

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-27-1991

Senate Meeting, February 27, 1991

Academic Senate

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, February 27, 1991" (1991). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 577.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/577>

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

February 27, 1991

Volume XXII, No. 11

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:08 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes of February 13, 1991

XXII-53 Motion to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of February 13, 1991 by Ritch (Second, Nelsen) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Len Schmaltz had no remarks.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Eric Raucci had no remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Terrence Sykes was absent.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace clarified a few points from the last Senate meeting. One has to do with the 1% rescission for next year. There has been some confusion as to whether this is 1% of the appropriation or 1% of the general revenue. As you know the appropriation is made up of general revenue tax dollars and tuition. When the Governor made his speech, he talked about 1% of the appropriation. The IBHE tells it is 1% of the general revenue budget. Looking at other University press notices, Eastern Illinois University has cut 1% of its appropriation. We have earmarked our 1% based on our appropriations. Since the IBHE has said it is 1% of general revenue, we have earmarked more money than we needed to. That allows us to restore the \$108,000 of the \$975,000 into the summer school

program. Therefore, the original amount of money that we talked about for summer school will be available. That means that students who register for summer school may look at the published offerings and they will correlate to what is actually available. This is not exact, because some things have changed since the material was published. But, \$108,000 will be restored to summer school. The money will not be put back exactly as it was extracted, but the summer school program is definitely being restored to where it was before we had the rescission. Another complicating factor is the question: will we return the rest of the money that has been earmarked to be cut? Our answer is not yet. There are two reasons. One is that the Governor's announcement of taking \$13,000,000 from the state universities correlates with 1% of the appropriation. There is a little confusion regarding the number. The other thing is that our income fund this year is lagging behind anticipated. It seems that the students on the average are taking fewer student credit hours and we therefore are monitoring that at this point in time. It will be a while before we know what the income fund will be. In looking at the summer session, it is clear to me that we need to review the criteria that we use for determining summer school needs. I have asked the Provost to review this criteria, not for this summer, but for next summer. We will hear during the next academic year a report from the Provost on what the criteria are for summer school programs -- how we address large sections that are needed for university studies; how required courses in a major and elective courses in a major are covered, etc. I met before this meeting with the Academic Senate Budget Committee to talk about the 1% rescission and I gave them a listing of the budget areas that had been earmarked for the 1% rescission. We also talked about the reductions for next year and when that occurs on March 6th when the Governor gives his speech, we will know what kind of a reduction we will be working with for next year. I also shared with the Budget Committee five general principles to guide the FY92 budget preparations. This was shared in an earlier draft with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. This would be something that we could do throughout campus in our FY92 budget process. We will circulate that to you in its final form. We also talked about the process for conducting the FY92 budget reduction. I see us approaching it from this way. Each Vice Presidential area will work with some general principles like we are now in the process of putting together and we will use those to put together possible alternatives to address the budget reduction. When the department faculty work with their chair to address whatever the Dean's have suggested on how to address those reductions, the college will then have a plan alternatives for addressing the budget reductions, and will be able to bring those to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Other Vice Presidential areas have a similar process. I will then work with the Vice Presidents to

integrate alternative ways of reducing the budget and addressing the plans each Dean and College have put together. Those alternatives will then be taken to the Senate Budget Committee for discussion and explanation. Those alternatives will be shared on campus prior to final budget decisions for FY92.

Senator Walker: Regarding our income fund being reduced because of less course enrollment. Is that 3%, 5%, 7% -- do you have any kind of idea on the magnitude?

President Wallace: Nothing like that. It is probably a matter of \$300,000. We have tried to get a fix on that. Of course, the amount of summer school activity in first session will also be a factor. What we do know is that students are taking fewer credit hours.

Senator Walker: Is this the first year that has occurred for us? Is this a trend?

President Wallace: No, this is not a trend. This is the kind of thing that you have to do every year. What we do is adjust our spending accordingly.

Provost Strand had no remarks.

Vice President for Student Affairs Neal Gamsky had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander had an excused absence.

No Action Items

Information Items

1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposals for Approval of University Curriculum Committee Programs

a. Degree Alteration in English

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee has approved these information items, and is bringing them to you. We have as our guest Dr. Charles Harris, Chairperson of the English Department, who will answer questions about this program. The first proposal is for a degree alteration in English. The Senate does not have to approve this, but we brought it to you for information tonight. What English proposes is to eliminate the BS Degree in English except as an option in the teacher certification sequence. They will still maintain the Bachelor of Arts Degree and the BS degree so students can enroll in the Student Teacher Certification Sequence.

b. Deletion of Comprehensive English Major

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee approved this on the recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee. If you have any questions about this proposal, Dr. Charles Harris of the English Department is present.

c. Addition of Music Sequence (Classical Guitar)

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee approved this on the recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee. We looked at it and saw no problems. We have with us this evening representing the Music Department, Paul Borg and Doug Rubio to answer questions.

