.

Senator Mohr: Are you going to "read" each of the reports to us? We can read them ourselves. Will we be permitted to ask questions?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The question and answer session will follow the committee's full report.

The Facilities Committee was composed of: Scott Williams, Chair; John Dossey; Dan Hackman; and Joe Warner. Chairperson Scott Williams had no report.

The Performance Committee was composed of: Mary Ann Webb, Chair; Al Otto; Scott Rendleman; Thomas Ryan; and Susan Smith. Thomas Ryan reported that the committee studied personnel issues. One recommendation was that the staff be raised by 1 1/2 -2 FTE. They also studied comparisons of ISU with other institutions in regard to GPA, graduation rates and placement following graduation. Of the approximately 400 students in athletics, the average GPA was 2.54 in the Fall; and 2.80 in the Spring. ISU has a graduation rate of 55.7% overall, with a rate of 48.7% for recruited student athletes. These statistics indicate that our athletes perform better in the classroom than athletes at other large public universities and many of our conference schools in terms of graduation rates. Team performance showed ISU as the top 3 of 8 schools in the Missouri Valley Conference; and as the top 2 of 10 schools in the Gateway Conference.

The Communications and Image Committee was composed of: Susan Smith, Chair; Dan Hackman; Scott Rendleman; Joe Warner; Scott Williams; and Donna Jo Workman. Chairperson Susan Smith reported on the public relations aspect of athletics. The athletic program at ISU has contributed positively to the University's image in that it is a well-rounded program which supports the perception of ISU as a comprehensive university. The basketball program in particular has been one with a proud tradition and creates enthusiastic support from various constituencies. The athletic department has recently capitalized on its fundraising potential while maintaining its integrity, and the continuation of this endeavor should be encouraged. Recommendations to address anti-athletic sentiments among various groups included: (1) continuing to ensure significant student representation on committees which make decisions regarding athletics; (2) continuing recent innovations to increase visibility and interaction between athletics and students such as tailgating, special events, assisting on move-in day and meetings with residential advisors and Greeks; (3) making available pertinent information on athletics and funding of programs to students and faculty; (4) continuing efforts to reach out to faculty, such as offering free tickets to football games, voluntary coaches program, tailgating events, speaking to departmental meetings and offering significant faculty discounts on tickets; (5) continuing to take steps to support academic performance of student athletes; and (6) cultivating effective working relationships with the Pantagraph and local and Chicago media representatives.

The Governance Committee was composed of: Al Otto, Chair; Claude Graeff; Dan Schramm; Susan Smith; and Paul Walker. Chairperson Al Otto stated that Athletics reports directly to the President. There was concern that the Athletic Director have direct access to the President. The conduct of the Athletic Department falls under the rules and regulations of the NCAA.

QUESTIONS

Senator Zeidenstein: The third paragraph, basically when you refer to subcategories of sources of funds, student fees and tuition support are classified together. For example, about half way down in that third paragraph, you say that ISU is ninth in student fees or tuition support, etc. Is it not possible to separate income fund (tuition) from student fee funds. Not only for this University, but in comparison to other universities, is that possible?

John Dossey: That was not possible in comparison with other universities because of the way the data was given to us. They are different accounts. In order to make a direct comparison, you would be making a comparison with only two other schools. Say, three on this one, two on that one. In order to get a picture of state support, that was the best we could do.

President Wallace: For clarification, one of the problems is that private universities combine tuition and fees.

Senator Zeidenstein: Well, it is a problem. But, if you look at tuition as something that students have no voice over and fees as something that students sometimes have a choice or a vote on, there is that distinction.

President Wallace: The difference between a public and private university is that quite often a private university charges tuition which covers everything (athletics, library costs, etc.) where a public university is forced by the state to separate the two. This is why it is difficult to do a study.

John Dossey: There are private institutions in NCAA. In the comparison data for the Missouri Valley Conference, they were all public institutions. In the valley there are private institutions, but we only used public institutions in our comparisons.

Senator Zeidenstein: On page 7, the last paragraph under your first question, the second paragraph from the bottom on the page concerning your recommendations. "The Committee recommends the current levels in proportional funding of the athletic department be maintained." Why? Having established that you are recommending the same proportional levels of money from different sources, "Such a policy requires immediate attention to closing

the widening gap between the proportional share and actual contributions from student fees. Any shortfalls in the budget for the athletic department should be met first from fees which allow students the opportunity for input on the funding decisions before income fund money is considered." Two questions on that last sentence. How do students have input over how their fees are used or who makes the decision for the students? Who, if anybody, is given input about whether or how income fund money is used? You are setting priorities, first the students pay through their fees, but they have some input on the funding decision. The second priority is that income fund money is considered, but no one apparently has any input on how much income fund money is used. Have you thought about the structure by which students have input? Had you thought about the implication that there is no provision for input about the use of income fund, i.e. tuition fund?

John Dossey: I will go back to what our basis was to review the internal report and provide a status report for that. We basically said that there is a widening gap in the data. Students do have the opportunity, in fact they exercised that opportunity yesterday on this campus in voting on a referendum to increase their student fees. I would assume that type of an increase of an additional \$3.00 or \$4.00 charge in an athletic fee would come before the students as a vote. In the case of income fund, I think it is either the Academic Senate or the Administration that takes the leadership in monitoring that.

Senator Zeidenstein: But, this is a recommendation from your committee. You are simply recommending the priority of funds, which makes it look like your committee is endorsing these two sources. If a recommendation is not an endorsement, I don't know what a recommendation is.

John Dossey: This is a work of the entire committee. This is not the wording that came from the Finance Committee. What you see is what the report says.

Senator Walker: In all fairness, we had a little different language, but President Wallace wanted it written this way so that he would buy off on it in terms that were acceptable for him in dealing with political realities such as dealing with the Board of Regents.

President Wallace: Let me explain. We had gone through four years with no tuition increase and what we discussed was that if you are sitting here trying to build a budget and balancing all these things -- if you go through a four-year period of time with no tuition increase, you certainly can't develop a budget from income or tuition money. The question was raised, what do you do to build a budget if students do not approve a fee increase? Every year we don't have an

institutional option. That left us an option of balancing that off and giving the institution some flexibility.

