

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

March 5, 2003

Volume XXXIV, No. 13

Call to Order

Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of February 12 and 19, 2003

Motion XXXIV-87: By Senator Liguas, second by Senator Anderson, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of February 12, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIV-88: By Senator Burk, second by Senator Fowles, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of February 19, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: Welcome to our new Provost, John Presley. On the agenda, we have a special section for a discussion of the budget.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Bathauer: Welcome to Provost Presley on behalf of all of the students. We are really excited to begin working with you. The election results for the Student Government Association will be announced tonight at 9:30 p.m. We will be announcing my predecessor as well as the new senators. I wish the best of luck to Senator Ghrist, who is running for student trustee, Senator Gaylor, who is running for Student Body Vice President, Senator Schneider, who is running for off-campus senator, and to Senator Weiss, who is running for Chief of Staff.

President's Remarks

Senator Crothers: President Boschini is in Springfield preparing for a meeting with the House Appropriations Committee tomorrow. The recently named, soon to be interim President, Dr. Bowman, has been asked to make a presentation in place of President Boschini.

Dr. Bowman: I would also like to welcome our new Provost, John Presley. Several of the vice presidents will be joining President Boschini in Springfield tomorrow for the House Appropriations Committee hearing. This is just the start of the budget process. We will have Steve Bragg bring us up to date. We have some positive news on the enrollment. We have over 10,000 applicants for the fall 03 class. The attendance at our area meetings continues to be strong and our on campus open houses have been drawing record attendance. Last week, the President, Dr. McGinnis and I went to Washington and met with members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation. We feel very good about the relationships that we are building. There is strong support there for some federal initiatives and you will be hearing more about those down the road. The Comprehensive Campaign is well underway and we are very close to the \$65 million mark. We are confident that the program will continue to move forward despite the loss of our President and I certainly plan to put all of my effort into that campaign to help it be as successful as it can be.

Senator Razaki: In light of the budget situation, is any consideration being given to lowering the enrollment this year?

Dr. Bowman: That is being talked about, among a thousand other options. As everyone knows, we are funded by program, not by enrollment. That is certainly something that we will look at seriously.

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's Remarks

Provost John Presley: I appreciate the welcome that I have received from this group. It is indicative of the sort of welcome I have received so far from everyone on campus. I am going to enjoy participating with the Senate. This is a new model of shared governance to me with many constituencies represented.

Vice President of Student Affairs's Remarks

Senator Mamarchev: I want to thank Senator Bathauer, Senator Maroules and Karen Kellam for their leadership in setting up and hosting the Town of Normal Redevelopment Commission last night. We had a really good turnout and a good exchange of ideas. I hope that everyone has a very safe spring break.

Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks

Senator Bragg: I would also like to welcome Provost Presley and make a prediction that he is going to a most successful Provost. We will postpone most of our budget discussion until the session at the end of the meeting. I have been appraising you on the progress of the bond sales. We actually sold about \$16.9 million worth of bonds last Tuesday. We were aiming at a target of 4.45% overall as a weighted average interest rate. We ended up getting them at 4.26%. In the fall, the President asked each of the vice presidents to put together a 5% contingency planning process just in case the budget situation did not improve. Indeed, the President has concluded that the budget process is not improving and has communicated to the campus that he is now going to invoke a portion of that 5% contingency plan and has asked that \$2 million of the 5% plan be placed in reserve. If additional cuts do not materialize this year, then we have the opportunity of rolling those funds over and addressing budget cuts in 04. There is, however, every indication from Springfield that we will be some cuts this year.

Let me underscore that the situation is very, very fluid. There is still a lot of uncertainty in Springfield. This is still a new administration. There is a lot of miscommunication going on and the situation changes dramatically. The Governor does not give his budget address until April 9 and the General Assembly has not entered into the process. We have received a letter from the Bureau of the Budget asking us to put into reserve 8% of our appropriation. That is roughly \$7 million. That amount would be put into reserve against which we would be able to plead our case on why we deserve that money back. Then certain individuals will make a decision about releasing money out of that reserve. We don't know who is going to develop that process or when that process will be developed. To give you a perspective on this, we have about \$28 million left in appropriated funds in this year's budget and we have salary obligations of about \$26.9 million. If the full \$7 million has to be put into reserve, that is 25% of the remaining general revenue funds. We have a lot of challenges ahead.

Senator Reid: The bonds sales were for restructuring our debt?

