

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-12-1992

Senate Meeting, February 12, 1992

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, February 12, 1992" (1992). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 591.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/591>

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

February 26, 1992

Volume XXIII, No. 10

Call to Order

Roll Call

ACADEMIC SEN.

Approval of Minutes of February 12, 1992

1010

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:
1. Proposed Academic Senate Meeting Calendar for July - December 1992
 2. Approval of Five University Curriculum Committee Proposals as Recommended by Academic Affairs Committee
 - a. Health Education Program
Minor in Community Health
 - b. Department of Foreign Languages
Minor in Japanese Studies
 - c. Department of Art
New Studio Arts Sequence
 - d. Department of Art
Art History Sequence
 - e. Department of Art
New Graphic Design Sequence

- INFORMATION ITEMS:
1. Academic Affairs Committee
Proposal for Bachelor of Fine Arts
 2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal
for Philosophy: Minor in Religious
Studies
 3. Academic Affairs Committee Presenta-
tion of University Studies Review
Committee Document
 4. Faculty Affairs Committee Changes
in ASPT Document
 5. Sense of the Senate Resolution to
Dissolve the Board of Regents

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

February 26, 1992

Volume XXIII, No. 10

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:16 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 12, 1992

XXIII-40 Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of February 12, 1992, by Senator DeRousse (Second, Camp) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Schmaltz had no remarks.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt had no remarks.

STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Student Body President Romney Ruder had an excused absence.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

President Wallace: You will recall that I addressed the faculty on February 12th and gave the Senate a briefing on the IBHE Report in November, and the Executive Committee suggested that the whole Senate receive copies of that report. You received it under separate cover, but I am distributing a copy to you this evening. In November, 1991, the Illinois Board of Higher Education prepared a paper entitled "Priorities, Qualities, and Productivity of Illinois Higher Education." This paper proposed a plan for examining priorities and showed how Illinois higher education has shifted its priorities during the decade of the 80's by changing expenditure patterns in a number of budget areas. It generated a number of newspaper articles and commentaries concerning university expenditures. In essence, these articles imply that students and taxpayers have been shortchanged

by Illinois public universities, since campuses have diverted resources to research and public service at the expense of instruction. While it is important to continually focus on the questions of priorities, quality, and productivity, it is our conclusion that the IBHE report confounds rather than informs these questions. The importance of establishing priorities in higher education is paramount, since all educators and administrators are faced with issues of providing competitive faculty and staff compensation, improving the quality of undergraduate education, promoting minority student achievement, maintaining operations budgets, securing modern laboratory and studio equipment, obtaining computing hardware and support systems, enhancing library resources, and maintaining our facilities infrastructure.

I would like to draw your attention to the three major problems with the IBHE report:

1. The source data used were the IBHE Resource Allocation Management Program (RAMP) annual reports. Annual data from fiscal years 1980 and 1990 were used to constitute a longitudinal study without taking into account any changes which may have taken place in university organizations or reporting procedures.
2. With no statement of methodology, the IBHE redefined the standard RAMP functions by creating a new function entitled administration. In creating this new function, subfunctions were moved from instruction, academic support, student services, institutional support, and operation and maintenance of physical plant. What the Board of Higher Education did was to create a new category called administration and costs shown as being budgeted to this are shown as administrative costs. The point to be made is that it is not an expenditure on administration, but an expenditure by administration.
3. The creation of this new category resulted in a summary which is very different from historical RAMP data. Simply put, without adding the function of administration, there has been no significant shift away from instruction toward research and public service.

With the creation of this new category, the results are very different. Table 2 provides expenditures for administration for each of the public universities, while Table 3 details each of the expenditures for administration for Illinois State University. As you can see, without taking into account changes in organization; changes in reporting requirements (financial aid, for example); the reporting of major expenditure items in fiscal year 1990 (ISU net, major equipment, etc.) without a concomitant

item in fiscal year 1989; resulted in a report which confounds, rather than informs, the issues of priorities, quality, and productivity.

Phase II of the IBHE Study will come out next week with a new "Priorities, Quality, and Productivity" report. It has twenty-three "should-do" items for each public university in Illinois. What we have underway to review the scope of programming takes care of providing the data.

The next item I would like to talk about is the salary exercise. I would ask you to keep separate in your minds the exercise on scope and programming which is for 1994 through 1996. It is separate from the exercise which we are going through for next year.

I would like to point out that I have had extensive meetings on this subject - a faculty meeting on February 12th, meetings with the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate Budget Committee, the Deans Council, the Civil Service Council, and the A/P Council to formulate guidelines for the next fiscal year salaries. My comments in the February 12th meeting were printed in the ISU Report of February 14, 1992. A salary increase for next year is imperative. "A \$150 lump sum payment was authorized by the Board of Regents to compensate for employees' increased cost of health insurance in FY92 and will be distributed in the first applicable pay period after July 1 of this year for continuing employees at ISU. The state's appropriation for higher education provided no money for salary increases in the current year."

"I will recommend to the board a minimal average salary increase for faculty and non-organized staff of 4.5 percent for next year which includes the \$150 lump sum payment plus its annualized amount of \$300. **These funds will come from existing resources.**" "I hope the increment will be higher." "My target is to exceed 5 percent and will depend on the outcome of the state's appropriation for next year."

But President Wallace admitted that his frustration with the state's political process is growing because even before the current recession, tax support was in decline for public universities while tuition for students continues to rise. ISU gained only \$400,000 in new tax money during the past three years -- a much lower amount than the University raised through 'self-help' efforts in the last three years resulting in increases of \$2 million in faculty grants and contracts, \$1.2 million in individual and corporate giving, plus a doubling of student senior class pledges to \$101,000.

"Don't expect an improved economy to solve the state's financial problems," Wallace warned, saying that Illinois State will have to adopt a number of new strategies, including a reduction of programs to improve the financial support for those that remain.

"If we have the institutional will to make difficult decisions and reduce the scope of programs we can reduce the existing generalized situation of grossly inadequate departmental budgets." "The vice presidents will explore this avenue this spring semester with each of their units." "In preparing budgets for the fiscal years of 1994-96, the following institutional strategies will be adopted: (1) Across the board budget adjustments will not be implemented for programs of administrative units. (2) Reduction of lower priority academic and administrative support functions will be necessary to achieve institutional goals. (3) Organizational units will be reviewed for possible consolidation to simplify structure and reduce administrative costs. (4) Significant increases for faculty and staff salaries must be accomplished over the next few years; specifically, the University's faculty salary averages must reach the average of those institutions designated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education as ISU's peer institutions. These adjustments will most likely require reallocation of a portion of the University's current personal services budget. (5) Steps will be taken to broaden the University's sources of revenue beyond the state's appropriated funds. Specifically, to the extent possible, appropriated dollars should be leveraged to increase institutional revenues, promote quality, and achieve institutional goals. (7) Reduction or elimination of financial support for specific lower priority programs will be required to provide more adequate support for higher priority programs."

The Vidette today carried the headline, "Council votes against faculty pay raise plan." The Arts and Sciences Council has come to the opinion that it is opposed to a pay raise because budget reductions may lead to a reduction in faculty lines.

The faculty salary raise exercise is being done through the College Deans with recommendations going to the Provost. The process was accurately spelled out and reported in the ISU Report and we should allow the process to come to completion.

QUESTIONS

Senator White: One of the problems that the university community has had with decisions in the Deans and Provost's Office is the incompatibility between the exercise and some of the language you have used to describe it. In your own remarks tonight you have mentioned retirements, attrition, but not cuts in non-tenure track faculty lines or elimination of graduate student

funds. As a matter of fact, the reality is the particular colleges have to cut into areas that you have not at all mentioned as being sources of funds. Allowing for the fact of these exercises, it is still a little frightening for us to imagine how seriously these cuts will affect our departments. They seem to be incompatible with your other remarks.

President Wallace: I don't think that is an accurate assessment. A salary increase next year is imperative, even if it requires lines from the university personal services budget. Also, money will be available from retirements, attrition, and reductions. From the remarks I read that appeared in the ISU Report: "If we have the institutional will to make difficult decisions and reduce the scope of programs we can reduce the existing generalized situation of grossly inadequate departmental budgets." We were not excluding personal services budgets. We did not specify what cuts would happen.

Senator White: Then we are to understand that by the word "reduction," that will include cuts to non-tenure track faculty and graduate assistantships, etc.

President Wallace: We have said that the deans, chairs, college councils, and the Provost will look at this and decide what cuts can be made rationally.

Senator White: I have no problem with that. It seems that is the type of review that is underway with your scope and mission review with the Presidential Advisory Committee. However, the kinds of pressure that are upon the different colleges in making cuts, it doesn't seem to me that any of those cuts are being made rationally. They cannot be made according to the priorities that the committee is drawing up. The priorities will not apply for another year.

President Wallace: Let me say that is exactly the kind of thing that we need to look at. This has got to be multi-year exercise. The point here is, let's give the chairs and deans an opportunity to weigh these things you are talking about and take them to the college councils.

Senator White: Our morale is connected with programs and their integrity, as much as it is with raises.

President Wallace: We need to give the deans time to work on this. Maybe we aren't communicating what is going on in Senate committees. We have been discussing budget concerns in Senate committees throughout this process.

Senator Tuttle: I just wanted to clarify the air a bit in your remarks about communicating with the committees of the Senate. We have had a lot of discussions about the budget. I recognize that as an accurate reflection. Hasn't the Budget Committee reflected to you that it is their opinion that the money that is available for salary increases should be distributed almost entirely if not entirely through the ASPT system? I think that was the message that the committee tried to deliver to you.

President Wallace: Dr. Strand will address this in his remarks.

Senator Tuttle: But, hasn't the Budget Committee conveyed this message to you?

President Wallace: Yes.

Senator Tuttle: I just wanted to clarify this. There has been input on an item that has not yet been recognized.

Senator Razaki: The college deans and heads of departments are going to carry out a budget exercise. Once you come to conclusions, you will come back to the Senate?

President Wallace: I will address the Budget Committee and the Executive Committee of the Senate. I spoke of this in my February 12th remarks to the entire Senate.

Senator Ritt: I have two questions. First, while I was listening to you, the first time you mentioned the use of funds, you referred to University resources, and the second time you referred to personal services funds. Does that mean that using resources other than personnel funds is within the scope of your consideration?

President Wallace: It is my personal opinion that we should not be using non-personnel budgets. I think that our operational budgets are already strained. We have not put this restriction on the Vice Presidents. We have asked people at the department levels to do planning.

Senator Ritt: Have the Vice President's all been asked to come up with the same percentage figure, or is there some differential relationship among the various vice presidents?

President Wallace: Let me point out that there is a big difference between what we ask people to go out and target and what is actually allocated. We won't do it across the board. Even if we give 4.5% or go beyond it. It may be across the board in terms of the \$150 increase.

