

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, May 7, 2008
(Approved)

Call to Order by Student Body President/Academic Senate Vice Chairperson

Senator Mason, Student Body Vice President and Academic Senate Vice Chairperson called the meeting to order.

Seating of New Senate

Senator Mason: The first thing I would like to do is recognize the new senators. As I say your name, please stand and remain standing. We will hold all applause until the end.

New Senate Members:

Danielle Abdalla
Judith Briggs
Andrea Davis
Harry Deutsch
Adam Dumelle
Jack Glascock
Jodi Gray
Jodi Hallsten
Alexander Hochhauser
Mark Hoelscher
Cassie Lund
Chelsea Merth
Tiffany Mihovilovich
Casey Miller
Eric Peterson
Scott Preston
Matt Spialek
Garrett Spiek
Ken Stier
Brandon Thornton
James Van der Laan
Matt Whittington
Linda Wedwick
Anne Worthman
Stephanie Winzer
Jennifer Zeinz

Roll Call by Student Body President/Senate Vice Chairperson

Academic Senate Vice Chairperson Ted Mason called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of April 23, 2008

Motion XXXIX-77: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of April 23, 2008. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Election of the Academic Senate Chairperson

Senator Dan Holland was nominated as the Academic Senate Chairperson by the Faculty Caucus. There were no additional nominations from the Senate floor.

Motion XXXIX-78: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Stewart, to elect Senator Holland by acclamation. The motion was unanimously approved.

Election of the Academic Senate Secretary

Senator Susan Kalter was nominated as Academic Senate Secretary by the Faculty Caucus. There were no additional nominations from the Senate floor.

Motion XXXIX-79: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Stewart, to elect Senator Kalter by acclamation. The motion was unanimously approved.

Election of the Faculty Members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee

The following faculty senators were nominated by the Faculty Caucus to serve on the Academic Senate Executive Committee:

Senator Farzaneh Fazel, College of Business

Senator Kathleen Lonbom, Milner Library

Senator Ed Stewart, College of Fine Arts

Senator Paul Borg, College of Fine Arts

There were no additional nominations from the floor of the Senate.

Motion XXXIX-80: By Senator Kalter, seconded by Senator Ellerton, to elect the slate of nominees by acclamation. The motion was unanimously approved.

Presentation: Foundation Board Report (Joe Armstrong)

Professor Joe Armstrong, BSC Faculty Member/Foundation Board Faculty Representative: You never quite know what people know about the ISU Foundation. I have given this report annually since I have been representing the Faculty Caucus to the Foundation Board for about five years. I always start with a little bit of an introduction. The ISU Foundation, like all academic foundations, is a not-for-profit cooperation. It is there to basically assist Illinois State. It receives, holds and administers gifts with the primary objective of serving the purposes of the university. So, very simply, the Foundation solicits, secures and manages private gifts and it uses those to support Illinois State University in its mission. In one way or another, you can find resources from the ISU Foundation assisting in teaching, learning, scholarship and service on this campus. The Executive Director of the Foundation is Dr. Dianne Ashby. She was just hired into this position shortly after I gave this report a year ago. Prior to that, she had been in this position in an interim role for two years. A very impressive group of people serve on the ISU Foundation Board. Most of them aren't people you would run into on a day-to-day basis because they are not members of the ISU community directly. You can find out more about them on the University Advancement's website.

As of March 31, 2008, the funds managed by the Foundation came to just over \$82 million. This, in terms of university endowments, is in the small-to-middle range, but it has grown quite rapidly. There is growth that

comes from investment returns. Last year was a very good year for the endowment with an over 18% return on investments. It has not been so good since that time, but even during the last market downturn, the ISU Foundation kept the returns in about the upper 12% nationally. There is also money from new gifts and I will talk about that a little more later. The growth has to add to the value of the principal to offset inflation; if you did not invest these funds, they would just dwindle away. In addition to actually monies, the ISU Foundation owns and operates several properties on behalf of Illinois State University. There is the Ewing Cultural Center, which is on the corner of Emerson and Towanda. Ewing Manor, which is used as a conference center, is at that location. Also on those grounds are the Shakespearean Theatre, the Genevieve Green Gardens and the Moriyama Japanese Gardens. Foundation funds have made possible the relocation of the Alumni Center, as well as construction of the Traders Circle parking area. The new Alumni Center is located at the former Eagle's Market, which is being remodeled. The plans are to move into that facility in July. The Foundation also maintains a Chicago office. About 30% of ISU alumni live in the greater metropolitan Chicago area and about 40% of the student body comes from there.

