**Faculty Caucus Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, September 25, 2019**

**Approved**

***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter*:*I have a question before we begin, and this is a very non-traditional type of question, but because this is a subject of some interest to the campus, I was wondering if anybody has any objection to having a transcript of what’s going on here coming out in advance of the officially approved minutes? That would be very, very unusual, but to have something like that available, and the main reason to make it available is not really to the rest of campus but to ourselves as we’re moving towards looking at the Capital Budget Request again in two weeks for approval, that this would help to inform the rest of the Senate on that. So do we have any objections to that?

Senator Crowley: So then, it would only go to the Senate membership?

Senator Kalter: Yes, although again, we’re under Open Meetings Act so technically that would be a public document.

Senator Crowley: And it would be posted than?

Senator Kalter: Probably would not be posted, no. It would be circulated by email.

Senator Crowley: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: So no objections to that? Okay. We will try our best to get that out, and then, of course, we will have official minutes that will go out eventually.

All right. So we are focusing on the Engineering programs and President Dietz, Provost Murphy, and Vice President Stephens are here to talk to us about them. Take it away.

***Focus Group: Engineering programs President Larry Dietz, Provost Murphy, and Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

President Dietz: Thank you very much. I’ll start by making some general contextual kinds of statements, and then I’ll turn it over to Provost Murphy who can talk more specifically about the proposal, as well as the chronology of meetings that have been held that are relative to this topic and then Dan has some financial simulations that we’ve worked on relative to the building as well as the program.

As I mentioned earlier, the general context of this was around the idea of looking at work force needs in the State of Illinois, and Engineering is certainly one of those work force needs. As I’ve said previously that there are Engineering programs at several other institutions in the State of Illinois, but we’re still not producing, as a state, enough engineers for the companies that want to hire engineers, and so there is a demand for this effort. Also, to me, the whole thing fits much like as we were investigating Cybersecurity, we used a similar kind of planning model on this as we used on Cybersecurity which was obviously to get the faculty involved in this area as quickly as we could, in terms of having them be the major part of the conversation around the feasibility of Engineering.

Then there’s another context, which is really an enrollment context. Enrollment anymore is really a king for most institutions. The institutions that were in the meeting today with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, most were having terrific enrollment difficulties, and that’s always an issue for even those of us who are not having difficulties but we still always have a challenge in that the demography in the State of Illinois is in a downward spiral in terms of the number of students who are graduating from Illinois high schools. That has been in decline for several years now, and it’s supposed to continue to decline for the next 10 years, and so our market, if you will, is shrinking. You add to that the difficulty with outmigration of student, half the students that graduate from Illinois high schools now go out of state for their education. So we’ve got a double whammy in terms of just looking at the enrollment issues and market, if you will.

In addition to that, I think Engineering certainly would add diversification to the curriculum. It also would attract academically talented students, and so I think that Engineering students here would enhance our academic profile, which is always something I think that we’re always interested in.

And then, I would say finally based upon our projections is that for the university it would be revenue neutral. I ask when we first started this conversation, we had met with a number of private companies and I think there will be some support from some of those companies. But I asked Dan whenever he’s doing the financial projections, I said let’s assume that we don’t get a penny from the State of Illinois, and I think we would. How much, I don’t know. But I’m optimistic that this would meet a work force demand, and there may be interest on this from a state appropriation perspective. But I said let’s just not assume that. Let’s just assume that we don’t get anything from the state. And then let’s also assume that we don’t get anything from the private sector, and I think we’ll be able to do that. If you look back at the Cybersecurity model, one of the things that really made that a reality is that we received a $3 million investment from State Farm. And so we’ve had preliminary conversations with three different firms, major firms, I won’t identify who they are right now because they’ve made no commitment on this, but we’ve had really good conversations with at least three firms that hire engineers, and I think one if not all of those might invest in this program. But again, I asked Dan to not include any money from any private company that might help us out with this. So I asked him basically to say if we had the financial modeling on this was only coming from tuition, from students who are paying obviously to be enrolled in the program what would happen with that, and it looks like (he can get into more of the specifics here shortly but) to me it would be a revenue neutral kind of situation. So anybody that’s concerned that we’re going to take money out of any of the existing departments and put into this, we would want this to be a self-sufficient operation. So having said that, those kind of contextual things, I’m going to turn to Provost Murphy who will lead you through the proposal that came from a working group, and then also give you a chronology of meetings that have happened.

Before she gets into that, I would also mention that I had a meeting last week with all the academic department heads and directors and I asked specifically about any concerns that they had about the Engineering program, or rumors that they’ve heard, or facts that they wanted to share, or opinions that they wanted to share, and it was frankly a very brief conversation because they really appeared to be very supportive of this. So there was no contention in the room about this at all, there was no concern about it. So, I did meet with the academic department heads and directors last week myself on this. But now I want to turn to Provost Murphy for her remarks.

Provost Murphy: Very good. Thank you. I provided two handouts. One is titled, *Academic Senate Engineering Update September 2019*. I’ll use that as a little bit of a guide to help kind of let you know where we’re at, where we’ve come through the process. I also passed out a little bit larger document. It says *Proposal for Engineering Programs Illinois State University June 2018.* That replaces a document that was in the packet. The document in the packet was not the final version of that report, and I’ll talk a little bit about this report, but I think the numbers in the update that I provided you are a little bit more up to date.

So I appreciate President Dietz’s vision for this project. We’re very excited, I’m very excited about the opportunity to investigate the addition of Engineering programs to the University’s portfolio. I think that those programs would build on our very strong STEM programs, and on our strong general education program, and would really enhance the reputation of the institution as a comprehensive research university. So I believe as I look at that and investigate it more that we can do this in a way that makes us a better university throughout the university, and I think we want to think about it in that way.

We started in spring of 2017, the President appointed a taskforce to investigate the feasibility of establishing Engineering programs, and you can see from that list who was a part of that taskforce. In the summer, then, of 2017 (they worked all through the spring), in the summer of 2017 my office commissioned the Educational Advisory Board to conduct a feasibility study on the demand for Engineering graduates in Illinois and the Midwest, to identify top employers of Engineering graduates. They investigated several different kinds of Engineering, and EAB reported strong demand for Engineering graduates, particularly in the fields of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering; So strong demand for students that are not finding Engineering programs in this state, and are having to leave the state to study Engineering, and then strong demand for those students once they receive those degrees. And you can see from the EAB report that was in your, the full report is in your packet, and it provides you with more information about employability and the market for different types of Engineering in Illinois and throughout the Midwest.