Senator Walker: Also, I think as a member of that committee, I would have to plead ignorance. I didn't realize that recommendation means endorsement.

Senator Zeidenstein: Check a dictionary.

President Wallace: It was my understanding that the only thing now paid out of tuition dollars are the positions of the people, nothing else. Years ago there were a fixed number of positions. Those positions reflect an annual increase in salary. The decision isn't much of a decision when all you are doing is using tuition dollars to pay salaries.

Senator Zeidenstein: Then the approximate \$800,000 to \$900,000 used from income fund taken from tuition dollars, all of that is used to pay athletic department salaries?

President Wallace: Yes, all of it.

Senator Zeidenstein: I don't know at what level funding, increased proposal, or whether it is the purpose for which student fees will be used for increases. What is the criteria and the drive as to whether there is a student referendum about whether they will increase their fees?

Senator Gamsky: Let me explain the student fee process. All student fee processes are monitored by the Student Affairs Office. Funds are allocated through processes which have been specifically approved by the University administration and student leaders. The Student Affairs Office works with the student leaders to set up the constituencies including the SBBB, the Student Regent, the Black Student Union, the Vice Chair of the Senate, etc. We have a policy whereby we establish these committees with as least twice as many students as administrators on them so that the students will be in control. Usually, the administrators involved present the data and research. Part of the process is that any information the students ask for (budgets, salaries, expenses, income) is provided. The fee process goes on for a period of months. The boards meet for many hours. Resource people present charts and analyses. It is an elaborate and complex process. Frequently administrators are asking for more money in whatever area it is needed, and students challenge administrators concerning the amount. It is a give and take proposition on both sides. What arrives out of that process is a consensus of what the administrators want and what the students want. Major student constituencies then may vote on the recommendations: ARH votes on it, the SBBB votes on it, etc. All that information is forwarded to me and I prepare a final report that is given to the President. This is the process.

There is not a referendum on these fees.

Senator Richardson: There is no limit to how much you raise the student fees?

Senator Gamsky: No.

Senator Zeidenstein: Speaking just to student fees input into Athletics, is the implication of what you have just said, an accurate implication that if the various elected student leaders declined to authorize a rise in student fees for athletic funding, or decline to authorize as much of a rise as was asked for, then the fall-back is to make up any amount of money needed from income fund dollars?

Senator Gamsky: No. The income fund dollars are fixed. Unless the President overruled the committee's recommendations, we would then have to try to get money from other sources or cut expenses.

Senator Zeidenstein: Cut expenses or cut programs! Thank you. I have a question for Dr. Dossey, on page 9, Table B, the first and the third rows of data on Income Fund, under Student Fees, there is a negative differential between the amount projected and the amount given to maintain the proportions. There is also a negative amount on Income Fund between Present Projections from the Athletic Department as opposed to grade line projections to maintain the same proportions. Especially on Income Fund, but I could ask the same question on Student Fees, does this shortfall or differential concern mean by implication or by inference that your committee or the entire committee wants to increase the dollar amount taken from tuition or increase the dollar amount of student fees or both because of the difference between projections and maintained proportions?

John Dossey: No. We presented the data in a model which we thought would be understandable in proportions we had for 1988. The percentage breakdown is given at the top of page 10. We were not recommending any increase. This model was to show potential differences that can arise given the projections across to 1994. If you are not taking the money from the Income Fund, where do you need to make up the money, given the fact that you are reaching a place where you are topped out on Booster money and department generated funds. This was based on evidence from other athletic directors at other institutions.

Senator Zeidenstein: What are the present projections based upon? What kind of data? What kind of assumptions?

John Dossey: The figures for 1994 projections were based on the Athletic Department's Long Range Plan.

Ron Wellman: If the 1988 budget were maintained at that level, those were projections that were used for 1989-1994.

Senator Zeidenstein: What are you doing -- adding some inflation factor or what? What causes the amount of money to increase?

Ron Wellman: We used a 5% per year inflation factor.

Senator Liedtke: The document we received does not contain pages 10-13. We do not have any recommendations here. Some of the information is missing. We do not see that any programs will be cut. Where is that information?

John Dossey: These recommendations are paraphrased in the document. They are not exactly as they appear on the screen.

Senator Liedtke: No, that is not what I am asking, but its close. In recommendation number one, in your presentation of it you had indicated that should there be a shortfall, it would be taken care of by student fees, the income fund, or program cuts. Neither in your recommendations on the screen or in your document do the words "programs will be cut" appear. Is this a sense of your committee, the whole task force, or just your personal feeling?

John Dossey: If you would refer in the document, further over, there is a crisis management plan given on page 15. We were asked not to read the document to you.

Senator Liedtke: What I am indicating is that what you have and what we have are two different things. If this is not going to correspond with what we have, I am asking you where that information is that we are supposed to be basing our judgments on.

John Dossey: The Crisis Management Plan spells out the recommendations in that area. That talks about the process.

Senator Richardson: What you are proposing is that if there is a shortfall, first the students pay through higher student fees, higher tuition or income fund, and finally that program cuts will take place -- in that order. I would rather see tuition come last.

John Dossey: You are asking me to make policy for the committee that goes beyond what the committee gave. Page 7 or the third paragraph on page 5.

Senator Liedtke: That does not say that programs will be cut. In Recommendation 2, it indicates that any new initiatives in the athletic department should be met by department generated funds. I assume that to mean gate receipts and things of

that nature. Would new programs be allowed to be initiated while other programs that are negative revenue generating (negative gates) be able to cover those programs?

John Dossey: Yes, that is what currently happens. This is just talking about the overall budget and the required money.

Senator Liedtke: So it would be possible based on that recommendation to add new programs without covering for the use of generated gate receipts the costs that are now being incurred by student fees and tuition dollars?

John Dossey: If they are approved, via the approval process.