Foundation funds have grown over 900% from around \$8 million to its current value of over \$83 million in ten years. To put that in some perspective, ten years prior to that, it went from \$1 million to \$8 million; then in ten years, it went from \$8 million to \$83 million. I expect that in the next ten years, that amount will double. In the past 30 years, the state support has dropped from providing 71% of the university's budget in 1978-79 to 26% of the budget in 2007-08. That underlines that ISU is state assisted, but it is not state supported.

In the last 12 months, ending on March 31, a total of almost \$9 million was gifted to the ISU Foundation from over 1,500 donors. This does not include some matching gifts and gifts in kind, which are a little difficult sometimes to evaluate. There is an annual fund, which has over 9,000 donors and provided over \$750,000 in gifts, averaging \$83.52 per donor. That has been increasing at about 7% a year, which is really good. One of the amazing statistics is that Illinois State has over 166,000 living alumni. This last year, over 92,000 alumni households were contacted. As a side note for the student senators, the annual telefund employs over 200 students annually. Faculty contributions accounted for \$287,000 from 495 donors at almost \$600 per donor. That is approximately 25% of 1,600 faculty. That is a hard number to pin down sometimes, too. It represents about a 250% increase in participation over two years. We are particularly happy about that because that really represents a big commitment to Illinois State and its educational goals. To see faculty responding to these appeals is very gratifying. Staff contributions are up as well, so, again, we see the same kind of commitment.

There have been a lot of things going on this year with the Foundation which can be put in the category of working to improve its service to ISU. There is a new database for donors and alumni. This is, literally in this case, going from a card catalog to a computer database of 166,431 alumni. The Foundation had to buy some new accounting software. This is not your basic QuickBooks package; it cost \$150,000 plus, but it got to the point of being absolutely critical. A few years ago, the Foundation joined the Common Fund, which is a not-for-profit group of investment advisors. Over 1,700 institutions invest over \$78 billion in assets with this particular group. The idea is to invest smarter and make more money while taking fewer risks. For a long time, ISU could not join because it takes at least \$25 million to buy in and our endowment was too small. So, we have recently joined this particular investment group and they have been doing pretty well by us.

University Advancement is working to improve the fund drive and receive more donations from more people. Dr. Bowman told me that they have been working hard during the last 12 months to get the contributions to the \$10 million mark. Again, this has been going up about 7% annually. The average pledge gift is about \$70. At any rate, the goal is to increase the number of pledges, percentage of repeat donors, percentage of

faculty and staff donors and the size of the average pledge.

The ISU Foundation administers over 450,000 named endowment funds, permanent funds that support everything from scholarships to research activities at the university. This amounts to about 75% of the Foundation's endowment. The minimum amount required to name an endowment is \$20,000. This year, over 700 people attended the 2007 ISU Gala, which raised over \$50,000 for scholarships. Scholarship support is at an all time high for ISU, but it never seems to be enough. There is always a need for more. One thing I should point out is that \$83,700 comes directly from the ISU Foundation budget, not from these endowed scholarship funds, but directly from the Foundation's budget. There has been quite a bit of discussion about universities with very large endowments using the proceeds of those endowments to provide scholarships and assist students. At any rate, the ISU Foundation's budget has been doing this directly for some time, so this is over and above the scholarship endowment account. It is very difficult to get an actual total figure on the numbers of dollars for scholarships because these are administered by various units and departments and they are given at different times and in different ways. It's a number that you just can't seem to get.

The budget for the Foundation for this fiscal year is almost \$1.5 million dollars, including the scholarships. Almost \$300,000 is for supporting marketing events, promotions and programming for the 150th anniversary celebration. Almost one-half million is for the Development Office. You have to spend money to make money. That is a 50% increase from the previous year. Almost \$600,000 is for operations. This includes running Ewing Manor, insurance and fees, the \$175,000 for the new accounting software, \$50,000 to move into the Alumni Center and things like that. The ISU Student Foundation was successful in endowing its first scholarship and I believe that this being the year that it is, graduating seniors will be asked to pledge their \$20.08.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: I want to remind you that parking passes are only for use during Senate meetings. I also want to remind people to send in their Internal Committee preference forms if they have not already done so. Sometime during the course of the summer, we will be assigning people to committees. If we don't have your preference form, your assignment will be completely at random. Finally, I would like to acknowledge Senator Crowley and Provost Murphy. This is their last official meeting with us.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Mason: Last week was our last Assembly meeting of the year, so that was a good wrap up for us. We also had two constituent contact events by both our off-campus senators and our on-campus senators. I understand that they both went really well and that both groups made constituent contact and received constituent feedback. I am sure you are all aware that this is finals week, so we have not been in the office quite as much. People have been coming in, however, to get their work done and some SGA members will be working on projects during the summer. That's exciting for us. In the fall, we will all begin work on personal initiatives. By next week, I will have formally established a Student Elections Code Commission. That group will review the Student Elections Code to alleviate the problems that we discovered this year and make sure that it is a solid document for the next election. After I appoint one additional student representative, I will then formally establish the commission. Our goal is to have a draft of the new Student Elections Code for the fall.