Senator Ritt: So, it is quite possible then that some areas of the University might give up a greater percentage of their funds than other areas.

President Wallace: You will remember that last Fall we gave a very small amount of money, one-third of a percent. The faculty received the greatest percentage of those personal services dollars.

Senator Ritt: Then, I take it that you would not object to that continuing?

President Wallace: No.

Senator Collier: When you first came here as President, you very correctly recognized that one of our problems was too many students and too few faculty, and we entered into a program of enrollment reduction to make loads of faculty more equitable. This process has continued to the present, but has not yet reached its logical result. You also correctly identified that there is a problem with salaries which we would all like to see something done about. It is also true that after two rounds of decisions, there will be an impact on academic programs, which will affect loads and numbers of students in classes. Which is more important, the enrollment reduction, and the improvement of the educational quality; or salary increases?

President Wallace: I don't see how financial arrangements with the enrollment reduction based on the number of students can be compared to raises. Enrollment reduction is getting dollars in tax money for every tuition dollar reduced. Reduction will go on regardless of the raises. There is no connection in terms of tax dollars.

Senator Collier: I wasn't implying that.

President Wallace: If we go back to the beginning, we modeled the five year reduction on the reduction of student/faculty ratios from 22/1 down to 18/1. Obviously that projection did not take into consideration the number of dollars available at this time. We could not predict what money would be available. There are ways to minimize the impact given our circumstances. What is the profile of our classes? How often do we have to offer a certain section? We could streamline the delivery of instruction.

Senator Collier: We seem to be taking more away from ourselves. It is exacerbating because of the underfunding from the State.

President Wallace: That's true. And I think that is what people are talking about. I think we also need to acknowledge that there are some faculty who might not agree with that. One of the mistakes of higher education is to cut back on scope. Do we want to do fewer things?

Senator Walker: You have stated that you would prefer the Vice Presidents not to use operational funds to come up with the dollars, but to use personnel budgets. Is that correct?

President Wallace: Things like commodities, equipment, travel money, etc. are already so tight that they are hesitant to use other funds. A number of reports in generalities state that departments do not want to cannibalize their revenues.

Senator Walker: So pressure will be exerted to take the money from personnel lines, not from operational funds?

President Wallace: Yes.

Senator Walker: Senator Ritt addressed this. You have asked all vice presidents, including Provost Strand on the Academic side, to also look at the magnitude of dollars that will be cut from their areas. Will we have the right to cut from some vice presidential units more than others? Who will make that decision?

President Wallace: I will.

Senator Zeidenstein: For the current year that we are in now, cutbacks will be coming March 2nd, and there wouldn't be any time for these cutbacks to go through the process of priority cutting. The kinds of concerns that department chairs have are that they have students who are going to be registering in a matter of weeks, and they don't know whether they will have classes for them, come summer or fall. They are looking at more than simply an exercise; they are looking at chaos for summer and fall classes. Maybe what we need is a clear demarcation between what may happen in summer or fall or next spring versus the impact of what may happen starting in FY93.

President Wallace: Next year is FY93. The exercise we are going through is for next July 1, (FY93). Keep in mind that we have some variables. We don't know what tuition is going to be. We don't know what the General Assembly is going to give us. We may have another cut. All we can possibly do is take what we control and handle it the best that we can. We have a number of scenarios to work with. We won't know until July 1st. What we control is very limited. We really don't know which one will occur.

Senator Zeidenstein: There are at least four months between now and July 1. From what I understand, the proposals have to be in the Provost Office by March 2. That is not very much time. The rationale that underlies this -- couldn't the whole thing be postponed for a year so that each department could plan their priorities and be able to plan and establish their budgets. A scenario that says "Something is going to happen, and nobody is sure what." Most people assume the worst. Most people imagine, we don't know what is going to happen, but whatever it is will be pretty damn bad.

President Wallace: Nothing is final yet.

Provost Strand: I have had several discussions with the deans and they will have until March 2nd to respond to the analysis of what a 4.5% salary increase would do to their budgets. We have asked the deans two questions. One, do you wish to recommend an FY92 salary adjustment above the 4.5% figure recommended by President Wallace in his comments to the faculty and staff on February 12th. Secondly, if you should respond no to the first question, please indicate the types of programmatic consequences that a 4.5% raise would create in your college or unit. Those answers are to come back Monday of next week. Based on that information, then I would be prepared to discuss with the President and Vice Presidents the consequences of the 4.5% exercise, as well as the damages that will be suffered. We will proceed from that point. We will decide what is the logical course of action. That fact-finding or data-gathering exercise is what is contributing to some of the questions this evening.

Senator Zeidenstein: At what point, if any, will there be an allowance for feedback, say at the department chair level? Will there be time for departments to have input on this?

Provost Strand: That process should be going on right at this point in time. On the day of the President's speech to faculty and staff, February 12, Deans knew that morning, in general terms, what the President was going to say. The Deans are supposed to provide information in cooperation with department chairs of how they would implement reallocations within their departments. That review process has been in effect about two weeks now.

Senator Cook: President Wallace, in your address to the faculty and in the quoted remarks in the ISU Report, you specifically mentioned three sources of possible savings: (1) resignations, which tend to be somewhat limited; (2) program limitations;

and (3) loss of personnel lines. It is my understanding from previous experience, that when we have an academic program in place we are to some extent committed to the fact that students who are already enrolled in that program will (within a reasonable number of years) be able to graduate. I am therefore saying, are there non-academic programs that could be curtailed to such an extent that we would have savings available by next July? Academic programs will probably not give us many savings in that regard.

President Wallace: We did eliminate the University Museums, and Photo Services is targeted to be eliminated this summer.

Senator Cook: Will they provide a substantial proportion of this 4.5%?

President Wallace: No.

Senator Cook: But reduction in lines will probably bear the brunt of it.

President Wallace: There is some money to be gained in natural attrition. At the present time there are two bills for early retirement in the legislature. We are talking about postponing replacement of positions, not talking about huge layoffs of people. It would be more of a hiring freeze.

Senator Cook: Some of the descriptions of the early retirement bills indicate that they would be an additional cost to the university's personnel lines, depending upon how they were finally worded. That would be a burden rather than a blessing from a budget point of view.

President Wallace: (unintelligible)

Senator Sadeghian: After hearing the proposal, I fail to see the logic behind it. It is like asking the faculty to choose between two of their children, and the administration then boasts: "There, we are giving you the option. We have drawn up a proposal." What kind of proposal is this?

Senator Walker: I appreciate your trying to get me more money, personally. But, professionally, I think it is one of the dumbest ideas I have ever seen. You don't make cuts during a recession in programs when the meat cleaver comes down and those who run the fastest don't get cut. You make cuts when things are good and you have quality programs. Now, I am uncomfortable, but I am satisfied with Vice President and Provost Strand's making cuts in his units. I would like to ask the Vice President that is not here, Jim Alexander, how much will

be cut from his budget. I will ask Vice President Gurowitz how much will be cut from his area to help fund this project. Can you do it? Are there dollars there?

Vice President Gurowitz: We will be able to identify funds to do this. The department heads are going over funds now to see what it would mean to programs and activities. In terms of Student Affairs money, much of that money is Bond Revenue or Student Fees rather than General Revenue Appropriated dollars. There is not a lot to be mined. We do not have a lot of General Revenue dollars.

President Wallace: Can you remember when the last good year was?

Senator Walker: When I first came here in 1980, it has been downhill since then.

President Wallace: Faculty morale has been low because there have been three of the last five years there have been zero percent increases for those years. Another year it was only 2%. There are people out there who are seriously looking at other jobs. If the administration came up with a plan to not have a raise, it would have been another type of problem. The university community may come back and say we want to be the only school in the state that doesn't get a raise.

Senator Touhy: Fees and tuition are being raised, but services and programs are being cut. Where do the students benefit in all of this? We are concerned from the student perspective.

President Wallace: During the 1980's, funding in constant dollars for ISU was decreased by 8.5 million dollars. Illinois was 49th in the country during the 1980's in increased tax support for higher education. Students should direct their anger at the legislature. The IBHE productivity studies were to examine priorities and see how expenditure patterns in a number of budget areas could be changed. Until the tax structure in Illinois is changed, very little can be done.

Senator Touhy: Is it beneficial to have the enrollment reduction program right now?

President Wallace: What you would have is about 1,500 to 1,600 more students, but the same amount of money. You would have to have more sections of courses for more students.

Senator Touhy: Is it defeating its purpose?

President Wallace: The State took back its \$1.9 million dollars January 1st.

Senator Baer: I have two comments. A delay of a salary increase is not a delay, but a loss of a salary increase. Secondly, it seems to me that many of my colleagues are making the assumption that a reduction in personnel affects the integrity of programs. It doesn't have to be that way. We have to look at our programs. We have to look at the way we administer the programs, and have to come up with more effective ways to do things. If we can do things effectively with fewer people, then perhaps we should. What I am suggesting is that we deserve a raise, and do not have to affect the integrity of our programs to get a raise.

Senator DeRousse: This may be a myth going around campus, but many students have asked me: that Illinois State University is the lowest funded school in the state per capita.

President Wallace: We are the second lowest in the State. During the 1980's, ISU had 61% of the total enrollment growth in the state. Two thousand of the three thousand new students were at ISU. Yet our funding decreased by 8.5 million dollars.

Senator Sadeghian: How much is the administration contributing to this? Who is in charge of it?

President Wallace: Anything is possible. Dr. Strand is in charge of this.

Senator Zeidenstein: In the hypothetical scenario of a 4.5% state increase, would that necessarily obviate through reallocation exercise, or would it be a matter of continuing the 4.5% exercise. Or, would it no longer be necessary if we got 4.5% from the State.

President Wallace: We could go above 4.5% if we had the funds. Since we don't, it is not our intention to go above the 4.5%.

Senator Zeidenstein: If, hypothetically, the State gave us a 4.5% increase. At that point, would it be possible for department personnel to take back a section or two that they had to give up?

President Wallace: Hypothetically, yes. We have had discussions with everyone concerning this.

Senator Zeidenstein: The fall registration books are printed.

PROVOST'S REMARKS:

Provost Strand: I have three topics. First of all with regard to the possibility of a FY93 salary adjustment at the 4.5% level to how that might be implemented, I have been discussing this possibility with the deans and with President Wallace for a couple of weeks and I recommended to the deans and to the President that the following approach be taken or considered. Both the President and the deans have accepted this recommendation as a way in which we might approach the 4.5% exercise. The \$150 one time payment will be made across the board. The annualization of the \$150, or a \$300 addition to the base salary will again be made across the board. This is being made primarily to offset an increase in health insurance premiums. With regard to the 3% salary adjustment which will be a part of the 4.5% total, with respect to Civil Service and A/P employees, we would use the regular process. With regard to the faculty, it has been my recommendation and it has been accepted and endorsed by the other parties that 2% of this be allocated through the ASPT process, as an exception to X.A.1. of the ASPT document if no appropriated funds are available for salary increases. What this says, in essence, is that X.A.1. does not require that the University distribute this money through the ASPT process since it is not new appropriated funding. But an exception can be made if there is no appropriated money available. The final 1% of the 2% would then be administered through the administrative equity process which has been part of the salary package for the last several years. That is the way in which the 4.5% salary package might be allocated across the various groups of employees.

