

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 12-3-1991

### Senate Meeting, December 3, 1991

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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



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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, December 3, 1991" (1991). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 588.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/588>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

December 3, 1991

Volume XXIII, No. 7

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of November 6, 1991

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:               NONE

INFORMATION ITEMS:        NONE

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

December 3, 1991

Volume XXIII, No. 7

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 1991**

XXIII-33 Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of November 6, 1991 by Senator DeRousse (Second, Ruder) carried on a voice vote.

**CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Chairperson Schmaltz announced that after consultation with the faculty caucus he decided to withdraw the Sense of the Senate resolution that you have in front of you. Presumably, it will be coming up at a future date.

**VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt had an excused absence.

**STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT'S REMARKS**

Student Body President Romney Ruder had no remarks.

**ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS**

President Wallace: Institutional Review of Scope and Mission

On October 1, 1991, Mr. Arthur Quern, Chairman of the Illinois Board of Higher Education issued a letter to all Illinois public and private college and university presidents and chancellors. The letter announced an IBHE staff study intended "to identify areas in which we should reflect reallocations from lower priorities to higher priorities." Mr. Quern was very clear in his expectation that "things which are not as important to our mission and which we do not do well should be eliminated" and "we must choose to support quality and eliminate less effective programs." His directives will find wide acceptance among the

public, and the statement that "neither the taxpayer nor the tuition payer can continue to accept escalating increases in costs of higher education" will receive much applause from many quarters.

In response to the Chairman's letter the IBHE staff prepared a paper entitled Priorities, Quality and Productivity of Illinois Higher Education dated November 26, 1991. The paper states that "The ultimate goal of reexamining priorities and improving productivity is to realign resources to those serves and activities most important to higher education's mission and to guarantee that funds are spent most effectively." The paper points out that during the 1980s "expenditures for administration, research and public service at public institutions increased while expenditures for instruction.....especially undergraduate instruction.....decreased." Unfortunately, it appears that quality and productivity will be measured by how an institution spent its state appropriation in the decade of the 1980s.

Clearly, this is the beginning of yet another decade in which Illinois chooses not to invest in higher education relative to the state's wealth and relative to national standards of state support for higher education. At this point, the IBHE study appears to be solely a postmortem on how colleges and universities spent their money in 1990 compared to 1980 in order to demonstrate that the important mission of the universities could be accomplished if only resources were used more responsibly. There appears to be no intent to address Illinois' 49th national ranking in terms of the average ten-year percentage increase for public higher education for the period FY79 to FY89. So much for the investment in higher education by the nation's ninth ranking state in per capita income for 1990 in the academic year in which the State of Illinois set an all-time record enrollment for public higher education.

It is doubtful that the IBHE will focus on the fact that the change from 1980 to 1990 in constant dollar expenditures from state tax dollars for Illinois' public universities declined by 3.3%.

For Illinois State University, this figure is -12% and represents a decline in state tax support in constant dollars of \$8.5M. During this period ISU increased its enrollment by 10%.

While the IBHE study speaks of dealing with the effective use of state resources, ISU has repeatedly pointed out that the distribution among the public universities of state appropriation per FTE student ranged from about \$4,000 to over \$10,000 and translated into institutional inequities as demonstrated by the IBHE Comparative Cost Analysis. At this point, there is no indica-

tion that such comparative data will be included in the study of institutional priorities, quality and productivity.

While the nature of the IBHE review is clearly a political exercise to justify the reality that there will be little if any new tax support for higher education in the next few years, a state plan for dealing with financing public higher education is long overdue. The realities of today's state politics will not permit the needed restructuring of the state's tax system, thus any small yearly increases in state revenues will not be sufficient to address even the bare bone needs of the state. In addition, the outdated tuition policy continues to make public higher education unaffordable to low- and lower middle-income families and is an issue that both the General Assembly and the taxpayers will continue to criticize.

The 1980s demonstrated that Illinois did not intend to invest in higher education, as did other states, even though by national standards it had the wealth by which it could have done so. Since this attitude and behavior is expected to continue in the 1990s, Illinois State University must prepare for this circumstance by reviewing the scope and mission of its programs and activities. I have requested the President's Advisory Committee to work with the administration in an Institutional Review of Scope and Mission which will require the remainder of this academic year. This review will address the IBHE's call for universities to examine institutional priorities and productivity.

The draft recommendations which result from this review will be circulated and discussed on campus next fall prior to the preparation of the FY94 budget. The President's Advisory Committee is currently reviewing a draft of the review process, time frame, President's charge, specific issues to be addressed and financial strategies for FY94 through FY96. The final draft will be distributed in January 1992 as the Vice Presidents begin their internal reviews. The review will be integrated into the FY94 three-year annually renewable strategic plans that all colleges and support units develop each year as part of the budget process.

Provost Strand: I have two topics on which I wish to comment. First of all, I received a request from Senator White to comment on recent legislation which the Governor vetoed and which was overridden in the veto session by both the House and the Senate. It is Senate Bill 644 which prohibits governing boards of public universities in Illinois from barring United States Armed Forces Training Programs or Organizations from their campuses because such programs derive their regulations and policies from the United States Government. This topic pertains to the discussion

we had earlier about the ROTC program and the Department of Defense policies and the posture of the Illinois General Assembly. Senator White said at the heart of his statement: "I think many people both senators and students would like to be assured that the legislation will not interfere with the University's commitment to lobbying the Department of Defense issue." I would like to indicate to members of the Senate that both the President and I will continue to work in behalf of the modification of Department of Defense policies. We aren't doing this as a single institution, we are working with other institutions. We are also a member of the American Council on Education which is also exercising some initiative in this regard. I hope that this response satisfactorily answers Senator White.

