CHAPTER FOUR

OUTSIDE INFLUENCES

There were periods in the history of Illinois State University when outside events or circumstances exerted an influence on the school’s development. An example that comes easily to mind is that of the 1960s when ISU’s development was shaped by the general growth of higher education and the social upheavals of the civil rights and antiwar agitation. ISU came of age in those years as an expanding multi-purpose, diversified university with a campus-wide system of shared governance. More recent examples of external forces affecting the University occurred in the decade of the 1980s: the uncertainties of state support of higher education, the possibility of faculty collective bargaining, national and state demographic changes, the explosion of computer technology, and the public concern over the quality of education at all levels. Some of these external factors were more potent than others in bringing change to the University, but all played influential roles in determining institutional characteristics and goals and thus the direction of Illinois State University’s future development.

First it was the uncertain, at times precarious, nature of Illinois’ funding of public higher education and the effects on the University’s development. Compared to the accomplishments of previous periods, program development and improvement during the ‘80s was at best only modest in meeting the needs of Illinois’ people because of doubtful and inadequate levels of funding. In the previous decade, university planning had followed a little changed pattern and was based on the assumption that financial resources would be available in the years ahead. In those years the University was successful in initiating new academic degree programs and improving its
instructional, research, and public service activities. But the budget crisis of 1981-83 brought about an abrupt change, replacing advancement with financial crisis management and retrenchment, and requiring changes in how the central administration, colleges, and department faculty planned for the future. That transformation can be seen in the University's five year academic plans. The Academic Planning Committee, chaired by Gene Jabker, confronted the fact of scarce and unreliable resources as it prepared the 1982-87 Plan. As outlined by Dr. Richard Wagner, executive director of the Board of Higher Education, Illinois public universities needed a new orientation and a new style for the coming decade. "We're not a growth industry," he said, and "we have to shift our emphasis to quality — quality programs, quality teaching, quality service, [and] quality research. And it all has to occur within the context of reality." The Committee summarized succinctly that reality: "For the first time in the memory of most faculty and administrators, institutions of public higher education in Illinois are faced with the possibility of a reduction in resources and the possible elimination of services and programs." The 1982 Academic Plan, therefore, departed from previous plans because of financial austerity. The Committee described its effort as a "plan for planning," explaining in detail the budgetary imperative for integrated, coordinated planning based on identified needs and priorities, and assumptions about the future of higher education. Until the Needs and Priorities Committee finished its work, which had just barely begun, the Planning Committee relied on an informal poll of program directors and college deans to identify institutional priorities. The results of the poll were revealing. Illinois State's primary mission was to provide, with an emphasis on teaching, the best undergraduate programs among the public universities of Illinois, complemented by strong graduate study, research, and community service activities. To fulfill that mission, the objectives of greatest importance were to recruit and retain capable students, quality faculty and staff, and improve the quality of programs available to all students. The major purposes of planning were now program improvement in all its aspects rather than simply adding new programs to the University curriculum. In place of the old
method, new program proposals, limited in number, were to be the products of careful study and preparation based on existing strength, and implemented only when additional money was available. Program reviews would no longer be perfunctory as in the past, but provide rigorous and critical evaluations for the purposes of strengthening programs.

The Academic Plans of 1983 and 1984 carried forward the new planning format in greater detail, relying on the preliminary and then the final "statement" of the Needs and Priorities Committee. An interesting part of the new-style was the analysis of certain assumptions about higher education which had to be taken into account in planning. Population and enrollment trends indicated an increase in older students and minorities, especially those of Hispanic heritage, and a resurgent interest of society in the study of the liberal arts and sciences. State and federal tax revenues available to Illinois higher education would remain stable or decline in the future, and as a consequence, increased tuition and foundation support would be relied on as sources of university income. This new awareness about funding necessitated the most efficient and effective use of all resources, whatever the source. Students would continue to experience as great or greater stress-related and behavioral problems because of personal financial difficulties and the demands of a complex world. Because of scarce resources, class size was likely to increase along with greater use of instructional technology, especially computers. There would be fewer federal and state grants and contracts to support faculty research at the same time that university funds must be concentrated on maintaining the quality of programs. Curriculum trends would be mixed: the baccalaureate degree would likely be redefined to emphasize the broader educational goals of analysis and problem solving, while graduate programs, particularly the master's degree, would stress an applied component; computer literacy would be vital at all levels of university study. Also included in the Plans of 1983 and 1984 were reviews, following the new format, of programs in the colleges of applied science and technology and arts and sciences.

