

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES****(Approved)****November 28, 2001****Volume XXXIII, No. 7*****Call to Order***

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

***Roll Call***

Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of November 7, 2001***

**Motion XXXIII-49:** by Senator Borg, second by Senator Albrecht, to approve the Senate minutes of November 7, 2001. There was a correction to the minutes. The minutes reflect that the Planning and Finance report indicates that future self-studies will be tied to the "NCAA" self-study. The minutes should read that future self-studies will be tied to the "NCA" self-study. The revised minutes were unanimously approved.

***Chairperson's Remarks:***

**Senator White:** I had the pleasure of meeting with Pat Cross last week, who came to campus to celebrate her generous contribution to the Comprehensive Campaign and the creation of an endowed chair. I have also worked this week in creating the preliminary stages of the Comprehensive Campaign's Family Phase. Senator White welcomed the new Senate representative for non-tenure track faculty, Mary Kay Rotsch.

***Vice Chairperson/Student Government Association President's Remarks:***

**Senator Kording:** Two weeks ago, the student government approved a measure and sent it to the Senate, President and Provost regarding the possible extension of Thanksgiving break. We are making a lot headway with a statistically significant survey that we are working on to inject student input into the downtown renewal decision-making process. We are getting hundreds of survey responses back that we sent out randomly to members of the faculty and students. We hope to be able to distribute the results of that survey in January. We are making headway on a telephone survey for a preliminary student interest assessment for a new campus recreation center. We are trying to assess whether or not it would be feasible to pursue a student referendum in March.

**Senator Razaki:** What do you have in mind for the extension of Thanksgiving break?

**Senator Kording:** We are asking a committee to look at moving the fall break day and tacking that on to the beginning of Thanksgiving break and perhaps the first two days, Monday and Tuesday, would be negotiable.

***Administrators' Remarks:***

- **President Boschini:** Senator Brown and I and several of the trustees attended a conference in Springfield for the governing boards of the four-year schools and the community colleges in Illinois. We were provided with an education session. I want to thank everyone who attended the Cross ceremony; the President of the Carnegie Foundation was in attendance. Since our last meeting, we also have had Myers and Associates on campus. Myers is a new firm that we have hired to represent us in Washington, D.C. I want to thank Dr. McGinnis, who organized that. Myers spent two days on campus with students, faculty and staff to talk about what we think our needs are. Currently, Dr. McGinnis is working with the colleges to try to refine those needs to give a more comprehensive list to Myers. We are going to work with

Northern Illinois University to co-sponsor a statewide summit on education focusing mainly on the special education needs in the State of Illinois. We received another \$2 million gift to establish yet another chair, which we will officially announce in March. That chair will be a chair in the Special Education Department. We have taken one cut on the state budget so far. Dr. Bragg will give more information on this issue. I am still very much concerned about what is going on in Springfield. I think that, unfortunately, this might be just the first step in a series of steps.

**Provost Al Goldfarb:** Many of you may have seen in the *Pantagraph* that we were involved this year in the National Survey of Student Engagement. That report surveys students to discover the kind of experiences they feel that they are having at institutions. We were selected to be highlighted in a section of best practices of the report for an academically challenging environment. Another institution in that group was the University of Michigan. It was a very positive place to be. We are going to make that data available on the web. Also, because of the Cross visit and the presence of the President of the Carnegie Foundation, as well as the recognition in the survey, we had a reporter from the *Chicago Tribune* on campus. The reporter was interested in looking at the activities on campus and visited an FOI class, met with Dr. Chizmar and with the President.

**Vice President of Student Affairs**

**Senator Mamarchev:** We just opened Brewster's Lounge in the Bone Student Center. This is yet another of our efforts to attract people to the Bone Student Center as the kind of "living room" of the campus. In addition to coffee and tea products, Brewster's also has upscale salads and vegetarian soups daily. We also have a new pastry chef, who has a degree from Johnson and Wales, which is one of the premier institutions in food service. If you have been upstairs, you will notice that our Barnes and Nobles store is well underway in its renovation and they hope to finish in a couple of weeks. At the start of the spring semester, we are going to have a weeklong celebration called Winter Fest, which will include many programs welcoming people back to campus.