Senator Liedtke: If the football team or basketball team suddenly generates additional gate receipts, it would be possible to initiate new programs prior to using those gate receipts to reduce student fees and reduce the use of income dollars for athletics. Can we look at Table A. The third set of bars for Income Fund show an increase of projections on the part of the athletic department as to their needs of income fund dollars. In March 1989, the Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution which requested that the administration show a manner in which they could decrease the use of income fund dollars for athletics. Why is an increase in the use of income fund dollars shown when we were promised that there would be a plan for the decrease in income fund dollars?

John Dossey: Our charge was to make a study of the extant information, both internal and external, and to present you with a status report on it. That is what we have done. Our charge was not to develop that particular point.

Senator Liedtke: I am not asking if you were to develop that particular plan, but why is the athletic department providing us with data that is showing an increase when in fact the plan to decrease is supposed to be in the offing?

John Dossey: I cannot speak for the athletic department. I do believe that that data that we were provided was extant and existing in their document prior to the time of the Senate resolution.

Senator Liedtke: So no changes have occurred over the course of this last year with regard to this resolution?

Senator Whitacre: I would like to commend the Athletic Director and his staff on the outstanding hosting of the Missouri Valley Conference. It was excellent. Applause. I should address my question to Dean Ryan because he was the one who mentioned facilities in his presentation.

In reading the document, it appears that recommendation three is to put the athletic director in charge of all athletic facilities. I am assuming that would mean Redbird Arena, Horton Fieldhouse, the playing fields, etc.? What type of consideration was given to academic units that also use those facilities -- for managing conflicts, scheduling problems, etc?

Senator Williams: The report also mentioned on the bottom of Page 18, "The Athletic and Recreation Coordinating Council should be convened to discuss events to be scheduled in the Arena. The original charge to the Council was to address questions concerning maintenance, scheduling and other 'usage' issues. The Council should also look at meeting once a semester to discuss the scheduling of events in the Arena. The Council should continue to meet as needed to discuss other facility and coordination issues." That committee meets to discuss the use of athletic and recreational facilities on campus. The committee was formed in 1987 with the charge to deal with those specific issues. All the representative bodies such as students, people from physical education, people from continuing education, and people from athletics are on that committee. That committee should be used and it is structured to deal with your concerns.

Senator Whitacre: This committee ends up voting on whether or not a physical education class will be held in place of basketball practice or whatever? Is that what it comes down to? Or does someone have to make that decision?

Senator Williams: There is a policy statement in the back of the document which senators do not have. It was developed for specific uses of Horton Fieldhouse concerning shared facilities with the Physical Education Department. It gives the time schedule, and academics does have a priority in that. I will provide you with my copy of the time schedule and the rationale for decision making.

Senator Whitacre: Then academics do have preference in the use of these facilities?

Senator Williams: Yes, in the areas that are shared facilities by academics.

Senator Richardson: I would like to refer to Dr. Dossey's presentation on institutional spending for athletics. I realize that it was outside your committee's charge, but I think we should consider not only how comparable we are with other institutions with respect to the number of students, but also how comparable we are with respect to funds available for instruction. I would like to share with the Senate information that I

obtained from U. S. News and World Report on "America's Best Colleges." In contrast to your report, the names of the colleges are included in this comparison. In other words, institutions are not embarrassed to cite what they spend on instruction in contrast to what they spend on athletics. When one considers what level of spending from university sources for athletics is appropriate, one should also consider the amount of money spent on academic programs and instruction. As I indicated in the article I had in the Vidette last week, ISU's instruction budget per student ranks in the bottom of all national colleges and universities in the USA. On the hand out, I have given data for all of the universities in the State, and the Missouri Valley and Gateway Conferences. I have included private universities in this comparison because private universities are in our athletic conferences and we compete with them for students each year. These data show that ISU's instruction budget per student is lowest in the Missouri Valley and Gateway Conferences. The average instructional cost per student in the schools in the two conferences was 100% higher than ISU. As Dr. Dossey indicated, ISU ranks somewhere in the middle of comparable schools with respect to the amount of institutional dollars spent on athletics; however, we rank way at the bottom with respect to the amount we spend on instruction. This is what many faculty resent about the use of tuition dollars for athletics. We need to spend these dollars on instruction not on athletics.

The next point I would like to raise concerns what the tuition dollars are used for in athletics. It has been stated that these dollars are used for salaries of personnel in the Athletic Department, e.g., coaches and trainers. What percent of the coaches are funded through the income fund?

Senator Williams: It is an X amount of dollars. It can be changed on a daily basis. It is a sum of money. Some coaches could realistically be paid out of an agency account and out of that account. To say how many are funded out of that would not be possible. We could give you a number today and tomorrow it might change.

Senator Richardson: I was just wondering what the figure might be -- 50%, 75%, 100%? I have been told that it was approximately 75%.

Senator Gamsky: That list includes all types of personnel in the athletic department -- not just coaches.

Senator Richardson: Of the people that are coaches and trainers that are paid by the income fund, what per cent are coaches on 12 month contracts?

Senator Williams: We do not have that information.

Senator Richardson: I have asked for this information several times in the past three months. The best I could determine with data I obtained from the library is that approximately 80% of the coaches and trainers who are paid from tuition dollars have twelve month contracts. The concern of the faculty stems from the fact that we spend tuition dollars for twelve month contracts for coaches and trainers but we have nothing like this for faculty who are responsible for teaching and research at ISU. I have checked with my department, the Biology department, the English department, and the Political Science Department and asked the department chairs what percent of their faculty have twelve month contracts from the University. Only five to ten percent of the faculty (which includes the Chairs) have eleven or twelve month contracts. Is it appropriate to use tuition dollars for twelve month salaries in the athletic department when this does not occur in the academic departments?

President Wallace: We are working on data for Calendar Year 1988. There were abnormalities in the data for 1988. In looking at the total compensation for faculty at ISU in 1988, anything that came through the University that faculty get paid for, and the average looks very good. On the average, tenure track faculty had eleven months of compensation for 1988.

Senator Richardson: You should make sure these data are accurate. In my nineteen years at ISU, I have never received more than ten months of support from the University. However, I have received summer support from external grants. Faculty in my college are expected to seek external funds for summer support. Why is this not the same required of the athletic personnel? The academic community is not playing on a level field with respect to athletics at ISU.