In the summer of 2017, and continuing into the fall of 2017, members of the taskforce visited Engineering programs at several universities, and you can see those universities on that list. These were universities that were not sort of, I’ll give an example, we didn’t have them go to the University of Illinois Urban-Champaign, because they’ve had those Engineering programs for 50 years. It’s a top 10 Engineering program, and it’s not that we can’t go visit them, but we really wanted to see schools that looked a little bit more like us, and Engineering programs that were a little bit newer, how you start an Engineering program. So these were Engineering programs that were maybe 10 years old, or 15 years old, just to get a sense of how does an institution begin to offer Engineering. We also had a number of administrators, as the President said, who met with executives from a variety of engineering firms that we think would be interested in partnering with us, sort of that same model that we used for Cybersecurity.

So in the spring of 2018, the taskforce submitted their report to Vice President Stephens and I, and I would tell you, I commend the task force for doing an extraordinary job of looking at this from a very comprehensive, holistic view, so then Vice President Stephens and I helped refine those numbers. So there were certain areas where, for example, how much would it really cost (we think) to renovate a building on campus, kind of trying to use market value for all of the faculty positions. So if you look at the final report, that’s the task force report with just some finalization of some of the numbers, that committee, as I said, did a really holistic job. So they didn’t just look at, what might it cost to build an Engineering building, or what might it cost to hire Engineering faculty. They also looked and thought, what would this mean to general education? what course might these students want to take and why? are there certain language course they might take that are more likely that engineers would need? what would it mean for technical writing? So following this report, I met with each of the department chairs that might be affected. I’ve got one behind me. I met with Chairperson Holland even though he was on that committee. I met with the chair of English. I met with the chair of Chemistry. The chair of Biological Sciences, trying to thing about this from a very holistic view of what we would need, and what it would mean to this campus as a whole. They also looked at things beyond just the faculty needs. What kind of technical support would we need for Engineering? what would it mean to the library and the holding in the library? Trying to think of all of the things that would go into building programs that speak to the quality that Illinois State has, and I think that’s real important. So I think as you look at that, you’ll get a sense of how all the different aspects that that task force looked at.

In April of 2018, the Academic Senate endorsed the 2018-2019 Institutional Priorities Report which indicated support of the efforts of faculty and administrators who have been working since early 2017 to study and develop a plan to begin offering quality Engineering programs that will be attractive to both domestic and international students. So we continued our work.

In spring and summer of 2018, Vice President Stephens worked with Facilities Planning to study John Green, thinking that perhaps John Green would be a building that could be renovated for Engineering; and those of you that don’t know John Green, that sits right across the street to the north of University High School, right on Gregory Street. (I used to have an office there many years ago). Of concern was the size of the building, the height of the ceiling in parts of the building, and eventually it was determined that renovating John Green would be at least as costly as building a new building, without the excitement of building a new building.

In November of 2018, the President and Vice Presidents presented the Engineering concept to the Board of Trustees, including the recommended programs, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, the budget, the concept of keeping this budget separate from the current and operating personnel budget, not trying to draw funds away from our already kind of minimal operating budgets, not trying to draw funds away from AIF. And so presented it, as the President said, in a real kind of capsulated budget model. What the facilities needs would be the timing of all this.

A year ago at this time, I presented an update to the Senate during my regular remarks. And then you can start to see just through the next few months all of the different places where we’ve tried to make sure that we’re talking about Engineering, we always include it in remarks so that nobody on campus can sort of say, ah what is this Engineering.

In summer of 2019, this past summer, Facilities Planning developed a QBC to hire an architectural engineering firm to help us really get our head around what would a building cost, and what would we include in that building. You know, for example, do we build a building just for Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, or do we build it so that we can incorporate other engineering? What if we wanted to move into Civil Engineering. For example, what do we feel about programs that share resources, so should that building include a Physics department, or should that building include an IT department, freeing up those spaces for other programs and others. So those are the kinds of things. I’m offering those as suggestion, but please don’t go back and think, oh my gosh, the Department of Physics is moving, I don’t mean to imply that at all. But what I would tell you is that we’re having those consultants come in and really try to look at all of the different questions we might have about what a building would look like, and about how big it needs to be, and about how much it needs to cost. Once the consultants have presented their report…I know that I should back up. We put that QBC out there, and on Friday I think, they’re doing the first interviewing of the bids that are coming in. I think that’s all day Friday. Once we have those consultants selected, and they do their work on campus, many of you will be meeting with those consultants. Once the consultants have presented their report, then I believe the next step if it looks like we need to move forward with this, and we can move forward with this, then I think we have a lot of focus groups that we need to do, opening it up when we know a little bit more and can finalize the budget model. Can you think of anything I should have said? Okay, move it over to Dan.

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Provost Murphy. What I’d like to do is I passed out (Chuck had passed out) a single document that actually represents two items, one’s called *Key Financial Assumptions the draft model November 7,* that actually is as Provost Murphy indicated, on November 7thwas our Board Retreat. So this was the information that I shared with the Board of Trustees at that Retreat, and that the back of it is, you’ll see a very colorful single page of a financial model. What I’d like to do is just walk through some of the major factors that are embedded behind the scenes but then this fiscal model just to give you a broad sense of this, and then I’ll talk a little bit about this single sheet, which is the fiscal sheet.

In order to model this, again in isolation was the easiest way to do it. We basically said we wanted to model a 1,000 students, for simplicity 500 Mechanical, 500 Electrical entering in students. We used the same retention criteria that we’ve had across our institution, so we assumed a 20% retention loss, which essentially means, at the end of the day, if you’re continuing to recruit 1,000 students, you’re going to end up graduating about 800. So the fiscal model itself lends itself to exactly how our campus is operating today. There’s no additional assumptions. We’re assuming that the Engineering programs would model exactly that.

From a faculty perspective, there are when I sat down extensively with Provost Murphy, and we sat down and walked through the information that the earlier committees had prepared, I produced a rather extensive model that outlined by year how the faculty would come in, depending on the various level of assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, for both Mechanical and Electrical, by year, using essentially an overall faculty to student ratio of around 16 to 1. So that was at the end of the day what we used to make sure we didn’t have too little or too many. When you add up essentially recruiting 1,000 students and graduating 800, it essentially comes out to be about 30 Engineering faculty, and we also identified the need of 20 faculty that were spread among other disciplines that we would need to have. That 20 faculty were two in Chemistry, eight in Mathematics, two in English, three in Physics, one in IT, and one in Milner; And then we also had seven graduate assistants and U-Grad teaching assistants spread out throughout the model, 13 support staff, and then we started calculating, we have them in the model, by year, growing out, beginning from starting recruiting out to a level of what I call maturity, which if you’re recruiting 250 students a year, and you stopping at 1,000, it would be basically four years. So I took those kind of statistics, put those into a fiscal model, we then started talking about what tuition level we would have. We used our base tuition, at that time, and then we added a differentiated tuition level. If you see in the back of the document in front of, right before this page, you’ll see two pieces of the puzzle: one at the top of it talks about programs premiums percentages both in-state and out-of-state, and the bottom of it refers to is differentiated tuition that just Illinois schools do. Inside the fiscal model we just factored in 15% differentiated tuition. When you compare that to other schools within the state, the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign does 42%, almost a 50% increase above their regular tuition, and it applies the minute the student actually gets accepted to the school. UIC in Chicago’s at 23%. Northern is 13%, at least a year ago, we’re not sure where they are this year. And SIU is sitting at 15. When you look outside of the state, the Engineering program at Iowa are 35%, at Missouri they’re 32%, Wichita State 23%. So just using a conservative 15%, we actually could probably even price that even higher, that was factored in from a revenue perspective.