2. Academic Affairs Committee Presentation of Philosophy Statement for University Studies

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee has looked at this following the recommendation of the Council on University Studies to approve the Philosophy Statement for the University Studies Program at Illinois State University. We have with us this evening the chair of that committee, Paul Borg. Also present are: Jim Grimm, Business; and Macon Williams, Psychology. I represent the Senate on that committee. We would entertain any questions that you have at this time.

Senator Mohr: Mr. Chairperson, please bear with me. I do not plan to debate; just ask some questions. As a prologue to my questions, when I wrote the first chapter to my dissertation, I wrote sixty pages of theoretical justification for the analysis of the data that I had available. I sent this sixty page chapter to my thesis advisor, and he sent it back without a single mark on it, except for a note attached to it that said: "You cannot build a mansion, if you only have enough bricks for an outhouse." I was so despondent that I put it down and didn't touch it for a month. Then I came back and wrote it. I would hope that this would be a similar situation. Right at the beginning of this statement, there is a statement (Page 2) "The University Studies Program consists of courses which are of the highest caliber, which are taught by the most qualified faculty, and which develop both general and specific knowledge." Are we really claiming that Illinois State University has the best of all possible University Studies Programs that you can find in the world, taught by the most qualified faculty found anywhere in the world, and that this is the best of all possible places to come for general education. That statement is really an idealistic picture of what we would like to have and at best we can only approach such ideals as asymptotically coming close to them, but never really fully achieving them. I think it is a disservice to

this university to engage in such false advertising, such false claims. Does the committee really feel that this University is the best university in the whole world?

Senator Walker: Our charge to the University Studies Review Committee was first of all to develop a philosophy statement on what university studies should be. Second of all, we are charged to develop what the objectives of a university studies program should be. We are then going to look at our own University Studies Program and make two determinations, (1) does it fit our philosophy of what it should be, and (2) does it fit what we think the objectives should be. We are not claiming pie in the sky for the present program. This is what we would like for it to be. Then we will look at what we have and see if it is. If it is, then we have a great program. If it isn't, then we need to change it or make up a new one or proceed from there. No, we don't claim that ISU's is the best. But we do claim that a good university studies program should be those things.

Dr. Paul Borg: I would draw your attention to the page before that, in the Preface, where it states: "The Committee is not to be constrained in its thinking by the existing program, by current administrative structures, or by current institutional practices. Instead, its aim is to construct a program based on the best current thinking on general education and aimed at providing the best possible general education for Illinois State University students." The committee is looking beyond what we have now.

Provost Strand: I drafted the charge for the committee and I feel very sincerely that the charge we have in mind and my objective for the committee is to recommend an exemplary or noteworthy program that could conceivably be considered by some to be the best in the nation. We know of other institutions which have gone through this exercise recently. We had a faculty member from such an institution here this fall. That institution's revised general education program was noted by Ernest Boyer as being the best in the nation in terms of the revision process and the conceptualization of university studies. I would like our standards to be high as we begin this process. I would like our objectives to be laudatory, and not settle for mediocrity in terms of a revision. So, this is an exercise that can lead to a dramatic departure from what exists at this point. That is part of the vision which this committee is charged to pursue.

Senator Mohr: Would the committee object to changing the phrasing to: "The University Studies program should consist of courses which are of the highest caliber, and should be taught

by the most qualified faculty," which would make it more of the goal you are shooting for. Why create an ambiguity when you don't have to?

Dr. Paul Borg: I believe it was the thinking of the committee that we should not allow for the possibility of failure, that we should produce a successful program.

Senator Mohr: On Page 4, the second paragraph: "The central problem is, rather, relevant breadth versus a limited and dangerously irresponsible competence' (p. ix). Competence is not inherently 'limited and dangerously irresponsible.' Rather, conceived and exercised as if in a vacuum, competence which becomes an end in itself--this is 'limited and dangerously irresponsible competence.' I read that several times and can't make heads or tails of what it is trying to say. Dangerously irresponsible competence -- I have never heard of competence that was dangerously irresponsible. It is a contradiction of terms. If you are competent, you are competent, if you are incompetent, you are incompetent. That whole paragraph to me is utterly obtuse and contributes nothing to this document.

Dr. Paul Borg: The Committee in fulfilling the first part of this task has spent considerable time and effort culling the literature about concepts of general education. The parts of the document from page three on are not entirely our phraseology, but the articulation of our philosophy statement with quotations from literature that is out there. You will notice that the wording "dangerously irresponsible competence" is not our phraseology, but one that we have had to deal with in studying this. It is simply one of the points of reference with our statement, explaining what the literature said. They are correlated according to the various sections of the philosophical statement on page two. You are quite correct that many of these phrases are very difficult.

Senator Mohr: Why do you obfuscate this document? George Sarton in "A History of Science," wrote: "It occurred to me very early (as a student) that one could not live reasonably without science nor gracefully without arts and letters." That says it all. You don't have to write all this garbage. Why obfuscate when the purpose is to elucidate?

Senator Zeidenstein: You do if you are trying to write a seamless web of unified knowledge.