Because of the unstable and bleak funding circumstances, plus the demands of the educational quality reform movement
discussed below, the development of new degree programs was understandably limited during the '80s compared to the accomplishments of previous years. In the Academic Plans from 1982 to 1988, three new undergraduate degree programs were proposed: international business, public relations, and East Asian studies; six were planned for the graduate level: master's in writing, applied computer sciences, public administration, and agribusiness, and doctorates in school psychology and math education. Of the nine, five received final approval from the Board of Higher Education by 1988 (international business, public relations, writing, applied computer sciences, and school psychology) and one was denied approval (public administration). It proved to be a struggle for President Watkins and other administrators who presented the University's requests to the governing boards, largely because of the constraints imposed on the University's budget. But persistence won, as was the case with the school psychology doctorate which required nearly four years to progress from a planning proposal to final approval. The development of new minors and departmental units was also limited. A department of military science, subsidized by the federal government, was established in 1981, providing for a full-fledged ROTC program; a minor in military science was added five years later.

Greater success was achieved in the years of budget difficulties in making other advances in the University's academic condition. Improving academic standards had a high priority. Changes in academic policies and regulations during the early '80s represented a continuation of the earlier work associated with the Basic Skills Report and revision of University Studies. Beginning in the fall of 1982, in addition to other requirements, high school graduates had to complete three years of English and one year of algebra to qualify for admission to the University, a requirement that was extended to transfer students in 1983. Several proposed changes in academic regulations came to the Academic Senate from the Academic Standards Committee. One change would recognize outstanding graduating seniors at commencement, beginning in 1982, with summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude baccalaureate degrees. The committee in 1982 also sent to the Senate, which
then approved, an adjustment in the “incomplete” policy by eliminating the “I” as a default grade and requiring the removal of all incompletes before graduation. A major proposal from the Standards Committee addressed what it called the “writing problem” among ISU students. Despite the changes resulting from the Basic Skills Report, faculty surveys and reports from the director of the Writing Skills Center indicated that the writing abilities of 85 percent of ISU students were “mediocre or less.” One cause of the problem was the apparent low quality of teaching in some high schools and community colleges, but the University also was at fault. Since the late ’60s a gradual reduction in the traditional English composition requirement had occurred, so that by the middle 1970s students could graduate without taking a writing course as part of University Studies. Another factor was the increased number of large lecture classes, particularly for beginning courses, and the reliance of faculty, confronted by heavy student loads, on multiple-choice examinations. A partial correction was made in 1976 when English 101 was once more required of all students, but the Standards Committee’s investigation revealed that ISU lagged behind other state schools in assuring that its graduates were reasonably “literate.” Further reform was obviously needed. In the spring of 1982 the Committee proposed that an additional composition course as well as a writing examination be added to the University’s graduation requirements. After long discussions and negotiations among various faculty committees and the administration, it was decided to defer the proposed second composition course because of the cost involved. However, the Academic Senate and President Watkins in the fall of 1983 did approve a junior writing exam as one of the graduation requirements to be listed in the 1984 catalog.

A required writing exam was guaranteed to raise the anxiety level among students, but additional measures were necessary to bring about a more lasting improvement in their writing ability. The faculty of the English Department, chaired by Dr. Charles Harris, already was in the lead in promoting ways to develop student writing skills. In addition to the assistance available at the Writing Skills Center and in the department’s own writing programs, a telephone Grammar Hotline was estab-
lished in October, 1980 by the English Department to help students and the public resolve writing problems. It was a distinctive service which quickly gained state and national recognition in the news media. The department also recognized that emphasizing writing once more in all types of courses would be helpful to student skills. Encouraged by Dean Virginia Owen, English faculty in 1982 conducted writing workshops for department faculties in the arts and sciences college, in which most of the University Studies courses were taught, as part of a "writing-across-the-curriculum" effort. A low-cost pilot project was started in 1984 in the English Department to test computer assisted instruction as a way to improve writing skills. While these activities were not all that needed to be done to improve basic skills, further plans, such as a second composition course and greater use of computers, would have to wait until the University's budget picture changed.