Senator Bragg: Yes, \$10 million of the \$16.9 was for refinancing existing debt.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Lindblom: The committee met with Dr. Lou Perez, the Director of the Gen Ed Program, to discuss

the ongoing five-year review of General Education. Right now we are looking at the five-year review of FOI. Next year we will look at the five-year review of the entire Gen Ed Program. We spoke about the different kinds of assessments that are already going on regarding FOI. Later in the semester, we will be setting up open forums to discuss FOI with the campus. Several weeks from now, we will discuss with the Council for Teacher Education teacher education performance assessments, particularly the live text program which is one vendor for the E-portfolios, which CTE is recommending to the teacher education programs on campus.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Boser: We met with Rules briefly today and continued the discussion on the Consensual Relations Policy. We then reviewed the Blue Book policies on what our committee does. We have requested that Senator Crothers join us in that review process at the next meeting.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Winchip: Rick Olshak was our guest this evening. He gave us an overview of the ombudsman position and what that would mean here at ISU. Our committee will be forwarding a decision regarding that very soon. We also met with the Rules Committee to talk about the Faculty Code of Ethics.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Crothers: You will soon see as an information item the report that Planning and Finance has developed regarding University priorities of short, medium and long-term programs to be funded. We also continued our discussions on linking with the accreditation team planning and budgeting processes to make the institution stronger over time.

Rules Committee

Senator Reid: The committee met with the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee about the Consensual Relations policy. We agreed on a final wording. This policy will now be sent to the chairs of Civil Service and AP Councils to make sure that the wording is appropriate for their procedures. Once that is resolved, we will be sending it to deans, chairs and faculty through the deans for a period of commentary. We also met with the Faculty Affairs Committee on the Faculty Ethics Code. The Faculty Affairs Committee brought up some very interesting questions on the functions of the philosophical statements within the Ethics Code and the extent to which those philosophical statements could be used to bring ethics grievances. So, we are going to be meeting, probably for quite some time, to try to decide what the nature of this document should be in relation to the ethics and grievance process.

Assessment Processes (Wendy Troxel, University Assessment)

Dr. Troxel: It is important to have a common terminology for "assessment". Assessment is the gap between what you intend for your students to be able to do and what their actual performance is. The assessment process should be documentable. You are already doing this and the trick is to capture what is happening. That is what we are trying to coordinate.

We have been working on goal 5 of the IBHE *Illinois Commitment* for almost three years now. The general goal for program assessment is that by 2004, all academic programs will systematically assess student learning and use assessment results to improve programs. What does that look like? There are a number of elements that have to be in place: 1) statement of program goals; 2) intended student learning outcomes developed by each program's faculty; 3) systematic, multiple measures at critical points; and 4) feedback from key stakeholders. There also has to be evidence of the process for using the results to improve teaching and learning. "Process" is the key term. We are not looking for product and I don't believe that the IBHE is looking for product.

At this point, there is no template for what these documents are supposed to look like from each academic program. The assessment plans have to be context specific and work for your discipline, but it is important that all of the critical elements are there. All of the plans are posted on the web site:

<http://www.assessment.ilstu.edu/program>. Some departments are farther along than others. Our deadline to get this finished is June 1, 2003. That will give us a full year of refinement before the IBHE starts to take a look at it in 2004.

In 2000, the “National Report Card” by the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education was released. This was the first-ever look at all 50 states and grades were assigned to each state in six areas: preparation for college, affordability, participation in college, graduation rates, benefits to the state and student learning. The State of Illinois received an A in preparation, participation and affordability. We received a C+ in completion and a B- in benefits to the state. The sixth area was one in which no state received a grade. That was in the area of student learning. It was determined at the national level that there are no common measurements that can be used to compare states to states.

The pilot project, in which four states are involved, plans to look at snap shots of data elements: licensure tests, graduation admission tests, assessment of adult literacy, surveys of student engagements, Collegiate Learning Assessment and others. If we participate as an institution, our students would only be involved in the Collegiate Learning Assessment and the National Survey of Student of Engagement, in which we already participate. They would take about 12,000 first semester seniors from around the state, probably about 100 to 150 from Illinois State University. Then someone within the institution, probably the Assessment Office, would get them together to take the Collegiate Learning Assessment and the National Survey of Student Engagement. The model would never compare institutions but would provide a snapshot of measurements for the state. At the heart of our decision to be involved is that we need to be active participants in building the model.

What are our next steps? We will continue with the program assessment piece and the additional piece in goal 5 of the *Illinois Commitment* that findings and recommendations for improvement are monitored by the institutions for results at least yearly. We need to continue with our General Education assessment strategies and the General Education Coordinating Committee is the best group to address the end of program issues. I do recommend that we participate in the national project to be there to truly shape the process at the state and national levels.

