

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-19-2003

Senate Meeting, February 19, 2003

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 19, 2003" (2003). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 740.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/740>

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 AGENDA
Budget Meeting
TIME: 7 P.M., Wednesday, February 19, 2003
PLACE: Ballroom, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Comments

SGA President's Comments

University President's Comments

Vice President for Finance and Planning's Comments

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's Comments

Vice President for Student Affairs' Comments

Vice President for Advancement's Comments

Dean Representative's Comments

Chair of the Chair's Council's Comments

Questions and Discussion

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meeting 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
BUDGET SESSION
(Approved)**

February 19, 2003

Volume XXXIV, No. 12

Call to Order

Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: We welcome a new senator from the College of Education, Norma DeMario. Tonight there will be significant differences in the normal procedure. Rather than having questions after each of the presentations, we will entertain questions after all presentations have been made. Prior to this meeting, I sent out an e-mail asking people for their ideas about what might be done about the budget at Illinois State University. Suggestions included:

1. Reducing or eliminating athletics
2. Reducing staffing for student services
3. Freezing or reducing student fees in favor of tuition
4. Subcontracting out the physical plant functions
5. Lowering building temperatures
6. Slowing down equipment re-capitalization
7. FOI was the target of substantial comment as was the General Education Program
8. Increasing NTT loads
9. Eliminating the Lab Schools
10. Program/Department consolidation
11. Tightening of travel rules
12. Increasing graduate school teaching
13. Reducing the number of graduate students
14. Revising faculty work load structures to emphasize teaching and service
15. Elimination of research
16. Eliminating "centers"
17. Eliminating CAT and LILT support functions
18. Restructuring the college structure
19. Reducing assistant positions in the administrative structures
20. Requiring administrators to teach regularly
21. Elimination of U-College
22. Administrator contracts of 10 or 11 months rather than 12
23. Elimination of consultants

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Bathauer: I am concerned about the connotations under which the conversations regarding the budget have occurred. I want to stress that students do understand the need for faculty salary increases to be funded partly by increased tuition dollars. We also understand the need to have competitive salaries for faculty in order to retain and recruit for crucial positions. There is a limit to our willingness to fund this. Students cannot be expected to solely supplement salaries with increased tuition dollars. We should not be expected to fix the shortcomings of the State. Students have worked diligently to retain oversight of the student fee review and allocation process. To suggest that students should no longer have a say in where fees should be spent or increased should not be considered.

Students have felt the impact of the budget cuts as much as other constituents of the University. For example, the library is no longer open for 24 hours. The SGA is requesting that the library budget be fully reinstated to levels that allow the facility to remain open 24 hours. There is a growing concern about the availability of summer classes and the impact any reduction will have on graduation rates. Students are willing to help during these tough times. Students, however, should be consulted on all decisions regarding their tuition dollars.

President's Remarks

President Boschini: I am going to take a lot of notes tonight. This meeting helps me to get some context to go on when having to make hard decisions in the weeks ahead.

Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks

Senator Bragg: I will give you an overview of the budget as context for the discussion we are going to have. We get two kinds of monies. Unrestricted funds are monies that we can spend as we want within the instruction, research and public service functions of the institution. Then we get restricted funds. These are things like federal grants and contracts, mandatory student fees and room and board monies over which we have very little control on how we spend. They must be used in the areas for which they come.

We are anticipating \$87 million from state tax funds. We also anticipate that we will receive another \$60 million in income funds. That is the fund in which tuition revenue and some student fees are deposited. So, we are anticipating revenue in unrestricted funds of \$147 million. That compares to \$146 million last year. You might find that surprising because we have been talking about budget cuts that we have had to incur. We took significant cuts in state tax funds. We offset most of the budget cuts through internal reallocation and through increases in tuition last year. That \$147 million does not include \$7 million in tuition waivers foregone income to the institution that we spend every year. It also does not include about \$3 million in health care costs. In total, we take in about \$133 million in restricted funds. The largest is room and board, followed by gifts, grants and contracts. We only take in about \$10 million in mandatory student fees.