When we got to expenses, from an operating expense perspective, we factored in a level of supplies, travel, conferences, equipment, probably the biggest operating expense that we factored in was Milner Library subscription that was necessary in order to add that discipline, that’s in the model at $300,000 a year. And then we also modeled the utility cost that is similar to the Science Lab Building, we did 95% of the electric bills that the Science Lab Building pays, the reason we didn’t do 100% is that the building would be new, and so chances are we’d probably have greater efficiency.

From a capital perspective, when you add all of that particular up, we also built in equipment, if you heard me earlier, I factored in specialized equipment from beginning at being around $15 million. So we’ve got a lot of data inside of this business model. At the end of the day, if you don’t mind looking at the back of this sheet, I’ll walk you through a couple of what are colored highlights. The reason I colored these before, I did it for the Board, is I wanted for them to focus on the main column which is in green called maturity year four. What maturity year four means is that it’s essentially that’s at the point where we’ve hit 1,000 students, and then from that point on it just stays exactly that. But the first four years is when we’re growing, attempting to do a cohort every year until we get to that point. If you go down to one key point from (I’ll just hit some high areas), total revenues, overall tuition, we also did in-state and out-of-state, we did 98% or Illinois students, we did 2% out-of-state, we do have an out-of-state rate, I was being very conservative in that standpoint. We also have INTO. One of the things from international perspective, if we were able to add Engineering to our University, our ability to recruit international students would jump in leaps and bounds. But again being very conservative, I didn’t want to, I wanted to assume that the reason that the state would help support us in a particular building is that we would not do what UIUC is doing, where they’ve got 30% of their students being international students or out of state. We would continue to do what our mission is, is we’re 97-98% Illinois students, we would continue along that path. So I wanted to work from those in-state rates using a conservative differentiated tuition. Overall, if the program was at maturity today in year four at 1,000 students, it’d be roughly about $13 million in revenue, also factored in a financial aid amount for every single student, even though we would not give financial aid, it would be obviously based off of the criteria. This would be merit aid, but to keep it simple I did $2,500 per student, which give us $2 million dollars of funds of financial aid to spread among those students. So if you take net revenue (which would be that gross revenue), minus the financial aid, and then also had some of the student fees, we’d end up with net revenue a little over $13 million. The personnel cost which are 50 faculty at various stage levels, that would work out to be about almost $5 million a year. Our operating expenses are, the biggest cost there is Milner Library. When you add personnel and operating expenses, you’re about $5.4 million. I’ve got literally over a million dollars every year for utilities and lab equipment replacement. When you add all of it up, if we were able to have the building today, built today and all 1,000 students showed up, and we were serving again the 800, that when you take that revenue stream, if the state provided the building and my model was exactly perfect around the number of students that we have, the differentiated tuition, the financial aid, our operating expense, we would actually, from an annual budget perspective, have a positive margin of over $6 million a year, not a negative margin.

So from a positive perspective, we actually then have an ability, if the state chooses to not do this, we then could look to the issue of do we consider working with donors, do we consider working with a P3 (very similar to what we’ve done for housing) and reach out to the capital markets and essentially do what is called a P3 for an academic facilities, which is becoming one of the ways academic buildings are being built across the country. More and more universities are having to look to the private sector very similar to how housing facilities were done well over two decades ago. There is a market for that, it’s a more sophisticated market, but it is an avenue we were investigating; essentially it would be having someone else finance the building, and essentially we would be providing what’s called an availability payment, which is essentially almost like a car lease. They would finance the building, issue the debt, and we would use the building for this purpose. And if we had to finance a $100 million building today on a tax free perspective, it would be somewhere around $4.5-5 million to $5.5 million depending on where interest rates are. So in a full funded model where we’re funding 100% of this and no support by anybody, which is what President Dietz asked me to do, we actually would still have a positive margin after debt.

So I’ll stop right there and allow you to ask questions. And then the model just continues to stay at exactly 1,000. Would we continue to just keep it at 1,000? Probably not. I think we would be looking at the issue of, do we have the demand to even look at an even higher amount. We’re actually going to ask these consultants to not just look at our institution at just 1,000, what would a facility or program look like if it was 1,500 or if it was 2,000, and do that kind of analysis. I can change this model. It’s a very dynamic. I can make changes in this model in a matter of minutes and change the estimates, revenues, and expenses relatively quickly and determine when it makes sense and when it doesn’t make sense. So I’ll stop right there and allow for questions.

Senator Kalter: All right. Thank you, and I saw Senator Nichols hand go up actually at the beginning of your remarks, Senator Stephens, so I’ll have him go first.

Senator Nichols: So I’ve got a question with respect to the retention rates, and that they were based on our base level of retention. But nationwide Engineering programs have freakishly high attrition rates. Like I think the nationwide average is about 60%, it usually is between 35% and 40%, the first year that the students are in programs, and my experience with you is that you’re somebody who typically makes very conservatives assumptions in your financial models…

Senator Stephens: Yeah. You always want to be conservative and try to make the model work; even in likely conditions, it would be better.

Senator Nichols: All right. So I’m a little curious about if we do see attrition rates that are higher than just our regular rates that we see in other programs, how we would envision dealing with that with increased expenses and recruitment, to keep those positions filled, or whether we’d drop that percentage from 80% to lower for a more conservative model.

Senator Stephens: It took me probably, there was no model, I actually had to build a model from scratch, if you’d like I can put it up on the screen.

Senator Nichols: That’s okay.