Topic two is the early retirement initiative. Reference has been made in the discussion this evening about the 5 + 5 program or the early retirement initiative. The Senate should be aware that the Illinois Board of Higher Education as part of its proposals for action at next week's meeting has an alternative to the early retirement initiative which calls for adding two years of service credit rather than five. It calls for no employee payment, rather than 50% employee payment. It calls for a 55 year of age threshold instead of 50. The other parts are similar to the 5 + 5 program; a sign up in the fall by October 31st, faculty members would be expected to complete the academic year unless granted an exception by the President of the institution. Other individuals would be expected to retire December 31, 1992, unless requested to continue on by the President. There are some variations in the IBHE approach from the legislation initially proposed in the General Assembly.

The final topic is summer school. The impact of the recision on the summer school will result in approximately a twenty per-cent reduction in classes and courses. There is a variation by college. In those colleges that have been hit the hardest by the summer school reduction through the recision, deans are attempting to restore funds that are made available through variance dollars as those variance dollars become available between now and the start of summer school. Overall, the impact of the recision on the summer session is that about one fifth of the seats will not be available.

Senator Zeidenstein: Provost Strand, do you know that I respectfully but firmly disagree with you in terms of that 2% of the 3% would be looked as exception of X. A. 1. of the ASPT document which states: "the Provost shall make known to the URC the amount of funds available for salary increases to faculty subject to the ASPT system." That refers to the minimum amount of money appropriated by the General Assembly. I interpret that minimum includes funds from non-appropriated. Mr. Provost, I disagree with your statement.

Provost Strand: I thoroughly understand your statement. I respectfully disagree with your interpretation, since I was a part of the group that drafted the current policy.

Senator Manns: Can you tell us what departments are being cut? Some students are planning to graduate in August, and depend on summer school classes to finish school.

Provost Strand: The summer session course book went to press before the Governor announced his recision. The summer session book does contain some errors. I do not have the specific information with me tonight as to which departments will be affected. I have asked each dean to provide information as to the loss of credit hours in their colleges. Each dean has gone through this exercise. If you are anticipating enrolling in summer school, I would suggest you check with your department. We are painfully aware of students who are affected by this and unfortunate circumstances such as inability to graduate. Once again, I would suggest that your anger, frustration, agony, over this be impressed upon people off campus, namely your elected officials. These people need to know what consequence comes from imposing recisions on an institution when more than 50% of the fiscal year has passed. This recision came after we were into the Spring semester and there was very little financial flexibility and summer session was one of the few areas where we could make adjustments. All other funds were already encumbered. We are painfully aware of this and certainly sympathize with the students.

Senator Razaki: Out of the 4.5%, 1.5% is across the board, about 2% is through the ASPT process. Why does the administration want to withhold 1% from the ASPT process? If there is money outside of the ASPT process, what is the reason for the administration using it outside of the process, other than favoritism?

Provost Strand: I take exception to your reference to favoritism. Let me give you one example. Matching offers cannot be addressed through the ASPT process. There is a fine line that does not allow us to match offers from other institutions in a timely manner. Faculty and departments themselves will recommend that something be done to retain a given faculty member. The ASPT document is not responsive to that. That is one of the primary ways in which a college dean can respond. Such offers are given to those who are highly regarded in the department.

Senator Razaki: So, why don't you let the departments decide on offers that are outside the ASPT process, not the deans and the chairpersons. We are well aware of what faculty members are worth. I do not see that happening fairly. Maybe there should be a set of guidelines about matching offers.

Provost Strand: I was part of a joint committee which several years ago recommended a matching offer concept to the university community. That committee was composed of faculty members, University Review Committee members, and others. That proposal got as far as the floor of the Academic Senate and was defeated by the Academic Senate. At this point, Deans have to work outside the ASPT process to try to respond to this circumstance. We would be happy to see changes in the ASPT process which would minimize this problem.

Senator Razaki: Is this remaining 1% totally for matching offers?

Provost Strand: No. It is to be used for a number of purposes that would be agreed upon by the deans working with the chairs.

Senator Walker: With the Chair's permission, as Chair of the Faculty Committee, I would like to yield the floor to a non-senator, Dr. Chris Eisele, who is Chair of the University Review Committee.

Chairperson Schmaltz: If there are no objections from the Senate, we will hear Dr. Eisele.

Dr. Chris Eisele: I am here as Chair of the University Review Committee, which reports to the Senate on matters of the ASPT Document. I respectfully disagree here with Provost Strand's interpretation. I have recently read all of the discussions and debates when X.A.1. was passed by the Senate, and it seems to be relatively clear that it focussed only on the issue that if money was found when the Provost was allocating salaries; that it was to be distributed to groups of faculty, not given to individual faculty members. I don't think there was anything in that discussion or in the ASPT Handbook that suggests it is necessary to have an exception to X.A.1. to use the ASPT system. I think it would be a bad policy decision to use an exception to the ASPT system for the allocation of funds for salaries.

Secondly, this is a question for Provost Strand: When you spoke of administrative equity, was that referring to X.10.C. "Personal service funds, other than the salary increase funds defined in X.A.1., may be utilized as supplemental salary increases for individual faculty members covered by the ASPT system. The Dean, with prior approval of the affected department's DFSC, shall recommend such salary increases to the Provost. Half of such increases shall come from the Department's salary equity funds allocated under article V.F." (This is located at the top of page 23.) Is that the section you are using to distribute money through the administrative equity process?

Provost Strand: X.A.1. talks about funds appropriated by the General Assembly. What we are talking about here and, as we have in the past, is funds which are not appropriated by the General Assembly which are utilized for faculty salary adjustments. You will recall that in previous years, recommendations by the General Assembly were for a 3% increase and that by agreement it was stretched to 3.19% or 3.24%. The difference between #% and 3.19% or 3.24% was between the funds actually appropriated by the General Assembly and those that were finally allocated for salary adjustments.

Dr. Chris Eisele: X.A.1. speaks of "the personal service funds appropriated by the State legislature for that year. The Provost may distribute additional funds outside the ASPT system for designated categories of faculty." Those funds are not from Springfield. The second statement regarding additional funds outside the system is the criteria you are using. Your second statement that these offers come from the dean's recommendations. I think that is not permissible. I think this complicates the use of funds that way. In the last line it says: "Half of such increases shall come from the Department's salary equity funds allocated under article V.F." The exception you created was

that administrative equity is separate from the ASPT system.

Senator Young: It kind of astonishes me the interpretation of X.A.1. The wording seems to be very straight forward, "the Provost shall make known to the URC the amount of funds available for salary increases to faculty subject to the ASPT system." That's it. It then goes on to define a minimum, but does not define a maximum. If salary increase money were to come from reallocations, the document clearly covers that. It covers the funds available for salary increases.

Provost Strand: Let me comment. When X.A.1. was written, there was no thought that there would ever be a year in which the General Assembly would not appropriate funds for salaries. You have honest differences of opinion over what X.A.1. means. In the past it has been used to describe those funds for salaries appropriated by the General Assembly, but what the institution produced or stretched beyond that was handled differently. We have a policy statement that is not as responsive to the environment as it was previously.

Senator White: Where, within the 2% or 1% is the wet promotion money for merit equity and market equity?

Provost Strand: Neither. Wet promotion money is outside this process.

Senator White: Where do merit equity and market equity fit in?

Provost Strand: There are three types of market equity adjustments. One is where the department decides that it wants to do in an equity process, generally related to market conditions in the discipline. Sometimes departments link with colleges in a comprehensive equity study.

Senator White: What about the 1%?

Provost Strand: Well, it could be done within the ASPT process. There is a section in the document that speaks to that. There are then, the counter offers, that I mentioned earlier to Senator Razaki, which are not addressed adequately in the ASPT document. The third is an affirmative action adjustment which we have not had in recent years. We did this five or six years ago.

Senator Zeidenstein: Even if I accepted the historical context explanation that provided your interpretation of X.A.1., we should go on the basis of the words as written in the document. Secondly, if this body ever gets a

document for its consideration and approval, that says as an exception to X.A.1., I would plead with you never to pass that or you would set a precedent for undercutting the document that we now have.

Vice President for Student Affairs, William Gurowitz, had no remarks.

Vice President Alexander had an excused absence.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed Academic Senate Meeting Calendar for July - December, 1992

XXIII-41 Motion by DeRousse (Second, Touhy) to approve Academic Senate Meeting Calendar for July-December, 1992, carried on a voice vote.

Senator Tuttle: For the Academic Senate Budget Committee reported on the curriculum proposals presented by the Academic Affairs Committee. The Budget Committee was asked to make a comment on each of these items from a budgetary perspective. I would like to explain what we did, and what we found out, and provide information on each of these programs. The Budget Committee met and asked me to prepare a questionnaire to be mailed to department chairs, asking about the budgetary implications of their proposed program. Since the proposals all stated, "no new resources," chairs were asked: what they would not be able to provide (major courses, service courses, university studies courses, etc.). What we were trying to get at with that question, is an honest statement by a chair that if the program is approved, then in order to do that, here is what we would take from someplace else to do it. Most of these proposals said no new funds required. We just wanted to test that to see if it was true. The second question asked: In view of the changing economic environment (State of Illinois and ISU internal) is this proposal still a priority for your department. That was essentially a yes or no question. For all of the proposals you have before you as action items this evening, the chair of their department answered "yes." It is still a priority item.

The Budget Committee had difficulty planning a meeting, and I was to sent out the questionnaires, get the answers, disseminate them to the budget committee members, and if they had concerns they were to let me know, and somehow or another we would magically find a time to meet. I did not get any requests to meet, and I checked with two members specifically, and they felt it was not necessary to meet.

Therefore, I am providing the information for the departments.

The first program: Department of Health Sciences, Health Education Program - Minor in Community Health. In reply to question one on "no new resources needed,": Nothing - all courses offered to minor and also a part of the major program. There will not be any additional sections and people will be in the courses presently in the program. It appears to me and the rest of the Budget Committee that this really does mean no new resources, nor any reallocation of resources.

The second program: Japanese Studies. I want to thank Chairperson Alice Berry for an extended response, certainly far reaching beyond what any other Chair has done. You may wish to add to the brief interpretation that I will give. We did raise questions at the last Senate meeting about the no new resources, when it appeared that somebody's time might have to be reallocated to do this. In the reply it is pointed out that there is 1.5 FTE committed to that minor, just as it is to some other minors in the department and that seemed sufficient for the other minors and probably would be for this one. If there is any effect in having the one individual, Dr. Roger Thomas, teach the additional course that is needed it would possibly in a worse-case scenario mean one less section of Japanese I, of which there are apparently now several sections.