We spend \$117 million for personal services. That is salaries for all employees at the University who are paid out of unrestricted funds. We spend another \$16 million on contractual services, most of which is spent for utilities. We spend \$1 million in travel, \$3 million in commodities, \$7 million in equipment and \$3 million in smaller accounts. There has been a growth in staff of about 12%. Personal services are 78% of our budget. The President spends about \$2 million per year for all of the units that report to him. Student Affairs spends about \$3 million. The Provost's area spends \$106 million in academic affairs. That includes all faculty and all support staff. In my area, we spend about \$21 million, \$4 million in University Advancement and \$11 million in institutional support. The bottom line is that dollars are tied up in people, most of the people are in academic affairs and most of the growth has been in academic support functions, academic advising, technology support and other support roles.

I want to give you an idea of what things costs. A 1% increase in salaries in unrestricted funds costs \$1.12 million. A 1% increase from restricted funds costs about \$280, 000. We had to pick up an increased share in health insurance costs in recent years paying \$2 million from our unrestricted funds budget. All other funds helped to pay that cost in the amount of \$1 million. We foresee that as continuing in the near future. The top priorities in *Educating Illinois* cost \$25-30 million.

We have been asked to testify in front of the House Appropriations Committee on March 6 to address how we would cope with a 5% and a 10% budget cut. That translates into a cut of \$4.4 million and \$8.8 million, respectively, in the general revenue fund. To offset the hypothetical cuts would require a 10% to 20% tuition increase.

There are bills that have been introduced that we will work very hard to defeat. There is a bill to appropriate the income fund. Right now, we have control over the income fund. We hold it locally. That gives us an

amazing amount of flexibility. A bill has been introduced to cap tuition at either 5% or the consumer price index, whichever is lower. There is a bill that has been introduced to appropriate monies to us in a very detailed, line-item level. That means that we could not transfer money between objects of expenditure. There is another bill that has been introduced that would ask us to guarantee a price to students. The tuition that a freshman would pay would be guaranteed for all four years.

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's Remarks

Provost Bowman: We have a significant challenge before us, but we have also positioned ourselves to deal with it. We have a strategic plan that identifies many of our areas of focus. Our undergraduate enrollment is strong in both quantity and quality. With good solid planning in place, the Master Plan, Educating Illinois and the Comprehensive Campaign, we should be able to advance our agenda even in a challenging budget climate.

In spite of the difficult budget year we are in, most of the faculty searches that are underway are attracting our top choices and the profile of the fall 2003 class is at a historical high. It is absolutely essential that we do everything to maintain quality. That may mean that we may not be able to continue to fund every program and service at their current levels, but we will still continue to fund the drive for quality. We were able to advance to the next tier in *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, an accomplishment that placed us among a select group of only 5% of universities. We enhanced significantly the academic profile of the student body and even though this was a very tight budget year, 81 new tenure track faculty members joined us. We were able to open the Center for Performing Arts and a new College of Business building is taking shape.

Ironically, by facing our problems head on and planning for them, we may have created the false public perception that we are immune to budget cuts. Good planning has allowed us to avoid layoffs. However, the impact of these cuts includes larger classes, vacant faculty and staff lines, and even greater pressures on an inadequate operating budget. Illinois State began FY03 with \$8.7 million less than at the start of FY 02. The loss would have been greater if we had not raised tuition. The increase offset about 40% of the loss, but \$3.08 million of that was taken to cover health insurance costs that were previously covered by the state. Academic Affairs lost \$2.6 million in FY02. \$1.9 million of that was in general revenue funds. In addition, the academic side lost \$1.3 million in FY03. That meant that critical vacancies were left unfilled. These vacancies included 10 tenure track lines, 13 non-tenure track lines, 4 civil service positions, 7 administrative professional positions and 25 graduate assistant lines.

As my office made budget reduction decisions, I did it with three priorities in mind: 1) preserve the ability of academic programs to attract and retain quality students; 2) maintain a robust research and scholarly enterprise; 3) maintain those support functions that are essential to our mission. Our guiding principle was to preserve the integrity of the academic mission and in order to that, I used targeted cuts that shielded academic departments from the full brunt of the rescission. My office has also engaged in planning that will allow us to respond to additional reductions should they occur.