At the request of the Budget Committee I am reporting to the members of the Senate on the status of New Program Requests. The Senate requests that each year the Budget Committee report whether or not there are new program requests that will come before the Senate as a part of the budget process. There are no new program requests as part of this year's academic planning cycle. However, there are three new programs that have been approved by the Illinois Board of Higher Education that have not received new funding from the Board of Higher Education, General Assembly, and the Governor. Those three programs are the Ph.D. in Mathematics Education, the Master of Science in Agribusiness, and the Master of Science in Geo-Hydrology. During the FY92 budget cycle for this year, ISU engaged in an internal reallocation exercise and a portion of our budget was reallocated from lower to higher priorities. As part of that reallocation exercise, each of these three programs received partial funding, and they are in various stages of implementation. We have requested from the Board of Higher Education the remaining funding to totally implement the programs. It is doubtful that at this point in time the funding will be forthcoming from the General Assembly because higher education is in dire straits in Illinois at this time. I would like to repeat that there are no new programs that are scheduled to receive funding. There are three that have received partial funding through internal reallocations, and they await additional funding.

Senator Hesse: Can you comment at all on new program requests that are being considered, for example, name changes to Ph.D. programs.

Provost Strand: We are in the process of responding to technical questions and at this point have nothing definitive to report. We have sent back our responses. We are awaiting the Board of Higher Education's analyses at this time.

Vice President for Student Affairs, William Gurowitz:

Reply to November 21, 1991 letter from Senator Paul Walker, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate. "According to our (FAC) understanding of the Incident Task Force Committee will 'review the few incidents that do occur.' Accordingly, the FAC wants clarification as to 1) what is the charge of the Incident Task Force Committee, and 2) how will the Incident Task Force interact while avoiding conflict with the already established Committees such as Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee, Academic Freedom Committee and SCERB. The FAC is concerned that with the creation of the Incident Task Force, the possibility of double jeopardy now exists particularly for faculty, students, and others who have been wrongfully accused."

I would like to quote from the document senators received on "Combating Intolerance and Harassment," dated September 19, 1991: "**Role** The role of the Commission is to promote a University environment conducive to education and personal growth and to oversee the coordination and implementation of efforts to reduce intolerance and harassment. The Commission is responsible for ensuring that there is a fair system for addressing intolerance and harassment and that policies and procedures are effective. The Commission will promote the utilization of existing judicial and grievance procedures for addressing cases of discrimination, harassment, intimidation and intolerance. Should concerns be raised as a result of the utilization of current processes, the Commission will review policies and procedures and, where appropriate, make recommendations for change. **It will not review individual cases.** The Commission, through its working committees, will provide guidance in developing strategies and programs that would preclude discriminatory campus actions. An annual report will be prepared indicating the status of the University environment with regard to intolerance and harassment."

The Incident Task Force is one of the five working committees of the Commission. Each working committee will make recommendations to the Commission and other working committees on an ongoing basis. Each working committee will provide the Commission with an annual report of its activities and recommendations. The Incident Task Force is chaired by the Vice President of Student Affairs. Its duties include: 1) Meeting as deemed necessary by the Chair or, in the absence of the Chair, or in the absence of the Chair, by the Vice Chair when incidents are not able to be handled at the unit level; 2) Ensuring that processes are functioning, and in a timely manner; 3) Assessing whether these processes are adequate to manage the incident and bring it to a successful conclusion; 4) Ensuring coordination of processes and policies;

5) Making recommendations to the Commission and/or other working committees for correcting any inadequacies found on an on-going basis; and 6) Annually reviewing incidents that have occurred and making recommendations to the Commission to correct inadequate processes or policies.

I would like to alleviate any fears that anyone has. The Incident Task Force will not interfere with any existing committee or process if they are functioning effectively and in a timely manner.

Senator Walker: I am glad to hear the statement that this committee will not interfere with already established committees such as the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee, Academic Freedom Committee or SCERB. I speak for Faculty Affairs Committee that we would certainly hope that when you annually review incidents that have occurred, you review overall policies that they don't overlap Faculty Ethics and Grievance policies and Academic Freedom Committee policies.

Vice President Gurowitz: None of the incidents so far have involved any faculty members.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander, had no remarks.

#### **NO ACTION ITEMS**

#### **NO INFORMATION ITEMS**

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

Chairperson Schmaltz: According to the Athletic Council Bylaws, the Director of Athletics attends a Senate meeting once each year to report to the Senate on the activities of the Athletic Department. As I pointed out several meetings ago, if senators had questions of the Athletic Director, they could submit them in advance particularly if they involved a lot of statistics. One senator has asked four rather complex questions which Mr. Wellman will respond to. He has also agreed to answer questions from the floor if they involve his report. He will try to provide us with as much information as possible. Accompanying Mr. Wellman is Dr. William Tolone from the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work who is the current Chairperson of the Athletic Council.

Ron Wellman: Rather than just answer the questions that have been submitted, I thought I would seize the opportunity to try to explain a number of different areas of the Athletic Department to you and try to familiarize you with those areas.



The first area is academics and what we try to do within the Athletic Department to assure that our student athletes are performing well not only on the athletic field, but also in the classroom. Secondly, the finances of the Athletic Department, and how we finance the Athletic Department and expenses. Thirdly, if you are interested, we can get into the competitiveness of the Athletic Department and various teams and how they are doing and how they are representing not only the department, but the University. I have a number of handouts that we will use this evening to help you understand what we are trying to do. A lot of the information I am going to present to you is numerical in nature and for me to recite all the numbers would probably be rather useless, so I will use handouts and give you that type of information.