Dr. Alice Berry: Currently the department offers three sections. It may mean that we might only be able to offer two. Students could pursue a third year for credit, which is extremely important for language studies.

Senator Young. Are the three sections closed now?

Dr. Alice Berry: Yes. In the fall there were 25 students in one class, 21 in another, and 30 in another. In the spring there are two in one, 21 in another, and 28 in another.

Senator Tuttle: It seems to me that we are talking about reallocation of one section for another. Assuming that this is not going to lead to requests for additional resources, this does not require additional resources.

There are four new programs from the Department of Art. Chair of the department, Ron Mottram, replied on these programs. Replies to question one on "no new resources": "Approval of the BFA will have no impact on other courses. The expansion of credit hour requirements is based on courses that already exist in the curriculum. Making the Graphic Design Program into a separate sequence has no impact on other courses. The sequence utilizes existing courses. The changes are essentially ones

involving sequencing and pre-requisites. Separating Art History from the Studio Sequence will have no impact on other courses. It simply rationalizes the Art History program by setting pre-requisites and a more defined sequencing of courses students will take. Making the new Studio Arts sequence a separate sequence allows better control of pre-requisites and the various concentrations offered within the sequence. It has no impact on the department's other course offerings. No new resources would be needed for any of the programs.

Senator Sadeghian: What about question two, about where it is still a priority.

Senator Tuttle: The Art Department answered "yes" to question two concerning the priority of the proposals.

XXIII-42 2. Approval of Health Education Program for a Minor in Community Health

Senator Ritt: I move approval of the Department of Health Sciences - Health Education Program Minor in Community Health. (Second, Whitacre) Motion carried on a voice vote.

XXIII-43 3. Approval of Department of Foreign Language Minor in Japanese Studies

Senator Ritt: I move approval of the Department of Foreign Languages Minor in Japanese Studies (Second, White). Motion carried on a voice vote.

- 4. Department of Art - New Studio Arts Sequence**
- 5. Department of Art - Art History Sequence**
- 6. Department of Art - New Graphic Design Sequence**

XXIII-44 Senator Ritt: I would like to recommend approval of all three of the Department of Art Proposals: The New Studio Arts Sequence; the Art History Sequence; and the Creation of a New Graphic Design Sequence (Second, Stearns). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Academic Senate recessed for twenty minutes. (9:10 p.m.)

INFORMATION ITEMS

Senator Ritt: Before I proceed, I would like to call attention to an inadvertent omission of the Department of Communication Proposal for a Professional Public Relations Sequence which was distributed to the Senate in the previous packet and to which I made reference on Page Nine of the Minutes of February 12, 1992. I would like unanimous consent to include that as an

Information Item between Items Two and Three on the Agenda.

Chairperson Schmaltz: If there is no objection, we will add this to the agenda tonight.

Senator White: I object. This item was not on the agenda, and I am not prepared to discuss it. We already have a full agenda for this evening.

Senator Ritt: I would call attention to the fact that in my remarks during committee reports at the last Senate meeting, I informed the Senate that these items would be coming up for information at this meeting. The items were part of the distribution of the material that went out for the last meeting.

Chairperson Schmaltz: According to the Senate Rules, we need unanimous consent to add an item to the agenda. That item cannot be added tonight. We apologize to the Department of Communication.

1. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Bachelor of Fine Arts

Dr. Ron Mottram, Chairperson of Fine Arts was available for questions.

Senator Zeidenstein: On the first page, I don't see any signature for approval by the Teacher Education Council or the University Curriculum Committee. Has this proposal been approved?

Senator Ritt: It has been approved by the University Curriculum Committee.

Senator Zeidenstein: Are there any additional dollars involved?

Dr. Ron Mottram: No.

Senator Tuttle: The Budget Committee received a reply. The courses are there. Therefore, there will be no budget impact. I have one question that might cause budgetary implications. The proposal states: "to add 9 semester hours of 300-level studio and studio-related courses to the BFA degree." Does that mean more courses in the department?

Dr. Ron Mottram: No. All of the additional hours are in courses already offered in the departmental curriculum.

Senator Cook: We heard the Academic Plan a few meetings ago, and it included program reviews from the College of Fine Arts.

I have the recollection that there were remarks to the effect that studios were under considerable stress -- lack of space and lack of resources. Are they going to be able to absorb the additional enrollment without rehabilitation?

Dr. Ron Mottram: There is no additional enrollment. The change is essentially motivated by the curriculum committee. The changes will bring us in line with department and accreditation agencies.

Senator Cook: By no additional enrollment, do you mean no additional majors, or no additional student contact hours within the department.

Dr. Ron Mottram: There are additional student hours within the program, but there are no additional students. The BFA program is quite small.

Dr. Catherine Batsche: The BFA program currently enrolls 19 students. Only four students graduated with 149 or less hours.

Senator Zeidenstein: This is a followup question. Is the amount of time in existing facilities going to be a problem. Somewhere down the road, will there have to be reservation requests for studios simply because there are only 24 hours in a day? When you have more students who have to use a studio, will they not be more crowded?

Dr. Ron Mottram: No. We distributed a sheet this evening that shows the number of hours.

Senator Baer: I have a question regarding the total number of hours. On the first page you state, "To meet this 72 hour requirement would mean adding 15 semester hours in studio art to the current program, creating a 135-hour degree, which would be unacceptable to the Department, the University and the Board of Regents." Then you make this compromise which you are able to get the accrediting agency to accept so that the program goes on the books as requiring 129 hours; but in fact students still have to take a 135-hour major.

Dr. Ron Mottram: No.

Senator Baer: It says: "...but with the understanding that the BFA will continue to require students to work with a faculty member for four semesters on a non-credit basis in preparation for the BFA exhibition. For purposes of accreditation, NASAD will assume that the preparation and exhibition will be equivalent to six semester hours of work, without requiring that the 6 hours appear in the catalog copy for the degree program." I am

not sure that students will believe that it is not a 135-hour program.

Dr. Ron Mottram: There is no way to prepare students for the enormous number of hours that are required. The demands of NASAD, the accrediting agency, have to be met.

Senator Hesse: Isn't it the case, that students are already this many hours, but not receiving credit for them.

Dr. Ron Mottram: There are only four students without 129 hours, and one student has as many as 188 hours.

2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Philosophy: Minor in Religious Studies

Senator Tuttle: The Budget Committee did not receive a reply from the Philosophy Department.

Senator Collier: (Acting Chair of the Philosophy Department) There would be no budgetary implications because all of the courses are already being taught. Many are in other departments, but the program is administratively housed in the Department of Philosophy.

Senator Tuttle: Is that making additional demands on other departments.

Dr. Kenton Machina: Judaism is taught once every other year. They are re-focusing, rather than adding another course. It is an IDS course. The proposal was written by Professor Shields.

Senator Tuttle: Will the English Department have to give up anything to teach this course?

Dr. Kenton Machina: The English Department Chair, Dr. Harris, assured us that Professor Shields already does this.

Senator Walker: Do they have letters of endorsement from those other departments saying that they are willing to support this?

Dr. Kenton Machina: Yes. They are attached to the proposal.

3. University Studies Review Committee Document

Senator Ritt: The Academic Affairs Committee is presenting tonight the University Studies Review Committee Statement of Objectives, which was distributed to you under a cover letter to me from Robert Stefl, of the Council on University

University Studies
Objectives -
Information Item
2/26/96 pp 24-28

Studies. In your material, you have a let Borg, who is Chair of the University Studie We discussed this, and upon my insistence, discuss the Objectives Statement with you.

Dr. Paul Borg: As you are aware, the Unive approximately two years ago the process of University Studies portion of the baccalaur University. Our committee was formed in M four-part charge by the Provost. First, w the national literature on general studies develop a philosophy for university studies University. This we did, and the Academic ~~Senate approved~~ that on March 13th of last year. The second part of the charge was to develop objectives for that university studies program. This is the draft proposal that you have before you. Assuming these are approved by the Academic Senate, we are then to proceed and compare what we offer through university studies with the philosophy and objectives to see how well or better we are doing, and if not to come up with some sort of a program. The process we have used in developing the document has been fairly lengthy, but we think rather complete. We have canvassed opinions throughout the campus, and solicited information from beyond the campus. The objectives themselves are meant for the entire program unlike the current description of the present university studies program which are meant as a major core of courses. The objectives we propose are routed in the Statement of Philosophy and are meant to elaborate some on the intent of the Philosophy. The actual structure at the present time is what you have before you tonight. Are there any questions about the document.

Senator Tuttle: I have a question for clarification. On page four, Global, I read at the top number ten, where it says: "and the emerging common civilization of the contemporary world community." Then I relate this in my mind to item e. which states: "discuss the events, values, and ideals that contribute to an emerging world civilization." I am not quite sure there is an emerging world civilization.

Senator Ritt: We raised this question in the committee, and were assured that there was.

Dr. Paul Borg: It is now possible from many of the offices on this campus to communicate with similar offices throughout the world on communications systems that have been set up over the past twenty years. There is something about the world that goes beyond national boundaries. The document intends to anticipate or at least allow for changes in the program. An entirely unified world culture may not emerge.

Senator Walker: Don't confuse the words culture and civilization. You are interchanging them, and they are not synonymous terms. Culture does not necessarily imply civilization. Also, a civilization could include many cultures.

Senator Tuttle: I am still puzzled. I have trouble visualizing a satellite uplink and downlink as anything approximating a world civilization. I was in Australia, and I saw the marvelous technology communicating with the outback for educational purposes via satellites that we put up for the Auzzies. But, I have trouble imagining that as a world civilization.

Dr. Ron Fortune: There is a difference between cultures and concepts. (unintelligible)

Senator Tuttle: I guess I might understand something like an emerging appreciation of the status as it changes the characteristics of the civilizations in the world. But, I would have trouble calling that emerging world civilizations.

Dr. Paul Borg: Perhaps I should introduce the other members of the committee who are here: Dr. Roy Austensen, Provost's Staff; Macon Williams, Psychology; Ron Fortune, English; and Derek McCracken from Biology.

Dr. Roy Austensen: As we engage in these discussions of study around the world, we see over the past few years that the curriculum in schools in Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America has become more and more alike. What children are learning in schools is more alike than ever before all over the world. What we are trying to express here is that our new curriculum must be open to the consequences of all of this communication that is taking place. Our curriculum needs to be open enough to adjust to the changes. The new communications are bringing us all closer together, and we need to be prepared for the consequences of this.