In less dramatic yet substantive ways, other academic advancements occurred during the budget crisis. The undergraduate programs in the college of business gained a five-year accreditation in 1981 from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. An honors residency program was initiated in the fall of 1982, made possible by the relocation of International House from Fell Hall to Walker Hall. The designation of Walker Hall as an international/honors dorm was not a popular decision with either the foreign students, who preferred Fell Hall, or the hard-drinking "Walker men," who closed out their last semester in the building with a mock funeral. The "internationalizing" of ISU was furthered by an exchange agreement signed in 1984 with Srinakharinwirot University of Thailand. More numerous study-abroad opportunities were developed for the regular semesters and summer sessions; for example, nine programs in seven countries were offered in the summer of 1982 alone. As part of academic programming in International House, two political science faculty, Joel Verner and Jamal Nassar, began "Global Review" in 1980, which quickly became a popular discussion series focusing on current international issues. And the Office of International Studies, directed by Joan McCarthy after the retirement of Dr. Ted Sands in 1983, actively sought exchange agreements with additional foreign universities.
Perhaps it is impossible to gauge fully the consequences of the years of fiscal retrenchment to the University. In some ways the effects were positive: the survival of forward planning, particularly in the areas of academic standards, support services and special programs, now depended on linking budget decisions to institutional priorities. An important start toward that end was made which would be developed further in the years ahead. Obtaining external funds was also stimulated by financial austerity. A larger number of faculty across the colleges aggressively sought out grants and contracts from government and private sources to support their research, teaching, and public service activities. The growth rate in annual totals reflected faculty expertise and success: from $1.3 million in 1977-78 to over $5 million in 1986-87. President Watkins in 1983 launched a parallel effort to improve the level of private fund raising among alumni and friends of ISU. The trend of declining public appropriations for Illinois higher education made it necessary to seek alternative sources of funds, and Dr. Watkins made several appointments in 1983 to organize and advance that work in conjunction with the ISU Foundation. Richard Godfrey was named director of institutional advancement, Fred Hansen was hired as director of development, and alumni services was restructured. Through the efforts of Tom Jacob and Bert Mercier, presidents of the Foundation, and personnel of the invigorated development-alumni office, positive results were achieved. Annual gifts and donations to the University jumped from less than a million to over $2 million by 1986. Considering that private fund raising was not particularly emphasized in the past, the improvement in such a short time was startling. But some things would never be recovered: the loss of top faculty to better jobs and the reduced purchasing power of salaries. Many other needs of the University were simply deferred to better days, usually with a higher price tag or scaled back to a bare minimum: repairing and remodeling buildings (the Fell Hall and Cook Hall projects are good examples) and instructional and laboratory equipment (especially in the sciences and applied fields). President Watkins put the matter in bold relief: "The state universities of Illinois, once the envy of surrounding states, find themselves battling underfunding and the mediocrity which
that generates. Salaries are non-competitive and operating budgets skimpy. It cannot be a source of state pride to know that thirty-four states are spending more to educate a student than is Illinois.” Whatever the effects of those “skimpy” budgets on the University’s well-being, the funding crisis of 1981-83 was an example of how a powerful external force could severely diminish the flexibility of internal decision-making on the scope and direction of the University’s educational functions.

Another external factor that came to exert an influence on the University during the 1980s was the effort to unionize the faculty. While local faculty leaders were the principal figures involved in the campus agitation over collective bargaining, the primary force behind the effort came from national and state organizations dedicated to unionizing university and college teachers. The first campaign to establish a collective bargaining unit for ISU faculty union came in 1970-71, during which the basic campus divisions and arguments for and against a union were established. Although the union drive of the Illinois Association of Higher Education in 1971 gained the support of over 50 percent of the faculty, the Board of Regents, in the absence of a state law enabling university faculty to unionize, declined to recognize the campus group as a collective bargaining agent. Faculty discussions of collective bargaining continued in the years that followed, as did the concern of the Regents, no doubt stimulated by the unionization of the universities controlled by the Board of Governors. By 1976-77, campus interest again was at a peak, as it was at the other two regency universities, prompting the Board of Regents to hold several open forums on the merits of collective bargaining. Once more the local chapter of IAHE argued that it had the support of over half of the faculty based on informal polls, but the opponents of the IAHE, led by Arlan Richardson of chemistry, petitioned the Regents to reject collective bargaining. Based on its reading of faculty attitudes and divisions, the Regents in the spring of 1977 decided against having a formal faculty vote on the issue.