President Wallace: For example, what if a faculty member teaches one course per semester year after year after year. I don't know what the answer to that is.

Senator Richardson: All of the data show that the faculty loads at ISU are higher than loads at comparable state universities. In addition, the administration loses site of the effort faculty put into directing graduate students in the summer without any support. For example, a young faculty member in our department had five J.S. students finish their degrees last summer. She had a research grant in Texas that paid her summer salary; however, she gave up this summer support to stay at ISU for two months, without salary, to help the students complete their degrees. This is not an isolated case, it happens all the time. We tell faculty that "we don't have money for you to direct student research in the summer" and we turn around and provide twelve month salaries for coaches. It is not fair.

President Wallace: We need to look at Senator Richardson's list of schools in the Missouri Valley Conference and the faculty/student ratio and the instructional cost. I would like to point out that I did a quick check of these schools compared to ISU. For the rank of Professor, ISU salaries are number two; For an Associate Professor, they are number one; and for an Assistant Professor they are number one. I hope you don't take this to be a flip comment, but I tried to look at the other side of the coin. As far as ISU faculty salaries compare to those institutions, how much money do we have to play with. Just to give you an example, with that excess faculty salary money we could hire 125 new Assistant Professors to lower our student/faculty ratio. Another thing I would like to see us look at is how we would compare to these institutions when it came to computer facilities, library facilities, and other things. What I am saying is that there is a lot we need to categorize when we sit down as a Budget Committee and talk about our priorities. We need to use the data that has been compiled and identify the questions. I think these are really important questions.

Senator Richardson: I can see we could bring up the faculty / student ratio if we reduced faculty salaries and increased the number of faculty. However, we must remember that the number of students we educate at ISU is very large compared to the number of faculty at ISU; therefore, it shows how efficient faculty at ISU are compared with almost all other universities. However, reducing salaries and increasing the number of faculty members would make no difference in the instruction cost per student at ISU. We would still rank at the bottom of the list!

I have one last question of the Committee. During the past few years, the views of Dr. Klass and myself with respect to using tuition dollars for athletics have been painted by the administration as out of step with our fellow colleagues at ISU. I am truly concerned that the committee failed to look at faculty attitudes and student attitudes towards athletics. As I understand, the committee conducted no survey of the faculty.

Susan Smith: The goal of our subcommittee was not to survey public opinion but to identify the factors which posed barriers to effective communication and public relations between the athletic program and its constituent groups (students, faculty, alumni, and other community persons). Our subcommittee felt that we did not have the capacity to adequately survey faculty, students alumni, and others. We decided that our time would be most productively used by assessing problematic areas in communication and making recommendations for addressing them.

Senator Richardson: On page 23 of the report, you list factors that contribute to anti-athletic sentiment, "Anti-athletic sentiment peaked among ISU faculty in 1981 and 1989, two periods

of significant financial hardship within the University." To be quite honest, I don't see how you can reach such a conclusion without some type of survey instrument. I did not realize anti-athletic sentiment peaked at these times. Did you study any previous surveys of faculty opinion in this area?

Susan Smith: No.

Senator Richardson: One place where you could have obtained data on faculty opinion would be from the Educational Leadership Initiative, which was conducted in the Spring and Summer of 1988. This survey went to 818 faculty members on regular contracts and had a 46% return rate. In other words, a large number of faculty were surveyed. In this survey, one of the questions dealt with identifying and ranking twenty programs with characteristics that were essential to the mission of an ideal multi-purpose university. One of the twenty programs was a competitive inter-collegiate athletic program. In this survey, a competitive athletic program ranked dead last of the twenty programs ranked as being an essential program. In addition, almost 42% of the faculty indicated that a competitive athletic program was inconsistent with an ideal multi-purpose university. I am not saying that we should do away with athletics; however, you can't say, as you did in the report, that "a few faculty are academic purists who view athletics in general as a distraction." It seems that it would be more accurate to say that "a few faculty feel that athletics is essential for an ideal institution and a significant number question athletics' relationship to our mission." More importantly, I would hope that there would be some assessment of student attitudes to athletics and student attendance at athletic events, especially in light of the fact that student fees are a major factor in the support of athletics at ISU. The Vidette suggests that student participation in athletic events is very limited. Several people have stated that the survey was flawed and inaccurate. In my field, if I publish something that someone disagrees with, the proper response is to show, with data, why I am wrong. In other words, if you want to criticize the methods used by the Vidette, conduct a better designed study. We need more input from students because two thirds of the money for athletics at ISU comes from students either in fees or tuition. This should be done by a campus-wide survey and not from students sitting on various committees.

Senator Goldstein: I am not trained to comment on projections, as I am used to only straight line projections. This is not an econometric model. Let's assume it is a decent model. The data in this Athletic Strategic Plan will be important in creating funding options. It seems that you keep using the term shortfall. Any major shortfalls are going to have a tremendous impact on student fees and tuition. We do not have the data on projected shortfalls. Have projected costs been factored into your maintenance? It would seem that even a straight line pro-

jection should have costs. I don't see any cost data at all.

John Dossey: We are taking a look at the cost data built in by percentage increase. We added in 5% inflation per year. What we were basically comparing was maintaining the percentages that the allocations for their 1988 budgets. The way it was protected in their budget, in their Long Range Planning document versus maintaining those percentages across time. That would change the percent.

Senator Goldstein: You are saying that the cost is factored in that projected 5% inflation increase? The larger costs are not factored in?

John Dossey: No. The dollar amount per cost is in the total amount projected for each year.

Senator Goldstein: This is revenues. Is that total gains minus costs? If costs increase at a different rate than the revenues, then you have to increase the shortfalls. It seems that costs have to be considered independently and not as some constant factor.

John Dossey: We are going against a balanced budget. We are trying to budget those costs.

Senator Walker: Cost equals revenue -- therefore a balanced budget.

Senator Goldstein: Cost equals revenue?