Administrators' Remarks

· ***President Al Bowman***

President Bowman: As many of you know, the Board of Trustees will meet on Friday morning and, among

other items on the agenda, they will take up our tuition fee/room and board recommendations. We have recommended a 9.9% increase in tuition for new students. Of course, that will be guaranteed for four years. We are doing that not knowing what our state support will look like next year. Based on historic patterns, if the legislature is able to put together a budget that offers a small increase for higher ed, it would likely be in the 1 to 2% range and certainly not more than that.

Commencement is on Friday and Saturday afternoons. About 3,700 students will be graduating. The job market for those new graduates is actually not bad considering the slowing economy. The projections are that hiring will be up over 7% from where it was a year ago.

We are closely following the application process, which is winding down. I am sure that Provost Murphy will talk a little bit about where we are on enrollment deposits, but the applications, of course, have closed and we up 10% over where we were a year ago at 13,979 applications from a high quality, very diverse pool. We couldn't be happier.

You heard Dr. Armstrong talk about fundraising. We have had a very good year. When this year started, we set a goal to raise somewhere between 8 and \$10 million and then over the next couple of years to get that up between 10 and \$15 million. Between now and June 30th, we have a pretty good chance of making the \$10 million mark if everything falls into place. The staff is doing a good job; we are holding a lot of events. We were in California a couple of weeks ago and there are many people there who are interested in talking to us and who are willing to step up and give us some support.

Congress is continuing to meet on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. It is a major piece of legislation that governs a lot of important campus matters like accreditation, various regulatory issues and student financial aid. The House and Senate Conference Committee can't reach agreement, so they have just passed another extension. They passed a one-month extension I think yesterday and if the process is not wrapped up by the end of the month, then they will likely pass another extension. We have all been watching the capital bill in Springfield because when and if it passes, it contains funding for our Fine Arts Project, which is very important. Of course, at this point, it is too early to talk about where that may go.

Finally, I would like to say that the year, despite our financial challenges, has really been very positive. The fall 2007 freshman class had the highest ACT average in history. The median was 24.2. We now have higher admission standards than three of the schools in the Big Ten. Our graduation rate of the most recent cohort is at an historic high of 65.9%. It is also at an historic high for Hispanic and African American students. We have a record number of academic programs on campus that have national rankings. The most recent two were *U.S. News and World Report* rankings that included the College of Fine Arts and the College of Education. Facility progress this year has also been very strong. We opened Linkins Dining Center by the Friday of the beginning of the fall semester. Wright Hall is occupied. The new tennis courts are nearly complete. The Alumni Center is on track to open this summer and, in a 40 degree wind, we broke ground on a new baseball stadium on Saturday. The work on Stevenson Hall is progressing according to plan. Our big project will be the Student Fitness and Kinesiology building that will start in June. We were also able to manage a midyear salary adjustment for faculty and staff. We have put about \$2½ million into that program in the last three years. Given that state support is down to 26% of our budget, we have had a pretty good year.

Senator Stewart: Where is the new baseball stadium?

President Bowman: It will be at the field's present location on Gregory and Adelaide. It will involve

replacing the old bleachers and putting in a permanent grandstand, press box, ticket office and concessions. It will be a nice addition. We had help from our esteemed governor to get this done.

· **Provost Jan Murphy**

Senator Murphy: President Bowman mentioned the 13,979 new freshman applications for fall of 2008. Jonathan Rosenthal's area, Enrollment Management and Academic Services, has the task of fine tuning those applications into a class of 3,300. This is no small feat. The two indicators that we have of how many students will show up on our doorstep in the fall begin with the enrollment deposits and then how many students show up for Preview with the parents at the summer orientation. This year, we have 3,616 enrollment deposits paid compared to 3,330 last year.

Though our enrollment has been trending downward just a little bit, by a percent, we really have a healthy enrollment of about 20,000 to 20,500. That is really where we want to be; that's what we plan and budget for. So 3,616 can be good news and bad news. It will help us with enrollments if we have a few more freshmen show up, but what it also means is that we are looking at Plan B in terms of the number courses for the fall semester. Again, we really won't know until Preview who is going to show up in the fall.

We also know that of those enrollment deposits, we have 444 new freshmen from underrepresented groups. We had 441 last year, so we are holding steady there with work that we still continue to do in that area.

We just initiated a search for the Dean of the College of Business. We already have a slate of search committee members that includes representatives from the AP Council, Civil Service Council and Student Government Association. We currently have faculty elections for the search committee being conducted in the College of Business. I am hoping that in about two weeks, we will be able announce to the College of Business the composition of the search committee.