While it appeared that the ISU faculty had lost interest in collective bargaining after the board’s decision, the issue was not dead. It surfaced again in the middle 1980s, this time with greater intensity and division among the faculty. Several rea-
sons account for the revival of the collective bargaining question. The unwillingness of the governing boards and state legislature for a number of years to give pay raises equal to the inflation rate produced a rising anger among faculty over the declining purchasing power of their paychecks. One consequence of that faculty anger by the spring of 1980 was the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee for Salary Improvement to lobby the legislature; another was talk of using collective bargaining to gain greater salary increases from the state. Capitalizing on faculty discontent, the Illinois Federation of Teachers in late 1980 created a special organization, University Professionals of Illinois, to unionize the state’s public universities outside the Board of Governors system. A campus chapter of UPI was formed the next year with Merle Howard of speech pathology as president, and it immediately launched a vigorous informational and membership campaign, emphasizing among other things its ability to negotiate higher faculty salaries. Two other factors added to the revival of collective bargaining as an issue among ISU faculty: one was the effects of the two year state revenue crisis on the University’s budget, which raised the specter of faculty layoffs as well as no raises. Perhaps it was partly in response to the deeply felt concerns of faculty and staff that the University in September, 1983 began a “Wellness Program,” coordinated by Linda Sorrels, to combat the physical effects of stress. The second factor affecting campus collective bargaining was the passage of a state law in 1983 enabling faculty to decide for themselves, instead of allowing the decision to be made by governing boards, whether or not they should unionize. On October 10, 1983, UPI launched a sign-up campaign to become the bargaining agent for faculty at the regency universities.

Three years passed before the matter was finally decided by a faculty vote. Once more as in past bouts over the issue, the faculty were divided into contending camps, each holding discussions meetings, bringing in outside speakers, and stuffing faculty mailboxes with informational literature. In addition to the UPI, two other faculty groups were actively involved in the issue. The usually somnolent chapter of the American Association of University Professors awakened under the leadership
of William Linneman and then Gerlof Homan to challenge the UPI's claim to represent the faculty. To oppose the contentions of both UPI and AAUP, Arlan Richardson and Charles Thompson revived their Committee on Shared Governance to offer faculty the option of rejecting collective bargaining. They argued that unionization would mean the substitution of a management/employee form of governance in place of the faculty's time-honored participation in university decision-making. The administration, though opposed to collective bargaining, stayed out of the fray, but President Watkins did sound a note of caution: "We are entering an era where traditional modes of internal governance and historic patterns of operation may be challenged and possibly changed. It is imperative that we refuse to allow future events to cause us to turn upon one another, that we remember that our mission is to provide high quality educational experiences for our students."

The UPI had the initiative, at least in the beginning, and by February, 1984 the organization had enough faculty support to petition Governor Thompson to call a system-wide election to allow faculty to determine bargaining or no bargaining. From that point on the issue became more complicated than whether or not the faculty favored unionization. Should the issue be decided by a combined vote of the three regency universities, or should each campus decide the issue for itself? UPI wanted a system-wide unit like that already covering schools under the Board of Governors. The Board of Regents disliked the idea of a faculty union, but if it had to be, then a single bargaining agent was favored. In part to deal with the prospect of negotiating a labor contract, and also because of the retirement of the board's long-time executive director, Dr. Frank Matsler, the Regents in May, 1984 created a chancellorship with greater authority in regency affairs and named William Monat, president of Northern Illinois University, to fill the position. Faculty in AAUP, in the fray more to block the labor unionism of UPI than because of a commitment to collective bargaining, opposed a system-wide decision out of concern that a combined vote of UPI supporters on the three campuses would carry the election. Another question complicating the issue involved the identification of those who were in or out of any bargaining unit. The
sides disagreed on a long list of positions, but the controversy, at least at ISU, boiled down to the status of department chairs and the teachers in Metcalf and U-High. Months passed following the UPI's request for an election while a hearing officer and then the full Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board heard arguments on these questions. In the end, the IELRB decided in favor of separate campus units, excluding lab school teachers from the unit but including department chairs. An election on collective bargaining was finally held on October 1, 1986. Ninety-six percent of eligible faculty voted, evidence enough of the intensity of interest in the issue, and more than half, 383, chose "no representation," while UPI received 223 votes and AAUP only 64. It is difficult to interpret the full meaning of the election outcome. Certainly collective bargaining had been rejected, but whether the vote also meant that faculty approved the way ISU's system of shared governance operated cannot be said. One thing is clear: during three years of sustained interest in the effort to unionize the faculty, hundreds of people found their time diverted from other important concerns.