Senator Mohr: Like any government department, they spend every dollar they get.

Senator Goldstein: It would seem that in projecting shortfalls, it might be important to consider the costs independently from the income to see what the difference is. My second question is that there is no statement about what will happen if you get surpluses. For instance if we get Bradley's television contract. Will there be some rule that says the money will go back into the income fund.

John Dossey: There is a cap on reserves that can be rolled over at the end of the year. This is established by the Illinois Legislative Audit Commission. I think this goes into general university funds. What the Athletic Department can maintain and roll over, it can have.

Senator Mohr: To add a bit of levity, concerning the august, decision-making body of the Senate, my mother once said, "Oh yes, I know all about committees.....there's a session, a report,

and the matter is dropped." When I read the preamble to this, the committee's charge was: "The Athletic Strategic Planning Committee will review all internal and external studies of ISU athletic programs currently being conducted. After examination of all issues, analysis of all information and employing external consultants, the Committee will prepare a status report for the University community. The report will address funding levels, governance structure, student academic performance, support services and competitiveness of the ISU athletic program. Further, the Committee will compare ISU's performance relative to comparable Division I institutions in cost as well as performance paying particular attention to the need for a balanced educational experience for undergraduates. Recommendations to strengthen individual programs, attendance and donor support will be addressed." You indicated that you had some recommendations. I assumed that you had some idea how to implement these. Can you tell me to whom did you think you were making these recommendations? Were you just throwing them out there to anyone in the University community?

John Dossey: We were providing recommendations to the Strategic Plan for the Athletic Department which is then turned over to the University.

Senator Mohr: Who is the University -- the Academic Senate?

Senator Walker: In my opinion, as a member of the committee, we were turning it over to the Strategic Planning Committee of the University like all other Departments and Colleges on campus did with their Strategic Planning Documents.

Senator Mohr: I still have a problem with the procedures here. What is the Senate doing with this report here? Are we the University community. Is anyone going to pay attention to this document? What is the procedure? Do we approve this?

President Wallace: We are thinking of this as being one of eight strategic plans that I talked about earlier. Because of so much interest in the athletics, when we were circulating that document to the University community last November, we sent a copy of the document to the Academic Senate and the Student Affairs Committee. The Athletic Council did discuss this plan and whether they sent a recommendation to the Senate Student Affairs Committee, I don't know. We gave this document much more attention as to distribution than we did any of the other 8.

Senator Mohr: Will some action be taken on this?

President Wallace: I think that is up to the Senate. The Senate may wish to send this to a committee, or ask the Athletic Council if they have come to a conclusion on a recommendation or send it to the Student Affairs Committee, which could then bring it to the Senate.

Senator Mohr: On that understanding, we have spent quite a bit of time on this, I would like to see some kind of results on this. I have two more questions. In the discussion, on Page 16 of the report, there is a procedure for the Senate to review athletics: "At the beginning of each fall semester, at the request of the Athletic Director or at the invitation of the Academic Senate, the Athletic Director may address the Academic Senate on issues of general budget (major sources of revenue and major areas of expenditures), academics (team GPA's, graduation rates, etc.), and other topics deemed appropriate. To facilitate a meaningful dialogue, questions should be submitted in advance to the Chair of the Senate for submission to the Athletic Director." It is a little open-ended, but there are some specifics. Since we are uninformed, unless it is presented to us, how can we respond with meaningful questions if we don't know what the message is going to be. It seems to me that we should be supplied with a formal report if we are going to submit formal questions. Is this may or is it must? It would appear that this is one of the duties of the Athletic Director. Is it your understanding that this is voluntary on his part?

Al Otto: No. It is my understanding that the Academic Senate would have access to the reports and the Long Range Plan for the Athletic Department. These reports give information about the Athletic Department. The intent of having these budgets submitted and then to submit questions in advance is that many times these questions deal with factual information which the Athletic Director may or may not have available at his or her fingertips. It gives them an opportunity to be prepared to answer questions.

Senator Mohr: The intent is not to preempt information from the floor of the Senate?

Al Otto: No. The intent is that when a report is given to the Senate, there will be questions at that time. I am sure that when the Athletic Director makes his report to the Senate that he will be prepared to answer questions.

Senator Mohr: On Page 5, Item 5, on adding, deleting, or reducing sports: "Who should decide, and on what basis should the decision be made, as to which sports are appropriate to offer at Illinois State University?" and there are some criteria listed: "Any decision to add, delete or reduce sports should be based on the following criteria: tradition, available facilities, financial status, available talent, gender equity, regional interest, offerings at peer institutions, conference requirements, competitiveness, interest of the University and/or interest of the community." There are a lot of criteria, but none of

them have any relevance to the academic mission of the University. There is a sentiment throughout the document that somehow the academic program of the University should be enriched by athletic programs. Nowhere do I see that connection made. Certainly I don't find convincing that the University needs a good, solid, very successful athletic program in order to be academically excellent. Is there that message in there? Or are we to become subsidiaries of the conglomerate?

Senator Zeidenstein: If you read the last sentence in that paragraph on Page 5: "In most situations the criteria of financial status of the athletic department and the University (both apparently equal there) in combination with tradition of sports offerings, available facilities and general interest will be given the most emphasis." So it is narrowed down to about a half a dozen there. To hail back to a book written many years ago, "The Two Cultures." In humanities and science, you have to substitute one culture for another.

Senator Hall: Regarding finances, and a prior question by Sen. Zeidenstein on Page 3, and the discussion about the student referendum to increase fees. It seems to be a moot point when the plan states on Page 7, "Any shortfalls in the budget for the athletic department should be met first from fees which allow students the opportunity for input on the funding decisions before income fund money is considered." It would appear that the student voter is just symbolic here and that it really has no bearing on how much money is actually going to be spent on athletics. Is this sentence really saying that students have a choice over: (A) paying more for athletics from their fees; or (B) They will still pay more for athletics, but have that amount paid from their tuition money, which is the income fund.

John Dossey: I can just react in that the recommendation that was made was done by the committee. We have already mentioned the reason for that. We argued that a greater percentage of the income fund must be devoted to athletics.