We have had many successful faculty searches, so you will have many new colleagues and faculty instructors on the campus in the fall. We have already planned our new faculty and chair orientations and Passages, our student orientation. So we are getting ready for fall already and we are looking forward to welcoming Provost Everts to campus on July 1.

Senator Gifford: Are there any concerns about the increased number of freshmen and available classroom space?

Provost Murphy: That's when we kick into Plan B because we start to think of the numbers of sections in the General Education courses. We have a pretty good understanding of which courses new freshmen take. We have had those big classes before and I will ask the President if was three or four years ago that we had a bigger freshman class coming in. It just means that we start with Plan B and think about the resources needed and the courses needed.

President Bowman: Our total campus enrollment has been trending slightly downward during the last couple of years and we are just above 20,000 right now. Now that our budget is so tuition sensitive, we are really pushing to make sure that we stay above that 20,000 threshold because that is the number that we need to meet our operational needs, from a budget perspective anyway.

Senator Gifford: I was curious about Stevenson and the amount of space offline.

Provost Murphy: You can't imagine the number of meetings that the Registrar, Scheduling and Jonathan are in. So that's not a problem to me; we know that we are working hard to find good space for those extra classes that we will need if our freshman class is bigger than we originally thought it would be.

Senator Wang: President Bowman, if we exceed 20,000 students, will that hurt us or help us?

President Bowman: You generate certainly more tuition revenue. It has no effect on our state funding because we are funded by program. The down side of going too far above 20,000 is that as those students work their way into majors, it creates problems of having enough seats in the majors. So we are trying to be very sensitive to keep it just above 20,000, but not get into 21,000. The graduate enrollment has also slipped slightly and that is part of the reason that we need to see our undergraduate enrollment gradually come up a bit.

Senator Kalter: Is there a sort of a long-term type of planning for the kinds of inner core courses that don't have the accordion effect? For example, in English 101, you have to keep to a certain number of students per class. My guess is that you have a long-term plan so that when enrollments increase in the way that they are, you have a way to handle that.

Provost Murphy: Absolutely, and we look not just at inner core, but we start to look at middle core. Students move in cohorts, though not as clearly in cohorts as we first envisioned when we developed the new General Education Program 12 or 13 years ago. As we monitor enrollments, we sort of know where cohorts of students are going to go as they move through that inner core and go into the middle core. In terms of long-term planning, our enrollments are very stable. We are crafting a class of 3,300 first-year students and we are going to come pretty close to that in a way that really says we can take another 100 students. We know almost exactly how many sections we need. There are weekly applications, but for classes in Gen Ed, everyone in my office receives reports daily when we start to move through Preview. We get e-mails from the Academic Advisement Center and we begin opening up sections as we need to.

Senator McLoda: You mentioned at a meeting earlier in the semester that you thought that the average ACT score may decline this year. Is that still holding true?

Provost Murphy: We think that we will be looking at a 23.9 instead of a 24.3.

· *Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams*

Vice President Adams: President Bowman mentioned that the commencement ceremonies begin on Friday. There are two ceremonies on Friday and four on Saturday. There are many people in all of the divisions that contribute to putting commencement together. With 3,700 students graduating, you can only imagine the kind of work that goes into putting together those ceremonies. I think for an institution the size of ours, to have every graduate walk across the stage and receive that diploma cover (the diplomas are printed during the summer) is quite a feat.

With commencement ending on Saturday, the residence halls will close at noon on Sunday. In previous years, there was a period of time in which we had the opportunity to spend a little more time turning those rooms around, doing some painting and rehab. That is not the case this year, particularly for two residence halls, because of the start of the new summer session on May 12th. So it is almost like an express hotel check-out on Sunday and a check-in on Sunday evening. We are going to see a very quick turnaround. A lot of students have already moved out, but the last will, undoubtedly, remain until sometime on Sunday afternoon. Just for

your information, Atkin-Colby will be the primary residence hall complex that will remain open for the summer and it will house somewhere in the neighborhood of 100 students this summer. That may not seem like many students, but ordinarily, it's around 15 students attending summer school who are housed. Provost Murphy, congratulations to you and to all of the Academic Affairs people who are responsible for putting together the summer session. It has attracted the interest of a lot of students who have the opportunity to get some extra course work out of the way throughout those summer months.

Also during the summer, the Preview program is held. That program will be housed in Atkin-Colby. Somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,000 or 5,500 new freshmen and their parents will come through and most of them will spend time in Atkin-Colby for their two-day session on campus. In addition to the conferences sponsored by the university, such as the Preview program, there are a number of outside organizations that use our facilities, including our residence halls. Many will use Atkin-Colby and Hamilton-Whitten this summer for their conferences. The first conference begins next week and about 500 people will be staying in Hamilton-Whitten for that.