Senator Mohr: I find that much of the document is a discredit to the work of the committee. Phrasing it in such obscure and difficult language is not necessary, when it can be said so much more clearly. This assignment was not all that difficult. Although, I know you got paid for it. Did the committee members

get paid for their work, and did they put it on their annual departmental brag sheets as a service activity?

Chairperson Schmaltz: If we routinely asked that question of all committees that come to the Senate, it would be all right to ask that question. I don't know why we should single out this committee.

Provost Strand: If the senator has a question of that nature, he should direct it to the Senate Budget Committee. I object to the nature of this conversation. It is totally inappropriate, since we are supposed to be discussing the Philosophy Statement for University Studies.

Senator Mohr: I have a question about the word "global." This word is also used in the Vision Statement. It is supposed to serve two purposes. One is that the term is used in the sense of multi-cultural or multi-ethnic in its approach. I think it is used in emphasizing the multi-cultural perspective in developing a comprehensive undergraduate curriculum. The other way it is used is to emphasize the idea of an international perspective on education, introducing the idea of cooperation with other universities across the world, such as international studies programs. Again, I would like to say that the word "global" is more related to international studies than to multi-cultural studies programs. This is a term that should be cleared up both here and in the vision statement. Do you mean multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, or international?

Dr. Paul Borg: We mean all of that. The section "Global" on page two includes four statements to elaborate what it is. It includes multi-cultural issues (race, class and gender), cultures and peoples beyond the Western tradition itself, as well as social nature of knowledge and learning and environmental knowledge. It also deals with both the international community of the world as well as the national or university community.

Senator Walters: I was also very struck by the use of the term global and the following phrases which included no emphasis on the international community. It reads almost like a domestic document. I wondered why the committee chose to restrict the international use of the word global and stress the inter-cultural approaches. As a geographer, I have found that the word global frequently does not mean global in the sense it is used. This document, it seems to me, fails to properly stress the international facet of that word. Was that your intention?

Dr. Macon Williams: I don't read the document the same way you do at all. Two paragraphs on page ten refer to both western and non-western traditions; and also it is mentioned on page 11.

Senator Walters: If I may say, the use of tradition in place of regional areas does tend to focus the document on a limited portion of the world. Unfortunately, that is how we are finding the word global is being used.

Senator Walker: What key words would you like to see?

Senator Walters: I would like to see the document worded without suggesting changes here. So that there are clearly international implications to the word global. So that it is clear that global includes references to parts of the world outside of the United States. That global is used in the proper sense of the word global.

Senator Walker: I guess I would have to agree with Macon, in that I see it does address "global" in terms of the Western and non-Western traditions and cultures. I fail to understand how it does not apply to cultures outside the United States.

Senator Walters: What I am saying is that if it does, then that is what the document should state.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have seen little or nothing in the second draft to change anything in my memo to the committee of Thursday, November 15, 1990. One quote that illustrates one of the more egregious examples of so many things that show a form of elitism which is not linked to clear criteria of what is superior. In the middle of Page Nine, "The interdisciplinary nature of the University Studies Program is striving, then, for "more intellectual freedom and responsibility..." (as well as) a more authentic view of life" (Boyer 1982, p. 92). Would someone explain to me who decides and what the definition is of: "a more authentic view of life."

Dr. Paul Borg: That quotation represents the literature that we considered in this process. We offer it as an example of the literature we studied. Our philosophy statement is on page two; the other information supports and attempts to explain that.

Senator Zeidenstein: You went through all the literature and showed us examples of this literature. Did you find in the literature a compelling, demonstrable need for the kind of renovation that is alluded to here. Is this more than some passing intellectual fashion, or are there some bricks of a substantial nature to make this whole enterprise worthwhile. Or is it some kind of fashion to use all this rhetoric in lieu of any definite process. Did your committee find the literature compelling and persuasive?

Dr. Paul Borg: We found portions of the literature persuasive. However, we were constrained by two factors in trying to make sense of what is out there. That includes both the literature itself and our gaining an insight into how the education process should work here. We were charged with coming up with some sort of a philosophy statement. We are aware of those kinds of ideas that seem to need testing. At this time we cannot do much else until the next step of our process. This university has no philosophy of university studies right now.

Dr. Jim Grimm: We did not start out with data and then attempt to justify with theories as alluded to earlier in the meeting. People tend to take things out of context. One gets a "more authentic view of life" if we look at "University Studies" as interdisciplinary rather than as a single discipline. If one selectively interprets the quote in terms of just mathematics or just business, and not in terms of an interdisciplinary program you would not get a more authentic view of life.

Senator Zeidenstein: Inadvertently or not, you are misconstruing the intent. I am looking at it as an unsubstantiated form of elitism without any clear criteria.

Dr. Jim Grimm: If we read the top literature in top journals and magazines, there is quite a bit of literature suggesting general education programs are not functioning properly. We have attempted to look at this in terms of a philosophy of what general education should be.