Senator Stephens: You don’t want to see it but it took several months to build it. The nice part about building it, it was built specifically for ISU, and so I’ve got factors in there that allow us to do any kind of scenario that we would see from the level of demand. And what I wanted to do was use assumptions that are very common across not only specifically for ISU, but also the level of type of student that we do have, or we would likely have. So I think we would be incredibly successful in taking our national representation for the programs that we have and adding Engineering here. It would immediately start out as a peer to a lot of schools. We would not be a peer to UIUC. We’d be a peer to probably UI Chicago from day one. And so I actually think we’d probably recruit even more aggressively than they would, and be even more successful because then we can move the students away from Chicago and down here to Central Illinois, where there is a lot of employment for Mechanical and Electrical within 30 miles of this location. So I can make this model move all kinds of ways depending on whether we want to be very cautious and pessimistic, or whether we want to be very optimistic, but we can be very fluid about those decisions, and as you start to build out a program—I’ve been a part of universities where you’ve started new programs and within a few years begin to see what your demand is like—there is no doubt in this one, because of the research done with EAB and just Engineering in general, that I suspect we would… Our limitation honestly would be, is how big of a building do we build, because at the end of the day I think we’ll be able to fill whatever we need, because we’re only identifying two programs. I went to Kennesaw State and visited their school and looked at their Engineering. They have seven degrees, they had 4,000 engineering students in a building 125,000- 130,000 square feet of labs and classroom space, and I can guarantee you we’d be able to… our academic reputation is equal to theirs and others, so I’m very optimistic about meeting… I’ve actually already met with some of our underwriters to begin to have them help us begin to study a strawman analysis to try to look ahead and see what would the investor community look like from a P3 point of view, and would there be an appetite for this, and we’ve got Bank of America, Merrill Lynch looking to help us do that, because they’re very excited about ISU, about helping us, potentially position ourselves for this type of situation…

Senator Kalter: Senator Stephens I’m going to interrupt you to let your boss get a word in edgewise.

Senator Stephens: Okay. Sorry, I wasn’t looking in his direction.

President Dietz: I think your point is well taken. I think also that if in fact some of these individuals didn’t find Engineering to their liking, academically, and that there’s lots of other programs that they might move into, so we might not lose them to the institution, but may lose them out of Engineering to some of these other programs. I’m not as concerned about that perhaps as I should be, but I do hear all the time about students who are trying to get into the Engineering program at the University of Illinois. You can have a 34 on the ACT, be an Illinois resident, son or daughter of an Illinois tax payer, and not get into the Engineering program at the University of Illinois. And some of those individuals don’t want to go, all due respect, they don’t want to go to Northern, they don’t want to go to Southern, they don’t want to go to Eastern, or Western, or SIU Edwardsville; they go out of state. My sense is that we would be drawing that academic profile that is a darn good academic profile. And so my hope is that we would beat the national average on that, but I think Provost Murphy also wants to weigh in on this a little bit.

Provost Murphy: Sure. It’s a great question of attrition. And so I know the task force--and I’m going to kind of look over, because we’ve got a couple members of the task force—but they did look at that so you’re absolutely right. So, I think the attrition rates we built into that model are for institutions that look more like ours, but I agree. The other piece that the President said I think is important is that as you design a curriculum, we also as an institution have to think about how to help students who start in Engineering, find they can’t finish in Engineering for a number of reasons, what are their other opportunities at the University? Do they start to think about Engineering Technology in our Department of Technology? Do they start to think about some areas of Information Technology, not that those are… I mean those are difficult majors, but I agree, and I think we need to be very careful and very purposeful about those students that we admit to that program, and thinking about them in a very holistic way to make sure that we offer them the opportunity to succeed at Illinois State, if they can’t succeed at Engineering.

Senator Meyers: Following up on that, would there be any plans to expand instructional capacity in other parts of the University to accommodate that potential attrition, because that’s not in this budget, like hiring additional faculty or you know, I don’t know what else we would need.

Provost Murphy: I would say that it’s hard to predict that, but I think as an institution we absolutely have to work, the deans, and the department chairs, and school directors have to continually be monitoring that for just that reason. And again we have to think about—and again the task force, I thought, did an extraordinary job—something as simple as, what if we bring these students in and because of the demographics of the state, we don’t necessarily increase our overall enrollment at all, we still will think differently about general education, for example, they’re going to take different Math courses, they’re going to take different science courses, they’re more likely to take a Chemistry course, or a Biological Sciences labs course, than maybe a Geography/Geology, we kind of know that. So we really have to think very much about all the resources available to these students. We have to think about tutoring. We have to think about advisement. So I think, yes, we have to think that way. Some of that will be a little bit hard to predict, but then we’re going to have to use our regular routes of looking at enrollments, and movement of students within the University, to try to make sure that we’re meeting those demands for those students that do perhaps move to other majors, because those are also some of our most high demand majors anyway. When I mentioned something like Engineering Technology or IT those are very high demand majors, as we know, so thank you.

Senator Meyers: Related questions. Has there been any effort to study the market for hiring all these new faculty? Like, and GAs actually. Like there’s, I don’t know, like, eight GAs, are those graduate students that are already here that don’t have a GA or are we going to be expanding graduate programs to be able to staff these programs?

Provost Murphy: Sure. That’s a great question. We’ve built into that model GAs, although again we’re not necessarily recommending we start with graduate programs in Engineering, but those are GAs that could come from Physics, or from Information Technology. So we’ve built into the model the funding for that kind of support: student workers, grad assistants. I might have missed the first part of your question, oh faculty.

Senator Meyers: What I was really wondering about was recruiting the people, including the GAs, like do we have bodies on campus to fill those jobs, or would we have to expand the Physics graduate program in order to have enough people to hire to do that? But also recruiting faculty.

Provost Murphy: That’s a great question. I might turn that over to people that were on that taskforce. You know the faculty piece of it, the feasibility study from EAB would also look at that. So are those available Engineering faculty to hire into Engineering programs and certainly that’s not an issue.

Senator Marx: We didn’t look at that specific question about the market availability for faculty, that’s something…

Provost Murphy: But I think the EAB study does, that’s part of the feasibility that the consultant did for us.

Senator Marx: Yeah, it does. It does but we didn’t specifically look at that.

Senator Houston: On page one of the model, Senator Stephens, you estimated approximately 50 faculty would be needed, so I’m wondering, is that, for my understanding, would that be a combination of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty?

Senator Stephens: That is, and I’m actually now looking at the details of… And we kept it simple. Whatever we did for Electrical we did for Mechanical, and I’m looking at the detailed list. It is all assistant, associate, and full professors.

Provost Murphy: Faculty.

Senator Houston: Okay. Thank you.

Provost Murphy: The question might be… For example, in this model, we hire one new English faculty member to help with the technical writing, because these are all students that would take technical writing. Now I would look to the English department for their decision, and their judgment on is that one FTE tenured/tenure track faculty, or is that one FTE non-tenure track; I think that’s something that the English department would know. So the vast majority of these I really envision being tenured/ tenure track faculty, but that’s a very good question, and I think in some of those areas, for example, in Math as we think about hiring seven or eight new Math faculty, I think the Math department is going to have to decide, are those, you know, how many of those are tenured/ tenure track, how many of those are non-tenure track. And I think as the curriculum is truly developed, those are conversations that departments have to be a part of to help develop that curriculum.