The President also mentioned the construction that is going on. I won't go into detail; I will leave that for Vice President Bragg, but Hewitt Hall, on Fell and College, will come back online in time for the fall semester of 2008. At the same time, Manchester, which is on the corner of Mulberry and Fell, will go offline. So there is an even trade off there, but with the decommissioning of Dunn-Barton and Walker, we are down the number of spaces that we will have available for the fall of 2008. Some creative planning, reconfiguring of rooms and healthy granting of exemptions to those freshmen students who will become sophomores have enabled us to have available somewhere in excess of 6,100 spaces for the fall of 2008. That compares to 6,700 that were available on the first day of classes in the fall of 2007.

Again, we are able to offer as many spaces as we are because of the number of exemptions that we have granted, which is somewhere in the neighborhood of 700, compared to 450 last year, and the fact that many of the rooms that were super singles became doubles, those rooms that were doubles, in some cases, became quads. The entire campus residence hall system was looked at very carefully to make sure that the amount of space that we could offer was the maximum space available for this year.

This will be the toughest year just because of the fact that we have Dunn-Barton and Walker decommissioned and we have Manchester still offline. There is relief down the road as Manchester will come back online in the fall of 2009. At that point, we will regain around 800 spaces. That pretty much covers the situation as far as the residence halls are concerned. Not only for this summer, but also for the fall, we have high hopes that the long-range housing and dining plan will remain on schedule. It is a very critical piece of the way in which the campus operates and we will do all we can to keep you posted throughout the next academic year.

Senator Kalter: Does the university have to comply with any square-footage-per-student regulations in terms of how many students per square feet per room?

Vice President Adams: I am not sure of how the regulations are stated, but I can tell you that we would not put two students in a room that was designed for a single. We have converted some rooms over the years that were doubles into what was called super singles, so we are not going to violate any code by putting more students in a smaller room than what the room was ordinarily set up for.

Senator Wang: If I recall correctly, the last time you mentioned Dunn-Barton and Walker Hall, together there were about 1,000 beds. Does that mean that we will permanently lose about 1,000 beds?

Vice President Adams: The long-range housing and dining plan, which began in 2003 and will conclude in 2013, calls for the reduction of available spaces from somewhere over 7,000 to somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,200. So over that period of time, we are going to reduce our housing spaces and the size of our housing program by about 1,800.

Senator Wang: So this is a planned reduction?

Vice President Adams: Yes, and it is at the expense of a renovation program to provide more amenities and greater possibilities for students, which is in line with what the expectations are in this day and age. All of our residence halls, with the exception of Dunn-Barton and Walker, were built in the 1960s and I think that most public universities would agree that all campuses overbuilt at that time. So in order to deliver a quality program and quality structures, it is in the plans to reduce the number spaces while still keeping the freshmen and sophomore requirement of residing in the residence halls and giving the priority to that group of students.

That brings about another point to make. You all are probably aware of the controversy over the way the process changed for the fall of 2008. A lot of students were pictured in the *Vidette* with a sign saying, "Evicted". The upper level students were lead to believe through some sources that they were not allowed to live in the residence halls. I can tell you that, as of today, somewhere in the neighborhood of 400 upper class students will be residing in the residence halls in the fall of 2008. That compares to about 800 last year, but it is 400 more than those 'evicted' students believed was going to be the case. I am not going to in any way try to justify the process and the communication. I have already dealt with that throughout this year, but I will say that a lot more students at the junior and senior levels were able to get spaces in the residence halls than what was anticipated.

Senator Abdalla: Just a follow up to Senator Kalter's question. How do maximum occupancy codes factor into next year's residence hall plan? For example, some triples will become quads.

Vice President Adams: When those rooms were built, they were built as quads. So there may have been three students living in a residence hall room that was designed for four or two students living in a room that was designed for three. Now, we are in a situation in which the maximum number of four would reside in a quad or the maximum of three would reside in a triple.

One other point to make is that as we move through this long-range housing and dining plan, it is very important to note that the university is not ignoring other possibilities of housing that could be offered in partnership as the years go on. So we are not shortsighted from the standpoint of recognizing that other types of housing within the community and near the campus would be certainly be possibilities for housing students.

Senator Krug: Are any of the doubles in Watterson built for three people?

Vice President Adams: I am not sure that I can answer that question. I am not familiar with all of the rooms there. I would again say that if it was built for three, we would put no more than three in it.

· **Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg**

Vice President Bragg: President Bowman, Provost Murphy and Vice President Adams have already covered most of the important issues. We will have plenty to talk about in the fall. A lot is going on, as my colleagues have pointed out. There is a lot of building, construction and financing issues that will get resolved over the

summer, so we will have a complete report for you in the fall. I do want to mention one other item. President Bowman mentioned the Board of Trustees meeting this Friday. Also on the agenda is a resolution to name the atrium of the science building after long-term chemistry professor and Chairman of the Chemistry Department, Dr. Sol Shulman. Assuming that the Board of Trustees approves that, and we have every reason to believe that they will, we will have a formal dedication and naming ceremony. Dr. Shulman is a real treasure of the university.