Senator Gamsky: I think there is some confusion involved here. The income fund portion is fixed. It is a set number of positions that are funded through the income fund. That doesn't increase. It only goes up with raises. If there is a 6% salary increase on the average, it goes up 6%. If it is 3%, it goes up 3%. This is a fixed amount which does not vary unless there is a salary increase granted to the University. The only change that would come in that would be if an administrative decision was made about the number of positions and that has not occurred for at least ten years. Another thing is the proportion of student fee dollars (36%) that we have said a couple of times is not the majority of the budget. If there is a difficulty in the budget, it does not automatically mean that students will be asked to pay for it. You create a budget like any

department does, then you attempt to live within that budget.

Senator Ritt: I am hearing a lot of talk about projections. I still do not understand them. I calculated the total department expenditure to be 6% compounded. Then I just hear the statement of Vice President Gamsky, and I look at the income fund chart, the first three projections, and pass a straight line through them, then at the last four projections and pass a line through them. They are not the same straight line. I have a little problem understanding the remarks. There is a slight discrepancy. It looks to me as though the total 5% or 6% was sort of made up of the inflationary costs of the department and then that the student fees increased at a slightly greater rate than that and the tuition waivers increased at a slightly less rate than that, and the income fund increased in a wavering sort of line. Then I look at the department generated (Redbird Club) funds. I would be the first person to agree that it is almost impossible to make a sharp prediction as to what those are going to be. I would assume that between yesterday and today there has been a significant increase in the predictions for this year's giving. I would hope that would continue. I suspect that these estimates, particularly in department generated funds, are projections which fit in with the hopes of the department, but which are not based upon any real projections of what the athletic program should be. I would like to be optimistic and think that that part of the department generated funds is the future of the finances of the athletic department of the university. I worked at a university that sold a hundred thousand football tickets to every game. The athletics were completely self-supporting. I don't think this will happen at Illinois State University. I would suggest that we make this a real strategic plan and make a commitment not necessarily to holding the department growth to a minimum by doing away with minor sports, but to at least have a contingency so we have some sort of a way of knowing what we are going to do if those department-generated funds increase. That is the opportunity that we have. And we should consider reducing the income fund.

Senator Schramm: I have two questions for two senators. Senator Mohr, you said in your remarks that you see an unimportant relationship between athletics and academics. I would like to ask you another question, since tuition dollars also go to other programs, wouldn't you agree that the University Museums and the University Groundskeeping are also irrelevant to academics.

Senator Mohr: I did not say that athletics was irrelevant. I said it was not supported by a connection. The report talks about the synergistic program and strength of the athletic program. However, there is nothing in the program that makes that connection. In the criteria for selecting the sports

that will be played at ISU, none of those criteria made any reference to academics.

Senator Schramm: Seeing that there are tuition dollars used, do you have anything to say about the University groundskeeping, or the University Museums?

Senator Mohr: I don't see any relevance of your examples. Keeping the grounds neat is simply a matter of housekeeping. I think that we owe that to the community. I do not see how that would make you a good scholar. I do not see the connection of that with the athletic plan. The Museums are a store of the artifacts, values and culture of a people and the University would suffer severely academically without these.

Senator Schramm: You don't think that the University would suffer a loss if the athletic program was cut by 1.1 million dollars? -- from a community standpoint also?

Senator Mohr: If they lost a million and a half dollars, they would certainly suffer. But, there is no reason why we could not gradually phase out certain areas of support. When I was fourteen years old, my father called me into his office and asked me what I had done with the money he gave me for the movies. I knew I was caught. I said, "I bought cigarettes with it." He said, "I resent it if you use the money I give you for one thing for another purpose. If you want to smoke, I will see that you get cigarette money. I do resent being lied to." If we collect money for tuition, for academic tuition, it ought to be spent on the academic programs.

Senator Schramm: As a student, my viewpoint is that I see athletics as being important to the wholistic approach to academics. I would like to ask Senator Richardson about the education survey he quoted from U. S. News and World Report. Since you feel strongly about the results of this poll, did an educational center do this survey for them or was it just the reporters at the magazine?

Senator Richardson: Although this was true several years ago, it is not currently true. The ranking of the universities was based on other parameters than ranking by Presidents, for example graduation rate, faculty teacher ratio, instructional budget per student, and the quality of the student body as determined by the percentage of the freshman students who graduated in the top 10% of their high school class.

Senator Schramm: On this, where it says additional universities in the Gateway Conference. It lists Western Illinois University as number one. Being realistic, do you think that Western Illinois University is a better undergraduate university than ISU? Do you find that they have trouble attracting students to their

university? And maybe the reason why their i
per student is higher than ISU's is that the
does not want to take money away from Wester

Senator Richardson: I have no idea why Wes
budget per student is high. However, they
the top institutions by U. S. News and Worl
factors were considered in ranking institut
tion, quality of faculty, graduation rate,
dentsfaculty, the graduation rates, the pe
in the top of their graduating class, etc.
just one of the things used. I can tell
facilities are 100% better than ours. I
puses of several universities on this lis
cally state that based on the number of s
facilities are much poorer than other in

Senator Schramm: Of the universities t
ranked high, were the quality of facilit
included?

Senator Richardson: Facilities were not included.

Senator Liedtke: Point of order. Were we not supposed to be
asking questions of the committee?

Chairperson Schmaltz: I was just about to remind the Senator
of that.

President Wallace: That "U.S. News & World Report" survey is
a survey of college presidents. You get a list of the schools
that reply. I throw mine in the trash can each year.

Senator Richardson: I am not sure that this survey is done
that way.

Senator Strand: A reference was made to the publication, "How
to Get an Ivy League Education in a State University," in which
Illinois State University is included. Consumer Reports indi-
cated that that was one of the best college guides available in
the nation to parents and prospective students.

Senator Alstrum: On page 7, the second paragraph, says:
"Reports by two external consultants suggest that the athletic
department is nearing its ceiling in terms of generating external
contributions. This is an especially troubling projection since
the program has relied on increased external funding and in-
creased external funding and increased generated revenues to
offset the proportional decline in student fee support." Is
there hard data available on the correlation of relative success
or failure of major sports programs and the contributions that
they generate?