To redress our serious deficiencies, tuition increases will be one of many sources of revenue that will be needed to meet the budget shortfall. However, we cannot lose sight of the fact that rapidly rising tuition is a subject of national concern for public university students. Historically, in bad times as well as good, Illinois State has steadfastly supported tuition-accessible public universities.

We have a major responsibility to demonstrate that now, more than ever, the public universities are crucial to the well being of Illinois and constitute a wise investment of public funds. We recognize that any investment of state funds comes at the expense of another investment. To secure the funds needed for the University to be outstanding, we must underscore our connections with the state at large. Our principal service to the state is teaching and research, yet those of us engaged in statewide outreach need to examine how we can do so more collaboratively in order to expand our effectiveness and reach. We need to be active in all areas of the state. We need to make the case for increased state support through a strategic advocacy program, which enlists

parents, alumni and friends throughout the state. We need to reverse in Illinois the national trend to reduce state expenditures and increase tuition. Given the economic circumstances of these times in Illinois, this will not bring immediate results, but we must accelerate our efforts now to accomplish our goals in the next few years. In the short term, we need to think about deferring some non-personnel expenditures, such as equipment, if it can be done within our stewardship responsibilities. In order to maintain momentum toward progress, we must take a hard look at how we are investing the dollars we have now. The campus community must be energized and hopeful for the future.

In spite of the short-term budget difficulties Illinois State is facing, this is our golden era. We occupy a unique position of strength and visibility among public and private institutions of Illinois and there is no doubt that we will achieve our goal to become the first choice public university in Illinois.

Vice President of Student Affairs's Remarks

Senator Mamarchev: The largest category of funds in Student Affairs are bond revenue resources because we have expenditures from this source for our residence and dining centers all over campus. When you have a very heavy bond revenue side of your operation, it means that you are spending a lot of money paying off debt service. About 55% is in operating funds and about 45% in personnel. Every public university in Illinois has to follow the Legislative Audit Committee Guidelines, which define how funds can be used. For example, no state funds can be used for residence halls and dining operations, the student health service, the student center or recreations centers. The other caveat that we have to follow is that funds need to be spent for purposes collected. For example, when we collect the student health service fee, the student health service is the only department that can use that money.

The process that we use in determining our budget is our Planning Resource Allocation Model. Our staff refers to it as our budgeting triangle. CAS, the Council for Advancement of Standards, has set the minimum standards for all departments within Student Affairs. We have taken the last year and half to see how we are doing compared to the minimum standards of our profession. This, then, has given us information to work on the second leg of our triangle, which is our strategic plan. It has also given us an opportunity to reorganize our goals, mission and vision to match those in *Educating Illinois*.

Our resource allocation process supports *Educating Illinois*. We evaluate each program, department and division by comparing our past year's financial statements to our current year and we compare our division priorities to our available resources. We have significant and welcome student involvement. I want to thank Senator Bathauer and Senator Maroules for their wonderful leadership in helping us with this process. We also have a lot of involvement with the Association of Residence Halls in setting the room and board fees. I want to thank Chris Lapetino for his leadership in that effort.

Vice President for Advancement's Remarks

Dr. Kern: University Advancement's mission is correlated very closely to *Educating Illinois*. Our mission is to enhance, strengthen and expand the University's image, relationships and financial resources. We spend a lot of time on each of these three areas of our mission. We are responsible and charged with communicating the image and identity of Illinois State University. Secondly, we cultivate relationships. We work with all kinds of external groups. Those relationships are key to us from lobbying to influencing public opinion to forming the future of our financial resources in raising private dollars. The third major emphasis is supplying private dollars to Illinois State University to help supplement the budget that we receive from the state.