Dr. Macon Williams: I think we need a broader perspective. We approached from the start of this by trying to see what it is that represents a baccalaureate degree, and within that context what role should general education play? We tried to articulate a philosophy statement and see if there should be some interlocking and what that should be. Rather than getting into specifics, we tried to look at this in the broadest possible perspective, and then from the viewpoint of objectives. We tried to establish a guidance line, rather than starting off with this objective and that objective, this structure and that structure. If we did that, I think we would end up with a situation like we have now, which is a university studies program for which there is no guide for determining what courses are taught. We hope as we develop these funnel shape approaches, that we will be able to train faculty to have courses that are suitable and maintaining these courses. We would like to see a self-correcting process, rather than one that we have to throw out every ten years. This should be an adjustable system, flexible to some extent. We are trying to go beyond that. We would like to develop a baccalaureate degree that will go well into the next century.

Senator Nelsen: Am I correct in determining that Page Two is the Philosophy Statement, and all the other data is to support that? If it in fact is, is it designed to stand on its own? Or, must a person in order to understand page two have pages three through twelve.

Dr. Paul Borg: Yes, the philosophy statement is on page two. And it is does intend to stand on its own.

Senator Collier: This is touted as a philosophy statement of university studies. Just a moment ago one of the members of the committee used the word, theory of education. Is this a philosophy or a theory? There are very real differences.

Dr. Jim Grimm: If you are referring to our statement of philosophy on page two, that is philosophy. The following pages explain the statement, possibly referencing theories.

Senator Collier: I am not convinced that there is any theory in here at all.

Senator Tuttle: When you set about your task of looking at university studies and its philosophy, was there any kind of assumption that our present university studies, born out of all kinds of compromise was apparently flawed and should not be a candidate of what we might want as a university studies program? Or are we operating under the assumption that everything is fair game? Because there was a lot of faculty concern about it, what prompted the process?

Dr. Macon Williams: There was a natural concern when this issue came up.

Senator Tuttle: Has that necessarily caused you to close your mind to the present university studies system?

Dr. Paul Borg: No.

Dr. Paul Walker: Everything is go at this point. After we develop the objectives, we will then look at our university studies program and see how it meets the philosophy and objectives. It could be great.

Senator Tuttle: So it is an open-minded assumption.

Dr. Paul Borg: The committee has a charge that builds it in.

Senator Tuttle: That is kind of what I thought it was, but I wanted it articulated.

Senator Moonan: Is Part II going to follow Part I, forever; or will it disappear, or what.

Dr. Paul Borg: It is up to the Senate. What does the Senate want?

Senator Moonan: Part I is on the way to becoming a university document. Is Part II on the way to becoming a university document?

Dr. Paul Borg: I would think not.

Senator Walker: I would think so. The philosophy statement is page two, and pages three through twelve explain it. I would assume that when we get all through with it we have one complete document. Let's say the current system doesn't fit and we develop a new program that is recognized to be the best in the nation and we have a new implementation and a new structure, I would assume that would all become a new university document. That is my personal opinion, not that of the committee.

Dr. Paul Borg: We have drawn this in a number of layers. I think that in any general university publication would be the one page statement. We can then amplify it with Part II, Part I is designed to stand on its own.

Provost Strand: From my perspective, I would concur with what Paul Borg has said that if what we mean by university document that Parts I and II would appear in many publications, the answer would be no. Part I would appear. But, I would consider Part II a university document in the sense that if this body in two weeks endorses Parts I and II, in that respect I consider both to be university documents. It is a reference from which other processes will flow. It will be a frame of reference for university studies consideration.

Senator Stearns: Having been raised in rural Indiana, I think there has been enough said about outhouses this evening. However, I am confused. We were told that the statement of philosophy is Part I on page two. On the bottom of page four is a statement of philosophy: "The University Studies Program provides a common foundation for the baccalaureate degree at Illinois State University." It seems to me that contains the obligation for students not to take significant courses in their major until they develop the necessary combination of skills required in university studies.

Dr. Paul Borg: The elements in the boxes in pages three through eleven are the statements contained on page two. The statement

in the box on the bottom of page four is the same as the statement in the second paragraph on page two.

Senator Stearns: Does your committee feel that students should take all the university studies courses before concentrating on their major?

Dr. Macon Williams: In fact, they are more likely to take university studies courses first. University studies courses are at more than the 100 level. Courses are set up sequentially -- from 100 level to 300 level.

Senator Stearns: I understand when you build outhouses, you can go either way.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I realize this is a philosophy statement, but when do we get into the practical aspects. When does the committee hope to address the more mundane questions, like who is going to teach the interdisciplinary courses, how they are going to react, what is the reward structure going to be for those who are brave enough to attempt teaching in the interdisciplinary areas?

Dr. Paul Borg: As a part of our process, all of these questions will eventually be dealt with to follow steps starting with the statement of philosophy. We do not know yet whether the current program needs revision or not, how that revision can take place, etc. Those specific questions do need to be answered eventually. The committee is very concerned about anticipating problems and finding solutions.