Senator Waterstraat: How do we stand in relation to other universities in the state with the proposed tuition increase?

Vice President Bragg: We stand very well in relation to other universities. Assuming the Board the Trustees approves our recommendation, which we believe they will, we will be just slightly lower than the University of Illinois and slightly higher than Northern Illinois University and Southern Illinois University. That is a strategic position, and a goal that the Board of Trustees has had, that we have set out to maintain. It makes us very attractive pricewise in comparison to the other institutions.

Senator Kalter: I noticed a new parking structure in Normal; I assume that there is another one going up for the hotel. I am wondering if there is any opportunity for the university to cannibalize those.

Vice President Bragg: No opportunities to cannibalize them, but we are actually working very closely with the Uptown Normal Parking Advisory Committee and the consultant that they have used to coordinate parking plans on campus and uptown. We have approved and received the monies for the construction of a 500-bay addition to our parking structure on the southwest part of campus.

Senator Borg: Dr. Bragg, Dr. Shulman was indeed a valued member of the Academic Senate for a number of years, was he not?

Vice President Bragg: Yes, he was.

Senator Borg: So we have another reason to be proud of him.

Advisory Item:

Academic Plan 2008-2013 (Provost Jan Murphy)

Provost Murphy: You should have the Academic Plan in your packet. This is the final report of the Academic Planning Committee, which is an External Committee of the Senate. It reports to the Academic Affairs Committee. Nine faculty members serve on the Academic Planning Committee, one from each of academic colleges, the Senate Chair and a faculty member from the Academic Affairs Committee. Also on the committee are the Dean of the Graduate School and the Director of the University Assessment Office. The Associate Provost sits on and chairs that committee.

The Academic Plan contains pieces of *Educating Illinois*, mission statements from the colleges and the Board of the Trustees' vision statement. It is also where we formally house the University Mission Statement. The second section of plan includes some of the more significant institutional priorities, for example, degree programs that the university is committed to exploring. There are academic unit objectives for fiscal year 2009. Those match up with those objectives and goals that you would have seen at the Division of Academic Affairs' planning and budget hearings in March. Then there are the program review reports.

The program reviews comprise the bulk of the work that the Academic Planning Committee does during the

year. We do program review by degree programs. The Illinois Board of Higher Education mandates that degree programs are reviewed at least once every eight years. Most departments do those in batches, so you can see that all of the Department of Communication's program and its communication center, WGLT, all went up for program review at the same time. It's a year of self-study resulting in a program review report.

The Academic Planning Committee reads and reviews each of those program reviews. They ask questions, they have healthy discussions, and they develop executive summaries with recommendations. We then meet again with the department to review the draft of the executive summary and the recommendations. What you see in this Academic Plan are just the executive summaries and recommendations. The executive summary is typically a three to four-page summary of what started out as an approximately 30-page document.

The Academic Plans are held in the Provost's Office and we have the academic reviews from each department for each academic degree program for about the last 20 to 25 years, since the IBHE instituted this process. We use those reports, so these are living, breathing documents. When we start to think about enhancement requests that we get from departments, when we start to think about new faculty positions, we pull those program reviews that the department has written. They are really significant measures of the quality of our degree programs and they are important markers of the recommendations for program improvement, which we expect those degree programs to act upon.

This Academic Plan comes to you as an Advisory Item. It will go to the Board of Trustees in July and then is mailed from there to the Illinois Board of Higher Education as an information item. We also send just the program review summaries formally to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in July. They actually read them and it is not uncommon for their staff members to ask questions about the program review reports.

Senator Gudding: I was curious as to why the first two statements of fiscal year 2009 objectives were so short as compared to the others. Was there a strategic reason for that?

Provost Murphy: No, we don't have one set format for each of the college's strategic plans, objectives and objectives. So you do see vast differences in format.

Senator Borg: I noticed that Communications and Fine Arts are on the list this year. Can you advise the Senate on the rotation of these sorts of things, such as how often program reviews are held and what determines which programs are reviewed in any particular year.

Provost Murphy: About 10 or 15 years ago, the Illinois Board of Higher Education was very specific about when programs went up for program review. They wanted the same sorts of degree programs reviewed at the same time statewide so that they could make comparisons. They changed that, but I am not sure of the date.