University Advancement has a variety of funding sources. About 60% comes from general revenue sources and 40% from other funding sources. The 40% of our budget goes up and down depending on our performance. We have been adjusting our budget throughout the year. Today, University Advancement is running on about a 12% reduction in personnel. Our budget is off by about 5%. In order to accommodate those reductions, we are doing some of the same things that you are doing. We have reduced our travel, frozen

technology and personnel. We have limited our staff development and curtailed all of our summer employment of student workers. We have tried to address the rescissions and cut backs in two ways. We ceased communicating with our internationally based alumni. That is an expensive magazine to send. We have eliminated all of our clip services for media. One of the things that we do is monitor ISU's coverage throughout the country. We were able to eliminate that paper clip service and substitute a web browser search package. We saved \$9,000 just by doing that. We were also able to reconfigure some of our Xerox contracting and our printing services and actually increase our service delivery while reducing our costs by over \$36,000. We have tried to address the budget reductions in two ways: cuts in services that are not core to our business and to look for efficiencies where we can.

Dean Representative's Remarks

Senator Rossman: In transitioning from FY 02 to FY 03, Academic Affairs gave up 4% of its budget. This means that we have \$3.3 million dollars less in FY 03 than in FY 02. Of this, 56% is in personnel dollars, largely unoccupied lines, and 44% is in operations. So, generally, personnel funds were spared in favor of cutting operations dollars and occupied positions were for the most part not touched at all. No one was released from employment.

In fulfilling its academic mission, Milner Library incurs costs differently than the six academic colleges. Nevertheless, it has been adversely impacted as well. Rescissions thus far have resulted in a reduction of operating/service hours, cuts in the number of journal and serial titles purchased and delays in basic library services. Currently, twelve staff positions out of seventy-two are unfilled, some in highly specialized areas.

There are four areas the Deans believe need immediate attention in order to seriously implement a strategy. They include enrollment management, implementation of cost containment strategies in departments, downsizing of campus wide support services, and a reexamination of General Education for cost saving opportunities including possible adjustments to FOI.

We need to engage in program admission practices that set ceilings for each major. When a major is full, it is full. General students need to understand that not all majors will be available to them as internal transfers. When we accept an incremental addition of students in a curriculum that is already full, rather than accepting students into curricula that have more capacity, we incur additional, unbudgeted costs with no more students than we could have originally accommodated without additional cost.

Departments are the basic unit of production at a university. When faculty in departments create curricula, they have created future costs that will need to be met. When classes are scheduled, costs are created. If there is to be significant cost containment, it needs to occur where costs are being created. Deans interacting with faculty through department chairs need to create a dialogue about how costs can be avoided and contained in a way that still preserves our uniqueness. The best knowledge about how to succeed at this is located in departments.

We all enjoy the amenities provided by student advisement, technology support, teaching support, research support, and so on. However, in a rescission climate, the costs for providing these services now compete with the cost of direct instruction. In the short run, there should be no expansion of these units or their costs. There should be an immediate review of their role, function, and efficacy with a mission of reducing some of these costs rather than face reducing costs by eliminating direct instruction.

General Education costs more than the institution can afford with this present day challenge of economic slow down and rescission. Since General Education on this campus is still not fully funded, this exercise is most likely one of cost avoidance rather than cost cutting. We need faculty and administrators to examine our General Education program and make adjustments to preserve as much of the idealism envisioned as possible at a cost we can afford consistent with our other curricula resource needs. Cutting the number of hours

required for General Education or encouraging appropriate “double dipping” in General Education and preparation for a major are two strategies for quickly containing or reducing General Education expenses.

Through appropriate but speedy campus dialogue, cost cutting strategies for FOI need to be identified. The most immediately available solution is to increase class size thereby reducing unit costs. But there are others that bear examining. The role and function of FOI could be examined again. It could become a one-hour course or some other configuration appropriate to a newly defined role.

Certainly we need campus discussion about our options. Our current problem is to identify where we can contain and avoid costs. Our future planning for curricula and enrollments must include discussions about their financial impact. The Deans are ready to help explore the options we have presented this evening and others that emerge from these discussions.