3. Academic Affairs Committee Report on Mission Statement for the Strategic Plan

Senator Walker: Last Spring our committee was given the charge by a Sense of the Senate Resolution to:

"It is the Sense of the Senate that the Executive Committee of the Senate be directed to forward the Illinois State University Vision Statement, Final Draft, to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Senate; further, that the Executive Committee direct the Academic Affairs Committee to prepare, for submission to the Senate during the month of October 1990, recommendations for possible revision. The recommendations from the Senate should go back to the colleges, and committees and task force that wrote the original material for their consideration. After receiving changes, if any, from the appropriate authors, the document should be submitted for Senate approval of the Vision Statement."

We then sought input from various groups, and in January and February we formulated a recommendation. We offer it tonight for information. We will try to digest your comments and come forth with a recommendation for action at the next Senate meeting. Before we take comments this evening, I believe President Wallace would like to make a statement regarding the Strategic Planning Task Force and the University Strategic Planning Document.

President Wallace: I would like to point out that in 1988 there was an effort by fourteen units in the University to put together strategic plans. Those included the five colleges and faculty; (Colleges of Applied Science and Technology, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, and Fine Arts); the Graduate School; the College of Continuing Education and Public Service; Milner Library and Media Services; a Committee on the Nature and Quality of the Undergraduate Experience; a plan on International Studies; a Committee on the Statewide Minority Agenda; the Division of Student Affairs; Institutional Advancement; and Athletics. There were a total of fourteen strategic plans which were developed by the individual units. In the Fall of 1989, twenty-two individuals comprised a task force on strategic planning to address the following charge: "Review the college and unit strategic plans prepared during the 1988-89 Academic Year; identify the University's strengths and emerging opportunities; develop an overall vision statement for the University for the year 2007; and develop recommendations for implementation of the vision. I would like to point out that the Vision Statement all alone is not the Strategic Plan and that the title and the content of the Academic Affairs Committee Report interchangeably uses the words Strategic Plan and Vision Statement. I think what the Academic Affairs Committee actually looked at was the Vision Statement. I just wanted to clarify the process. The Strategic Planning Document is comprised of about a foot and a half of paper, which represents the strategic plans from all fourteen units. I believe the committee looked at these.

Senator Walker: The committee asked for input on the whole University Strategic Planning Document which included each of the college plans, athletics, etc.

President Wallace: So the committee looked at the whole plan?

Senator Walker: Yes.

Senator Collier: In light of the report that I presume will be coming to the Senate shortly on increased efficiency on campus, and given the outline of events and data gathering outline of pages one, two, and three of the vision statement in which innumerable constituencies of the university were consulted,

in which innumerable plans which President Wallace referred to were prepared by faculty at many levels, and finally the members of the university community were asked to communicate their reactions to the Chair of the Task Force, Len Schmaltz, and in addition the Task Force met with the Alumni Board, the Student Body Board of Directors, the Association of Residence Halls, the Academic Senate, and a group of community leaders, etc. I have a very simple question. What in the hell are we doing that is new and substantive in this action? It seems to me that we are reinventing the wheel. It seems that we already did this once, why are we doing it again?

Senator Walker: You're asking me. Our Committee is doing it because a Sense of the Senate Resolution charged us to do it.

Senator Tuttle: It may seem unnecessary, but you have to understand that there is only one body on this campus that puts an official stamp of recognition on anything -- that is the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate's role in this so far was to listen to the final report of the committee and interact with them. At this point we have a document that might be called, lacking in legitimacy. I think we ought to legitimize it. Therefore, we have to look at it. Therefore, the Senate passed a resolution directing this process.

Senator Ritch: Another bit of information is that in the responses that we received from more than one college council, it became evident that somewhere along the line the college councils were not consulted about this document. Several college councils would like to go back and look at their college mission statement. Some of them had never seen it. Sometimes the Dean wrote it and sent it on. So, while on paper it says that all these groups were consulted, there were still bodies that felt they had not been consulted on this. That is another reason we decided to go back to these groups for input.

Senator Mohr: I would like to ask this question of Senator Walker. You have some recommendations to the Senate in your committee report. Do you propose to introduce those as a motion of some kind when this comes up for action.

Senator Walker: I guess I would have to say at this point that the Academic Affairs Committee has not voted on this as the recommendation. Assuming that the Academic Affairs Committee would adopt what we have written down now in whole, yes, we would bring it forward as a recommendation to the Senate. Right now, I believe we are seeking input from you in terms of questions and answers. We will meet again on Thursday, and if the recommendation needs to be altered, we will alter it. Perhaps we can get it done in one meeting and bring it back for action at the next

Senate meeting. At that time we would perhaps have a recommendation for you which the whole committee agrees upon. It is possible that this could be a recommendation as you see it, it is possible it could be changed.

Senator Mohr: I have a problem with that in the sense that this is supposed to be an information session in preparation for action. If this is not a proposal, but still only the skeleton of a proposal that still has to be approved by a committee, it seems to me that we will have to have another information session when you do have a proposal. I think there are elements in here that depart away from the usual procedures of academic planning now followed in the University. I think we need more time to think about it. The procedure differs from what is done now.

Senator Walker: I guess I wouldn't agree totally with you.