Senator Ferrence: So I have a few, not too many. I’ll preface it with these are from constituents mostly, but things that as I talked to different faculty that came up, and wondering if we thought about, or for example, I’ll open with: Tuition Illinois is a program where many residents have already bought in for semesters of tuition . Now University of Illinois had it set that it was a different cost for buying into the program if you wanted to include U of I because it has an Engineering programs in Tuition Illinois. If we’re going to a gradiated tuition model, would we still be honoring the Tuition Illinois commitment of prepaid tuition by Illinois residents were they decided to enter our engineering program?

President Dietz: I would say that we just haven’t talked about that. Interesting question, and that’s one we’ll have to get back to you.

Senator Ferrence: Sure. This one’s kind of a two part, and I think it was kind of answered but it would be helpful just to kind of hear it articulated. One colleague was asking me, is the goal here to replace 1,000 extant ISU students with 1,000 engineers, or expand the enrollments of the University by 1,000 students when it’s done?

President Dietz: I would say that the first part of any plan related to enrollment is stabilization, and we don’t know what the future holds in terms of the number of students coming here. We’ve obviously had a good track record given the academic programs that we’ve had, but the demography is working against us and the outmigration is working against us. So the first part, I’ll answer the question is stabilization. Second part may be modest growth, but enrollment is key to all institutions in terms of their financial viability. So somewhere in between those two, I’d say is kind of where we’re going to land. This is not necessarily a step toward, well, we’re going to get to 30,000 students or 25,000 students, right? We haven’t really talked about those things. What we’ve talked about is to make sure that our curriculum is vibrant, that it’s appealing to the students who want to enroll here, that we have quality academic programs, and I’m more interested in the quality piece than I am the quantity of numbers, but I don’t have a specific answer to that to say yes, and here’s how we’ve charted the overall enrollment, because that’s too dynamic to predict right now.

Senator Ferrence: Okay. So if I can follow up that with somewhat related, but incredibly dependent upon which way that model would go. So it would be a projections issues depending whether enrollment grew is, if you’re looking at bringing in, ignoring any attrition, 250 students a year you could be potentially talking about an additional 500 freshman and sophomores on campus who would then need campus housing. How are we looking at addressing the housing issue when we already feel that we have a bit of a housing…

President Dietz: We’ve been talking about that. The new facility is being designed to house an additional 1,200 students, or I should say up to 1,200 students, kind of what we’re looking at. I think that this number could easily be a part of that 1,200. I think if we hit 1,200, I think we’ll be able to accommodate the existing needs of living to our policy of freshman and sophomore students living on, and to accommodate this population.

Senator Ferrence: Thanks. Finally my last one, which is really my question, which is more of a follow up from something earlier. If students were choosing to move out of the Engineering majors and into other majors, which this has been something we’ve been talking a lot about students getting into the majors they want on the Senate committee that I sit on, but I was just wondering what our projection is in terms of: is the goal to try to get this Engineering program to approximately 1,000? So if you see students switching out of the major that are Engineering, that would somehow de facto mean that we need to recruit more students into the Engineering at the beginning to make sure we get to a stable population of 1,000 students in the Engineering program?

Provost Murphy: I think. I shouldn’t say I think. The model has built attrition into it. So we can start with, we have used the 1,000, but I really envision us to begin with—you know we have to kind of build a plan and build a cohort—and I think to begin with we would look at 250 students, but I think you have to wait and see how that plays out, and see what attrition happens. It’s sort of like the same question of what if we see more students move out of there into certain majors. I think we’re going to have to, I just believe we’re going to have to play some of that out as it goes. You know, Senator Stephens mentioned, truly we picked 1,000 because we thought looking at enrollment trends, and looking at the demographics, and the difficulty at maintaining this class, 1,000 seemed like a number that we could build a building for, that probably keeps us near our same enrollment. I’m telling you, you know, the U of I turns down tens of thousands of applicants annually, into Engineering. I mean you can’t fathom how many students either can’t major in Engineering because they want to stay in Illinois, or leave this state. So we could say 4,000, but 4,000 seemed like it would actually change the dynamics of the campus too quickly. So we really tried to pick 1,000, thinking that that is a manageable number, that it keeps us in our mission. Now I’m acting like the President, I better be quiet. That seemed an appropriate number for us, for a residential campus of our size. Did I say anything wrong?

President Dietz: No.

Provost Murphy: Okay.

Senator Ferrence: Thank you. The only other thing that I think I almost feel like I should ask, but I’m not really going to, is I feel… I probably being the parking person should have said how does this impact parking but I…

Provost Murphy: Well, you’re going to lose your spot, right there, write that up. You’re going to be parking up by Heartland, I hope that’s ok.

Senator Kalter (to Senator Ferrence): You’re out of order!

(Laughter)

Senator Stephens: …have a QBS out and I don’t think it’s been selected yet. But just simply on a campus wide parking study, mainly because of both the new housing P3 project being anywhere between 800 to 1,200, placing that large of a complex over there next to the rec center. So we’re actually studying not just that, but we would be encompassing a new facility somewhere on the campus, what would we do if we added all of this over the next five years, ten year environment. That’s what we’re really trying to do is that long term planning, and actually do some strategic planning around parking, as opposed to reactionary. So we’ll have your spot picked out, it’ll have your name on it. That’s my goal, I’ll have my name on your spot.

Senator Ferrence: In Gibson City.

Senator Campbell: I had received some emails earlier this week from my colleagues in the Department of Technology, both hold PhDs in Engineering. The first one is pretty much a positive endorsement, and repetitive of what we’ve been hearing before, as far as he really sees it as an area that we’re currently missing out on, and that we could get into. It’s a high demand area and will remain high demand. U of I is really competitive and selective and students have been going out of state to Wisconsin, Purdue, Iowa, Iowa State. And then the other options in Illinois have their drawbacks as well, which he didn’t specifically mention, and also he mentioned that a lot of the universities our size already have Engineering schools, so that would put us on par. The second email that I got was touched on a little bit earlier, but coming from the Department of Technology, we have a Construction Management program, and we have people with, overlapping in Civil Engineering area, and kind of the question is, why are we starting in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering as opposed to Civil Engineering when we already have expertise in that wheelhouse?

Provost Murphy: For us, it was really a case of the EAB really indicating to us that those would be two good majors to begin with, but I will tell you, we have had conversations about Civil Engineering being perhaps the next option if we’re successful starting the first two programs and for just the reason that you indicate, Senator Campbell, because we have such a strong Construction Management programs, so absolutely.

Senator Geoffrey Campbell: Okay. Thank you.

President Dietz: I could tell you that the Farnsworth Group was very interested in the Civil Engineering part, and they sat around the table some, so points well taken.

Senator Marx: I have a question about consideration of additional facilities for, in particular, Chemistry and Physics. We need additional teaching labs, and also research labs, and offices for the additional faculty. Is that built into this?