The first handout is a "Graduation Summary." Each year the Athletic Department does a study as to how well our student athletes do, and what percentage of student athletes graduate. This will be mandated in the future by the NCAA. You have seen a little bit of that already in various publications. USA Today has run a number of articles on the various institutions and how their student athletes are graduating. The study that you are receiving now is a study that we have done internally in the past and will be publicized in the future. I don't think it will be publicized in the detail that you are receiving it, but there will undoubtedly be totals publicized. I will point out some areas of strengths within the department, as well as some areas of concern and try to identify how we are responding to those concerns within our department. This graduation study, mandated by the NCAA, is a study of a five-year program. You will see on the top of the page, 1984-85. Those are the Freshmen entering that particular year. They, therefore, are the class of 1989. That was the class we studied here. You will notice that each sport is broken down. If you look at one particular year of a sport, it can be misleading. If a golf team recruits one golfer, and that person graduates, or does not graduate, you either have a 100% graduation rate, or zero percent graduation rate that year. We do a cumulative study, as well, and we will get into that in a moment. You will notice that in this particular year (1984-85 or the graduating class of 1989), our men graduated at a percentage of 45%. You will notice that in the total men, about halfway down the page, where you see the number of entries at 55, and the NCAA graduation rate at 25 people, which of course is 45%. That includes those who withdraw from the University for one reason or another who are in good academic standing. So those individuals count against the athletic graduation rate in this particular study. The studies which you see publicized in USA Today and the other publications include those individuals who withdraw even though they are in good academic standing. We have numerous athletes

who withdraw even though they are in good academic standing. We have numerous athletes who withdraw in good academic standing for various reasons: they aren't getting enough playing time; their girlfriend is going to another school; finances; and all of the typical reasons that all of us are confronted with. A little bit further down on the page, you will notice that our women graduated in this particular year at 58%. The total department graduation rate was 51%. Comparing that to the university graduation rate, this one year was 45%. In this one year, we could say that the athletic department did better than the total university or the non-athletic students in the whole university. We don't get too excited about that, quite frankly, mainly because if you do a ten year study or a seven year study, the Athletic Department graduation rate is exactly what the university's graduation rate is, as summarized by those next columns. In the 1980-84 summary, you will notice that our men graduated at 41%, our women at 66%, the total department at 49%, and the university graduation rate was 49% as well. A couple of concerns that I want to identify for you include: Number one, we are not happy with graduating 41% of our male athletes. That is not acceptable to us, we feel that we can do better, we should do better, and we will do better. This was for those athletes entering between 1980 and 1984. We have instituted a number of programs that we feel speak to the issue and are assisting our athletes moving on the satisfactory progress or graduation track. Number one, we have instituted a targeting program for not only those athletes who are doing poorly, but any athlete who wants to take advantage of a targeting program, they meet with an individual targeter, and this individual, usually a graduate student helps the individual athlete in time management, study skills, how to go about studying, and those types of issues. They do not assist the athlete in writing papers, or preparation for tests. They do it more on a global basis, rather than zeroing in on one class or another. The second program that we have is a tutorial program, and the athletes can take advantage of the tutorial program. That of course is where the tutors zero in on a particular class and assist the athlete in that particular class. Once again, however, the tutors do not assist the athletes in writing papers or any outside endeavors such as that. We really believe that with these two programs and that when we do our retention studies, which we will get into in a little bit, that our graduation rate for all athletes will be close to 60% for our department within the next three to four years. The retention rates especially for the football team have improved significantly within the last three years. Of course, there are so many athletes in that one program, that if they are doing poorly academically, it really has a negative impact on the entire program. If we can continue to do well with the other programs and improve the football program as we are doing, we think the graduation rate is going to improve drastically.

Are there any questions?

Senator Tuttle: How might you compare the 49% figure with a national norm or study group?

Ron Wellman: We know of no studies at this point on a national basis.

Senator Hesse: Does your study include those athletes who withdraw who are not in good academic standing?

Ron Wellman: Yes, anyone who withdraws. There are two columns on this study, and you will notice that the adjusted entries in graduation and the percentage -- the adjusted rate does not include those people who withdraw in good academic standing. So, those people don't count against you.

Senator Hesse: Have you any data on the cost per student for these services? How do these costs compare with other services available to non-athletes?

Ron Wellman: I would guess that it's comparable. We have chosen to do our own tutorial and targeting program because if we don't we pay for it from the university services. We find that we can do an adequate job, and we feel a good job, by doing it ourselves. That is the reason we separate it.

Senator Hopkins: Is this for a four year period?

Ron Wellman: A five year period. All NCAA graduation studies are based on five years. NCAA does not allow you to award a four-year scholarship. You can only award one year at a time. At the end of that year it is reevaluated. It is very unusual for us to withdraw a scholarship from anyone. We have embarked upon a fifth year aid program. After an athlete's eligibility has been completed, oftentimes the athlete after the four years has not graduated, as many other students as well. We are now attempting to support those students with a fifth year aid program. It is a minimal amount, but it does assist.

Senator Walker: As a followup to Senator Tuttle's question pertaining to the figures for a national norm for graduation rates. I thought that the NCAA did this on an individual sport basis.

Ron Wellman: They are doing it on football, basketball, and track, and maybe baseball. They do it by region. I don't know that they do it nationally.

Senator Walker: Those figures could be compared, couldn't they.

Ron Wellman: Yes. We stack up well with that comparison. The next handout is a retention study. Our coaches are evaluated in all these areas, not just whether they win or lose. Their retention of athletes and how the athletes are performing academically, their graduation rate, the team GPA, how many athletes are on probation, etc.

There really isn't an awful lot to review on this form, other than to give you an idea of what we do within our department in tracking the athletes. Each year we evaluate every recruiting class that has come through the University in every sport. This is a compilation of those figures for 1981-1987.

Senator Newgren: Are these only referring to recruited players, or are scholarship players included?

Ron Wellman: Recruited and scholarship players. That is what the NCAA study is based upon. The NCAA originally in their academic studies included any rostered athlete. Obviously, there could be some abuses to that. So, now, it includes only recruited and scholarship athletes.

Senator Walker: The study includes those that withdraw from the University, not necessarily from the team sports themselves.

Ron Wellman: No. We attempt to track those individuals who quit the team for one reason or another, but stay at the University, so they would be included in this study. In other words, if a student is recruited by us and then quits their sophomore year, but stays at the university, we continue to include them in our study.

Senator Walker: Why are the women's sports so much better than the men's sports?

Ron Wellman: Quite frankly, it is because of the poor academic performance of a couple of men's sports, football in particular. (For the years of this study, not now.)