Senator Mohr: For one, the University Academic Plan would come before the Senate as an information item only, we would not act on it. In the past the Senate would withhold its approval until the administration actually tries to do something concrete to implement the plan such as add a new degree program. Then the Senate would review that particular proposal and act on it, either approve it or disapprove it. The problem was that if we approved the general plan, in a way we have already given our approval to the individual items before they come before the Senate. I remember years ago we disestablished some programs. The President asked us to approve of the Academic Plan that included the review for disestablishment. Then when the actual proposals for disestablishment came to us, the Senate was already committed to disestablishing those programs, and did not consider them individually each on their own merits which at the time was a mistake. That was one of the reasons we said we would not approve the Academic Plan. We would approve the pieces as they come to us from the administration.

Senator Walker: I am confused now. The Senate charged us to come forward with a recommendation for approval or non-approval of the University Strategic Planning Document. That was the Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Senator Mohr: Was that just the Vision Statement.

Senator Walker: No that was the Strategic Planning Document which includes the Vision Statement, the College plans, the whole ball of wax.

Senator Mohr: Was that the intent of the resolution? Now, I am confused. I thought the Senate did not approve things until they came to us for action for implementation.

President Wallace: There is nothing in the plan that detracts from the existing planning and budgeting processes within the University. All of the processes, as you have indicated go on as they always have. Each year the budget goes through its cycle, the Academic Plan, program review, all those things will go on as they always have. There is nothing in the strategic plans that says the approval process will be changed.

Senator Walker: In fact, in our first recommendation it says that it would go according to established University governance system policies. So, we would not be trying to change anything. What we will perhaps recommend is that the Senate approve the concept of the University Strategic Planning Document. As Senator Tuttle said, give it some legitimacy. That indeed the University community does support this concept and it does represent the University.

Senator Mohr: Would our approval of the general plans then not mean that we endorse every action that is taken under that plan at the same time. In other words, we can review parts of the plan and find them unacceptable later on, such as the disestablishment of a program or the introduction of a new Ph.D. As long as that is understood, I have no problem.

President Wallace: In the strategic plan there is a diagram and on the left hand side it talks about the strategic plan as a five to seven year planning blueprint for the direction of the University. That is linked to the annual, renewable, three year college and unit plans. We talked about this in the Budget Committee meeting this evening. That is linked to the annual budget process (one year resource allocation plan); so that it all is linked together. When you look at that diagram, you will see that the PIE's and NEPR's and the Capitol Budgeting, the Planning Statements, and the Missions Statements, Enrollment Targets, are all included in there as part of the annual University process of priority setting, so that all of these processes are in this continuum of planning and budgeting. All the different university processes are subsumed within the process. You are correct. That is shown in the diagram on page four.

Senator Zeidenstein: Under Recommendation, Paragraph 2, it reads: "Each Academic and Service Unit currently listed in the University Strategic Planning Document should have the opportunity to review the document and develop a process whereby faculty and appropriate members of the unit approve the unit's strategic plan on a periodic basis prior to incorporation in the University Strategic Planning Document." Then, under 3. G., it reads much the same: "Themes, Actions and Strategies sections of each of the Academic and Service Programs should be returned to each respective unit for review and approval by corresponding

faculty and appropriate unit members." It seems to be saying the same thing. Does paragraph G. refer to the Vision Statement only; whereas Paragraph 2 refers to the big document, The entire Strategic Plan for Five Years.

Senator Walker: Yes. Paragraph 2 refers to each of the colleges own strategic plans, that each of those units should be able to develop a process whereby appropriate people review their own strategic plan and then under 3. A--G, it refers to the Vision Statement, Themes 1--7, Strategies.

Senator Zeidenstein: At the top of the Recommendations Page, in the introductory paragraph, "The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Academic Senate conditionally approve the concept of a University Strategic Planning Document which sets forth "A Vision for Illinois State University," subject to acceptance and inclusion of the following recommendations:" Did you mean to say by that (A) that we should approve conditionally the abstract concept of a visions statement; or (B) approve the existing vision statement provided its amended and altered as you recommend below. Sen. Walker: (B)

4. Enrollment Reduction Plan

Senator Ritch: I understand that individual senators have not had the plan very long and that various committees have not been able to meet on this. In Academic Affairs Committee, we have not discussed this. I suggest we postpone this.

Senator Walker: Well, we sort of discussed it, and we thought we would not have a recommendation until after things were aired out on the Senate floor, and then discuss it Thursday. Our charge for each committee was to have a recommendation. I am not sure who is supposed to bring forth a resolution.

Chairperson Schmaltz: This is at the information stage. I suppose the entire document or procedure is what the Senate will be asked to approve. I would remind senators that there is only on Academic Senate meeting of this current senate.

Senator Mohr: I have two questions. On Page 4, Item 4, under Program Issues, "Based on the historically strong relationship of the summer session enrollment to the previous spring enrollment, the summer session enrollment is likely to decrease as a result of the planned enrollment reduction." In view of the comments of the President earlier about summer school, would that indicate any change in Item 4 of the vision statement? If I understand you correctly, you are evaluating the basis for the need of summer programming to be included.