Senator Stephens: Not specifically, you know, in the piece, but what I can tell you is that we’re very aware from a facilities perspective. One of the goals in this study of having the consultant group look—it’s not just a building that just simply is targeted for this group—it’s actually a review of the partnership with what we’ve got in other buildings where it makes sense to draw in and consolidate. For example, if you’ve been out, when you look at Engineering programs you see large equipment, and so what you want to do is maximize that space. So we would be looking at, not just simply in isolation, how would we design a building that not just serves Engineering but also brings together Information Technology, especially in the electrical side. The first floor typically of an Engineering building is the one that houses the heaviest equipment and the one that has the greatest vibration. We’d be looking to consolidate… As we consolidate all that, we would be looking at what are our other needs and how do we use that space more effectively, and that is where I was thinking we would do exactly that, if we’re freeing up space from another facility in order to pull into there, how would we refurbish that and what would be that purpose. So I was fortunate enough to visit a couple of schools myself, personally, and got to see firsthand one school that worked with older buildings and renovated those, and I got the opportunity to see one that literally got the state, that gave them the facility to a brand new Engineering building and I can tell you this, if you see the positive outcome you get of the Bone Center being renovated, if you think about a very attractive new academic building that’s multi-purposed, may have an Engineering or combination focus, but it’s brand new, it’s just unbelievable what that does to the recruiting mechanism. I hate to use the phrase eye candy, but at the end of the day it was just amazing when I pulled up and saw that.

Senator Avogo: So for me and some of my constituents, what we are concerned about is, you know, some kind of iron clad assurances. I know there are no such assurances, but assurances that it’s not going to take away from the quality of the Social Sciences, or the Humanities and we going to focus more on Engineering, technical programs, applied programs, and so on and so forth. So we’re not taking resources away from Social Sciences and Humanities to direct them to Engineering and applied programs.

President Dietz: I can tell you that that’s not the plan at all. As a matter of fact, that’s why we’ve been talking about this to view this program as a standalone program until we know more about it, but in fact it may enhance the Social Sciences for some students that are coming into this and have miscalculated their career, and it may send some of those students into Social Sciences. So I think this is an effort to potentially emphasize quality with both the Physical Sciences and the Social Sciences.

Senator Torry: So having experience in Engineering, I’m going to just reiterate what Senator Nichols said that, for instance, in Electrical Engineering for St. Louis University the attrition rate is 70%, at Denver University it’s 68%, and University of Pittsburg 70%, so I think 20% is way below what it should be. Given Illinois State, we always have a place for students who don’t make it to go. We have Kinesiology, we have general studies. Most Engineering programs have some place for the Engineering students to go, and having been faculty in many Engineering departments, Engineering students aren’t going to drop out of Engineering and go to Kinesiology or Biology. You’re going to lose them, because there is no place for that kid to go. So I think in this model, Mechanical and Electrical have high attrition rates, higher than 20%, I’m certain. Where are they going to go, because I don’t see them going, maybe Physics, maybe Chemistry, but across Illinois State I don’t think we have the breath to support that student and his skill set to go someplace else. So it goes back to the original comment of, there’s going to be a high attrition rate, where are they going to go? I don’t know if we have the breadth across Illinois State to keep those when you have a 70% in Electrical, which is the highest in Engineering.

President Dietz: Point well taken.

Senator Blanco Lobo: Somewhat related, but going in the opposite direction, what if best students from major X want to move to Engineering, so kind of like a negative externality per se, is that somewhat taken into consideration? Of course, this is calling for a model that it is super dynamic, and perhaps we don’t have that information right now, but I don’t know if you have considered this as well.

Provost Murphy: I’m sure that is a possibility, and I think we have those kinds of internal transfers that occur in many departments, but it’s a very good question. So, for example, we have to think about what’s the impact on our Physics programs, or what are the impacts on Engineering Technology programs that we already have, or what are the impacts on Information Technology. So I don’t think I have a firm answer, other than I think again, we have to, as we do with every major, we have to start to think about—because we really would like students to stay and if (I’ll pick on Physics, only because David and Dan are here) if a Physics major really wants to become an Engineering major, then we hope that we can facilitate that transfer, but we have to always be sure and be aware that our own Physics departments, that that impacts Physics. And I’m using that as an example…

Senator Marx: That’s a very good example

Provost Murphy: Again, I think that’s a great consideration that we have to keep watching as we think about enrollment management. I don’t have a firm answer.

Senator Marx: One of the ideas that we considered was the possibility of setting up agreements with community colleges to take some of these people that drop out from Engineering that we could have some kind of agreement where they would accept those students, is one possibility.

President Dietz: Reverse transfer?

Senator Marx: Yeah. Exactly. [Senator Marx noted after the meeting that he had misspoken about the direction of the transfer.  The idea that should have been stated was to set up agreements with community colleges to accept their qualified students directly as transfer students in to the engineering program to replace students that leave the program.]

Senator Qaddour: I’m Engineer too. I also taught in Engineering school. So really most of Engineering school have like the Information Technology within the Engineering school, especially I’m talking about Computer Science, talking about part of IS as well. They make it as one and pretty close to each other. So if you fail in the Engineering side, they can easily go to that side, because less Math, less demanding in Physics, and so forth. Because the Engineering is really high demand in Math, Calc 1, 2, 3, and Differential Equation and so forth. So really, that one exit is going to definitely enhance the Information Technology. Now we’re working in Network Engineering which is, you know, about the network, and that really is going to boost it up. But an advantage too, from a Physics point of view, because many students I’m sure, I graduated from Wichita State University, they do a dual major which is Physics and Engineering, and that’s really going to help to recruit more Physics to do both, and it’s going to take them maybe one semester or two semesters, one year, but they got two degree and that enhance... We did it in Wichita State University, that enhanced the Physics program tremendously. So really I would argue against that, the 20% would be enhancing other programs, and it would be a good idea to combine it, I mean, to bring Information Technology to the Engineering, and really have, because many, like we have one third of the program right now from Electrical Engineering in our department in IT. We’re teaching all of this programing, and networking, and all of these things.

Senator Stephens: If I might, that 20% retention, that’s literally a student dropping out of school, not moving over to another program it’s dropping out of school. That is our retention here at Illinois State. So your point’s well taken. If they move over into another discipline, they’re still here at ISU, but I’m still factoring… that 20% is just leave the institution. They move over, that just means that they’re going into… Now we’d have to have room in another discipline, but that is what I factored, is that they just quit school in general.

Senator Qaddour: Right.

Senator Horst: I appreciate that there’s all these students that can’t get into U of I, and there’s this need, but I’m just wondering where Northern fits into this, because my understanding is that their enrollment is not necessarily healthy, but they have an Engineering program. So have you thought about them, and looked at their program to see why their School of Engineering is potentially not as successful as U of I’s?