A third external factor influencing the University in the 1980s involved demographic changes in the nation and state which challenged enrollment stability and altered the composition of ISU's student population. The principal demographic change was the shrinking size of high school graduating classes on which universities and colleges traditionally relied for new students, a drop predicted to go from 3.2 million high school seniors in 1977 to 2.3 million in 1992. The potential damaging effects of an enrollment decline on all University activities was clear to President Watkins, and counter measures were undertaken to maintain enrollment stability. Recruiting students in the 18 to 22 age group became more aggressive, utilizing local alumni groups around the state, telephone campaigns, and closer relations with a large number of community colleges (an effort directed by Art Adams out the president's office). In addition to the advantages of a central location in the state and easy accessibility by interstate highways and Amtrak service, the University's recruiting campaign conducted by the Office of Admissions stressed the improvements in academic standards and the invigorated and expanded Honors program. Looking
into the future, a special "Academically Gifted Enrichment Program" was initiated in 1983 to bring talented young people, grades seven through twelve, to the campus during the summer months.

These efforts, however, were not enough to maintain enrollment. Each year since 1972 the proportion of total campus enrollment in the 24 and under age bracket declined, from 87 percent in 1972 to 80 percent in 1987. It was also necessary to give special attention to attracting a larger number of minority students, the only group among high school graduates increasing in number, and the so called "non-traditional" students, men and women in older age brackets. The recruitment and retention of minority students, especially black students, was a major concern to campus leaders because of declining numbers entering the University. From nearly twelve percent of all students in 1976, minority enrollment had fallen to under ten percent by 1983, with most of the decline occurring in the number of black students, from 9.9 percent to 6.6 percent. While this enrollment trend was common to higher education everywhere and would become worse in the years ahead, President Watkins reaffirmed the University's commitment to "access" to educational opportunity and encouraged efforts to arrest the decline. A special committee was appointed, chaired by Dr. Susan Kern of President Watkin's staff, to coordinate an effort to increase minority enrollment. To improve retention of black students, nearly all of whom were regular admissions but of disadvantaged backgrounds, the academic and personal support services of the High Potential Students and Special Assistance programs were invigorated by new leadership from Rosalyn Green (1980-82) and then Brisbane Rouzan who later would become an assistant to the provost. The Office of Admissions gave special attention to recruiting minority students and, with the help of Regent Clara Fitzpatrick of Evanston, initiated a special recruitment program in 1982, "ISU Associates," that drew on the assistance of minority business, professional, and community leaders in various cities in the state. A new program was planned for academically talented minority students, called "Minority Professional Opportunities," and initiated under Francene Gilmer in 1984.
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While these activities brought about a small improvement in the number of black students at ISU by 1983 and 1984, the larger state-wide, as well as national, problem of falling black enrollments remained. Largely through the tireless efforts of Dr. Charles Morris, vice president for administrative services, a number of state education leaders met at ISU in May, 1982 to form the Illinois Committee on Black Concerns in Higher Education for the purpose of improving the educational and employment opportunities of blacks in higher education. The first ICBCHE conference was held at ISU the next year to discuss strategies to improve educational services for minorities in Illinois. The Board of Higher Education awarded the new organization funds which enabled it to sponsor forums and workshops at other campuses, and to publish the proceedings of its annual conference. The ICBCHE also presented testimony to legislative committees assessing the place of minorities in higher education and the state economy. All these efforts at bolstering minority enrollments were important but limited in success. The numbers of students of Asian and Hispanic heritage increased to a combined total of 485 in 1987, more than double what it had been in 1976, but the long-term decline in black enrollment at ISU continued unchecked, falling to 1200 by the end of the thirteenth decade. Perhaps what was needed was greater financial aid to help minority students from low income families enter higher education and an expansion of academic support systems to retain and graduate those already attending ISU. But the prospects were not good, for whatever more the University might wish to do depended on an improvement in the level of state support of higher education, which seemed unlikely to happen.