President Wallace: I think we need to look at the criteria that is used for determining summer school needs. Number 4 here is indicating that the total enrollment of the University go down by 3,000 students, and it would seem logical that there would be less of a need for courses in summer school.

Senator Mohr: So all that is saying is if we have fewer students, we will have fewer students in the summer. On Page 9, under Monitoring Issues, number 2: "Resources which are released because of enrollment declines are eligible for reallocation based on the University's Strategic Plan." One of the things that bothers me with statements like that is there an implication that if a college is particularly good at contributing to the goal of reducing enrollment, that it may as a result lose some of its budget?

President Wallace: Remember that the object of enrollment reduction is to keep pretty much the level of revenues and appropriation the same while reducing the number of students by 3,000, while increasing the expenditure per student by \$1,200. While there may be some reallocations that might go on in colleges because of the strategic plan, they wouldn't be greatly influenced by the fact that the enrollment was declining. I don't think this would be a significant factor.

Senator Mohr: One of the problems I see is that there is a danger if you reduce the number of students in majors in your college that if the purpose is to reduce student enrollment in various areas of programming, then you should want to give people more money because they successfully contributed to the goal of reducing student enrollment.

President Wallace: No. I think if you looked at how the two million plus dollars was reallocated as a result of the strategic planning in the colleges, I suggest that a fairly small percentage of that money was based on worrying about who was going to get the most new majors, but it was based on creative ideas and new directions in the colleges. One exception was that we addressed the very specific problem that the College of Arts and Sciences had in terms of university studies. But, we did put resources in because of the instructional pressures on university studies. If you look at the other colleges, they were to address new and innovative directions in those colleges. We are trying to make people believe that the allocation or removal of these resources has very little to do with whether your majors go up and down or the student credit hours go up and down with the caveat that we are sensitive to trying to alleviate the problems of instructional overload in those departments.

Senator Mohr: I hope that we can assure people that there would not be a credit hour game.

President Wallace: There would not be.

Senator Raucci: The Rules Committee had a question about minority enrollment. Will it be reduced proportionately, or will you maintain the numbers you have now?

Senator Zeidenstein: Page 2, Item 2, Planning Assumptions, Enrollment Issues, states: "While the overall enrollment of on-campus undergraduate students will be reduced, the enrollment of minority students will be increased. An active recruitment strategy will be continued to increase the number and quality of minority students."

President Wallace: We look at maintaining the same initiative to increase minority enrollment that we have used in the last few years. The year before last we had the highest percentage of increase in minority students in the state. We don't have the IBHE figures for this year yet. That is a part of a group that we feel is a special mission -- to get quality minority students.

Senator Raucci: Then, by 1995, there would be a higher percentage of minority students?

President Wallace: Yes. I think the numbers will go from about 6% to about 9%.

Senator Walker: This is the reduction side of the issue. If we drop students faster than what we anticipate, we just turn the spigot back on. Is it that easy to do turn it back on? What if we achieve all our drop in one or two years? Is it not true that right now the whole university target enrollment for freshman is 71% below our expected goal and freshman transfers are 55% below where we should be at this point in time? Is it possible that we will in effect by advertising an enrollment reduction snowball the effect and drop it faster than what we anticipate and faster than what the IBHE can accommodate us on the map.

President Wallace: I think the problem really will be to maintain the level of quality of students we admit so that we can alter the numbers as we see fit. A result of the institutions that have had their profile of quality changed, as we are in the process of doing, have had the opposite effect. They are more of a higher quality institution, so they become more in demand. In response, we know that the number of high school graduates will continue to decline until 1995, so there is a smaller number. We are getting enough students that we can accept

students. The question is, what quality.

Senator Walker: Are current admits for freshmen 71% below the goal?

President Wallace: I don't know what you mean by that.

Provost Strand: Let me respond to that. There are some adjustments in the targets for next year because of the differential between freshmen and transfer students that are being anticipated. We are meeting Monday to discuss some possible adjustments and fine-tuning. The reduction in no way approaches the magnitude you cited with your percentages. You used 71%.

Senator Walker: I have a figure of freshman admits being 71% down from what our targeted goal is for FY91.

Provost Strand: That freshman admissions are 71% below where we are supposed to be?

Senator Walker: No. We only have 71% of our goal at this time, which is behind where we should be.

Provost Strand: Then we are 29% below where we should be?

Senator Walker: To meet our targeted goal for fall, we need to admit 29% more students. That is behind where we normally are at this point in time.

Provost Strand: I don't have the data in front of me, and I can't comment on specific percentages. There is a meeting Monday at which we are going to look at college targets and look at the ratio of freshmen versus transfer students based on the current data.

Senator Walker: I think in your meeting you may find that some of the colleges are not where they think they should be in terms of meeting their expected goals. In effect, our advertisement of enrollment reduction may be snowballing the decline in student admits. The other question I have is on the perception of the agreement of Dr. Wagner at the IBHE, would it be possible to get from Senator Maitland and Representative Ropp what their perception of that agreement is and whether it is the same as your perception.