The handout that you have now, I just want to talk about the top portion of that handout (Academic Summary of the Athletic Department), and then we will get into the percent of revenue a little bit later when we get into the finance area. This is just an average of what our recruited athletes have in terms of the ACT and their high school cumulative GPA. All we are trying to demonstrate here is that we think that we are doing a pretty good job of recruiting qualified student athletes. You won't find Illinois State recruiting what are referred to as Proposition 48 athletes, those who are not eligible initially, those

who do not have a 17 ACT, and a 2.0 GPA in the core curriculum which will probably increase in the next year or two. We have a rather intricate system of getting those people admitted to the University if we so desire, and we have not pursued that. That is not something that any of our coaches are interested in doing. A couple of reasons for that are that you might recruit a blue chip athlete, but then when they get here they have to perform academically, and we do not feel that Illinois State University is necessarily the type of institution where that type of student is going to meet an awful lot of success academically. So we feel that we would be doing a disservice if we recruited a lot of those types of athletes.

You will notice that the average ACT and the cumulative high school GPA has increased significantly in 1991. There was a concerted effort on our coaches this past year to recruit a better quality student. A lot of that has to do with the improved standards that we are seeing in the freshman class. The academic profile of our freshman class seems to be improving each year, and we quite frankly don't want our athletes to be behind the eight ball in the classes. We want them to be competitive academically, and if we are bringing students in that are way below the university average, we feel once again that it would be a disservice to them.

Senator Zeidenstein: Is the cumulative high school GPA based on a 4.0 basis?

Ron Wellman: That is correct.

Senator Hesse: Have the numbers of scholarships remained the same? For example, are there the same number of women's tennis scholarships offered in 1992 as in 1988?

Ron Wellman: There have been no major fluctuations, some minor ones.

The next handout is a Gradepoint Average Study, both semester and cumulative gradepoint average, that we do each year. It goes back to 1981. We are proud to state that last semester, Spring of 1991, was our best GPA semester ever within the department. The department had a 2.66 GPA, which was our best ever. The football team had their best semester ever, and a number of other sports had their best semester ever. I should state that we are really pleased and appreciative of faculty who have been very cooperative with us in trying to monitor the athlete's progress in your classes. As those of you on the faculty know, we send out grade report check forms either two or three times per semester. We receive about 85% of those back from our faculty. When we go to our various con-

ventions and mention that to our colleagues, they are amazed that we get that type of response from the faculty. So, we really are appreciative of you for responding to that. And it does help us in supervising and monitoring our athlete's progress in your class.

Senator Zeidenstein: In the Spring 91 column, do these figures represent four years per senior, three years per junior, etc.

Ron Wellman: This handout is a compilation of the GPA ranges, 3.5 to 4.0, 3.0 to 3.5, and the number of athletes we have in each range, as well the percentage of athletes in that range within our department. We were really pleased the last year, the academic year of 1990-1991, that the number or percentage of athletes on probation has decreased significantly. Right off the top of my head I can't remember what it is. But, it was four percentage points lower than the university average. We believe that that is a reflection of the success of the tutoring program, and the targeting program within the department, as well as an orientation program that we have for our new student athletes. We have found in the past that the vast majority of athletes on academic probation are freshman. So, we have embarked upon an orientation week for the athletes to try to acclimate them into the university and college life and what they can expect. I think it has been successful. When you compare our probation rate last year to previous years.

Senator Walker: I want to compliment the athletic program on the graduation rates. What percentage of your athletes are men and what percentage are women. It looks like the men are not doing as well as the women in graduation rates. Is it a 50/50 ratio?

Ron Wellman: The ratio is probably 65/35.

Senator Walker: Given the higher academic standards of the females, they are carrying a bigger burden. A substantial portion of your good GPAs are coming from the women, not the men.

Ron Wellman: This information is shared with the coaches every time it comes out which is each semester, and we discuss it as a department. We recognize and reward those who are doing well. We don't punish those who aren't doing well. But, it is a part of the evaluating process.

Senator Walker: Can you explain why the women's sports do so much better than the men's.

Ron Wellman: The women's sports at this university probably do better than women's sports anywhere in the country, quite frankly. It is a reflection upon Jill Hutchison who is our basketball coach. You won't find many women's basketball teams with a team GPA the last six consecutive semesters of 3.0. That is just unheard of. Our volleyball team, the last six out of seven semesters has had a team GPA of 3.0. It really is unheard of. It is a reflection of not only the type of athletes that those individuals recruit, but the way they monitor them once they get here.

Chairperson Schmaltz: When you said the percentage was 65/35, you were referring to 65% males and 35% females.

Ron Wellman: Correct.

Senator Walker: Because 35% is a low number, the graduation rate seems high.

Ron Wellman: You will notice that the male graduation rate has been increasing. In some of the summaries and statistics, it appears that the males are going to be above the university average. I am not sure that they are going to catch the female athletes at this point, but they are on the right course.

Senator Tuttle: If you use retention and graduation data as a source of evaluation for coaches and award them accordingly, then I would presume that some of the women coaches would be getting significant larger raises.

Ron Wellman: By reward, I did not mean monetary reward. We would do everything that we can to reward their success, but not reward them monetarily.

Senator Razaki: Why don't you reward them monetarily?

Ron Wellman: It is a portion of their total evaluation. We do not say that this portion of your raise is because you did well with your student athletes academically. We look at the total evaluation and determine the raise that they receive.

Senator Razaki: What percentage of the evaluation is this?

Ron Wellman: It is equal to the competitive portion, and I think that is 30%.

Senator Hesse: Do you have any information on the majors of student athletes?

Ron Wellman: Yes. I do not have that information with me. It is across the board. We have representation in just about every major in the university. I will send that information to you.

Senator Newgren: Do you have the percentage of male/female breakdown overall university graduation rate?

Ron Wellman: Yes. It is indicated on our studies. It is 49% over the past seven years.

Senator Strand: Yes. It is higher for females than males. I don't have the exact figures.