Chair of Chair's Council's Remarks

Senator Barone: The Provost has protected the academic budget this year, but there still has been unavoidable reduction in the quantity and quality of instruction. In psychology, for example, this year we lost one and a half non-tenure track positions. Some of the 12 sections that would have been lost this year received temporary funds from the deans and Provost offices, but there were many courses that were not offered.

Enrollment management is an important means of living with continued budgetary cutbacks. We should fulfill our commitment to the students we have accepted doing our best to provide them with the quantity and quality of instruction that they are expecting. ISU does not gain, but loses money for each extra student we accept. State funding is not per capita, so extra students bring no new money from the state and tuition pays only part of the cost of educating students.

Tuition increase is another important means of enabling the quantity and quality of instruction that current students are expecting. If distribution of the general revenues of the state fall 5 or 10% short of the funds needed to deliver the instruction that we offer and students expect, then those funds need to be made up by students currently attending. To not fill the funding gap will result in losing faculty members. To not fill the funding gap will result in students not progressing in a timely manner because of loss of sections.

Questions and Discussion

Senator Lindblom: At the state level, what are we as an institution doing to get smaller cuts for our institution than others?

Senator Bragg: We present our case and the case of higher education to the General Assembly and to members of the governor's office on a daily basis. They are fairly aware of the efficiency at Illinois State University and fairly sympathetic to our situation. In the Board of Higher Education's recommendation, clearly 70% of the recommended increased monies go for things other than public universities. One of the cases that we are trying to make is that direct educational delivery occurs primarily at the institutional level and that ought to be highest priority.

Senator Razaki: What is the marginal cost of teaching a student? What is our optimal level in terms of enrollment?

Senator Bragg: If you reduce enrollment by 200 students and reduce concomitant costs associated with it, you do reduce the marginal costs. The key is reducing the concomitant costs, which is very difficult to do in the short run. Secondly, it depends on where you reduce. There are some programs for which reducing enrollment would actually drive the marginal costs up. You would have to do it very strategically. On average, students are paying for half of their instructional programming. Fifty percent is supported by the state and fifty percent is supported by tuition.

Senator Razaki: When is the final decision going to be made about summer school?

Senator Bowman: We are going to proceed under the assumption that we will move forward until we have a clear signal from that our 03 budget will be cut. We are also looking at alternate funding models for the summer.

Senator Fowles: Given the March 6 hearings, what would you present as your priorities given a 5% or 10% cut?

President Boschini: I am waiting until after tonight to finalize that. To make a 10% cut means personnel because 78% of our budget is salary based.

Senator Crothers: I would ask Senator Bathauer if the State cuts \$4.5 million, what do you want to give up if there are not sufficient tuition increases to cover it.

Senator Bathauer: That is not something that I can answer by myself. Some of the things that I think the students may be willing to sacrifice would be somewhat larger classes as opposed to more sections. We have tried to avoid Saturday morning classes, but they are probably inevitable. We definitely do not want to lose faculty. Students are not opposed to raising tuition, but there has to be a limit.

Senator Kurtz: How real are the legislative threats such as the tuition caps and line item designations?

Senator Bragg: These are very real concerns. The governor is very sympathetic to these legislative initiatives. The argument that we are going to make is that the last thing you want to do to us right now is cut off any kind of flexibility that we have.

Senator Kurtz: Was not the line item appropriation tried in the past?

Senator Bragg: Yes, up until fiscal year 1997, we did receive our appropriation in line items. In order to transfer funds, we had to seek permission from the IBHE and in some cases the General Assembly.

Senator Kurtz: Since the governor has taken direct aim at "administrative bloat", I can imagine they would ask questions about the 35% growth in AP staff since 1995. Do you have a break down by percent of the groups that covers?

Senator Bragg: About one-third of the growth has been in academic advisement, one-third in technology support and one-third in all other categories.

Senator Kurtz: If we do face the cuts, what kind of mechanisms are you contemplating involving the campus community in discussions about what the priorities should be?

Senator Bragg: This is a good first step. We need to hear from you what you think the priorities are. My recommendation is that our presentation on March 6 be a very general presentation. We don't want to present any specific information until we get an opportunity to come back and engage in conversations with you.