**Vice President of Finance and Planning**

**Senator Bragg:** As we have been foreshadowing for a good part of the fall, the economic downturn has started to hit close to home. The governor requested that higher education hold \$25 million in reserve of this year's general revenue funds. The Board of Higher Education allocated that cut proportionately on the appropriation base. ISU's share of that is \$1.06 million, which is 1.14% of our appropriated base. We are still in the process of identifying how we will implement those reserves. We hope that this will be the only cut, but we are anticipating other cuts and so have not finalized anything yet. The State is looking at alternative ways to fund the group health insurance program, which has about a \$10 million shortfall. Higher education is a big consumer of that program and we may be asked to help fund that shortfall as well, but that has not been decided yet. The governor has announced another \$220 million cut in other parts of the state budget, but higher education is exempt from that. Trading was halted today on Enron. Enron was one of the largest energy distribution companies in the U.S. and ISU has an eight-year contract with them to provide electricity. We are working with legal council and others to understand what the implications of this are for our electrical procurement contract.

**Senator Goldfarb:** Just to place this into perspective, would you describe what is going on in other states?

**Senator Bragg:** This is obviously a national phenomenon. Florida, for example, has taken over a 15% cut in their current budget. We know that Nebraska is in double digit cuts as well. Iowa has been close to a

20% cut in their budget for the last couple of years. It is all around us and much more severe than in Illinois. We have been able to make the decision that the salary increases that we have awarded this year will not be affected and we are very confident that instructional programs will not be cut.

### *Committee Reports*

#### *Academic Affairs Committee*

**Senator Borg:** The Academic Affairs Committee discussed a report that originated in the University Curriculum Committee about distance education. We will be discussing that at our next meeting and provide a report to the Provost. We have two information items on the agenda tonight.

#### *Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee*

**Senator Wells:** The committee did its perfunctory review of the 2005 academic calendar. We discussed getting this year's presidential commentary process underway. The final item that we discussed, which was the most significant, had to do with evaluating and systematizing campus policy on freedom of expression. Among our efforts is connecting with other groups on campus who are working on the same issue. We have made contact with an administrative group, which is chaired by the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, that has been working on this for some time. We are concerned with coordinating efforts. Given the concerns about this topic, we will not be moving quickly on it, but we will have something to report in a more definite fashion by the next Senate meeting or the one after that.

#### *Faculty Affairs Committee*

**Senator Deutsch:** The Faculty Affairs Committee has made revisions to two important policy documents generated by the Provost's office. Revisions were forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Senate. Presumably, they will be on the next agenda.

#### *Planning and Finance Committee*

**Senator Kurtz:** Planning and Finance met the week before Thanksgiving and met for several hours before this evening's Senate meeting. We have voted approval of a paradigm for self-study that we are going to be recommending as the model for any kind of collegiate restructuring that takes place in the future. We are also going to be recommending that self-study be linked to the NCA tenure accreditation review. We received a copy of the results of the focus groups that were held earlier in the semester. We are going to be undertaking consideration of those. Most of the meeting was taken up with considering the results of the email survey that was done at the beginning of the semester. At our previous meeting, we identified the major topics that were raised in the course of that survey. This evening, we began to formulate those topics that we might recommend as meritorious of further study by the institution. We have not voted yet on those topics; perhaps that will take place at our next meeting.

#### *Rules Committee*

**Senator Reid:** The Rules Committee met this evening. We discussed revisions to the Milner bylaws and those should be coming to you at the next meeting. We also took up the Graduate School changes in bylaws and have many suggestions that we will be making to the Graduate School for further revision.