Ron Wellman: We will go back to the finances. On the handout that you have in front of you, the percent of revenue, Dr. Wallace gave the Athletic Department an objective three years ago of relying less on a percentage basis upon the income fund or the appropriated fund dollars in the Athletic Department and more upon our own ability to raise dollars. This is just the summary of where we were in 1988 in the five areas of revenue sources compared to where we are today in Fiscal Year 92. The five sources of revenue include: Student Fees, Appropriated Funds, Tuition Waivers, RESF (Redbird Education and Scholarship Funds -- our fundraising arm of the Athletic Department) and the generated area (ticket sales, concessions, those types of things). In 1988, those two areas that we generally raise ourselves were 30% of our budget. This year, FY92, you will notice that that percentage has been raised to 17% and 23% or 40% of our budget. So we are meeting that goal. It appears in the future that we will even be higher than what we currently are. There are some dangers to that of course. From that athletic standpoint, it puts a premium upon winning. If we are going to do a good job of fund raising, if we are going to do a good job of selling tickets, we have to win ball games. And that is the only way we are going to be able to raise money. That creates a lot more pressure within the department to perform but we all know that when we go into this business, too, so we don't back down from that.

The handout that you are receiving now is the budget for this year in the Athletic Department.

Senator Nelsen: In real dollar numbers, how does this compare to the 1988 data that you gave us. Has there been real dollar amount increase in the overall operating budget of the department.



Ron Wellman: Yes, there has been an increase. I don't have the figures for 1988 with me.

Senator Tuttle: In appropriated costs, the percentage seems less than it was in 1988.

Ron Wellman: Yes. The Athletic Department receives the same increase that the university receives from the appropriated area. In other words, if the university receives a 2% increase in the operating and salary budget, then that is what the Athletic Department receives in the appropriated fund line.

Senator Nelsen: Beyond the increase in appropriated fund dollars, was there any additional reallocation beyond the annual appropriated dollars?

Ron Wellman: No.

Senator Young: The increase in the RESF fund from 1988 to 1992 was 4%. How much can you attribute to the move into the new Arena?

Ron Wellman: In terms of sales, a portion of it. We noticed in 1989 when we opened the Arena, that our ticket sales picked up and we were charging more for tickets then, as well, so there is a portion of it that can be attributed to the Arena. We have not put a percentage on it.

Senator Young: Do those ticket sales include concerts and other events held at the Arena?

Ron Wellman: Just the sporting events. The Athletic Department receives no income from concerts or other activities in the Arena. That goes back into the Arena, which is a separate budgetary item.

Senator Zeidenstein: I don't quite understand how tuition waivers are a source of revenue. My understanding of a tuition waiver is that a student does not have to pay tuition.

Ron Wellman: You are exactly right. However, we feel it is our responsibility to account for those waivers. There is no money exchanged. It is a book transaction -- an in and an out. Whatever appears as tuition waivers income, that same dollar amount is going out at the bottom, although it is in the form of financial aid. In this particular year, we anticipate \$353,436 going out in tuition waivers. It is a wash.

Senator Zeidenstein: I still don't understand why it is in both places. How can it be both? What you are saying is that a tuition waiver is an amount of money that the student does not have to pay. You list that at the bottom of the table as a cost. But you also list this as a form of revenue at the top. I don't understand why it is in both places. I don't understand how the same phenomenon can be both a source of revenue and a source of cost.

Ron Wellman: It is probably a matter of accountability more than anything else. We do consider those tuition waivers that we receive as a source of income. Even though there are no dollars coming into the Athletic Department, we have the opportunity to use those tuition waivers and we feel as though we should be accountable for and identify the fact that we do receive tuition waivers.

Senator Zeidenstein: But you only use them for one thing, right? You use them for scholarships, there is no expense.

Ron Wellman: That's correct. There really is no expense to the Department. If we just listed it as an expense to the Department, it would appear as if there is an expense, so we offset it by claiming the income as well.

Senator Zeidenstein: But it is an expense to the University as a whole?

Ron Wellman: Yes.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Can you see, Senator, where it would be unfair to list it in one place without listing it another.

Senator Zeidenstein: I agree with you.

Senator Hopkins: The golf team does not receive any money out the Athletic Department budget. I understand they rely totally on the D. A. Weibring event for their funds. Why is this?

Ron Wellman: That is not true. The golf team does receive support from the University. At the same time, the D. A. Weibring Event is a lucrative even for us. So some of their operating expenses come from the D. A. Weibring Golf Outing.

Senator Camp: Some of the student athletes are now selling tickets for a raffle on a car. Where does that fall under?

Ron Wellman: That would be under "Generated Revenue." Excuse me, that would not be there. That would be under RESF Non-Gift. It is not a gift that someone is giving us,

they are purchasing a chance. The Non-Gift Area would include the D. A. Weibring Golf Outing, the Drive-Away that we have, the other golf outings that we host, all of the fund raising endeavors that are not a contribution to the department.

Senator Walker: Under "Operating Expenditures," you list "Reserves." Is that part of RESF, or salaries, or what?

Ron Wellman: In the strategic plan, as you will recall, the Athletic Department was encouraged to start a reserve because right now forty percent of our budget is soft dollars -- dollars that we cannot count upon from one year to the next. We were encouraged to get fifteen to twenty-five percent of our annual budget in a reserve line. This is the contribution to that reserve fund for this year, if we have it.

Senator Walker: Then we are actually not meeting our reserve.

Ron Wellman: At this point, the strategic plan called for us to have a minimum of fifteen percent of the budget and we are at twelve percent right now.

Senator Walker: Are insurance rates going up or down? Are they high or low?

Ron Wellman: They have escalated drastically in the last three years, and that's just a reflection upon our history of injuries. Before we put the new football field in, in one year we had seventeen major knee operations on our football team. After that year, we experienced a an 80% increase in our insurance premium.

Senator Walker: Will that go up or down?

Ron Wellman: I have never known an insurance premium to go down in athletics. In all probability it will continue to rise.

Senator Walker: Is the major sport for that football?

Ron Wellman: You have more athletes injured in football. Probably the most dangerous sports on a per capita basis are gymnastics and wrestling.

Senator Walker: What do support services include? This expenditure lists \$488,288.

Ron Wellman: That gets into the academic services area. All of the things that we do to support the athletes in terms of training, promotions, etc.

Senator Walker: Do you pay a fee for the arena?