Senator Tuttle: I am still troubled with how unilateral this is.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have two copies of this, the one that came in the Senate packet, and also one I received months ago. It appears to be identical. They both have the same dates. The cover letter also has the same date, November 12. Am I correct in assuming that the November 12th cover letter to deans, department chairs, and other interested parties is the same as the Senate copy.

Senator Borg: Yes. We sent the proposal to "interested parties."

Senator Zeidenstein: Then there are no differences. Did you know that if by this you mean the intercommunications and rapid communications and what justifies common civilization, never mind world community, then it seems to me that item number ten ought to refer to the effects of instant world communication. Instead of saying emerging civilizations, say something like world community. If you mean the effects of communication, then say communication. You could even mention CNN if you want. As far as the examples you gave, I would call to your attention, if you think there is an emerging civilization about a decade ago ESPN carried Australian football. It doesn't do it any more. Lots of things are not emerging.

Dr. Borg: I might mention that Esperanto never caught on either.

Senator Zeidenstein: Correct. Or soccer in this country. Would you consider revising number ten to refer clearly to an instant media or worldwide communication network in lieu of the term you are using?

Dr. Borg: No.

Senator Zeidenstein: On Page One, Item C, "explain the relevance of science and technology to problems connected with the quality of individual and societal life." For those who have had the benefit of a CATSCAN, would you consider the following amendment: "explain the relevance of science and technology to problems and benefits connected with the quality of individual and societal life."

Dr. Borg: Off the top of my head, I don't see why that would be necessary.

Senator Zeidenstein: The way it reads now, science and technology bring nothing but problems.

Dr. Borg: Inasmuch as problems are opportunities, it need not follow that the implication is negative. It could be positive. I think you are reading too much into this.

Senator Walker: The University Studies Review Committee will address that issue before the next Senate meeting. We may not change it, but we will look at it.

Senator Sadeghian: One of my first thoughts when I saw this, especially in light of the earlier discussion this evening on budget cuts, we should keep in mind how one affects the other. How will they work together. I welcome a global understanding of the world in our university studies. But, if programs are going to be cut, we need to know how one will affect the other.

Dr. Borg: I can assure you that those very questions weigh very heavily on the committee. At the deliberations, we have considered as much implication on students. That is a thought we will have to address.

Senator Walker: If indeed this does pass the Senate, then our next step will be to look at the existing programs and in that analysis we will look at the current cost and if it needs to be modified or changed, look at what those potential costs would be. That is part of our charge. That will be addressed. The objectives themselves are the objectives for general education at Illinois State University, disregarding what program you are considering.

Senator Cook: I have a question of interpretation. I had similar concerns to Dr. Tuttle on page four. But I seem to be the only person who was perplexed about Item 5, C, on page two. Considering my strong interest in professional ethics, it embarrasses me to have to ask what the ethical implications of learning in one's personal and public lives are.

Dr. Borg: The committee considered this a number of times. There are some things that a program can foster. One of which is understanding what the nature of learning is. It is not what you have learned, but by being an educated person, there are certain ethical implications to that. The individual, you will recall, is the focus of the liberal arts portion of the general education program.

Senator Cook: I think that I understand this now.

Senator Nelsen: What sort of time line do you project for completing this and bringing it before the Senate? The Philosophy and Objectives are fine, but until we get to the actual implementation of them, we will not know what changes are to be made. This has been window dressing so far, when will we get to the meat of the program, the actual recommendations?

Dr. Borg: We plan to conduct the next portion of our deliberations in a similar fashion to what we have done so far. Draft proposals have been shared with the university community in forums for suggestions and discussions, and listening to all the input. Eventually, we will have to bring curriculum proposals to the Senate. The time line is already expanding. We are hoping to have something by the fall of 1992. It is an immense chore and there are an awful lot of loose ends.

4. Faculty Affairs Committee Changes in ASPT Document

Senator Walker: I would like to introduce Dr. Chris Eisele, EAF, who is Chair of the University Review Committee. Also, available this evening is Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo of the Provost's Office. The Faculty Affairs Committee would like to thank Chris Eisele who is Chair of the University Review Committee and has been working on these changes for the past three years. It is commendable that a faculty member would put that much of their personal time into a document. You have the changes before you, along with the cover letter which explains what we want to do. Essentially we have broken them down into twelve changes that the Faculty Affairs Committee unanimously voted to present to the Senate. We want to do it item by item, one at a time. There may be some overlap, but if we do it one at a time there will be less confusion. Let's discuss them one at a time.

Dr. Chris Eisele: I would like to begin with a brief background statement. In the Fall of 1989, the URC was asked a number of questions by faculty, administrators, and the president concerning various aspects of the ASPT process. After some discussion within the committee and meetings with various individuals, the URC decided it would be appropriate to survey the faculty on specific concerns and provide an open ended questions on other issues. That survey was developed and distributed to the faculty in the Spring of 1990. During the Summer and Fall of 1990 the URC analyzed the data. In the Spring of 1991 the URC distributed a report on the results of the survey, highlighting what we saw as ASPT problems and potential solutions. That report provided the basis for open discussion sessions with faculty. During the Fall of 1991, using survey data, individual written responses, and open session feedback, the URC finalized its specific proposed changes to the ASPT Handbook and forwarded them to the Faculty Affairs Committee earlier this semester. After several joint meetings we produced the final document you have before you.

In addition to thanking the faculty who took the time to fill out the survey, attend the hearings or provide written feedback, I would like to publicly thank some of the people who worked over the last two and one half years to get us to this point: URC members: Tom Eimermann, John Foster, Gordon Redding, Bill Semlak, and Peg Steffenson from the College of Arts and Sciences, Rodney Miller and John Kirk from the College of Fine Arts, Mike Dumler from the College of Business, Fred Fuess and Jean Memken from the College of Applied Science and Technology, and Marian Carroll and Steve Meckstroth from Milner Library. Anita Webb-Lupo from the Provost's Office, and her staff, especially Linda Jaspers and Mary Cowdery have been constantly cooperative.

Bill Gorrell and his staff in Institutional Research were very helpful in the survey design and data tabulation phase. The Faculty Affairs Committee gave us very prompt attention, meeting four times in eight days, to get the final document before you. In addition, we extend our thanks to Peg Hundley of EAF, Marty Rodriguez of the College of Education Dean's Office, and John Tarter of the College of Education Computer Lab, for providing emergency word processing support to make changes to drafts in, literally, minutes, so the URC could continue its work.

Finally, we want to note three items. First, that the proposed changes have gone through dozens of drafts, at least six typists, four computers, and three word processing programs, so we apologize in advance for any typos, spelling errors, and style inconsistencies. Second, that the URC and the FAC, as was stated in the cover memo, would like the Senate to approach this process as voting on twelve separate changes and not one single major change. Third, the URC will be returning to the Senate in the Fall with a second, smaller set of changes, including a completely re-written Personnel File section and a clarification of "confidentiality" in the ASPT process.

Senator Hesse: Was the Academic Freedom Committee involved at all?

Dr. Eisele: At this point the answer is no. Although, work on the Personnel File and Confidentiality sections suggests that we need to involve the Academic Freedom Committee and Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee because of the relationship between CFSC documents which suggest that AFC and FEGC violations should be part of the ASPT process. At this point there seems to be no link that guarantees that and there seems to be no policy on protection of that information.

Senator White: Is there anything in this document that might relate to differential staffing?

Dr. Eisele: The question of differential staffing was on the survey. It is one of the major issues that we put out to the public to talk about. We believe that the current system allows for differential staffing and that there is no specific need to add language that says that you can do that.

Senator White: I understand that. I also understood from discussions with the President that this process was something that would be brought to the Senate.

Dr. Eisele: We need to make a distinction between differential staffing and differential evaluation to start with. One college

a couple of years ago in their CFSC document proposed that departments be allowed to take a vote and decide by department whether or not they would be evaluated on 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 (teaching, research, and service); or if they would be evaluated 40/40/20. That would lead to differential evaluation. If they chose differential evaluation, I think the assumption is that people will probably spend their time differently than 1/3 equal, which could general differential staffing. That is some people would be more involved in research and some people would be more involved in teaching. From all I can understand, that is already possible. There is nothing in the document that requires that people have to be evaluated 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. For promotion and tenure purposes, you must according to the document, be evaluated for teaching, research and services.

Senator White: I may be in touch with you to clarify this. I may be working with a different understanding than you are.

Item 1.

Senator Cook: On page 1.3, we have sections F. and G., and as I compare these to pages 24 and 25 of the original document, it appears to me that Section D. 3. appears in part on the new document, but a substantial part of paragraph 3 does not. Is that an indication that the remaining part of paragraph 3 is not changed? or does it indicate that we have lost a piece of text in going from one word processor to another?

Dr. Eisele: Our intention was to have no substantive change in Item One at all. The intention was to make the document easier to read by cutting out the appeal process in the second paragraph and to make the document easier to index. In doing that translation, we had to take subparagraphs, delete it and split it in half, and add it to. The details are the same. If you found something that is missing, it may be an error of omission.

Senator Cook: Within Paragraph 11.D.1 on page 1.2, the current version and the one in the handbook state that "in case of promotion or tenure recommendations, the appellant shall notify the Chairperson of the UAC in writing of his/her intention to appeal" within a certain period of time after receipt of official notification of the college action relating to the matter giving rise to an appeal. I think that I fail to understand part of the process. If a person is up for promotion or tenure and is denied by the department, does the recommendation and its denial go to the college and then the college that notified the individual that they concur or disagree with the department activity.

Senator Walker: Doesn't the Department Chair give notification, but it goes to the college and the college has the right to overturn or agree. At that point then, notification would go to the faculty member.

Senator Cook: So an appeal of the departmental decision awaits confirmation or contradiction by the college.

Senator Walker: Dr. Webb-Lupo says no. But I thought that was correct.

Dr. Webb-Lupo: The document says no. XI. C. states: "Appeals in Denial of Tenure Cases: If a faculty member is appealing a negative decision with respect to tenure he/she must direct that appeal to the UAC only." In promotion cases, if a department says no, it is up to the individual faculty member to ask the CFSC.

Senator Cook: So, in some cases a person may not receive a college notification of a decision, and therefore could not appeal.

Dr. Webb-Lupo: If a person was not recommended by their department, and did not get any notification from the CFSC, he could appeal.

Item 2.

Item 3.

Senator Hesse: On page 3, Item VIII.C. "Criteria for Tenure" - "The tenure decision should not be the product of any set formula or based on yearly performance evaluation ratings....." I interpret that to say that a tenure decision should not be based on the early performance evaluations. I wonder if that was the intent?

Dr. Eisele: That was the intent. Let me give you the reason why we thought it was necessary to have this. There is now one college that says to go from an associate to full professor, you must rate exceptional merit for at least two years in your primary assignment. Our belief is that the promotion/tenure process requires a comparison of criteria. To say that a rating is the same as the criteria is a logical mistake. We think it is important to use the number of the criteria. Since the DFSC membership changes, the ASPT document needs to be clear.