President Boschini: We want as much input as you want to give. This is a great first step.

Senator Borg: I would like to share with you a memo that my colleague received in response to the invitation for specific items that the chair sent out. "Yesterday, I received in the mail a full-color alumni magazine, a 38 page full-color annual report and an 8-page weekly *ISU Report*. I find it amazing and confusing that on one

hand we are repeatedly told to economize, prepare for budget cuts, etc., and still our mailboxes are often filled with university publications, some representing significant outlays. Whether this is an area for real savings or whether it might just be symbolic, why do we continue to spend money on PR material? There are alternatives. The same day I received the above in my mailbox, I received an e-mail from TIAA Craft with a link to their quarterly full-color magazine. I also received various requested publications from a range of businesses in this manner. Why can't ISU do the same?"

Senator Allen: The question was posed to Senator Bathauer of what would students be willing to give up. What is the faculty willing to give up?

Senator Brasseur: We have had in the past year a freeze on raises. Our travel, at least in our department, has been cut severely. We do not currently receive, at least in our department, new equipment. Usually faculty members have an opportunity to apply for grants for summer money. Those were severely cut. People have retired and we have not been allowed to search for those lines. These are the kinds of things we find ourselves giving up.

Senator Allen: The equipment that you are not getting affects students as well. Many things that you say are getting cut, other than the salaries, are affecting students just as much.

Senator Jerich: To what extent might it be advisable in the future to offer invitations to community leaders, state representatives, members of the Board of Trustees and other interested parties to attend an Academic Senate meeting and continue with this dialogue so that we can have a full community discussion?

Senator Radhakrishnan: Assuming there is a 10% cut, how will this affect the hiring of new faculty for next year?

Provost Bowman: A cut of that magnitude would definitely force us to dip into the Academic Impact Fund. The short-term impact on the institution until we recovered from the cut would require a slow down in hiring. We would look at short-term savings in slowing down equipment purchases. We would do everything we could to protect faculty-staff lines, but a cut of that magnitude probably would result in layoffs.

Senator Brasseur: Can you speculate on the nature of the lay offs?

Provost Bowman: I would rather not. It is hard to believe that a cut of that magnitude would occur. The information that we have from Springfield is that that is not likely.

Senator Razaki: As mentioned, there were no pay raises last year and I don't expect to get a pay raise this year. I don't think I am willing to sacrifice much more than that. I would suggest that instead of just maintaining our salaries, faculty should get raises in the near and far future.

Senator Lindblom: Some of the questions have turned this into a budget discussion of faculty versus students. That is the wrong way to approach this. Last year, the Senate devised a mission statement. It is very helpful in situations like this because it reminds us how to make these decisions.

Senator Reid: How serious is Springfield about capping tuition?

Senator Bragg: We are approaching all of these bills as if they are very real possibilities.

Senator Bathauer: What would a 5% salary increase cost in tuition.

Senator Bragg: It takes a 3% tuition increase to award a 1% salary increase.

Senator Bathauer: I agree that faculty should receive the median salary. Perhaps we can identify those small things that students don't need as much of in classes in order to save money. We have to work together on that.

Senator Maroules: The majority of students understand the need for a tuition increase. I think that at least part of that tuition increase must go toward faculty-salary increases in order to maintain the same level of academic instruction we are receiving. The question is how can the university make its important, budget-related decisions. I think that everyone would agree that it should involve all constituents and the lines of communication should stay open.

Senator Deutsch: Are other state universities being asked to conduct a similar exercise? Are they being asked what would happen if they received a 5% or 10% cut? Do the bills apply to those institutions as well?

Provost Bowman: All higher ed institutions were given that directive, so it does apply to everyone.

Senator Jerich: To what extent should we help administrators take the message to Springfield? Should we have large numbers of people mass together to go to Springfield? Should we ask them to come here?

President Boschini: I think the most important thing that we can do is to vote for people who are for the things we are for. But would we take your help? Yes, any time. There is no corner on the market in working with these issues.