The University had greater success in attracting new students who were 25 years and older, a group that became a vital element in maintaining relative enrollment stability to 1983 and then contributing to an enrollment growth which pushed Illinois State to a record 22,041 in 1987. The growth rate of non-traditional students was greater than for the entire student population, with the most spectacular increases occurring in the number of students 30 years and older: the total of non-traditional students, registered either full or part-time in the
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fall semester, increased from 2,742 in 1976, to 3038 in 1983, and then to nearly 5,000 in 1987, comprising 20 percent of the total student population. The increase of those who were 30 and older was even more noteworthy, jumping from 943 to 1,457 to 3,059. Three quarters of non-traditional students were enrolled on a part-time basis, of which well over half were women, most of whom were 30 plus, fully employed and married or single parents, and working toward a degree. Clearly, the composition and characteristics of the student population were changing, becoming a little “gray” and with more varied life-experiences.

If enrolling older students allowed the University in the early Eighties to keep its enrollment stable when nearly all other Illinois public universities experienced declines, as was the case in 1984, those students also presented a challenge. In order to attract the non-traditional student, the University had to be flexible in delivering its academic resources to a special clientele that did not fit the usual 8 to 4 o’clock mold. Accommodating adult students, on or off campus, was not a new experience for ISU. The University for decades had been offering extension courses, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, at various sites in central Illinois, primarily for public school teachers, and summer sessions brought large numbers to the campus. But now something more was necessary to entice greater numbers of adults to take advantage of the University’s academic offerings, whether as returnees or first time students. Academic departments were encouraged to schedule more evening classes to accommodate adults working full time. In addition to expanding the number of off-campus credit courses, the college of continuing education coordinated special admission procedures and a schedule of evening classes for those in an adult learners/re-entry program. Begun in 1982 and directed by Marcia Escott, it was an immediate success, and by 1987 nearly 3,000 were enrolled in the program. In 1984 the college initiated a general studies degree for place-bound students and negotiated contracts to offer the program at the Pontiac and Dwight Correctional centers. But the University’s plans to further facilitate and develop its adult learner activities through an evening-weekend college division failed to gain approval from the Board of Higher Education because of the state’s financial problems.
A fourth external factor bringing change to the University in the thirteenth decade was the application of the rapidly developing computer technology to virtually every facet of university operations. Use of computers on campus began in 1964, essentially for administrative tasks and a few faculty research projects in the early years. As the application of computer technology slowly spread over the campus, a periodic upgrading and expansion of computer equipment became necessary, and technical staff were hired and formed into a computer services center, directed by Kup Tcheng. A new mainframe was installed in 1978 and expanded in 1982 and 1983, with terminal connections increasing from 47 in 1979 to nearly 400 by 1984, but so great did the demand for computer time become that a more powerful unit was purchased in 1985. The University also purchased computer services from the Mid-Illinois Computer Center, operated by the Illinois Educational Consortium at Edwardsville, in order to satisfy the growing instructional needs of the programs in computer sciences and accounting. The use of computers in various settings spread over the campus in the late 1970's and early 1980's with important consequences for many small and large aspects of university life. The holdings of Milner Library were computerized and by early 1981 became part of a new state-wide Library Circulation System and a inter-system library delivery network. Academic departments, like psychology, economics, business administration, sociology, and industrial technology, requested greater computer services and equipment for both instruction and faculty research. In the fall of 1982, the Vidette began carrying computer advertisements for local stores, and before long the Bone Student Center held its first PC sale.