Senator Hesse: Is the intent to render the early evaluations superfluous in the tenure decision?

Dr. Eisele: No. I am talking about the rating. That is not what the college does. It takes at least two years in the primary assignment to get promoted. What we are saying is that in the college, a person must have a certain rating in order to be considered for promotion. A faculty member's complete record should be compared to a set of criteria.

Senator Hesse: You are merely talking about merit, exceptional merit, no merit, etc.

Dr. Eisele: Yes. A letter which lists all the performance against a letter which doesn't list all of the accomplishments of the faculty member will not be used as a method of criteria.

Senator Young: Looking at VII. A., where you are adding: "based on yearly performance evaluation ratings." I expected to see the same statement regarding tenure, but I don't. VIII.C. Criteria for Tenure reads "The tenure decision should not be the product of any set formula or based on yearly performance evaluations ratings...." It seems that you need to say the same thing in both places. I think you are saying two different things. Why did you change the two words?

Dr. Eisele: It was probably the or, nor -- that would be an editing problem. What we tried to do was make VII and VIII parallel by leaving out the "or".

Senator Walker: How do they say different things. Is it the word "or."

Senator Young: The word "or" changes the language completely. You should leave the "or" out.

Senator Walker: The or should be left out?

Senator Young: You should make it parallel construction.

Item 4.

Senator Cook: On part C. on the top of page 4.2. We have parts a, b, and c inserted into the policy. My question is what the advantage to the Provost Office is to having the results of a four-year evaluation on a yearly basis? Does that access not currently exist?

Dr. Eisele: The Board of Regents issued a policy on 9/15/88: "The Universities shall, at regular intervals, review and evaluate the performance of tenured faculty in order to offer constructive guidance and to encourage a continuing high level of

faculty accomplishment. Each University shall establish the policies, procedures and criteria needed to accomplish such periodic evaluations, and a report of the results of such evaluations shall be made to the Board of Regents." The University had made a decision to do that on a four-year basis. No policy was developed to fulfill the requirement that would be reported on such evaluations. Evaluations did not flow through the Provost Office or reside in the Provost Office. The Provost Office needs to respond to the Regents and say, yes, the evaluations went on. They also need to have access to evaluations and what they were.

Item 5.

Item 6.

Item 7.

Senator White: Why are you deleting the matter in item 1?

Dr. Eisele: Item 2 replaces the deleted matter.

Senator Cook: A question of procedures. In X. B. 2, it mentions that the CFSC reviews and approves the procedures and policies developed by Department Faculty Status Comm. Who reviews and/or approves the policies generated by a CFSC?

Dr. Eisele: The University Review Committee does that. II. C. "The URC shall receive statements annually from each College Faculty Status Committee indicating current college criteria for merit evaluation, promotion, equity and tenure. It shall review these criteria....." The URC looks at the policies of each CFSC every year.

Senator Nelsen: The CFSC guidelines would make provision for two different scenarios for evaluating criteria. "2. At the beginning of the evaluation year, after each DFSC has developed department faculty status procedures and policies (following appropriate faculty input and the CFSC has reviewed and approved them, the Department Chairperson will distribute the DFSC procedures and policies to each faculty member in the department." Which guidelines are developed first?

Dr. Eisele: This document empowers the departments to make those decisions. A CFSC has no power to take away a department's right. The CFSC will have to provide another set of criteria.

Senator Nelsen: They will have to provide two sets of criteria?

Dr. Eisele: Yes.

Item 8.

Item 9.

Senator Cook: I was asked by someone else to raise the question as to whether the Faculty Affairs Committee has modified this section since the URC proposal was submitted to the FAC.

Dr. Eisele: The Faculty Affairs Committee has improved what was submitted to them.

Senator Cook: I thought I saw discrepancies between the two. What are variable dollar amounts in X. B. 10. E. 2. (pg. 9.2) "variable dollar amounts for each faculty member or group of faculty rated EXCEPTIONAL MERIT. EXCEPTIONAL MERIT salary allocations will be applied regardless of rank or tenure status and will be added to the option 1 (MERIT) or option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT) salary allocation." This implies that the departments can determine a dollar amount that goes to all the people of exceptional merit within that department uniformly, or that different amounts can be given to different individuals within a department. Is the variation among departments or internal?

Dr. Eisele: It is within departments. X. B. 10. d. 2 states: "2. In department choosing to use option 2 (MERIT/HIGH MERIT) faculty rated MERIT will receive one-half (1/2) the percentage increase of those rated HIGH MERIT." This suggests that departments have the right to choose. Instead of having the same amount of money for each faculty member, they may have a variable amount. These variable amounts may take two distinct forms. Every individual may get a different amount. They could use a point system for merit and exceptional merit where there are a variety number of points with the different total number of points receiving different amounts of money. In the hearing process, we heard from a variety of departments and faculty members that occasionally they would have five people with exceptional merit, four of them superior in their performance. Originally we had one, two and three. One as it is now - fixed; Two - grouped; and Three - totally variable. We realized that two and three were just variations of the same thing. Different amounts - exceptional merit; the same amount - exceptional merit; or different groups of exceptional merit - different amounts.

Senator Walker: This really gives the departments the flexibility to do what they want to do -- by majority vote.

Senator Nelsen: Is there a definition of what exceptional merit is, of what high merit is? The way I read this, a person with merit is doing his/her job. By my mathematical basis, if you get merit, you probably will never even get a cost of living raise at ISU. A 10% raise would cover 4% inflation, allowing for 10% equity above the ratio that is in there for merit. How do you define merit? If you do your job at this institution, you go backwards.

Dr. Eisele: Departments have a choice between the current system and a new system, depending on what we now call that category. That is a response to a lot of input from the survey forms and letters. If you are asking if the merit from one category and the high merit in the other category are equivalent, the answer is clearly no. Do those words mean the same thing (merit/merit), the answer is clearly no. Departments and colleges define those terms based on performances they expect the faculty to be evaluated on those terms.

Senator Walker: That is provided in Section VIII on Tenure Policies, where it clarifies the colleges choose those criteria.

Senator Nelsen: So there is no fixed criteria for those who are doing their jobs.

Dr. Eisele: This is not a URC function, and we do not want to tell departments what constitutes merit or high merit. We want to give departments a chance to experiment inside the system. Some departments through the years have all on their own made up a system of this which is clearly a violation of the ASPT document. Departments feel that the range from insufficient to exceptional is entirely too large. We have heard that over and over and over. The URC must find some way of putting that category out. We decided that the way to do it was what we are proposing.....off the top and not off the bottom. That survey talked about cost of living increases as a way to increase salary money. We looked at the responses, and what figure or indicator would be used. Cost of living increases do not fit into the salary allocation model. Working with the tools we had in hand made it look like it wasn't a good idea. We felt we would have the outside world driving us, and we wanted to distribute the money.

Senator Nelsen: You attempted to give flexibility to the departments. Why not give the departments the flexibility to determine one half or 50%? Why was there an exact number set?

Dr. Eisele: Certainly the URC realized that putting any number on that would generate that kind of question. What we wanted to accomplish was create a category in response to the wishes of faculty and administrators that had a reasonably clear disincentive packet. Whether you would call that punitive or disincentive, we felt after discussing the issue that there was enough disincentive for people who landed in the "half" category.

Senator Ritt: In the view of the committee, in the departmental four level scale, that high merit would become across the board norm. The difference between merit and high merit could be regarded as a disincentive to achieve merit.

Senator Walker: I'd say it is an achievement to receive high merit. Merit is the same.

Dr. Eisele: My answer is that we are not going to deal with conceptual problems involved. Any negative word that we associated with these categories was instantly attacked by 100% of the people that heard it. If we said low merit, people said you can't do that. For several months we used high/low language, but we found that was not acceptable to the faculty. Then we used levels 1, 2, 3, 4 -- and took all language out. People said that was just the same thing over. What we went to then was a new system. I am not happy with that. That is what the faculty response was to find new categories with names. In the new system, high merit becomes across the board.

Senator Ritt: So, basically, when you say merit in that system you are telling the person that they deserve half as much money as someone with high merit. So presumably, once the faculty knows it, we might just be smart enough to get by the system.

Dr. Eisele: You are confusing performance and levels attached to performance. Those are very different. Departments that have high merit are not going to just increase the performance requirements to get high merit. In the two categories, if you are high merit then you are probably doing more this year than last year to get across the board. Departments will be rewriting their documents if they choose the four point category system and your performance will drive the reward that you get. You will be evaluated on performance. Performance varies greatly in departments and colleges. If you get merit, then it means you are performing up to a certain level. What we were told was that insufficient performance has so many penalties associated with it that people who were not performing up to a merit rating were in fact performing sufficiently. Departments

did not wish to attach an insufficient performance label to them. They wanted another way of talking about it.

Senator Ritt: Is it your anticipation that in a department on this fourth step level, that most of the people in the department would be in the high merit category? It seems to me that the discussions you had and the surveys you took indicated that there was an insufficient gradation between the people in this large group and the people who were doing exceptional. There is a perceived lack of gradation between the people who received merit and insufficient; and a lack of gradation between the people who got merit and those who got exceptional merit. You provided for that lower end of the gradation; and did not provide for the upper. You said it had to be this much at the lower end, but you have not provided for the upper gradation according to the departmental action.

Dr. Eisele: That's why it took us so long to do this. You are asking why we picked a four point scale, as opposed to a five point or three point scale. We decided after reviewing the five point scale; that creating five equal points along the scale would not allow departments the flexibility to solve their problems. We provided a different solution to the problem in the merit category than we did in the exceptional merit category.

Senator White: Point of information, are there other items that will be coming up under communications.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

Senator Tuttle: I have a question at the bottom of page 9.1, X. B. 10. C. where the departments are given the option of using a three performance categories system or a four performance categories-system. Can they vote differently each year?

Dr. Eisele: Yes.

Senator Zeidenstein: I refer to Senator Nelsen's earlier comments. He referred to the inflation rate. I thought I heard him refer to the results of the faculty survey on the inflation rate. The question on the survey: "Should faculty in the merit category receive an increase at least equal to the inflation rate, even if it leaves little or no money for faculty in the exceptional merit category?" Nearly 66% of the faculty favored inflation rate increases.

Dr. Eisele: I didn't give a number. I said that there was a lot of faculty interest in that issue. That was reflected by the numbers that we had. The data on whether we were at

inflation rate or not was difficult to come by. We would end up saying that the national economy is determining how we allocate our funds internally. I was convinced by the arguments of my colleagues that we ought not let that happen.

Senator Walker: I hadn't looked at X. B. 10. B. the way Senator Ritt did. It is a point well taken. We have really written that in the negative. If we simply turn it around and write it in the positive, I think it completely changes the perception. Faculty rated merit will receive one and one-half the percentage increase. You can turn it around and say those that are rated high merit will receive twice that of those who don't receive merit. Perception is drastically different.