Senator Borg: When I became a member of the Academic Planning Committee some years ago, the programs were reviewed on a collegiate basis. Each college did it on five-year rotation. Then in the early 90s, the BHE mandated that all programs across the state with a similar CIPS code be done at the same time with the threat that those that were not producing would at least be under the gun, if not under the axe. Because of the process that ensued and the lack of coordination with individual program accreditation reviews, the Board then changed back to a rotation. Though there is still sort of an eight-year process, things like education programs are often separated from the professional programs in the department and they don't necessarily happen at the same time.

Provost Murphy: We have an eight-year calendar, so if you asked me what programs are due for program

review report in 2012, we could pull that up. At the beginning of each year, I meet with deans and chairs and give them the opportunity to flex that just a little bit if there are good reasons. For example, you will notice that in this Academic Plan, we have all of the College of Fine Arts programs except for the School of Art program. That is because they have a new director and he asked if he could have some time to really work on that program review because it such a good opportunity, particularly for a new chair or director, to really be a part of a self-study. He asked for a year and there was no reason not to grant that extension.

Sometimes accreditation issues will cause a department to want to change a cycle. If they have one accreditation of one degree program and they want to try to match that accreditation cycle, they might pull that program out and do it at a different time. As Senator Borg said, we try to run our teacher ed programs as close to the NCATE cycle as we can, which makes for a really tough year for the Academic Planning Committee. So if you are thinking about academic planning service in the future, you might not want to do it in 2011-12 when we have NCATE accreditation.

Senator Borg: How have our reports over the last 20 or 30 years been received by the BHE?

Provost Murphy: They like our program review process. The IBHE was finding that some universities were just writing the three-page executive summaries, but that has never been the case on this campus. These reviews take a significant amount of coordinating and a significant amount of the Associate Provost's time to do because we try to provide help to the departments that are going through the self-study. I am a real cheerleader for program reviews and accreditation. I believe very strongly in faculty-driven program reviews that really allow a department to take on the task of reviewing and assessing what they are doing and preparing for the future. So, on our campus, it has always been a significant process. I think it was about three years ago that our program review process was recognized by the Illinois Board of Higher Education as a program of excellence.

Senator Kalter: What kinds of things would put programs, in Senator Borg's words, "under the gun" or "under the axe"? It seems to me from sitting on curriculum committees that programs often get eliminated before it comes to that. I am wondering also if those decisions often end up with the department deciding or if they really have to have someone else say, 'you really need to reconsider this program'.

Provost Murphy: I would say it's a little bit of maybe both of those examples. When the Academic Planning Committee conducts a program review, we have three options. The IBHE requires us to say that we have a program that is in good standing or we have a program that is flagged for further review or we have a program that should be suspended. I have not seen us use the program review process to suspend a program, but I believe that it is because we have other processes in place to catch a program that is failing or is struggling long before we get to the point where we would use this public venue to say a program must be eliminated.

We have, at times, flagged programs, but more commonly what we do is require follow-up reports and we are probably atypical in that. I don't imagine that most of the other institutions in the state, which go through our process, actually do the number of follow-up reports that we do. To me, follow-up reports are our recommendations to departments. So, again, there are three different levels, but I have never seen the Academic Planning Committee suspend enrollment in a program. If we did that commonly through the program review process, I think the process would stop being a healthy, honest program of self-study and become sort of a PR piece. We don't want that to happen.

Information/Action Item:

Senate Meeting Schedule for 2008-2009 (Executive Committee)

Senator Holland: In your packet, you will find a schedule of all the Executive Committee meetings and Academic Senate meetings for 2008-09. We will need to approve this schedule.

Motion XXXIX-81: By Senator Holland to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Schedule for 2008-09. No second is required for a motion that comes from a member of the committee, in this case the Executive Committee, which has brought the document before the Senate. The motion was unanimously approved.

Information Item:***04.18.08.01 University Mission Statement – Revised (Frank Waterstraat/Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Holland: We had actually meant to bring the proposed revision for the University Mission Statement to the Senate quite awhile ago. We are proposing to add “public service” to the mission statement. Since it has become a much larger part of what this university actually does, we thought we should reflect that in our mission statement. We also wanted to revise it for the next iteration of *Educating Illinois* since it is also emphasized more in that document.

Senator Waterstraat: First I would like to apologize to the members of this body and to my committee. We discussed this a long time ago and I did not follow through on the paperwork, so I want to apologize to you. If you recall, the goal was to add “public service” to the mission statement. It came to our committee, but there were several letters that we received from faculty suggesting that we add not only public service, but also differentiate between scholarship and research. Then there were suggestions on totally writing the mission statement. After some extensive discussions in our committee, we decided not to make those significant changes. The subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee that actually wrote this mission statement spent a considerable amount of time on it, so we suggest that if someone would want to revise it again, that another subcommittee be formed and that it not be done simply by the Academic Affairs Committee. Therefore, we made only the changes initially suggested.

