

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 1-26-1994

Senate Meeting, January 26, 1994

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, January 26, 1994" (1994). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 778.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/778>

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

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

January 26, 1994

XXV, No. 8

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of December 8, 1993

Chairperson's 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 discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

January 26, 1994

Volume XXV, No. 8

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Old Main Room of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson Schmaltz called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 1993

XXV-42

Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of December 8, 1993, by Wilner (Second Barker) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Len Schmaltz had no remarks.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Renee Mousavi: I would like to welcome everyone back for the second semester. The Student Caucus will meet briefly following Academic Senate.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Senator Diane Shaya had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

PRESIDENT WALLACE: I would like to report back on an issue brought up at the last Senate meeting. All mail will now be delivered as long as it has a department address on it.

A second item is IBHE FY 1995 budgets as discussed at the January Board meeting. The IBHE Staff recommended and the Board approved a complete slanting of budgets to the schools who received good PQP reviews by the IBHE staff. The top six institutions received 69% of the \$90 million dollar appropriation. This year they only received 56% of the

appropriation. The Board of Regents objected to that and passed a resolution at their meeting last week. My office sent you the information. It is very clear that it has cost our institutions -- Northern Illinois University for not giving up their law school and Illinois State University for not giving up Agriculture and other programs. I think this will be a major battle in the General Assembly. In talking with our legislators, I think they will support us. I will keep you apprised.

QUESTIONS

Senator Walker: I appreciate all you have said and done on behalf of the Agriculture Department, but I just want to express to the Senate that Agriculture was not the only program that was not given up. Other programs recommended for elimination that were not eliminated included: Ph.D. in Biological Sciences; Ed.D. in Art Education; M. A. in Foreign Languages; Master of Music and Music in Performance. The Agriculture Department is becoming very sensitive to bringing this up again and again. In agriculture circles in the state, they are beginning to identify that there must be something wrong with Illinois State's Agriculture program. I know you are aware of this, but I wanted to emphasize the sensitiveness of the situation. Perhaps we need to be broader in saying what we did not eliminate.

President Wallace: I would point out that regardless of the programs that the IBHE asked us to eliminate, we did not do what they wanted us to do. I have very little doubt that this kind of money (\$59 million dollars) will be there at the end of the legislative session. Last year there was an attempt to penalize those institutions which did not comply. It is not just an Agriculture issue. If the IBHE gets away with this tactic this year, they will do it again. The athletic fee issue affects not just this institution. The IBHE has no authority over fees. This is a constant intrusion into institutions' decisions which should be made by the faculty and administration of an institution. Once they get away with something, they will continue to do it. There are better criteria for funding of institutions, than a political base like our General Assembly uses to establish criteria. I would like to mention that at last count there were over twenty some states that avoid this kind of issue by having a formula based funded budgets. They have an equation in which numbers go in and they crank out a budget. It is not done according to who is playing what political game. We have on the House appropriation committee, Representative Bill Brady, and on the Senate appropriation committee, Senator John Maitland.

Senator Schroeer: If I remember correctly, the U of I did not lose any funding?

President Wallace: The U of I got one half of the money. The amount of money went way beyond the PQP bonuses. The whole budget was slanted.

Senator Razaki: It seems like we are now in a political fist fight with the IBHE and the legislature. It seems to me that the U of I is supporting whatever the IBHE is doing, and receiving benefits. They are a much more powerful body compared to ISU and NIU. Suppose the IBHE does prevail in the legislature, where does this leave ISU? What does that tell us?

President Wallace: During the last few years, according to various quotations from various people at Illinois institutions, people have come out very much opposed to using the budget to punish institutions. Last year the U of I objected to it. One of the presidents who received money registered his objections. I don't think there will be very many people who will support that.

Senator Razaki: Suppose the General Assembly does accept their point of view -- then what?

President Wallace: I don't think that is possible. If they do, they do.

PROVOST STRAND had no remarks.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, WILLIAM GUROWITZ had an excused absence.

NO ACTION ITEMS:

NO INFORMATION ITEMS

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

Chairperson Schmaltz turned the meeting over to the Vice Chair, Renee Mousavi.

Senator Schmaltz: I would like to propose the following Sense of the Senate Resolution:

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION - JANUARY 26, 1994

WHEREAS the staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education recommended for the Regency System the lowest percentage increase for the FY 1995 budget of any system in the State of Illinois.

AND WHEREAS the recommended percentage increases for individual universities ranged from 2.7% to 6.0% (averaging 4.2%) and these recommended increases included PQP bonuses for those institutions which cooperated with the IBHE staff;

AND WHEREAS the recommendations made by the IBHE staff appear inconsistent with the most recent IBHE Comparative Cost Study and the IBHE PQP report on institutional expenditures in non-instructional categories;

AND WHEREAS the Board of Regents at its January meeting unanimously passed a resolution stating that budgets "should not be used to punish some institutions and reward others because of deference shown the Board of Higher Education and its planning dictates;"

AND WHEREAS the Board of Regents' resolution expressed its "vigorous disagreement with and objection to the PQP bonuses;"

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of Illinois State University joins the Board of Regents in expressing its vigorous disagreement with the use of PQP bonuses and the criteria used by the IBHE staff in the formulation of the FY 1995 recommendations.