#### *IBHE-FAC Report*

**Senator Crothers:** The FAC met November 9 at SIU-Edwardsville. The bulk of the meeting dealt with subcommittee meetings and our subcommittee's report, which will be up for consideration by the full FAC at our next meeting. These meetings provide a remarkable opportunity to listen to the administrators of other institutions to find out what they think the problems are in higher education. The Chancellor of

SIU-E attended the meeting and he identified what he thought were the five issues in higher education today: 1) Budget: While universities do a good job of adding programs, they do a poor job of eliminating them. 2) Teacher shortage and preparation: He said that basically there is very little that universities can do about that. 3) Retention and graduation rates: The big issue is the State's requirement to enhance these rates. 4) Attending to student learning more than we currently do. 5) "Part-timers": He suggested that the problem with part-timers doesn't really exist because most of them don't want to work fulltime. However, we did not get a chance to discuss how true that is. Our next meeting is Friday, December 7, with the Director of the IBHE, Keith Sanders.

**Action Items:**

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senate Representative Election Procedures:**

**10.29.01.01A Revisions to Senate Bylaws (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Reid:** In the latest version of our revisions to the Senate bylaws regarding the non-tenure track election process, we made sure that in both sections A and B of Article III, Section 3.1, it states that the elections will be held "during the last week of February", as opposed to the current language of "the last Wednesday in February". We replaced tenure-line with tenure and probationary faculty to be in line with the new wording in the constitution. We provided for the call for nominations and the election process to be conducted by the Senate office. Nominations would be solicited from all non-tenure track faculty members. Voting would be by non-tenure track members only. The NTT representative will serve a one-year term. There was one other change that we wished to make that is not contained in this document. We agreed to eliminate 3.2, which essentially talks about representation of discrete groups of faculty that are not directly under the auspices of a specific collegial unit. We felt that such groups had been taken care of by the new non-tenure track member and that Milner Library is included.

**Motion XXXIII-50:** by Senator Reid, to approve the changes to the Senate bylaws, second by Senator Rotsch.

**Senator Crothers:** The six provisions that have been specified for the election of the non-tenure track faculty seem fine with one exception. There isn't any mechanism outlined here to avoid a process that appeared to have happened regularly in the temporary appointment procedure that we enacted to ensure NTT representation for the current academic year. Chairs and others made nominations without any active involvement on the part of the NTTs university wide. There needs to be some mechanism specifying that the nominations are not to come out of some committee within the department or from the department chairs.

**Senator Reid:** Why does number 2 not take care of that?

**Senator Crothers:** Number 2 reads, "Nominations for the non-tenure-track faculty will be solicited from all non-tenure-track faculty and only from non-tenure-track faculty". As we know from this last process, that was our intent, but that is not what occurred.

**Senator Reid:** But you went to the chairs first and not to the non-tenure track faculty.

**Senator Crothers:** Right now there is no mechanism to go directly to the NTTs.

**Senator Reid:** Yes, there is. There is a list serve that has already been set up; however, not all NTTs have signed up to be a part of that. Secondly, we can reach NTTs through the list serve for all faculty. I was told by Dave Williams that a call would go out to all faculty members on the faculty list serve, but directed only to non-tenure track members.

**Senator Razaki:** My comment is related to the elimination of section 3.2. Faculty associates in the Laboratory Schools have wanted representation on the Senate. I have often voted against their inclusion on the Senate, but I do feel that it is a genuine case that should be discussed, so perhaps a version of 3.2 should remain intact. I do think the faculty associate issue should be addressed and finalized.

**Senator Reid:** Since this only relates to "faculty" as defined by the constitution and does not include faculty associates, perhaps we could eliminate this section now and consider coming up with a change regarding that segment of employees.

**Senator Deutsch:** Is the number of nominees going to be limited?

**Senator Reid:** We have had long discussions on this. We find it unlikely that there would be many nominations, but we would take measures if we were wrong.

**Senator Borg:** In the section on non-tenure track faculty, you have designated the last week of February as the election time, but in number 3 you talk about an absentee ballot for a faculty member that is gone on "election day". Does that mean that the final week will have a designated day or should the absentee-ballot section be modified?

**Senator Reid:** Would you agree with changing that from "election day" to "during the last week of February"?

**Senator Borg:** Yes.

**Friendly Amendment:**

**Senator Borg:** In section 3.1, B.3, the section referring to the absentee ballot, "election day" should be replaced by "during the last week of February". Senator Reid accepted the friendly amendment.

**Friendly Amendment:**

**Senator Crothers:** We should add to section 3.1, B.2 that nominations may not be solicited by department chairs or other administrators. Senators Reid and Rotsch accepted the friendly amendment.