President Dietz: The simple answer is no. The more complex answer is I’m not sure what they’re doing relative to Enrollment Management per se. I think that they would say that their trying to recruit students across their curriculum, and bottom line is that some students don’t want to go to Northern Illinois University, same is true at Western, and Macomb. Some of it might be the location. Some of it might be frankly, you know, their Enrollment Management strategy may not be as robust as ours. I don’t know that. I guess I can’t answer that question, other than the numbers say everything about that, and we’re fortunate here, we work hard at this, so it’s not just that we’re fortunate, but we work hard, all of us, at making sure that we have the enrollment, both the quantity and the quality that we have, and other institutions, either their program, their location, their reputation, whatever it might be, just have not been as successful.

Senator Mainieri: I apologize if this has already been addressed, my brain is tired, but how do we see this impacting or evolving our current college structure?

Provost Murphy: I can answer that, thank you. And I should have mentioned this and I apologize when I kind of talk through this. The taskforce recommendation was to begin by housing these two programs within current academic structures, so that thinking about, I think their recommendation at this time was to think of housing Mechanical Engineering in the Department of Technology, housing Electrical Engineering in the Department of Physics, but I want to talk a little bit about that. The one thing that would do would be to allow us to not build more administrative structure to begin with, to start those programs housed in current academic structures, so we’re not hiring department chairs and all of those things. I would envision eventually if this is successful (and I will be long gone), but perhaps five years, or ten years from now, we may have a School of Engineering, or. You know I think that administrative structure will evolve, but now having used those two examples as recommendations from the committee, it’s not really our place (my place, the President’s place, administrative place) to say to the Department of Physics, you’re going to start up an Engineering program. I mean we can’t do that. That’s not how curriculum works at Illinois State University, so if we build the model, and the financial model seems to work, and we start to move forward those conversations with faculty and units have to occur. I mean the Physics faculty really have to decide, does it make sense for the Department of Physics to have a BS in Electrical Engineering in the Department of Physics. And if it doesn’t make sense to the Physics faculty, then it wouldn’t be in the Department of Physics, maybe it’d be in the Department of Information Technology, maybe it would have to be a standalone; But I think that curricular process has to occur. Again, we got the recommendation that, for example, Mechanical Engineering would be in the Department of Technology, but lots of conversations by Technology faculty in the Department of Technology to decide if that really does make sense. I get the sense it probably does, but again those are curricular processes that have to occur. So I think for now we’re trying to think about a model that builds minimal administrative structure, and focuses on the curriculum, the students, the faculty. Did I answer your question?

Senator Mainieri: In that example in your answer, that puts the two programs in different colleges, correct?

Provost Murphy: It does.

Senator Mainieri: And so are we thinking about them as two programs or as an Engineering program?

Provost Murphy: Yeah. And that’s a great question. This model and these recommendations from the taskforce puts them as two separate Engineer…, a BS in Electrical Engineering, a BS in Mechanical Engineering in two different departments in two different colleges. Maybe that’s a bad idea, but I think we have to continue with focus groups, and we’ll have to let our faculty help us decide if that makes sense, and how that could work. That’s a great question but we’re really starting with that just because that seemed to come out of the taskforce as their preliminary recommendation.

Senator Qaddour: I’ve looked…I’ve heard really, but I would suggest, really to also, beside the like, I would say transition, right now, that’s fine, we can do like put the Electrical Engineering with Physics, and Mechanical Engineering with the CAST, which is like Engineering Technology, but really the Engineering is bigger and larger than both, and this is going to be niche really. So really, I would put in addition to that strategic transition to the Engineering program, which is School of Engineering, as a matter of fact it’s going to enhance Physics—Physics is going to be small comparing to the Engineering. Engineering Technology is going to be much smaller than Engineering. It’s going to grow up. So really, the strategic position to be a School by itself but maybe it’s going to take maybe 20 years.

Provost Murphy: So your recommendation is really begin that planning too. As we’re planning curriculum and those kinds of things we also need to be thinking strategically down the road. Yeah. Makes sense.

Senator Qaddour: Exactly. Because that would enhance our program and in this class it would be pretty clear, you can start integrating and converging as you go. And that is going to enhance the program.

Provost Murphy: Great point. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: I want to get back to that one, but first I want to say, like Senator Ferrence, I hear from a number of constituents. Some of them are in the Humanities, some of them are other Senators, some of them are just people, and I want to first just list major things that haven’t yet been completely talked about. Some of the things that I have on the list have been talked about. There are maybe six or seven different things. One of them has to do with process, and what comes first, and Senator Stephens had mentioned chicken and egg kind of thing. So there’s the concern about the process of, for example, asking for a building before we’ve approved a curriculum, you know. That kind of thing, because that at least has not been done in many years, if it’s ever been done. The second one has to do with differential tuition and lots of different concerns regarding that. The third one has to do with this organization change, because that’s also one of the things that the Senate is involved in, is we have a policy about organizational change. The order of events, I think I just mentioned this with respect to the curriculum, and at some point if Dr. Dietz could say a little bit more about what comes next in terms of the business plan and etc., that would be terrific. And then things in the EAB recommendations, and then also some things about the financial planning.

But I wanted to jump on this conversation between Senator Mainieri, Senator Qaddour, and others about organizational change, because the scale of what we have modeled does not seem to people to be realistic to not have an organizational change fairly quickly. In other words, hiring 15 Engineering faculty in the space of four years in each department pretty much doubles Technology, more than doubles Physics, and then you have that many faculty, which together would constitute a fairly large department in two different places but in one building, right? So I think that people have some question about whether it’s… Part of the financial planning question has to do with the pace of the plan, are we going… do we have a model that’s moving us too quickly compared to where the taskforce model had been a year or two ago. And so those two questions are kind of intertwined in a sense because it would be a fairly major organizational change to hire those 15 faculty and then to work that out if that’s going at the rate of four years from now rather than 10 or 20 years from now, which are the figures that have been brought up.

Senator Stephens: I guess my point to that is when you do financial models, when you build them, and in my career of built them again to be dynamic, so I’ve got the ability, again, to… I’ve worked with Provost Murphy, we’ve got these positions staggered over time. You have to model out to a certain level of maturity. I could have put maturity at six year out, you know, you just got to pick a time frame. But I literally have every position that’s been earmarked at a certain calendar year, and then the way we judged it to make sure that we weren’t getting ahead of ourselves, or getting too far behind with respect to the student population and faculty, is always use the student to faculty ratio, and that was that. So if we were successful in recruiting and were able to move faster we’d have to obviously hire more. If we slowed that down, we would slow down that hiring pace as well. So it’s written in that way for us to be as dynamic in our planning as we work through exactly that.

President Dietz: I agree with what Dan just said in terms of the modeling. The other part of this is that the QBC and the interviews for all that occur, it’s largely about facility but it will inform also the academic programing side of that, and then our plan is to, after we find out what the QBC folks recommend, and that consulting group, that that’ll inform the academic side, and then I think Provost Murphy also has an idea that perhaps what we need to do after we get the facility part of that, and it actually could be in conjunction with that, is hiring a person for ME and a person for EE who knows more about the academic planning side of that. But I’ll let Provost Murphy talk about that more.