The Academic Senate calls upon local legislators Senator John Maitland and Representative William Brady, both members of General Assembly appropriations committees, to scrutinize the criteria utilized by the IBHE staff in making its recommendations for FY 1995 and invites both legislators (along with local Representative Dan Rutherford) to attend a future meeting of the Academic Senate to report on the appropriateness and fairness of the criteria employed.

Motion by Schmaltz (Second, Macon Williams)

Senator Borg: Have you been in contact with the Senator and Representatives concerning this?

Senator Schmaltz: No. If the resolution passes, I will do so then.

XXV-44

Senator Winchip (Second, Williams) moved a friendly amendment at the end of the second paragraph: "for those institutions which cooperated with the IBHE staff;"

Strike "cooperated with," and replace with "assert complied with the IBHE staff;"

Senator Walker: I think it is our interpretation that we cooperated fully. It was the expression that Senator Williams was using that was more appropriate. I think we view ourselves as having cooperating with the initiative and have met the end result in terms of dollars. We did cooperate.

Not accepted.

XXV-45

Senator Strand (Second, Walker): It would read better to strike "cooperated with" and replace with: "which the IBHE staff perceived to be most responsive to the PQP exercise."

Motion accepted as friendly by mover and seconder of original motion.

XXV-46

Senator Hesse moved a friendly amendment to change "calls upon" in the last paragraph to requests or asks.

Not accepted as friendly.

Parliamentarian Cohen: I think Doug Hesse's approach is a correct approach in dealing with the legislature. This stems from my experience as Chair of the Senate. You want these people to do you a favor, the word "asks" is better. You want them at their convenience to do you a favor. The legislators are our potential allies, you don't want to use any words which they can bridle at for whatever reason.

XXV-47

Senator Williams (Second, Razaki) Replace "calls upon" with "urges."

Motion not accepted as friendly.

XXV-48

Senator Borg: I move we use the word "asks."

Motion accepted as friendly.

XXV-49

Motion by Hoffmann (Second, Wilner) to accept the entire original motion with the two friendly amendments. Carried unanimously on a voice vote.

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION - JANUARY 26, 1994

WHEREAS the staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education recommended for the Regency System the lowest percentage increase for the FY 1995 budget of any system in the State of Illinois.

AND WHEREAS the recommended percentage increases for individual universities ranged from 2.7% to 6.0% (averaging 4.2%) and these recommended increases included PQP bonuses for those institutions which the IBHE staff perceived to be most responsive to the PQP exercise;

AND WHEREAS the recommendations made by the IBHE staff appear inconsistent with the most recent IBHE Comparative Cost Study and the IBHE PQP report on institutional expenditures in non-instructional categories;

AND WHEREAS the Board of Regents at its January meeting unanimously passed a resolution stating that budgets "should not be used to punish some institutions and reward others because of deference shown the Board of Higher Education and its planning dictates;"

AND WHEREAS the Board of Regents' resolution expressed its "vigorous disagreement with and objection to the PQP bonuses;"

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of Illinois State University joins the Board of Regents in expressing its vigorous disagreement with the use of PQP bonuses and the criteria used by the IBHE staff in the formulation of the FY 1995 recommendations.

The Academic Senate asks local legislators Senator John Maitland and Representative William Brady, both members of General Assembly appropriations committees, to scrutinize the criteria utilized by the IBHE staff in making its recommendations for FY 1995 and invites both legislators (along with local Representative Dan Rutherford) to attend a future meeting of the Academic Senate to report on the appropriateness and fairness of the criteria employed.

NO COMMUNICATIONS

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator Walker reported that the Academic Affairs Committee in response to the forums for the University Studies Review Committee Proposal for a new program of general education prior to the end of the fall semester created a subcommittee to take the USRC Proposal and revise it. This subcommittee was composed of three members of the USRC Committee: Macon Williams; Judy Mogilka; and Wayne Lockwood; three members of the Academic Affairs Committee: Doug Hesse; Paul Borg; and Paul Walker; with a representative from the Provost Office, Dr. Alan Dillingham; three additional members from the University community: Jill Attaway, Marketing; John Kirk, Theatre; and Mohamed Tarvokoli, History; as well as Dean Paul

Schollaert, from the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee met over Christmas Break and substantially revised the program. It still has the same flavor and adheres to the philosophy and objectives approved by the Senate, but I think it takes into account many of the concerns raised by the campus community regarding the program. The committee will meet one more time and will probably have it all ironed out and then report to the Academic Affairs Committee. The Academic Affairs Committee will review their report. The revised program will be offered to the University community by the end of next week. The Academic Affairs Committee, if they endorse the new plan, will be requesting it to be an information item at a February meeting.