**Motion XXXIII-51:** by Senator Razaki, second by Senator Brown, to delete the Friendly Amendment that nominations may not be solicited by department chairs or other administrators.

**Move the Question:** The question was moved by Senator Razaki, second by Senator Landau, to end debate on Motion XXXIII-51. The motion to move the question was not passed.

**Senator Deutsch:** I think that the problem that arose with the solicitation by the chairs was that some chairs were demanding all kinds of documentation from nominees. That's inappropriate. When regular nominations are made to the Senate, there is no requirement that they submit a curriculum vita and a statement about their research. Wouldn't there be a way to allow solicitation by chairs, but at the same time avoid this kind of behavior?

**Senator White:** If that is the direction that we want to go in, then we might want to think about returning this to the Rules Committee.

**Senator Brown:** I believe that the sentence that says nominations will be solicited from non-tenure track only is sufficient and that we don't need to antagonize people who cannot do this.

**Senator Kording:** Are there any administrators in the room who feel antagonized by this statement?

**Senator Mills:** I am not antagonized by the statement, but I do know that there are a number of times when we are trying to get faculty to participate in shared governance, the email comes to me and we don't have nominations and we don't have volunteers. It is not a process of trying to discourage faculty from participating, but a process of encouraging them. We should encourage people to participate in shared governance in anyway we can.

**Senator Zant:** I would interpret the language of Senator Crothers' Friendly Amendment as being very restrictive and would not even allow a chair to encourage all non-tenure track faculty in their department to consider serving. In my opinion, that is too restrictive.

**Call the Question:** Senator Albrecht called the question to vote on whether debate should end on Motion XXXIII-51. There were no objections and the debate ended.

**Vote on Motion XXXIII-51:** The Senate voted in favor of removing the Friendly Amendment made by Senator Crothers.

**Friendly Amendment:**

**Senator Howard:** I would like to offer a Friendly Amendment using the language that Senator Crothers used, but inserting the word "solely": "Nominations will not be solely solicited by department chairs and administrators." Senator Reid did not accept the Friendly Amendment.

**Motion XXXIII-52:** by Senator Deutsch, second by Senator Crothers, to send the matter back to committee so that it may consider the issue of demands for curriculum vita by chairs.

**Senator Holland:** If the main objection is administrators demanding CVs, that is already covered in that you can self-nominate with no restrictions whatsoever.

**Senator Walker:** If we look at B.2, it reads that nominations will be solicited from all non-tenure track faculty and only from non-tenure track faculty. That seems to cover it. We talked about this in committee because we were concerned about department chairs or deans asking non-tenure track to serve and non-tenure track feeling that they couldn't say no, or NTT being told that they couldn't serve. We are trying to take it out of the administrators' hands and the Rules Committee felt that this language does that.

**Senator Crothers:** I have no doubt that most of the people on this campus are of goodwill. It is nonetheless the case that NTT faculty are particularly vulnerable; thus if it we don't built in some mechanism to protect those faculty, we are putting them in a position that those who are tenured and tenure-line don't face.

**Senator Deutsch:** One of the problems is that we need to get the information to the NTT people. The other problem is exploitation, so I really think that will take some thinking. That is why I suggest sending it back to the Rules Committee.

**Senator Fowles:** Perhaps in the call that the Academic Senate puts out, we could ask NTT faculty to submit whatever is required for nomination. I think it is the process we are talking about, not so much who is asking people to make nominations.

**Call the Question:** The question was called by Senator Thomas. There was no objection and the Senate ended debate on Motion XXXIII-52.

**Vote on Motion XXXIII-52:** The majority of the Senate voted against Motion XXXIII-52 and the motion did not pass.

**Move the Question:** Senator Razaki, second by Senator Thomas, moved the question to close debate on Motion XXXIII-50, the motion for approving the revised bylaws. The Senate voted in favor of closing debate.

**Vote on Motion XXXIII-50:** The Senate voted unanimously in favor of approving the revised bylaws, with the exception of an abstention by Senator Crothers.

***Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senate Representative Election Procedures:***

***10.12.01.01 Revisions to Constitution (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Reid:** The revisions to the constitution provide for the election of the non-tenure track representative. The specific procedures are outlined in the bylaws, but not in the constitution.

**Motion XXXIII-53:** by Senator Reid, second by Senator McNaught, to approve the revisions to the constitution. The Senate unanimously approved the revisions to the constitution.

***Election of Student Members to the Search Committee for the Dean of CAS***

**Motion XXXIII-54:** By Senator Kording, second by Senator Crothers, to amend the agenda to add the election of student members to the Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Senate voted unanimously to amend the agenda.

**Senator White:** The Senate is required to approve the members of the Dean Search Committee by the University's Policies and Procedures Manual.

**Senator Kording:** In order for student members to be placed on the search committee, the Student Government Association is to send nominees to the floor of the Senate so that they may be elected. In order not to hold up the process any longer, we are sending two names to you for your consideration. The SGA is nominating Adam Corelli and Ken Panfilio.

**Motion XXXIII-55:** By Senator Kording to elect the SGA nominees to the dean search committee. The Senate unanimously approved the nominees.

***Information Items:***

***10.15.01.02A Proposed Admission Requirements (for students entering in fall 2003)  
(Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Borg:** We bring to the Senate revisions to the admission requirements as they are stated in the University catalog. Senator Kurtz was a member of the team for Educating Illinois that drafted this proposal. Steve Adams, Director of Admissions, is here as well. These procedures were reviewed through the regular curricular process. Certain procedures that can be dealt with administratively are already ongoing for the

class entering in 2002.

**Senator Razaki:** On page three under Transfer Student Admission Standards, the first requirement is to earn a minimum of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale for all college work completed. Is this a requirement of the Illinois Articulation Agreement or can we change that 2.0 to a higher number?

**Dr. Steve Adams, Director of Admissions:** It is not a requirement of the IAA. The Senate has the opportunity to change that to a higher figure if necessary. All state institutions follow very closely the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science requirements of a 2.0 in order to graduate. The university minimum in order to graduate is also a 2.0.

**Senator Razaki:** Do you think that someone transferring here with a 2.0 has a high probability of becoming a part of the General Studies Major Program?

**Dr. Adams:** I think there is a possibility that that would happen, but I also believe that students who earn an associate's degree with a 2.0 average still have the edge. In addition, we have exercised the option in the admission's process of eliminating some of those students, becoming more selective when we deal with transfer students, and not admitting many of the students without associate degrees who have GPAs below 2.5.

**Senator Albrecht:** On the first page under College Preparation, the fourth requirement indicates that two years of laboratory science will be selected primarily from biology, chemistry and physics. In our Academic Affairs Committee meeting, Senator Armstrong brought up the possibility of adding earth sciences. Has there been any agreement on that?

**Senator Borg:** You will recall that in the meeting, we agreed to deal with this issue and one other by making recommendations down the line so that this would not be held up by that process.

**Senator Goldfarb:** In regard to Senator Razaki's question about a GPA of 2.0, the way this is structured, it provides a sense of what the average grade point average was for the transfer student in order to suggest that that is the type of student that we are looking for. Our average last year was 2.93. It also says that this is just to be considered for admission, not to definitively be admitted.

**Senator Razaki:** Don't you think we could signal to potential students that we do want a high-quality student by raising that limit?

**Senator Goldfarb:** I think the goal of the implementation team from *Educating Illinois* was actually signaling that by saying that of those transfer students admitted for the 2001-2002 academic year, the average GPA was 2.93. However, when we talk about motivated students and motivational factors, we don't want to exclude a student who might have less than a 2.93.

**Senator Reid:** How do you justify presupposing that a 2.0 would be equivalent between a junior college and our university?

**Dr. Adams:** The studies that we have show that transfer students are very much in line with the GPAs of native students. The transfer student average GPA for last year was 2.93 and the native student's average was slightly below that.



**Senator Goldfarb:** It may be debatable whether the 2.0 is equivalent, but it clearly states that a 2.0 is required just to be *considered* for admission.