Senator Barone: One of the ways of saving that would not affect the current students is enrollment management and reform in General Education. Both have been matters of discussion for a while and I think that we should approach them with more urgency.

Senator Pryor: When you talk about layoffs are we talking about NTTs, APs, whole departments?

President Boschini: I don't have those answers right now and I don't want to speculate on that, but in the event that there are cuts, all categories of personnel are open. There are many, many possibilities that we will look at.

Senator Meckstroth: If those kinds of decisions have to be made, what would the process be for making them?

President Boschini: We would involve as many voices as possible. The bottom line is that it is a decision I will have to make after I get input for all of you. I have not yet thought of the steps in between.

Senator Nur-Awaleh: Despite the way that we manage the institution, we still have some serious issues. We have lost faculty, increased class size and capped spending for technology. How do we overcome the perception that Illinois State can deal with anything?

President Boschini: You want to make sure that they understand that the cuts drastically affect what we can do. We are number 46 in funding, but according to the survey that they keep showing us, we are number one in the quality of education. The problem that we face in Springfield is getting that across.

Senator Reid: I would strongly like to put my support behind looking very seriously at reducing enrollment for next year and reducing FOI costs and Gen Ed costs.

Senator Lindblom: I would like for us to look at a way of forming smaller groups to do some of this work.

Then we can ensure that the principles that we are outlining are operationalized should these cuts have to happen.

Senator Crothers: That is an idea that the Executive Committee can pursue and bring back to the Senate.

Senator Berg: Although we as students agree that faculty salaries are an extremely integral part of any institution's budget and we do receive an excellent education through small class size and one-on-one instruction, overall, universities are in place for students. Without the students, this would not be a university. There would be no professors, solely researchers. Although I agree we need to maintain the highest caliber of professors, I think that we can look everywhere for ways to increase salaries like using overheads instead of handouts, black and white versus color and looking at how FOI benefits the students. Little cuts can make a big difference. Tuition increases and possible enrollment caps, although necessary in some cases, can also definitely deter many enrollments and also cut the graduation rate. We need to be a university that is centered on students because that is why we are here. We should keep students as a key goal throughout any budget cuts we make.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-86: To adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate
408 Hovey Hall
Mail Code 1830
Normal, IL 61790-1830
309-438-8735
acsenate@ilstu.edu

		Adjourn
SENATORS	Attendance	Motion
		Unanimous
ALLEN	X	
ANDERSON	ABSENT	
APER	ABSENT	
ARMSTRONG	X	
BARONE (Chair of Chairs Council)	X	
BATHAUER	X	
BAUM	X	
BERG	X	
BORG	X	
BOSCHINI	X	
BOSER	ABSENT	
BOWMAN	X	
BRAGG	X	
BRASSEUR	X	
BURK	X	
CLEMMONS	X	
COLIZ	EXCUSED	
CROTHERS	X	
CRUMPLER	X	
CUNNINGHAM	ABSENT	
DEMARIO	X	
DEUTSCH	X	
FEASTER	ABSENT	
FOWLES	X	
GAYLOR	X	
GHRIST	X	
HAMPTON	ABSENT	
HOLLAND	X	
HOWARD	EXCUSED	
JERICH	X	
KURTZ	X	
LANDAU	ABSENT	
LIGUNAS	X	
LINDBLOM	X	
MAMARCHEV	X	
MAROULES	X	
McGINNIS	X	
MECKSTROTH	X	
MEHTA	ABSENT	
MOHAMMADI	EXCUSED	
NIEMANN	ABSENT	
NUR-AWALEH	X	
O'BRIEN	X	
O'DONNELL	X	
PHILBIN	X	
PLANTHOLT	X	
PRYOR	X	
RADHAKRISHNAN	X	
RAZAKI	X	
REID	X	
REYNOLDS	X	
SCHILB	X	
SCHNEIDER	X	
THOMAS	X	
TUDOR	X	
VIRGIL	X	
WATERSTRAAT	X	
WEISS	X	
WINCHIP	X	