Ron Wellman: Are you talking about the Arena loan payment. That is a one-time only expenditure for the Athletic Department. Our bills for the Arena -- we owed a bill for the Arena that the University had not collected in terms of contributions from the donors who donated to the Arena. So, the Athletic Department helped make that payment which will be repayable or refundable to the Athletic Department next year. In terms of Horton/Hancock, that is being used by Physical Education, Athletics, and Campus Recreation Services.

Senator Walker: Are you pro-rating fees for that?

Ron Wellman: That has its own Bond Revenue Budget. The Athletic Department rents the Arena from the University. When we have a basketball game, we rent the facility.

Senator Walker: You don't do that for Horton?

Ron Wellman: No. That was never the agreement when Horton was built.

Senator Ruder: Does the NCAA compensate all the universities in a conference, when one in that conference goes to the playoffs?

Ron Wellman: That's correct.

Senator Ruder: Let's say ISU or some other team in the Missouri Valley Conference went to the NCAA playoffs. Is that money added into the reserve budget?

Ron Wellman: That is a part under generated revenue -- conference income.

Senator Ruder: How can you predict that?

Ron Wellman: The NCAA has gone to a new system. Rather than just looking at one year payoff to those teams in one year, they are looking at a six-year history. So it makes it a little bit easier for the Missouri Valley and the schools within the Missouri Valley Conference to budget the income that we will be receiving from the NCAA, because they have looked back over the six-year history of our tournament appearances, rather than just the one year.

Senator Young: Under student fees, does that include student fees to rent the Arena?

Ron Wellman: No it doesn't. There are three student fees that we are involved with to varying degrees. The athletic service fee, which is what you see here, that is for the operation of the Athletic Department; the Arena Fee, which is separate; and a third fee, the Athletic and Recreation Facilities Fee.

Senator Young: I assume that is the appropriated fund?

Ron Wellman: Yes that is true. We are being encouraged to use the appropriated fund rather than the income fund, and this was a mistake.

Senator Young: Are there any other activities that the University engages in where these funds are used?

Ron Wellman: For the Athletic Department?

Senator Young: Yes.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander: The income fund includes tuition and mandated fees.

Senator Young: There are \$1,949,256 dollars in Student Fees, and the Income Fund lists \$1,158,112 dollars in state appropriations.

V. P. Alexander: The income fund is a part of appropriated funds.

Ron Wellman: We'll say that there is a plan that has been adopted or accepted by the Athletic Service Fee Committee this year to decrease the appropriated fund dollars going to the Athletic Department. I am not sure if you are aware of that or not. The appropriated fund over the next five years if it is approved each year by the student fee committee will be eliminated from the Athletic Department.

Senator Tuttle: Wasn't there a sense of the senate resolution to the effect that the Athletic Department should develop a plan to phase out the use of appropriated dollars?

Chairperson Schmaltz: We asked the Athletic Department to do that.

President Wallace: The actual resolution read: "Be it resolved that the administration present to the full Academic Senate in September 1989 a plan for the following: phasing out the use of the income fund (tuition dollars) for intercollegiate athletics."

Ron Wellman: If you would like to talk about the competitiveness of the department and how the teams are doing, I will be glad to do that. If you would rather forego that, I would be more than happy to do that, considering that our basketball team lost to Loyola yesterday. I'd rather not talk about it. The handout entitled, "Championships," is a summary of how our athletic teams have done in the Gateway and Missouri Valley Conferences since 1982 and 1983.

Senator Walker: I have a philosophical question. If the five year plan were to be adopted, what is the philosophy regarding the accountability of the athletic programs to the University?

Ron Wellman: Philosophically, it is a concern of mine and in the Athletic Council we talked about this very issue in our last meeting. I think if you look across the country at those institutions who have had problems with the NCAA, the one common thread is that they are self supporting. While we are not moving totally in that direction, the lack of support from the university appropriated fund is a concern. At the same time, I understand the need for it and the desire of the academic community to have those additional dollars since additional dollars are very scarce to come by from the state these days.

Senator Walker: Philosophically, do funding of the programs carry more weight than the academic issues. Is winning that important, or can we just have teams that go out and compete without worrying whether or not they win?

Ron Wellman: I don't think you will find a Division I Athletic Program that is not concerned about winning or losing. We will always be concerned about winning or losing, just as the academic community is concerned about performing well. This is our performance, and it is easily measured in Athletics -- you win or you lose. We recognize that when we go into this profession, and we are measured by that. We will not de-emphasize the importance of winning. If anything, as you look at the revenue sources that the Athletic Department has now, we will probably be emphasizing it more and more, because we are dependent upon winning financially.

President Wallace: I don't draw a distinction between fees and tuition when it comes to defining university support of athletics. I think going the direction we are going doesn't lessen University support for athletics.

Senator Walker: I would hope that is a philosophy that would be maintained, as opposed to the other one we have discussed. We need to remember that the pie is very close, regardless of where you are coming from.

President Wallace: We also need to provide teams that win. It is part of the institutional culture to support teams emotionally as well as financially. We need to get the students more involved.

Senator Ogren: I am concerned with Senator Walker's wording. The students on the fee committee decided to raise the student fees to compensate for a readjustment of the income fund to academics while also maintaining support for athletics, and it will be the students who will decide whether or not to continue on that course of action to retain their support for athletics while also bringing out more money for academics.

Senator Wallace: The students were interested in what the dollars would be used for. The Provost gave us a list of academic projects the students could fund. One of those was extending campus-wide computing. Students were interested in having a voice in what the dollars would be used for. That would be \$140,000 for next year if the plan is approved.

Senator Hesse: I can appreciate the shift in the source of funds from income fund to student fees. I appreciate the effort to do so. However, I wonder how much discussion there has been about decreasing costs. How about competing at the Division II level? In an expensive sport, such as football, what is the cost of the University moving from Division I to Division II?