With the increased use and demand for computer technology, the need to coordinate and plan a campus-wide computer strategy became obvious. In 1983, two committees were established to give advice on the use of computer technology for administrative and academic purposes. The latter advisory committee, chaired by Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo of the provost's office, studied the larger-scale problem of promoting a general computer literacy among students and faculty. Based on a survey of the differing computer needs of the colleges, the
Outside Influences

committee recommended to Dr. Strand that each college formulate its own computer plan, with general direction provided by a coordinator of academic computer planning responsible to the provost. Computer planning in the colleges and departments took place during 1985, Wayne Andrews of industrial technology was named coordinator, and additional funds for equipment and services were requested in 1986 and again in 1987. While the return of the state's old revenue problems prevented the University from doing everything needed to realize its planning goal of a computer literate working-learning environment for students, faculty, and staff, progress was nonetheless achieved by means of budget reallocation to colleges and departments. The results were important, mirroring the larger electronic transformation of American society. By the end of the thirteenth decade, CRT terminals and microcomputers seemed to be in use everywhere in administrative and faculty offices; computer laboratories were located in the major classroom buildings and in the residence halls; use of Milner's card catalog to locate library materials was replaced by user-friendly computer programs and terminals; academic advisement and the registration process were computerized by the spring of 1985; a limited network system was installed in Stevenson and Williams Halls linking offices in those buildings; the administrative offices in the college of education were joined in a computerized management system; and electronic mail was begun in a small way. While computer assisted instruction could be found in many academic programs, with some of the applications quite sophisticated, one of the most interesting instructional uses of the computer occurred in the basic English composition course required of all students. The pilot project begun in 1984 by the English Department, which lasted two years, demonstrated that computer assisted instruction in the classroom improved student writing skills. In the fall of 1986, 200 microcomputers were in use in all freshmen writing classes.

These examples, and many others besides, emphasize the pervading force of technological advancements in altering, perhaps even making more efficient, certain aspects of university life. For all of the computer applications, however, much more remained to be done to bring offices and buildings together in a
common system, to fully enroll the campus in the new electronic age. This is not to say that yellow chalk, the No. 2 pencil, and the typewriter, the traditional and symbolic tools of higher education in this century, were or could be discarded altogether in favor of a CPU. They were not and perhaps never can be. Most of all, the new technology cannot displace the most elementary and vital component in the whole educational process, that of the interaction between teacher and student as both seek greater knowledge and understanding of the world in which they live.

The circumstances and condition of Illinois State University by the middle '80s revealed a subtle but important change of emphasis in student life. The apparent student preoccupation with weekend partying and the bitter relations with town officials slowly gave way to a calmer campus-community environment. Beer parties in violation of town ordinances did not stop, nor did local authorities relax their enforcement of town and state laws. Incidents and arrests continued, though fewer in number, but what was missing was the earlier focus on partying as a group problem, an issue which supposedly involved all students on one side and all town residents on the other. After the disruption of 1984, partying and its consequences were seen as an individual thing; personally costly and still irritating for those students and residents involved, but matters that were now devoid of the emotion which had produced the severe difficulties and confrontations in the past.

Several reasons can be advanced to account for the lessening of the party issue. Neighborhood areas close to the University, where partying previously had been a problem, were slowly being transformed to student housing, and zoning changes set geographic limits to the spread of new construction aimed at students, thus more clearly separating students from town residents. The repeated efforts of the University, student government, student legal services, and town to inform students on how to party legally began to pay off. Many Greek houses,
especially fraternities, formerly the location of large boisterous weekend affairs, now obtained one day liquor licenses from the city, more carefully checked underage drinkers, and in one case even asked police to administer sobriety tests to people leaving the party to reduce risks of DUI arrests. Finally, students themselves were becoming sensitized to the physical and emotional consequences of alcohol abuse, a condition generally associated with partying. Student Affairs actively promoted the educational efforts of such organizations as Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students (BAACHUS), which concentrated on members of social sororities and fraternities, and Illinois State Alcohol Awareness Committee (ISAAC), active in the residence halls. To reach students living in off-campus apartments, a federal grant in 1985 supported a "peer interventionist" program designed to promote social activities without drinking. A large number of student organizations participated in the fall semester National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week in 1986 and 1987, and at other times area dorms sponsored their own events. In 1986, the campus Interfraternity Council secured the agreement of local Greek houses that the fall "rush" season would be alcohol-free. Student parties and drinking were not eliminated by these developments, for both were too much an integral part of the general collegiate environment. Still, a change in student lifestyle was evident.