**Senator Magnabosco:** Point three of the Freshman Admission Standards on page two requires the submission of a personal statement. Is there any prioritization of those requirements for admission or are they all considered equally?

**Dr. Adams:** The order in which they are listed under the Freshman Admission Standards is the order in which we do look at a student's qualifications. College preparation is first, what types of grades they earn and standardized test scores are second, and the personal statement is third.

**Senator Wheeler:** If that is the order that we are going to consider those factors, should we let the students know?

**Senator Borg:** Where would you suggest that that occur?

**Senator Wheeler:** Just include a ranking for each of the items.

**Senator White:** The committee can consider that over the course of the next two weeks or you can make a motion when this comes before the Senate as an action item at the next meeting.

**Senator Walker:** Do you see any significant changes in the way in which the Office of Admissions will handle applications given the fact that we are moving away from a formula for admission?

**Dr. Adams:** This process is a solid process and provides us with greater flexibility in being more selective. It also enables us to go for more high-achieving and motivated students by looking at all of these factors, as opposed to being tied down to a formula.

**Senator Walker:** Do you have sufficient resources and staff to handle this?

**Dr. Adams:** Previously, an experienced processor could process between 60 and 70 applications a day. Now we see that they can complete about 50.

The Senate thanked Dr. Adams for providing information to the Senate on the admissions process.

#### ***01.23.01.01C Revision of University Mission Statement (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Borg:** In January of last year, the Academic Planning Committee asked the Senate to review the University's mission statement. The last major change in the mission statement occurred in 1988 when a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee condensed a three-page document to two paragraphs consolidating all of the extraneous materials to other parts of the Academic Plan. That was fine tuned over the next several years, but for the past six years, the mission statement has not changed. It was used as a guide for the changes that were discussed in *Educating Illinois* and in pointing the direction for decisions that were made in the annual Academic Plan. The review of the mission statement began last spring by my predecessor in the Academic Affairs Committee, Pat Meckstroth, who asked for input and suggestions from the university community. In the fall, the Academic Affairs Committee began to work on this again and after some initial discussions, we delegated this to a subcommittee. The document that you have before you is what we are recommending we adopt as our mission statement. There are also eight guiding statements, which are not a part of the mission statement, but guided us in our development of the statement.

**Senator Armstrong:** Based on input from a number of sources, we came up with some guiding principles to decide what a mission statement should consist of. We heard from numerous sources that we should be brief and that was our number one guiding principle. We also tried to do something that was specific to ISU and to avoid clichés. We agreed that visions and goals should be included in other documents, but not in the mission statement. We used broad and inclusive terms. We also didn't want a statement that was written just for the short term alone.

**Senator Lindblom:** We propose the following mission statement: "We at Illinois State University work as a community of scholars with a commitment to fostering a small-college atmosphere with large university opportunities. We promote the highest academic standards in our teaching, our scholarship and the connections we build between them. We devote all of our resources and energies to creating the most supportive and productive community of knowledge-makers possible to serve the citizens of Illinois and beyond." "Knowledge-makers" was a term that troubled the committee as did the phrase "and beyond".

**Senator Bathauer:** Last year, former Senator Bill Tolone and I did extensive work on this. We did numerous drafts. Was that work ever forwarded on to you?

**Senator Borg:** We inherited that work and worked from that basis.

**Senator Bathauer:** Were people from the last Academic Affairs Committee consulted?

**Senator Borg:** We did not consult any members of the former committee, but we made use of the document that you left.

**Senator Thomas:** Will the guiding principles be a part of the mission statement?

**Senator Borg:** No, they are here explaining to the Senate the process we went through.

**Senator Thomas:** In the mission statement draft, we have teaching and scholarship. Did the committee consider including service?

**Senator Armstrong:** We took a very broad definition of what scholarship was.

**Senator Razaki:** Did you consider including knowledge-makers and *knowledge-seekers*?

**Senator Borg:** No, but we will consider all suggestions.

**Senator McNaught:** I would like to make a request that when this is brought before us as an action item that we have the draft mission statement that Senator Bathauer and her colleague worked on before.

**Senator White:** Perhaps you can talk with Senators Bathauer and Borg about which version of the mission statement you would like included. It also might be helpful to have the current mission statement as well.