Senator Zeidenstein: Nobody's that dumb.

Dr. Eisele: You are experiencing the same sort of debate that we did on that issue. We tried to decide what was politics, what was logic, what was stupidity, etc. This was the way we came out. The concept is the same no matter what you call it.

Senator Nelsen: I am aware of some places on campus where there is a great deal of counting of the number of people in the exceptional merit category. In the four part system, how will colleges and departments deal with the pressure that comes to bear not to have too many exceptional merits in the department.

Dr. Eisele: In the survey that we sent to the faculty, we stated: "Nine departments in the last six years placed an average of 61% in exceptional merit while the university average was 34% to 41%. There is an enormous inequity in a small number of departments over the last five years. Our belief is that we will probably diminish the overall number of exceptional merits by providing a category that is above merit, but not all the way to exceptional. Again, we are back to the problem of what to call it, and how do people feel about it. Do you call it prime merit, and they feel better about not getting to exceptional merit. Is it distributed in a non-across-the-board fashion? Our solution was that we not call it exceptional merit. It may solve the problem. At least two colleges now have percentage limits on exceptional merit, and that the colleges are moving to solve the problem on their own. Because of that the URC would stay out of the business of suggesting percentage caps.

Senator Nelsen: Will the URC rewrite the statement in X. A. 1: "The Provost may distribute additional funds outside the ASPT system for designated categories of faculty. Nothing in this article shall preclude the addressing of salary inequities in a manner directed by the Board of Regents or Board of Higher Education." -- to relieve all of us of the burden of interpretation? It needs to be clarified.

Dr. Eisele: The URC will be glad to look at it. I will take it back to the committee. Is it a clarity problem or policy?

Item 10.

Item 11.

Item 12.

Senator Walker: There is a substantive change in item 12. We are not stating "consistency of purpose" rather than uniformity or consistency per se. We are saying that the purpose or the intent be the same. They don't exactly have to be the same.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Engelhardt: Tonight the student caucus would like to propose a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Everyone has a copy at their places.

XXIII-45 SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION - February 26, 1992

WHEREAS it is fiscally and ethically irresponsible to ineffectively utilize public monies, and

WHEREAS the State of Illinois has recently engaged in draconian budget reductions, and

WHEREAS the elimination of intermediate levels of State Higher Education Administration could save an estimated 3.9 million dollars annually,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF Illinois State University, in representation of the students and faculty of the university, urges the Illinois General Assembly to give serious consideration to the adoption of House Bill 1727 as introduced.

Motion by Engelhardt (Second, Lowery).

XX -46 Senator Walker: I would like to propose a friendly amendment: I would like to strike the last line under THEREFORE: "the adoption of House Bill 1727 as introduced."

And substitute:

"to dissolving the existing Board of Regents and its corresponding staff and to the creation of a distinct Board of Trustees absent of supporting staff for each of the Regency Universities, ISU and NIU."

Chairperson Schmaltz: There is a third regency university.

Senator Walker: I realize that, but I didn't mention it.

Senator Zeidenstein: You are proposing an individual board for each University?

Senator Walker: A board of trustees without a supporting staff such that we don't know exactly what is going to go with 1727, and we assume there will be some amendments attached to it. As it is right now, we might not gain much with Bill 1727. I am not real familiar with all the language in the bill. So, I would only like to address what specifically affects this university. The language I propose does what you intend, but only affects this university and this Board of Regents.

Senator Engelhardt: What does that do to public money -- dissolving the Board of Regents?

Senator Walker: You save 3.9 million dollars, because you don't have supporting staff. And you have a board of trustees that hopefully would be all ISU alumni that would be a voice for us. Our university would do the work that is now being done by the Chancellor's Office.

Senator Engelhardt: Are there any other amendments?

Senator Ritt: I have certain problems with this. If it is to be a friendly amendment, I might oppose Senator Walker's amendment where I might not oppose the main motion.

Senator Lowery: A similar bill sponsored by Northern Illinois University has been tried and failed in the legislature to establish their own board of trustees.

Senator Zeidenstein: In the rewritten portion, there is nothing stated about the staff work being done by the Board of Higher Education Staff or anyone. You are to create a separate Board of Trustees, absent of staff. Who does the staff work?

Senator Walker: The University does their own work. We don't need a Board of Regents staff.

Senator Zeidenstein: You won't have a Board of Regents, you have an Illinois State University Board of Trustees. You have no staff. Basically, they govern us and any staff work comes from Illinois State University.

Senator Walker: ISU does the staff work.

Senator Sadeghian: I don't understand the reasoning behind the changes. Could you explain why you are proposing a separate Board of Trustees.

Senator Walker: I don't know what 1727 says. I am not sure that it is in our best interest. Personally and professionally, I don't believe we need the Board of Regents.

Senator Sadeghian: Why would we need a Board of Trustees? Couldn't we go without any Board?

Senator Walker: I think it is in our best interests to have a Board of Trustees to lobby for us and speak for us. It would be a sounding board for advice, etc. It would be very similar to the U of I Board of Trustees. It would serve a purpose.

Senator Wallace: I would like to clarify Bill 1727. Bill 1727 calls for the elimination of the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents and transfers their powers and duties to the Board of Higher Education. The Bill is being proposed by representative Weaver. According to the sponsor, the bill's intent is to give the colleges and universities currently operating under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents and Board of Governors more independence. Some universities have expressed dissatisfaction with the current system, claiming that each college and university has its own goals and missions which are being thwarted by the Board of Regents and Board of Governors systems.

Senator Walker: But, our resolution says we support Bill 1727 as introduced. I don't think that is what we want.

Senator Wallace: I would disagree with you. Your amendment omits the other regency schools.

Senator Wallace: The way I worded it, it addresses ISU's concerns. We are not saying what other institutions ought to do, but what ISU ought to do.

Senator Engelhardt: As long as the wording is consistent with the Weaver Bill, I will accept the amendment as friendly.

Senator Lowery: I accept the amendment as friendly.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I have a problem with the wording. You name two Regency universities -- there are three Regency Universities. I would suggest "for each of the Regency Universities."

Senator Walker: Drop ISU and NIU.

Senator Zeidenstein: One point. The Weaver Bill provides for rotating members of the Board of Higher Education, Presidents of each of the Regency Universities, on two year terms. They would serve for two years and then be replaced for four years by the other two. I don't know that we should support this amendment.

Senator Walker: My amendment would throw out the bad stuff. They will probably run with Bill 1727, and amend it probably, but I don't think we want to be on record as supporting 1727 as introduced. I also don't think the Senate wants to spend time going through the Bill and editing out the parts we don't want. I think the resolution says what we want it to.

Senator Ritt: One of the things that we have within the Regency System, to the distaste of some people, is a University constitution which derives its authority and validity from the Regency System. Within that Constitution we have shared governance, and we also have a tenure system which is established through the authority of the Board of Regents. If I remember the executive summary of the bill which was read to us in caucus this evening, there was a phrase in there in which it assured: "All powers and duties vested by law in the current Board of Regents and Board of Governors relating to the management, operation, control, and maintenance of all colleges currently under their governance shall be transferred to the BHE. the Board of Regents or the Board of Governors shall be affected by the transfer." In my mind, that says that any benefits that we do receive in the Regency System will be preserved. I feel that when we throw out the support of Bill 1727 and substitute other wording, that that particular baby should not be washed down the drain with the bathwater. I would appreciate if someone more skilled than I would introduce some sort of an amendment which would preserve those features.

President Wallace: The University was chartered in 1857. As we have gone along, boards were created to operate the institution. The institution was here first. The legislature has the power to dictate how the university is operated.

Senator Ritt: I appreciate that, Mr. President, but it does seem to me that it could be interpreted that the existence of tenure within this university to a certain extent a contractual matter between a faculty member and the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents sets up the conditions of tenure. The Board of Regents awards tenure. I don't know what would happen to tenure when one of the contracting parties, especially the particular Board which established tenure is dissolved. Perhaps the traditions from 1857 would preserve it, but I don't know. I would like some sort of precautionary wording within our own statement that there are certain things that we have which we would not like to dispense with as a result of dissolving the Board of Regents.

Senator Tuttle: I am probably going to support this, simply because I have become more and more convinced all the time that anything that would eliminate the Board of Regents is worth doing. I can't think of a more incompetent, unprepared group of people serving on a long-term basis on a board that I have know for a long time, and it ought to be eliminated structurally. I might even add that one of their prime mistakes and errors was their ill-conceived decision to grant the Chancellor and two of the Presidents an annuity or reward when they didn't grant the rest of us anything. There are many other instances that demonstrate what they have done to negatively impact on this campus. I was prepared tonight to broaden this issue. I circulated a possible amendment in the faculty caucus which would add a whereas clause and add on to the therefore clause. I don't want to prolong this meeting too long by bringing that up. But, I do think the point is important enough to be made. My point is this: I hope we are not misled by the notion that if we can get rid of that mid-level, the Board of Regents and the Board of Governors, that we would be all that much better off or that it would be a tremendous savings in dollars. Simply because, many of the problems of higher education in this state are all interlinked, like a bunch of tinker toys that aren't put together right. They are all tied together. All we are doing is monkeying around with one piece of that problem. I would suggest that we bring the whole thing down. That is what my amendment would have done. It would have said that we should close Sangamon State University; consolidate the three Chicago metropolitan area campuses (Northeastern, Chicago State, and Governor's State) into one institution; and restructure Southern Illinois University system into one system. Then we would bring that whole system down and all of these issues would have to be worked out. I have a suspicion that once we pull one piece from the whole process that we might cause that to happen anyway. And that probably would be good. Two years ago, when we had a state hearing process to look at restructuring,

I was not as convinced. I thought that we should not bring the whole system down, but now I am convinced that that is probably necessary. So, I am not going to introduce my amendment. I am going to support the resolution. But, I support it with some pause. What we are talking about here, unless it brings the whole system down, and causes us to reorganize all higher education in the State of Illinois, isn't going to do very much good.

XXIII-47 Senator Hesse: I move the previous question. (Second, Tuttle)

Motion carried 25/8 on a roll call vote.

(XXIII-45) Vote on the Engelhardt/Lowery motion carried on a voice vote. (Thirty-three Senate members present at the time of voting.)

Senator White: I have a sense of the senate resolution:

Sense of the Senate Resolution by White (Second, Collier)

XXIII-48 I. Whereas, faculty salaries have not kept pace with inflation or market equity and therefore need adjustment, and (WITHDRAWN)

Whereas, the economic and intellectual climate of the state are not now supportive of higher education,

Any significant salary increase for FY93 will derive from internal reallocation.