As the difficulties in student-town relations subsided, other matters of a diverse nature gained attention from a number of students. Fund raising, always an important part of campus life, gained momentum, partly because a number of Greek houses saw an opportunity to combine fund raising activities with a beer party, made legal by a one-day liquor license, and perhaps partly from a stronger sense of responsibility among all students generally to help worthy causes. Money was raised by softball and basketball games, bike races, triathlons, mud-volleyball, Derby Days, Fight Nites, King of Hearts Variety and Fashion Show, March Madness competitions, door-to-door solicitations, and "can rattling" at Normal's busiest street corners. There was also a return of certain traditional rituals of student life. The annual student yearbook, The Index, was revived by student
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government in 1985-86. The practice of a gift to the University from the senior class had been resumed in a small way in 1982 with the gazebo on the quad and in 1983 with the distinctive colored glass rendition of the University seal hanging in Milner Library. A class Senior Leadership Council was started in 1984 to obtain pledges, and $25,000 was raised to benefit the school; even larger sums were pledged in succeeding years because of the greater efforts of many seniors, $52,000 in 1985 and $65,000 in 1986. The 1986 showing of the Gamma Phi Circus, always a popular campus and community event, attracted considerable attention to its 50th anniversary performance. Beauty pageants were also popular attractions. The Miss Black ISU pageant, which started in 1975 and was sponsored by a different black fraternity each year, was a major social event of Black History Month. In 1986, a white fraternity, Kappa Delta Rho, followed suit and put on a Miss ISU pageant.

Students also showed interest in a number of current national concerns to a greater extent than in the past. An evening vigil on January 29, 1986 to mourn the tragic loss of the space shuttle Challenger drew a large number of students to the quad. Hundreds more participated in the May 25, 1986 “Hands Across America” display against world hunger. The political issue of apartheid aroused student concerns during 1985-86, as it did on campuses across the country, stimulating a debate over President Reagan’s soft policy toward South Africa. College Republicans defended the U.S. position, especially on divestment, while officers of the BSU and NAACP voiced strong criticism. Eleven campus organizations formed a committee called “Students Against Apartheid” to sponsor various protest activities, including an October 11, 1985 demonstration on the quad which brought out over 300 people to hear President Watkins and faculty speakers denounce South Africa’s racial policies. Informational tables were set up in the Bone Student Center, the College Avenue overpass was plastered with posters, and heated exchanges in letters to the *Vidette* continued throughout the school year. United States actions in support of the Nicaraguan Contras also provoked controversy in the spring of 1986. Besides editorials and letters in the student newspaper, small groups in support of or opposed to Contra aid
confronted each other on the quad, a candle vigil was held by peace activitists, and 25 wooden crosses were planted in the center of the campus. The Contra debate continued into the following fall semester, and was joined by another issue, that of abortion, which had its own small demonstrations and confrontations. In an unusual display of unity, the Progressive Student Union was formed in early 1987 to merge the interest of students in different political issues. Comprised of the College Democrats, ISU-Nuclear Freeze, ISU-CISPES, Gay Peoples Alliance, NOW, Third World Student Association, Students Against Apartheid, Latin American Support Committee, NAACP, and European Students Association, the new political action group had no difficulty in attracting the curious to its informational table in the Bone Student Center: free condoms were available as well as political literature.

Yet, for all this, some of the concerns of 1984 still hung on. The new fee for the arena continued to rankle, and in the fall of 1985 demands for another referendum, which some students presumed would go against the arena, were heard. But it was far too late. The Board of Regents had already approved the project; the campaign to raise $850,000 from the community, directed by Richard Godfry and Bert Mercier, had been successfully completed; and architectural plans were out for bidding by building contractors. Under the circumstances, President Watkins announced that there would be no second vote on the arena. Officers of student government continued to complain about police tactics against parties, and they made plans to enter local elections as a way to gain a student voice in town government. But unlike the years 1980 to 1984, the emotion was gone.