**Senator Deutsch:** Did you consider replacing the phrase "knowledge-makers" with something such as "teachers and learners"?

**Senator Borg:** The phrase that the committee thought was best was "community of scholars", but we have

said that already and we were looking for another way of stating the idea. We will consider your suggestion.

**Senator Hampton:** Can knowledge be made? My colleague, Dave Thomas, has a very good suggestion.

**Senator Thomas:** Delete "knowledge-makers" and replace with "educated citizens". Then delete "the citizens" later in the paragraph.

**Senator Crothers:** I think you could delete the phrase "of knowledge-makers" entirely with no replacement.

**Senator Chang:** What is specific to ISU in the mission statement?

**Senator Borg:** In particular, the small-college atmosphere with large university opportunities.

**Senator Kording:** Perhaps we could email further suggestions to the committee.

### *Communications*

#### *Report from ISU Foundation Board (Senator Razaki)*

**Senator Razaki:** I wanted to provide some information about the Foundation Board and the endowment fund. Most of you know that the stock market has been in a decline. At the end of September, our endowment portfolio had dropped by 15%. It came back up a bit in October and November. In the past, the distribution policy of the Foundation Board has been 5.5% of the twelve-month balance that each unit has in the endowment. Out of that 5.5%, 1% was retained by university administration for development efforts. The Investment Committee of the Foundation Board agreed that it could not support a 5.5% distribution this year. The first figure mentioned was a 2.5% distribution because we felt that student scholarships had to be protected at any cost. Ultimately, the Investment Committee decided that the distribution should be 4.5%, out of which 0.8% will be retained for development efforts, giving a net return of about 3.7%. It has already been decided that next year, the distribution is going to go down from 4.5% to 4%. The reason for that is the general desire of the Foundation Board, other administrators and certainly my desire to try to grow our endowment with the passage of time rather than spending it. At Illinois State, we have an endowment fund of about \$33.5 million. At Illinois Wesleyan, the endowment fund totals \$213 million. I wanted to make this announcement so that senators can go back to their constituents and let them know what has been decided.

Members of the Foundation Board are very supportive and realize that the funds distributed are used for important purposes. Recently, several members of Foundation Board made very large contributions to the Comprehensive Campaign. Senator Boschini mentioned that there was a \$2 million donation to set up an endowed chair in Special Education. There were also recent donations of a quarter of a million dollars and \$100,000. If my numbers are correct, the current amount that has been pledged in the Comprehensive Campaign is over \$38 million, which is a very substantial amount and a lot of it has come from members of the Foundation Board. I am really trying to make a plea to get the university community more involved in a culture of giving and philanthropy. The faculty and students benefit a great deal from what is done by the Foundation Board. We should all donate to the Foundation. You can donate whatever amount that you want, large or small. Outside donors always look at the number of people contributing within the university. A campaign will start in March that will involve the whole ISU community.

**Senator White:** To add to Senator Razaki's comments, members of the Senate, myself included, are already involved in the steering team efforts for the Family Phase of the Comprehensive Campaign, and that will be a very visible process next semester, but it is never too early to think about our own ability to participate.

***Curricular Proposals:***

**Senator White:** As you will note on your agenda, we have approved several curricular proposals through the Consent Agenda on the Senate web site. We have received inquiries about two proposals that are currently on the Consent Agenda, so several proposals are likely to go to the Academic Affairs Committee in the near future.

***10.29.01.03 Art Therapy Sequence approved by Senate on Consent Agenda November 12, 2001***

***11.05.01.01 Specialist in Deaf and Hard of Hearing Sequence Revisions approved by Senate on Consent Agenda November 19, 2001***

***11.05.01.02 Specialist in Learning and Behavior Sequence approved by Senate on Consent Agenda November 19, 2001***

***Adjournment***

**Motion XXXIII-56:** To adjourn by Senator Brown, second by Senator Bathauer. The motion was unanimously approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate

Hovey 408, Box 1830

438-8735

E-mail Address: [acsenate@ilstu.edu](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu)

Web Address: <http://www.academicsenate.ilstu.edu>