Ron Wellman: The significant cost that you would reduce would be the scholarships. In Division II, you are permitted 45 scholarships. We are currently giving 65 to 68 scholarships in football. You would realize a savings there. One of the major problems in moving to Division II for Illinois State is who would we play. The state of Illinois happens to be a good I Double A state. There are numerous institutions who compete at the I Double A level. I don't believe there is a Division II team in the state. The College of St. Francis is going to go Division II in the next couple of years. Other than that institution, we do not have another Division II team in the state. That means we would be traveling to North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, or Michigan to play a Div. II schedule, which would mean substantial increases in travel.

Senator Walker: I believe going down a division doesn't save you much. As a team, you still have the same costs involved. The only way to really decrease your expenses is to eliminate a sport. Much as in academics, the only way to really save money in a department is to eliminate the department. In a sport, you have to maintain trainers, coaches, etc.

Senator Hesse: Our program is comparable to Illinois Wesleyan's.

Senator Walker: I am not opposed to what you are saying. My question is whether or not you eliminate a sport.

President Wallace: A significant portion of revenues now come from gate receipts and donations and dropping sports and going to Divisions II and III may decrease a major portion of your revenues.

Senator Hesse: This is the kind of issue that I hear my colleagues asking in the department. It is a real concern.

President Wallace: Appropriated dollars of 1.1 million, out of a 6 million dollar budget would be replaced by fee dollars and maintain current university support which can leverage NCAA money, gate receipts and donations.

Ron Wellman: The perception is that football is the most expensive sport, and it is when you look at the bottom line. However, when you look at the cost per athlete, whether it be per rostered athlete or per scholarshipped athlete, or any way you want to look at it, football ranks ninth or tenth in sixteen sports. That is very unusual. So, we feel that we are doing a good job in containing the costs of the football program. In most universities, the football program per athlete, is the most expensive sport. And here, depending upon the year, it is ranked 8th to 10th.

Senator Zeidenstein: How do you compute the cost of football as being tenth? What are you figuring per cost? -- Astro-Turf, Hancock Stadium, What? What is not included in the cost?

Ron Wellman: We include the salaries of the coaches, etc. We do not include facilities. We do not include the Astro-Turf. If you look at the use of the Astro-Turf, the football team uses it less than many other groups. We do include the salaries of the coaches, and all the travel expenses. But we offset that with the income that the football program brings in, not only the gate receipts, but when we go to play Akron University, or I-A schools, we receive a guarantee and make a profit on those games.

Senator Zeidenstein: So the cost per athlete per all the sports is based on the bottom line and expenses are subtracted from the income.

Ron Wellman: Correct.

Senator Zeidenstein: What about marching bands. Is there a cost for the ISU Marching Band anywhere in your budget.



Ron Wellman: It is a part of our student fee process. The band receives a percentage every year of the student fees that the Athletic Department receives. This year they received in the vicinity of \$80,000 from our student fee line. That is not earmarked here because we do not have it as an expense.

Senator Zeidenstein: You list as revenue from student fees \$1.9 million dollars. From that \$1.9 million dollars, \$80,000 goes to the marching band.

Ron Wellman: That \$80,000 to the marching band is not included in the \$1.9 million dollars here. But, we are the negotiators for the band with the student fee committee.

Senator Zeidenstein: Under support services line item, you list \$488,288. That includes, but is not limited to the academic part of your program. What else does support services include?

Ron Wellman: That is correct. One of the most expensive areas for us is the training room. The equipment in the training room, and all of the supplies we use in the training room.

Regarding competitiveness, you have a handout entitled "Championships." In the past, as you know, the women have been competing in the Gateway Conference and the men have been competing in the Missouri Valley Conference. The Missouri Valley and Gateway Conferences will be merging next year except for football. Football will remain a Gateway Conference sport and all of the other sports will be in the Missouri Valley. We feel this is a real step forward and will be a benefit to us.

Senator Young: What will the conference be called -- the Valley Gateway?

Ron Wellman: It will be called the Missouri Valley Conference.

Ron Wellman: (Providing answers to questions in 11/5/91 Memo to the Academic Senate from Senator Keith Stearns.)

Breakdown of the \$5,648,545 budget provided in the Peoria Journal Star: (FY 91 Figures)

Revenue from ticket sales.....	\$879,934
Revenue from Redbird Club.....	\$975,454
Student Fee Dollars.....	\$1,949,255
State subsidies, including tuition waivers, scholarships, working salaries, facilities contributions, etc. ....	\$1,511,548
Generated Revenue less ticket sales.....	\$ 362,123

Operating costs for various facilities used for athletics and how these costs are apportioned for joint use facilities:

Redbird Arena.....	\$	588,620
Hancock Stadium.....	\$	
Horton Fieldhouse.....	\$	
Other.....	\$	

Provide for Northern Illinois University, SIU-Carbondale, Western Illinois University, and Eastern Illinois University their total athletic budgets with a breakdown similar to question one. The figures I have are from the USA Today Study and are for NIU-1989.

	<u>ISU-1991</u>	<u>NIU-1989</u>
Revenue from ticket sales	\$879,974	
Revenue from Booster Club	\$975,454	\$118,499
Student Fee Dollars	\$1,949,255	\$1,907,771
State Subsidies	\$1,511,548	\$3,000,000

Senator Walker: Has your RESF fund topped out yet?

Ron Wellman: We don't feel that we have topped out as long as our teams continue to perform well. The vast majority of contributions that we receive up to 85% to 90% are from McLean County. We are coming close to reaching the ceiling for McLean County. We need to do a better job in the Chicago-land area and some of the other large metropolitan areas where we have a large number of alums.

Senator Walker: I appreciate the Athletic Department working with the Ag. Department. I think that is the type of activity and cooperation that we like to see between academia and athletics on this campus.

Senator Tuttle: I would like the record to show that the Senate appreciates Ron Wellman's presentation tonight, and the interpretation of his facts and figures.

Senator Young: I think the report tonight shows that athletics is going in the right direction. The new five year plan seems to be in the right direction.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I wish to thank both of you for your presentation.

ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Senator Ritt: I received the following communication from three professors in the Department of Chemistry (Otis S. Rothenberger, James W. Webb, and Richard C. Reiter). They asked that I share this correspondence with the Academic Senate.