Provost Murphy: Sure. You know if we find out from the consultants that this seems to be a business model that could work, I think the first hires need to be program directors, a senior level faculty member in each of those areas who can then help us truly start to plan this curriculum. You know we’ve developed a curriculum by a very good group, but it wasn’t a group of engineers that developed these kind of thought through, tried to think through these curriculums. So eventually we actually have to go through our full curricular processes to develop curriculum that meet ABET accreditation. And so those program directors, those first hires, and you know I would see first hires very senior faculty, even before the building is finished you start to hire in some of your senior faculty who can help you develop those programs, start to answer some of the questions that you have. In terms of what the organizational structure side of it, of course, I mean eventually if we have a School of Engineering or College of Engineering absolutely those would go through our policy, and go through all organizational change. Developing programs, to me, goes through curricular processes, but again, we really have to look at the departments that these programs could be housed in, and find if this seems to be an opportunity that the faculty in those departments think is appropriate. Yeah, it’s a pretty fast model, but I think when we met with… We had taskforce members that visited universities, that again were like us, that had started Engineering as new programs they’d never had. And then we’ve actually had the opportunity to meet with a couple of alumni who have helped to establish new Engineering programs, some of them 10 years ago or 15 years ago, and I think it will go fast once we have that curriculum in place, once we start to work on accreditation, and we’re hiring faculty, I do agree, I think the faculty hiring will go quickly, but I think we need those faculty to help us make sure that we’re developing a program that is of quality.

Senator Stephens: In the model, the first hires for both programs, there’s a program director for Electrical and there’s a program director for Mechanical. They’re not one, there’s two. And so every program is set up in that way and that is the initial, that is actually year zero when you look at it. It’s the beginning and then the year later after that we begin to figure out as students are being recruited and the faculty are being recruited, that’s how the model works. But we plan the investment upfront of that curriculum development program so that we can help move the development of the programs, and the recruiting efforts, and then the facility itself will be designed again with the expert designers, they’ll ask us at that point at the pace by which you want to move, and how big you want it to be.

Senator Kalter: Presumably, those two program directors need to be in the budget cycle this year or next year. In other words the two chairs that are sitting in the room would need to have, their departments would need to prioritize those positions and ask for those to the Provost office.

Let me also just outline some of the concerns that have come to me about differential tuition, and of course tuition decisions are not made by the Academic Senate. They’re made by the Board of Trustees. But people have expressed concerns about the potential impact of differential tuition on enrollments in other programs other than Engineering—because apparently that has been talked about—on the culture of campus and the nature of the University in terms of the student body, and in terms of whether it would give a so-called perverse incentive for us to just keep recruiting people into the areas where the tuition is higher, and this goes to the other question that Dr. Avogo, Senator Avogo, asked, about would that then negatively impact the Social Sciences, Humanities, and other areas of the University, like Fine Arts?

President Dietz: The issue about differential tuition has been a part of an agenda of every Board Retreat I think I’ve been involved with since I’ve been here. And I think earlier on we didn’t pay as much attention to that as we had been asked to pay attention to now, particularly with high demand areas. And Engineering would be one of those, parts of Business are usually candidates for that as well, Nursing is a candidate for that. So you basically look at the high demand areas and if you look across the country side at what other institutions are doing, the differential tuition has been a part of their reality for a long period of time. We’ve not had it as part of our history here. I think frankly we’re missing out on some of that, and I think we have for a while, so I think it’s very applicable to some of these higher demand areas. I don’t think that that negatively impacts the Social Sciences, I think, because these students in the high demand areas that are going to be taking Social Science courses. And so it does add into the complexity as to whether or not if they in Nursing, for example, or if they’re paying that differential tuition if we had that for the English course, or for the Sociology course, as well and there have been different models for that, so I think that’s something we’d need to get into a little bit more. University of Illinois, for example, in the conversation today they take great pride that they’re freezing their tuition for the University and they’ve mentioned that they’re in their fifth year of that. There are very few students at the University of Illinois whose tuition has been frozen. They do not freeze the differential part for Engineering, or Business, or about any of their academic programs; that part has been growing, but that’s not reported. So I can tell you that the differential part is really become a part of the fabric of higher education as a way to help finance those course that many of which are more expensive to offer and are in higher demand.

Provost Murphy: And can I add to that? So we don’t have an RCM model, so if I’m the College of Business, and we have differential tuition, it’s not that all of our tuition goes to the College of Business, so differential tuition helps the University as a whole, because it’s not… Don’t think that if we charge 15% differential tuition for (and I’m making this up) Accounting, it doesn’t mean that Accounting gets all that differential tuition, that tuition goes back to the University as a whole. So it does have the potential for benefiting all of our programs, because it can help with the operating budgets for all of Academic Affairs as a whole.

Senator Kalter: I think you’re on a more sophisticated level than the question I got asked. In other words, they weren’t thinking back to that old summer model that we use to have where—what was it called, the Entrepreneurial model—it wasn’t that kind of a question. It was more about the flow of students in terms of… and this kind of got asked a little bit before…but having more students entering the higher tuition areas which would, in the mind of the questioner, sort of pull them away from other majors.

I think I cut off Senator Ferrence’s question and then we are a little but past our usual hard stop time, so do you have a final question that you wanted to ask?

Senator Ferrence: I think the answer is borderline yes, or maybe a comment, but it may be a very nice one to close with. I wanted to revisit Senator Marx’s comment about the community colleges, because I know that ISU has a lot of students that transfer in from community colleges, and also as somebody who was personally was the ISU co-PI on a multimillion dollar grant with the city colleges of Chicago, College of DuPage, Oakland Community College, and Harper College several year back, I know that are some really excellent student in those community colleges, and one way to perhaps mitigate some of the attrition that we worry about is if we can pre-vet the students by having them get through those first two years in some kind of two plus two transfer program with selected community colleges that we know have very good reputations and some of us have worked with, that would be a really powerful way, and something that I think is fairly unique among certainly type Engineering type programs.

Provost Murphy: Great idea. It’s certainly working for us with Nursing. I mean I think that’s an excellent model.

Senator Kalter: All right. So I’m going to just hold off for just a moment for Senator Pancrazio, but it seems to me that this conversation could easily continue, and as I sort of suggested at the Senate meeting I think it will continue during Senate meeting next time because we’re going to be looking towards the Capital Request, and that kind of thing, so we will leave space for more questions. I know that not all of the questions that I received, you know, or comments came up so please retain those, and think about it for next time.

***Adjournment***Motion by Senator Pancrazio, seconded by Senator Huston, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.