Senator Kaiser: I am puzzled by the process by which so many of the members of the original University Studies Review Committee have been involved in the review process, both as members of the Academic Affairs Committee and as a majority (50% or more) of the review committee. Part of the reason for having the review process is to gain new perspectives, etc. I wonder whether new perspectives have been provided when over half of the committee was comprised of original members.

Senator Walker: That is a point well taken. I think the committee did bring in substantial new blood and outside perspectives. We kept members from the original University Studies Review Committee because the vast amount of review that had taken place in the last three years. We would have lost all that review and understanding of general education not only at ISU but at other institutions if we had an entirely new committee. A new committee would have been starting from scratch.

Senator Williams: The members of the USRC heard all of the objections to the University Studies Proposal from the hearings in December. All of those issues were brought up and considered by the new committee.

Senator Schroeer: Will this new proposal go to the entire University community? Is there time to consider it, if it is coming to the Academic Senate as Information and Action in February?

Senator Walker: Hopefully by the end of next week we will have it in a form that we can resubmit and we will attempt to mail it to all faculty members. Assuming that Academic Affairs Committee approves it, we will request the Executive Committee to make it an Information Item in February. Following that, if Executive Committee feels it is ready for the next stage, it will become an Action Item.

Senator Razaki: Are you going to have open meetings to discuss this new proposal? If you don't, I perceive the

same type of problems that we had last time. I can see the same objections arising. The University community might again feel that they did not have a say in the process.

Senator Walker: I think it becomes the duty of the senators at some time to take on their role as a senator and obtain input from their constituents. We have had two years of forums and discussions. We have revised the program now twice. I think the program either has merit or it doesn't have merit. That is the point where the Senate should approve or disapprove it. The committee structure of the Senate has looked at it. Both the University Curriculum Committee and the Council for Teacher Education have approved it. The Council on University Studies looked at it and suggested revisions. The Academic Affairs Committee reviewed it. We created a subcommittee and made some changes which will again go through the Academic Affairs Committee. We will bring it forward to the Senate. We could have forums and discussions at large forever and a day and never get anywhere. I think at this time we need to distribute it to the campus community and bring it to the Senate.

Senator Johnson: Our college curriculum committee has looked at the new proposal. It will be different, it will be new, but it will be more palatable.

Senator Walker: We are not going to ask for upfront approval. We are going to ask for the Senate to endorse that this change be done and approve a pilot program and come back to the Senate for final approval. So, the Senate will not be giving prior approval to something that creates itself. It will probably take two or three years before it comes back to the Senate for final approval. The Senate will have its chance to have its say.

Senator Wallace: I was under the impression that this is a review process, and that the committee was trying to modify the proposal and make it more acceptable. I would urge that the campus community become involved at the departmental level with faculty discussions in their departmental meetings and forward constructive suggestions. Certainly then there should be a time period when departments can discuss the proposal.

Senator Rosenthal: A lot of faculty and chairs are wondering about issues of implementation of the program. Will information about implementation be distributed?

Senator Walker: Yes. A big part of the revision process was clarification of the piloting process. What we want to stress is that it is an implementation process not just a pilot program without involvement. There will be faculty orientation, development of new courses, student

orientation, and curriculum development. Things will be spelled out more thoroughly.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: No report.

BUDGET COMMITTEE - Senator Wayne Nelsen reported that the Budget Committee met before Senate this evening. They considered the budget recommendation from the IBHE. Dr. Strand filled the committee members in on the budget process. The Committee also received copies of the College of Arts and Sciences Minor in Cognitive Science for review.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Khalid Razaki announced that the Faculty Affairs Committee met with the University Review Committee a couple of weeks ago and discussed some major and significant changes in the ASPT Document. In the very near future the Faculty Affairs Committee will be bringing to the Executive Committee and then to the Senate those major and significant changes in the ASPT Document.

RULES COMMITTEE - Senator Eric Johnson reported that Rules Committee had been working on the Disestablishment Procedures during the last year. A special ad hoc committee was formed and they have drafted changes in the document and are working on a final draft. Hopefully this will come to the Senate as an information item for the second meeting in February.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Jon Rosenthal reported that the Student Affairs Committee would meet at 6:00 p.m. before the next Senate Meeting.

Senator Walker: With the volume of work to come before the Senate, does it behoove us to have an extra meeting?

Chairperson Schmaltz: We have to work around Spring Break in March and have the Orientation of the New Senate. The Executive Committee has the power to schedule an extra meeting if it is necessary.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

XXV-50

Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Razaki) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JANET M. COOK, SECRETARY