President Wallace: On the day after that meeting, I put in writing what I felt was the summary of the agreement of the meeting. Everyone there received a copy of that report. Everybody has a copy of those minutes. Let me go back to the freshman admissions. I am not aware of the data that you are

talking about. At least two years ago, we started realizing that it would be to our best interest to begin monitoring during the process the ratio of transfer students who are freshmen because of the varied quality. I would expect that we will monitor that every year. We get a higher quality of students from transfers. We will continue to monitor that and adjust that.

Senator Walker: You call this "A Position Paper on Enrollment Reduction Planning." I always think you are better off talking in positive terms and rather than say reduction which means decline to a lot of people, wouldn't enrollment management be better.

President Wallace: Another term that has been mentioned is strategic constriction. Enrollment management would be fine.

Senator Walker: To a lot of people reduction means decline. If a University is in decline, I don't want to go there.

Senator Roberts: In the presentation in the last meeting and also as I read this report, there is a clear assumption that the non-tuition funded proponents at the university are going to be held harmless in the enrollment decline, for example student fees. I wonder if you would expand on that. There was mention of several other plans having been considered. Also, I notice in the report that there are no figures in the ratios of staff in those areas to students, and no discussion of plans for reallocation or reduction of management or staff.

President Wallace: I think that we did mention somewhere in the report that the student affairs area may need to cut back on the services provided or increase student fees. The fees that have been suggested for the coming year increase. We could cut back on services provided.

Vice President for Student Affairs Neal Gamsky: The farthest thing from anyone's mind is that these areas will be held harmless. On the contrary, they will be the hardest hit of any areas in the University. You might say the reverse is true of appropriated funds. They are in a sense being held harmless. It is certainly not the case with non-appropriated fund areas. We are going to have a very difficult road ahead to accommodate all the things we have to accomplish with a reduced enrollment because we are hit from several different sides. It is not only a reduction of fees, but it also causes a reduction in the amount of income generated for certain programs and shifting costs. Also, there are many items over which we have no control. For instance, in bond revenue, we have a bonded indebtedness which has just been extended to the year 2014. If fees don't pay for

this bonded indebtedness, appropriations will have to pay. The University owes that debt -- principle and interest payments. Those bills must be paid one way or another. In addition, if you keep the buildings open, you must pay utilities. If you have students in residence halls, you have to provide food for them. You have to clean up the rooms. There is a certain degree of built-in costs that are driven by the number of occupants. If the decision was made that we didn't need thirteen residence halls, we would reduce staff and costs. If a particular service is not used by students or the use diminishes, then that service or program is reduced or eliminated. We do not provide programs that the students don't want. Every one of those programs is supported by a student fee. These fees are not imposed on students. In my experience during the last seventeen years at the University, I have never taken a fee to the Board of Regents that students did not approve through the student fee process -- at least for those fees in my administrative areas. The students themselves review these programs in great detail. They go over the budgets, the services, the things that they want to know, and then they vote. If they want to delete a service, they tell us. I think there is a lot of misunderstanding about the student fee process.

President Wallace: On Page 7, in the third paragraph from the bottom, I indicated: "Services funded jointly by appropriated funds and fee income will be reviewed to determine the appropriate level of support provided by each fund source." This indicates that reduction of services is not to be excluded. When students see that they're looking at a 3% fee increase on the average, they might find that they don't want services that will make their fees go up. Those decisions would be part of the annual fee process.

Senator Roberts: I find your arguments persuasive that these areas will not be held harmless, but they would be more persuasive if there were numbers in the report.

Senator Walker: On Page 4, under Financial Issues, number one: "The number of tuition waivers will decrease, (see Table 13)." My question is: will the tuition waivers for athletics remain the same? Will we be cutting those? Will the tuition waivers for academic teams, such as debate teams, judging teams, etc. remain the same, or will we see a reduction in those types of tuition waivers?

President Wallace: I expect that we would retain the same ratio which is 60% academic tuition waivers.

Senator Walker: So, we can expect to have less tuition waivers

for sports and less for academics.

President Wallace: We have been putting so much more money in financial aid in the last couple of years, and I think we need to put that into the perspective that tuition waivers will go down. The fund raising aspect has been putting a lot more money into financial aid. Scholarships have been added because of more financial aid money.

Senator Walker: I understand that in the big picture. But, in the small picture, the livestock judging team has five tuition waivers and when you cut it and only have four; that is a big cut for that team. If the academic quadrathelon team had five tuition waivers, and if they cut one, that would be a big cut.

President Wallace: Well, let's say we have to cut one because of tuition waivers, we may find other money to pay for that.

No Communications

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Walker reported that his committee would meet this Thursday from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the Prairie Room at the Bone Student Center.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Nelsen had no report.

Budget Committee - Senator Mohr had no report.

Faculty Affairs Committee - No report.

Rules Committee - Senator Raucci had no report.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Adjournment

XXII-54 Senator Ritch moved to adjourn (Second, Collier). Motion carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN JOHNSON, SECRETARY**