John Dossey: There is data about the level of contributions to a university. There is none about the success of the athletic program.

Senator Liedtke: I would like to defer to Senator Richardson at this time and ask to speak later.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I have a few people on the list who have not had an opportunity to speak. You may yield to Senator Richardson.

XXI-95 Senator Liedtke: I make a motion to commit the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee report to the Senate Student Affairs Committee and the Budget Committee for review and report to the Academic Senate by the May 1990 Senate Meeting. (Second, Walker)

Parliamentarian Cohen: This motion would be in order since you are referring to a report that is on the floor of the Senate. It requires a majority to pass, and is both debatable and amendable.

XXI-96 Senator Richardson: I would like to amend the motion to read: To commit the Athletic Strategic Plan to the Senate Budget Committee with the instructions that it be revised consistent with the previous Sense of the Senate Resolution of March 22, 1989, and that it be resubmitted to the Senate for its approval by October 1, 1990. (Second, Hall)

Senate recessed for fifteen minutes.

Senator Edwards: In looking at Table A, it says "Steady State Growth" which suggests to me a linear growth. If you have a 5% decrease in the budget here, it would be geometric rather than linear.

John Dossey: I did not use the word linear. It came up in the discussion tonight. If you took the total percent and the total budget projected for the athletic department and put that down as a total dollar amount and applied those percents at the top of page 10 to each one of those, the unshaded bars of the graph would project in that same percentage source model against the projection values given in the departmental projections. That is what you have. Using the same percent of funds from student fees, tuition waivers, boosters, income fund, department generated. The model used for the University is 5% inflation. In fourteen years the athletic budget would be doubled.

Senator Liedtke: I withdraw my original motion (Second, Walker).

XXI-97 Senator Richardson: I move to commit the Athletic Strategic Plan to the Senate Budget Committee with the instructions that it be revised consistent with the previous Sense of the Senate

Resolution of March 22, 1989, and that it be resubmitted to the Senate for its approval by October 1, 1990. (Second, Liedtke).

This motion came from the comments made during the executive session that we had this evening. I believe that this motion is consistent with the Senate's view that policy issues, especially those that deal with intercollegiate athletics, should go through the Senate. Based on what happened with the report from the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee, I request that the Chair of the Senate and the President of the University work together to see that the report is submitted to the Senate and approved by the Senate. I would stress that members of the Senate are elected representatives of the faculty and students. Therefore, the Senate is the appropriate body to consider this issue. In addition, it is consistent with the ISU Constitution that the Senate is responsible for overseeing athletics. This was the spirit of the executive session. I feel this motion is better than the Sense of the Senate resolution I planned to propose this evening.

President Wallace: I would like to speak in support of this motion. I would like to thank members of the Senate for a good discussion about how to do this. I would like to review where we have been on this so we can see the connection between what we are now doing and what has been done in the past. The Spring, 1989 resolution resulted in the work of the Athletic Strategic Planning Committee. The September 1989 date was set by the Senate. The Strategic Planning group did finish their work in November, at which time that document was circulated on campus. I stated earlier how that was done. Unfortunately, I did not push to have that document formally sent to the Senate. However, the Athletic Council has reviewed the plan, and I am not aware if they have made a recommendation to the Student Affairs Committee. My final point is that Dr. Gamsky is very knowledgeable, to the point of being dangerous, about fee structures and is now doing the arena, recreation, and athletic fee processes for us. He and I have been working on this project, and as the Budget Committee has its deliberations we can share some of this work.

XXI-98 Senator Schramm: I would like to offer a friendly amendment: add "and the Student Affairs Committee". The Athletic Council is under the jurisdiction of the Student Affairs Committee. It would also involve more representation from the Senate.

Senator Richardson: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Liedtke: I accept the amendment.

Senator Richardson: I would also suggest that the entire student body be surveyed on this matter.

Senator Mohr: For clarification, the way the resolution reads, it limits the inquiry to the motion made earlier. Can they ask questions outside the original motion?

President Wallace: My thought was that the Senate would review this whole document and the Budget and Student Affairs Committees would then bring it in for approval.

Senator Mohr: Then those committees could consider the whole document?

Senator Richardson: I believe that there would be a good faith effort made to keep the document consistent with the motions that the Senate has passed.

XXI-99 Senator Ritt: I move the previous question. (Second, Liedtke) Motion carried on a 2/3 vote.

Vote on Richardson/Liedtke motion carried.

To commit the Athletic Strategic Plan to the Senate Budget Committee and the Student Affairs Committee with the instructions that it be revised consistent with the previous Sense of the Senate Resolution of March 22, 1989 (Resolution: Be it resolved that the administration present to the full Academic Senate in September 1989 a plan for the following: phasing out the use of the income fund <tuition dollars> for inter-collegiate athletics.) and that it be resubmitted to the Senate for its approval by October 1, 1990.

XXI-100 Senator Liedtke: I move adjournment. (Second, Hall). Motion failed 16 to 12.

ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Schramm: Results of a survey on Course Evaluations was distributed to you tonight. The current students rights and advocacy director, Kirsten Lynch, had to leave this evening, but she will be at the next Senate meeting to explain the survey.

Senator Newby: As Chair of the Rules Committee, I have a slate of committee appointments to bring forward.

Parliamentarian Cohen: Since this was not on the Agenda, it would require a 2/3 vote to move it to action status. It should be presented under Committee Reports.

Chairperson Schmaltz: You may bring this slate forward under committee reports.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - No report.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Richardson had no report.

Budget Committee - Senator Walker had no report. This is my last year on the Budget Committee and it has been a rewarding committee. I would like to thank the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt had no report.