Correspondence to the Academic Senate:

"The attached letter was sent to President Wallace on 11/26/91. Although we fully understand that it will take President Wallace some time to respond to the concerns expressed in this letter, we feel that it is important to communicate the contents of the letter to the Academic Senate. To this end, we are requesting that you read this letter as a correspondence to the Academic Senate at the next meeting of the senate."

"Letter to President Wallace dated 11/26/91

Dear Dr. Wallace:

As members of the Department of Chemistry's Faculty Status Committee, we will soon have the responsibility of rating our colleagues for exceptionally meritorious pay increases. We believe that the failure of the State of Illinois to adequately fund academic salaries has created an environment that is no longer compatible with the concept of merit pay. In this letter, we would like to outline why we believe that it is necessary for the Board of Regents to declare a merit pay moratorium.

For more than a decade, exceptionally meritorious ratings at ISU have been based on a chaotic and almost random reward process. At the beginning of each calendar year, faculty status committees struggle to objectively rate departmental faculty members. Over the years, the erratic salary allocations approved in Springfield have created salary inequities as ISU faculty have shared exceptionally meritorious status during different years. There is an interesting irony in this "merit pay" system. DFSC members make a serious attempt to objectively evaluate faculty performance. Over a period of years, erratic state funding ensures that the results of these efforts will be used to create salary inequities. Finally, selected salary inequities are subjectively corrected by administrative equity adjustments.

Although recent attempts on the part of the ISU administration to address this problem have been well intended, these attempts have only served to aggravate the problem. For example, the awarding of some merit pay increases during this year of no pay increase for the general faculty simply added to the chaos and inequity while divisively lowering faculty morale. Faculty members who received exceptional merit during the other numerous lean years of the last decade have not received similar consideration.

Special merit pay increases for distinguished professors also

create a problem for DFSC members. These pay increases establish a confusing second merit system that does not involve the DFSC. There is no doubt that these pay increases were deserved, and certainly no faculty member receiving a merit pay increase should feel the need to apologize. However, all meritorius and exceptionally meritorius faculty deserved a pay increase.

Of course, the real issue here is that the State of Illinois has no logical right to expect the university to enforce a merit pay system. A merit pay system must be built on top of a system that provides an acceptable basic wage for all faculty members. It is wrong for the Board of Regents to force faculty to administer a merit pay system without providing basic cost of living increases. We, therefore, request that you explore a merit pay moratorium with the Board of Regents. In fairness to all faculty members, this moratorium should remain in place until both meritorius and exceptionally meritorius faculty are assured basic cost of living salary increases.

Sincerely yours:       Otis S. Rothenberger  
                          James W. Webb  
                          Richard C. Reiter

cc: Robert Ritt, Academic Senator"

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Academic Affairs Committee** - Senator Ritt reported that Dr. Catherine Batsche had distributed a memorandum to members of the Senate, entitled Preview of Sections I, II, and II of the 1992-97 Academic Plan. I hope that this communication will be read by members of the Senate and that any suggestions for changes in that plan will be sent to the Academic Affairs Committee through the Senate Office. We are on a slightly less stringent time schedule than we have been in previous years because the date on which we report to the Board of Regents has been changed, but I believe the Provost Office would like to have this matter taken care of expeditiously so I hope during the month of January we will be able to come back to the Senate with your recommendations and those of the committee for any changes. I would also like to announce that I have received a report from the University Studies Review Committee. They are ready to have their work reviewed by the Academic Senate. This will become part of the Academic Affairs Committee agenda during January. I don't know what the distribution of this has been. I think it is just the Academic Affairs Committee. Speaking for the committee, I don't think there is any objection for there to be a general distribution

to members of the Senate. I think the more people who see this, the better it is for our own deliberations. I hope that people who do read it will communicate to the committee as soon as possible what their reactions might be.

Senator Walker: I represent the Senate on the University Studies Review Committee. What Senator Ritt is referring to are the Objectives for a University Studies Program. We passed the Philosophy Statement for a University Studies Program last spring. Now the committee has sent forward the objectives section. It is the same objectives section that was passed out in forums this fall, with some revision. Copies have been forwarded to every department and department chair and every dean on campus. They are available on campus.

Senator Ritt: If my committee members will meet with me following Senate, I can distribute some of this material to them.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have received a copy. This is the second revised version. I would strongly urge senators to take a look at it. Compared to the first draft, it is immensely improved.

Senator Walker: The committee did go to great effort to look at the response they received, both oral and written, in the forums. They did make a concerted effort to incorporate changes. Everyone who sent a written response to the committee received a copy of the revision.

**Administrative Affairs Committee - No report.**

**Budget Committee** - Senator Tuttle reported that his committee had met with the President and Provost to discuss future budgets and the President's Advisory Committee and how they will operate. The role of that committee as a whole will be advisory to the President on major university issues. The Senate will have an opportunity to have input through that committee in time to make a difference in decisions that are made. The Provost reported on the Administrative Efficiency Committee Report and assured the Budget Committee that it would have no budgetary impact. Finally, we ought to have a JUAC report from the Chair of the Senate after the Senate Meeting, to show us what the JUAC Christmas Carol sounds like.

**Faculty Affairs Committee** - Senator Paul Walker reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee had received a request from the DFSC of the Art Department seeking a clarification of the definition of administrator in the ASPT Handbook. We referred that to the University Review Committee. They will be getting

back to the Art Department. What has happened in the past is that the URC has dealt with that question on a case-by-case basis. We have requested the URC to come up with definitive language to be put into the ASPT Handbook, clarifying what an administrator is and who is eligible. The other thing I wanted to comment on this evening was Senator Ritt's question at the last Senate Meeting regarding whether or not all salary increases should be reviewed in the Academic Senate Executive Session. We have asked the URC to look at that. Chris Eisele was telling me that his interpretation up front is that not all of them have to go through Executive Session of the Academic Senate if they come under the category of Designated Categories of the Faculty, rather than specific salary and promotion. That is the distinction between the two.

**Rules Committee - No report.**

**Student Affairs Committee - No report.**

#### **Adjournment**

XXIII-34 Motion by Tuttle (Second, Newgren) to adjourn carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

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