II. Whereas, the economic situation of the State of Illinois makes "downsizing" an inevitable event independent of reallocation for salary adjustments, and

Whereas, retention of quality education concurrent with "downsizing" must be the produce of rational planning,

Institutional priorities and planning procedures must be established before reallocations begins.

III. Whereas, the effects of "downsizing" as a consequence of negative base budget adjustments will only be exacerbated by internal reallocation for salary adjustments for FY93, and

Whereas, neither institutional priorities nor a rational planning procedure has been implemented for the construction of FY93 budget,

BE IT RESOLVED: The Academic Senate endorses a faculty raise financed from reallocations from non-academic programs and distributed through the ASPT process. A "non-academic" program is any program not reviewed during the program review process.

Senator White: I would like to add to this that we discussed this extensively in the faculty caucus. Also, it was covered in administrator's remarks this evening.

Senator Wallace: I think the statement made is completely false. Planning procedures are ongoing.

Senator Stevens: I would like to ask Senator White why they rewrote the last paragraph?

Senator White: In our original paragraph asked that the raise be postponed, in the revised paragraph we say "The Academic Senate endorses a faculty raise..." We did not wish to rule out the possibility of some raise.

XXIII-49 Senator Ritt: I move to strike the last whereas paragraph. (Second, _____)

Senator White accepted the motion as friendly.

Senator Sadeghian: By internal reallocation you meant that money from personnel resources such as hiring, attrition, etc.

Senator White: Until the project program review is done for FY94, we don't think that personnel money should be cut.

Senator Sadeghian: What does "non-academic programs" mean?

Senator White: Programs that support the academic areas. Academic programs are programs that are reviewed during the program review process -- non-academic programs are not.

Senator Walker: The car pool or motor pool of the University are support areas. We might do away with the University fleet.

Provost Strand: As the final statement is written, all of the appropriated funds in the three vice president's areas outside of the academic area would be eligible and some of the administrative areas of the Provost's area would be eligible. About 72% of the appropriated budget is in the academic area. There is a small percent of the remaining budget that would be eligible.

Senator Sadeghian: Then this would not cover what is needed.

Provost Strand: I am saying that the programs from which funds would be extrapolated or raised would be those of three vice presidents outside of the Provost's area. I went on to say that 72% of the university funds are budgeted in the academic area. You are talking about a very small portion of the university budget that would be eligible for reallocation.

Senator Baer: I would like to clarify something. Senator White said that the faculty caucus discussed this. I want it understood that there was no consensus reached on this. Not all of the people at the caucus agreed. Senator White responded to certain questions as "us," and not all faculty at the caucus agreed with this.

Senator White: This isn't all my idea. Other senators agree.

Senator Touhy: I feel that the statement is harsh. Non-academic programs are also very beneficial to students. This money should be taken out of academic areas.

Senator Adams: I would like to look at this from a student's perspective. Perhaps someone can indicate to me which student programs that directly affect the students would not get funded as a result of this.

Provost Strand: Any program that is under the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs would be eligible for reallocation for the salary raises.

Senator Engelhardt: As Senators Hopkins and Touhy have said, and tonight in the student caucus, we were prepared to support that. That was before the changes were made. I can't see taking cuts from the Student Affairs area to support this. We are already taking 20% summer school cuts; cuts in the future; tuition increases; fee increases. The students every year seem to be paying more for less. I can't support this.

Senator Zeidenstein: The 20% cut in summer school programs comes directly out of the academic area.

Senator White: You understand that the burden of a 4.5% raise be shifted from academic areas to the student areas. There is no intention of taking that 4.5% out of student affairs area. The idea is that there would not be a 4.5% raise.

Senator Engelhardt: Why? The resolution says non-academic programs are not reviewed during the program review process, which would indeed incorporate student affairs programs.

Senator Zeidenstein: To prevent the postponement/gone forever of reallocation of funds for a whole year at all. It is a matter of not closing the door completely for a whole year.

Senator Camp: On non-academic funds -- student fees cannot be used for. They are arguing on the non-academic side that is far beyond student fees. Student fees cannot be touched. Only 28% of academic funds are allocated in Student Affairs areas. Close to 90% of our programs come from that area. I feel it is too important to cut. I don't believe this would be in the best interest of the students.

Senator Stearns: I move to table. (Second, Young)

Motion failed on a roll call vote: 14 yes; 18 no; 2 abstentions.

President Wallace: This is something the Budget Committee should take up. It does not speak well that we can not use the committee structure of this organization.

Senator Lowery: We talked earlier about what constitutes academic programs. The only thing that matters is that this proposal will affect students in a negative way. I don't care how it comes about, students are the one who will face the consequences of these cuts. We talk about faculty morale, what about student morale. We are the ones who face higher fees and tuition, we are the ones who face larger cuts, we are the ones who will be affected.

Senator Young: I don't think we have enough information to evaluate this resolution. That is why I voted to table it. Could we consider this at a later date.

Senator Collier: Most of the services in the student affairs area are funded from Bond Revenue Funds. We heard Vice President Gurowitz report earlier this evening that his areas will be cut very little. Students stand to lose little or nothing from this proposal.

Senator Adams: I would like to propose a friendly amendment to delete the "non-academic programs". (Second, Touhy)

XIII-51 Motion not accepted as friendly.

Senator White: Would it help to say in that sentence "The Academic Senate endorses a faculty raise financed from reallocations of appropriated funding for non-academic programs." That way it would be clear that student fees would not be used.

Senator Adams: No. The reason I am so concerned about that is that as Provost Strand mentioned earlier only a small percentage of the budget is a portion of non-academic program funding. Therefore, money taken out of these programs would probably be a substantial amount.

Senator Sadeghian: Why could there not be a mix of academic, non-academic and administrative funds? Who decides what the percentage is?

President Wallace: I do.

Senator Walker: If we accepted this amendment, it would put us back where we were and accomplishes nothing. I would argue to defeat the amendment. It puts us back to ground zero.

Senator Adams: I don't think it does nothing. From what I understood earlier, it was the original intent of the motion to prevent the complete elimination of the raise. This maintains the raise.

Senator White: I would like to withdraw the motion. Secunder, Collier agreed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt reported that three items presented for information this evening will come up for action at the next Senate meeting. The one item which was inadvertently omitted from the Agenda this evening will come up for information next time provided the Chairman of the Communication Department is willing to return to Senate. I have distributed to the members of the committee who are present some material on the Vision Statement. Last time I said that we would not present that for information at this time because of the time differential. The committee might actually present that as an information item at the next meeting. We have between now and the middle of March to make up our minds on that.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator White reported that his committee met and approved the Administrative Efficiency Report and sent their report to the Rules Committee.

Budget Committee - Senator Tuttle reported that his committee members received a handout from the Office of the President which lists some of the should do's and other things that will be expected by the IBHE. "I will be attempting to arrange a meeting with members of the administration the first week after Spring Break so we can talk about whatever is appropriate."

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Paul Walker announced that his committee will be meeting tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. in Prairie Room One of the Bone Student Center. "We intend to bring as action items at the next Senate meeting the ASPT changes that we presented this evening. Based on questions and comments this evening, we will consider some changes. Provost Strand has provided the Academic Senate and Faculty Affairs Committee with the annual report on non-tenure track faculty. We are providing a copy of this to the Senate Office to be available for faculty members to review. If you have any questions, you can contact the committee."

Rules Committee - Senator Rob Engelhardt reported that the Rules Committee met last week. We discussed the Administrative Efficiency Report. We are still waiting for a few reports to come back from other committees. We also discussed a possible change in the Athletic Council Bylaws. We sent the CAST Bylaws back to their College for a college-wide vote to approve them.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

Adjournment

XXIII-52 Motion by DeRousse (Second, Hopkins) to adjourn carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 12:07 a.m.

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

STEARNS/ HESSE/

NAME	ACCEN-DANCE	YOUNG TUTTLE		DOE				VOICE DOE	
		MOION # XXIII ⁵⁰	MOION # XXIII ⁴⁷	MOION #	MOION #	MOION #	MOION #	MOION #	Y N
ADAMS	P	NO	YES					XXIII-40	X
ALEXANDER	EXCUSED	-----	-----					XXIII-41	X
BAER	P	YES	YES					XXIII-42	X
BUCEY	P	NO	YES					XXIII-43	X
CAMP	P	YES	YES					XXIII-44	X
COLLIER	P	NO	YES					XXIII-45	X
COOK	P	NO	NO					XXIII-46	X
DEROUSSE	P	YES	YES					XXIII-47	X RC
ENGELHARDT	P	NO	YES					XXIII-48	WT DRWN
FRYDA	EXCUSED	-----	-----					XXIII-49	X
GUROWITZ	P	---	---					XXIII-50	X RC
HALL	P	NO	YES					XXIII-51	X
HESSE	P	YES	YES					XXIII-52	X
HOPKINS	P	NO	YES						
HULIT	P	---	---						
LOWERY	P	NO	YES						
MANN	P	NO	YES						
MAZARELLO	P	NO	YES						
MECKSTROTH	P	YES	YES						
NELSEN	P	ABSTAIN	ABST.						
NEWBY	P	YES	YES						
NEWGREN	P	NO	YES						
NICHOLAS	P	---	---						
OGREN	P	NO	NO						
ORR	P	---	NO						
PITOCO	P	---	---						
POMERENKE	P	-----	-----						
RAZAKI	P	---	---						
RITT	P	YES	NO						
RUDER	EXCUSED	-----	-----						
RUMERY	EXCUSED	-----	-----						
SADEGHIAN	P	NO	YES						
SCHMALTZ	P	YES	YES						
SHIMKUS	P	NO	YES						
STEARNS	P	YES	NO						
STENGER	P	NO	YES						
STEVENS	P	NO	YES						
STRAND, D.	P	YES	YES						
STRAND, K.	P	---	---						
SYROTINSKI	EXCUSED	-----	-----						
TIMMONS	EXCUSED	-----	-----						
TOUHY	P	NO	YES						
TUTTLE	P	YES	YES						
WALKER	P	NO	NO						
WALLACE	P	ABSTAIN	ABST.						
WHITACRE	P	NO	YES						
WHITE	P	NO	YES						
YOUNG	P	YES	NO						
ZEIDENSTEIN	P	NO	NO						
ZELINSKI	P	---	---						
		14 YES	25 YES						
		18 NO	8 NO						
		2 ABS	2 ABST.						

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING CALENDAR

JULY - DECEMBER, 1992

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

HOVEY 419
4:00 P.M.

July 6, 1992

August 17, 1992

August 31, 1992

September 14, 1992

September 28, 1992

October 19, 1992

November 2, 1992

November 30, 1992

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

CIRCUS ROOM - 7:00 P.M.
BONE STUDENT CENTER

*July 15, 1992
(subject to call)

August 26, 1992

September 9, 1992

September 23, 1992

October 7, 1992

October 28, 1992

November 11, 1992

December 9, 1992