Senator Holland: Since this is a somewhat time-sensitive issue in that we would like to have the changes for the new version of *Educating Illinois*, though it’s something that we don’t usually like to do, we can move this from an Information Item to an Action Item this evening. It requires a two-thirds vote by the Senate to move it to action.

Motion XXXIX-82: By Senator Waterstraat, seconded by Senator Mason, to move the item to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIX-83: By Senator Waterstraat to approve the revisions to the mission statement, which is to include “public service” and the appropriate grammatical changes to do that.

Senator Crowley: I certainly appreciate public service. I may be mincing words with the notion of professional service versus public service. I don’t know if that needs to be dealt with because there really is quite a difference.

Senator Waterstraat: I think that that falls into the same realm of differentiating between scholarship and research. Is scholarship and research the same thing or are they two different items? Do we need to separate those out? Since “public service” was the terminology that was brought to our committee, that was what we integrated into the mission statement. We did not go into an extensive discussion about the actual phrase itself. We do think that for the point on research and scholarship, and possibly for professional service, that it

might warrant a more in-depth analysis perhaps in the near future.

Senator Gudding: I might suggest that we simply remove the word “public”. “Service” could then include both professional and public service.

Senator Crowley: I would be pleased to see a clarification and perhaps drop the “public” because it does sort of pigeonhole service. “Service” would include both.

Senator Holland: Would you like to consider dropping the word “public” as a Friendly Amendment.

Senator Waterstraat: May I ask a question first? Provost Murphy, the request for the addition of “public service” came from your office. Was there a specific reason for that?

Provost Murphy: This really came out of *Educating Illinois* because of our continued commitment to provide our students opportunities for civic engagement and for service learning. I see public service as something different than professional service. I think of professional service as being a faculty activity.

Senator Ellerton: Is a possible solution to change the wording to “service to the community”? Public service has particular connotations and the notion of civic engagement might be captured by service to the community.

Senator Holland: I don’t want to get too heavily into wordsmithing here. There is a bit of a change in meaning, so these suggestions are not actually Friendly Amendments. Therefore, they need to be proposed as actual motions for amendments. If we want to change this from “public service” to just “service” or to “service to the community”, we actually need a motion to do that.

Motion XXXIX-84: By Senator Ellerton, seconded by Senator Stewart, that the proposed amendment to the mission statement be changed from “public service” to “service to the community”.

Senator Wang: Point of clarification. Is the motion to amend the phrase “public service” or to amend the recommended word, “service”?

Senator Holland: To amend “public service” since there has been no formal motion for “service”. We are now having debate on just the one issue of whether to change it from “public service” to “service to the community”.

Senator Fazel: I actually raised the issue in Executive Committee of what do we mean by service and some of the members said that we don’t mean, for example, service to your church. We mean something that is related to your profession. Then I asked if we were talking about professional service, so now going back to that. We do emphasis service learning in our classes and our students are involved, so I would like for us to somehow clarify that this is not just any type of service that is unrelated to the university.

Senator Borg: I will speak against adopting this amendment. I appreciate the work of the Academic Affairs Committee. I do consider, and would urge the rest the Senate to do likewise, these as issues that can be brought up in the future. Twenty years ago, I was on the committee that reduced the mission statement from four pages to two paragraphs. Then five years ago, I was chair of the committee, with Dr. Armstrong, that came up with the statement that is the three sentences that we now have. I appreciate the wordsmithing and some of these issues of minutia of meaning, but I would respectfully suggest that tonight is not the place to

do it. I would, therefore, urge us to vote down the amendment and to adopt the mission statement as the committee recommended.

Senator Krug: I agree with Senator Borg and I also feel that if we were to accept “service to the community”, then we would have to define “community”. So I would also encourage the Senate to vote no on this amendment.

Senator Mason: I would also agree with Senator Borg and ask the Senate to vote down this amendment. In addition of what Dr. Borg has said, there is more than one type of service than to “service to our community”. For example, students involved in Alternative Spring Break travel to distant places and provide public service in those places.

Call the Question: Senator Wang called the question in order to move the Senate closer to a vote on the amendment. There were no objections.

Vote on Proposed Amendment: The Senate rejected the proposed amendment, “service to the community”, by a majority voice vote.

Senator Holland: We now return to debate on the mission statement itself, as revised by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Winzer: I recommend that we approve the mission statement with the addition of “public service” because “public service” is more in line with the civic engagement that is encouraged at Illinois State.

Call the Question: Senator Gudding called the question to move toward a vote on the Senate’s approval of the mission statement as revised by the Academic Affairs Committee. There were no objections.

Vote on Mission Statement: There were no further recommendations for revision to the mission statement. The Senate unanimously approved the mission statement with the only revision being the addition of “public service.”

Adjournment

Motion XXXIX-85: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Ruscitti, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.