Rules Committee - Senator Newby presented a slate of faculty appointments to Academic Senate External Committees.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Dent Rhodes, C & I	1993
Bruce Hawkins, ENG.	1993
Judith Lyles, BEA	1993

ATHLETIC COUNCIL

(Elected by the Senate)

David Wallace, ACS	1993
Mohamed Targhi-Tavakoli, HIS	1993

COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY STUDIES

Robert Stefl, Art	1993
Judith Mogilka, EAF	1993
Arnold Insel, MATH	1993
Mark Kaiser, FOR	1993
Paul Anderson, GEO	1991

ECONOMIC WELL BEING

Douglas DeLong, Milner Lib.	1993
Claude Graeff, MQM	1993

ENTERTAINMENT

Dwight Brooks, COMM.	1993
Bonnie Pomfret, Music	1993
Prakash Dheerija, FAL (Alternate)	

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

Gerry Chrisman, ACS	1993
Douglas Hardwick, Psych.	1993
Michael Schwartzkopf, Music	1993

FACULTY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Joaquin Vila, ACS	1993
-------------------	------

HONORS COUNCIL

Gail Simpson, ART 1993
Marty Nichols, SASW 1993

LIBRARY

Willard Bohn, FOR 1993

REINSTATEMENT

Randy Winter, AGRIC. 1993
Ken Jerick, Curr. & Instruc. 1993

STUDENT CENTER AUDITORIUM POLICY BOARD

David Doss, ACS 1993
Susan Smith, SASW (Alternate) 1993

STUDENT CENTER AUDITORIUM PROGRAMMING BOARD

Patricia Klass, EAF 1993
James Coe, SED (Alternate)

STUDENT CODE ENFORCEMENT AND REVIEW BOARD

Fred Taylor, C & I 1993
Jean Pankonian, HPERD (Alternate)

SCERB HEARING PANEL (Alternates)

Ellen Abshire, HPERD
Ronald Budig, HSC
David Draper, HPERD
Ryan Brown, HPERD
M. Gay Masters, Speech Path
Shailesh Tipnis, MATH

SCERB STUDENT GRIEVANCE PANEL

T. Todd Imahori, COMM. 1993
Ione Garcia, C & I 1993

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Eric Behr, MATH 1993
James Van DerLaan, FOR 1993
Carol Chrisman, ACS 1993
Robert Franklin, MKT. 1993

UNIVERSITY FORUM

Deborah Gentry, HEC 1993

XXI-101 Motion to approve this slate by Marilyn Newby (Second, Alstrum). Carried on a voice vote.

XXI-102 Motion to move the item to action stage by Newby (Second, Goldstein) carried.

Student Affairs Committee - Senator Schramm had no report.

Motion to Adjourn

XXI-103 Motion to adjourn by Senator Mowles (Second, Alstrum) carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JOHN B. FREED, SECRETARY

From: US News & World Report: America's Best Colleges, 1990

Institution	Student Faculty Ratio	Instruction Budget per Student
Illinois State U	22/1	\$1,881

Universities in the Missouri Valley Conference:

Indiana State U	15/1	\$3,960
University of Tulsa	10/1	\$4,350
Drake University	15/1	\$2,242
Southern Illinois U	17/1	\$3,546
Bradley University	15/1	\$2,705
Witchita State U	NA	\$3,198
Creighton University	12/1	\$8,801
Average of MVC Universities (- ISU)	14/1 (36% lower than ISU)	\$4,114 (119% higher than ISU)

Additional Universities in the Gateway Conference:

Western Illinois U	14/1	\$7,772
Eastern Illinois U	21/1	\$2,016
Southeastern Missouri	21/1	\$2,283
Northern Iowa U	17/1	\$2,006
Average of All MVC and Gateway Universities (-ISU)	15.7/1 (29% lower than ISU)	\$3,980 (107% higher than ISU)

Other Illinois Universities/Colleges

Northern Illinois U	22/1	\$2,441
U of Illinois (Urbana)	12/1	\$4,065
U of Illinois (Chicago)	9/1	\$6,395
University of Chicago	7/1	\$19,171
Northwestern University	8/1	\$8,562
Illinois Wesleyan U	14/4	\$3,319

Illinois Universities/Colleges that were ranked by US News & World Report as leading undergraduate universities:

Top 25 Universities in the Nation:
 University of Chicago.....9
 Northwestern University.....19
 Top Midwest Regional Universities/Colleges
 Illinois Wesleyan University.....1
 Bradley University.....5

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 1990

CORRECTIONS TO MARCH 7, 1990 ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES:

JOHN DOSSEY

Page 9, Bottom Paragraph: Our committee based our analyses on two sets of external information and a study of the internal budget data for the Athletic Department for the years 1985-1989, plus university projections for the program through 1994.

A comparison of ISU Athletic Department finances and data derived from programs at a set of comparable NCAA institutions and a set of public institutions in the Missouri Valley/Gateway conferences indicated that ISU's athletic program, on a percentage basis, raised a greater portion of its budget through fund raising and department generated funds. On the other hand, it derived a smaller percentage of its income through tuition sources.

Table A in the report shows a projection of department income sources through 1994 using the following selective percents of income sources: 23% - Income Fund; 40% - Student Fees; 17% - Department Generated Funds; 13% - Fund Raising (RESF); and 7% Tuition Waivers. These percents, for sources, reflect the 1988 portions of the Department's budget and appear reasonable in comparison with comparable institutions. The projections result from application of these percentages to the Athletic Department's projected budget for the years indicated. When compared to the sources the Department projects for its income. These projections indicate that the proportion expected from student activities fees does not maintain pace with the levels projected by maintenance of the 1988 proportions within the Department's projected budget. These analyses led to the recommendations made in the financial portion of the report.

Page 12, end of Paragraph three: These comparisons are not always possible due to different university accounting systems and differences in public/private income sources. If fine distinctions are to be made, the comparisons would be between only two or three schools.

Page 12, sixth paragraph: There are private institutions in the NCAA data. In the comparison data from the.....

Page 15, seventh paragraph, mid-page: The figures for the 1994 projections were based on financial data from the Athletic Department's Long Range Plan and budget data from 1984-1989.

Page 23, top of page: We are looking at the total departmental projected budget figure dissected by 1988 income category percentages. The Department's overall budget total is built on a 5% compounded rate of growth.