Senator Mohammadi: Could you tell us how the IBHE is going to use the results of this assessment?

Dr. Troxel: That’s what I would like to know. I really can’t answer that.

Senator Borg: What is the mix of possible participating institutions within the state among private and public universities and is the Board of Higher Education providing additional funds to do this?

Dr. Troxel: It is clear that they will try to get a representative sample of institutions within the State. The Pew Charitable Trust is funding the project nationally. I am told that the cost to the institution will be in the recruitment of the 100 to 150 students to take the assessments. Most of that will be human resources rather than fiscal resources, probably by the University Assessment Office. The project hopes to hold in reserve incentives for students so that they will actually show up.

Senator Reid: Your handout reads, “By 2004, all academic programs will systematically assess student

learning..." Does that mean that by spring of 2004, we will have assessed student learning or that by fall of 2004 we will begin assessing student learning?

Dr. Troxel: My understanding is that if you can show that there is a process in place, even if you don't have all of the evidence that you need, that that would satisfy the requirement. You will have to write a report for an institutional entity to review.

Senator Reid: When will the first report on actual outcomes have to be sent up to whatever this entity is.

Dr. Troxel: I would think that by 2004 you would need to show that there are some outcomes being assessed. That is not clear in the document. I really think it is the start of the academic year of 2004-2005. We have to come up with a way to review these. We do have an institution wide coordinating council that is currently going through a review of itself with recommendations to become a faculty driven group. This then could be a group where these kinds of issues could land and get really good analysis and review. Senator Crothers and I have talked about what kind of connections we can have to the Academic Planning Committee.

Senator Lindblom: I want to commend you on the multi-modal aspect and also the insistence that you are making that assessments be content-specific and unique. What kinds of things can the faculty do to help your office and what kinds of things can we do that are not related to your office?

Dr. Troxel: Insisting on full faculty involvement at the department level is probably the most important suggestion. As far as our office is concerned, use us more. The third thing is to get involved in the Assessment Coordinating Council when it becomes a faculty driven group.

Senator Ghrist: Do you know of any reaction from the Student Advisory Council to the IBHE in regard to these assessments?

Dr. Troxel: I have not been to that group, but I would be happy to talk to them about it.

Information Items:

02.17.03.01 Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Policies and Procedures (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid: We have combined the Academic Freedom Committee with the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee. The reason for combining those committees was because there was some confusion about which document covered which cases.

If you look at the flow chart, the procedures have not changed dramatically for filing a grievance and for having it considered by the different committees. The first change here is that we have added discretionary conciliation efforts by the chairperson. This is the second attempt at conciliation, not just by the deans and the chairs before it comes into the committee, but also with the chair of the new committee, the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee (AFEGC). If they can't resolve it, we have the preliminary hearing with three members. The preliminary hearing generally would be just based on statements, but it can bring in witnesses and evidence. At that point, the preliminary hearing committee can decide on mutually agreed relief, they can recommend a further hearing or they can dismiss it. One of the major things that we have changed is that after it goes through the Faculty Hearing Committee, the person charged can bring an appeal to a special Appeals Committee. We have chosen to put that Appeals Committee after the formal hearing because we felt that that was the most important decision to be made and could culminate in major punishment of some type against a faculty member. Since we have taken the appeals away from the charged

person after the first preliminary hearing, we have added two levels of semi-appeals. One is that they can bring new evidence and ask for reconsideration by the Faculty Hearing Committee. The other is if it is being dismissed, the person bringing the grievance can appeal it to the chair of the committee. The proposed AFEGC document would include non-tenure track faculty and Faculty Associates. This document excludes any grievance brought under Integrity in Research and Scholarly Activity. It does include any question about the ASPT process in terms of following due process of the rules.

I would like to make several changes before we begin discussion. On page 2, A.7 at the bottom, add “in” after the word “listed”. On pages 7 to 8, statements are numbered 1, 2, 3... even though they are in different sections. On page 2, B.1, we need to add “Except for cases provided for in A.3 to A.6, the ASPT guidelines provide for exclusive faculty jurisdiction (and the AFEGC has no jurisdiction) in the following cases:” I will add that to the new document. This document has taken us about two years to complete.

Senator Crothers: I would like to commend the Rules Committee and Senator Reid for the extraordinary diligence that was involved in reconstructing this proposal.

Senator Armstrong: Is there a role of the Faculty Caucus in this process?

Senator Reid: Yes, it missing on the flow chart, but not in the document. You will find this on page 11, at the bottom, #12.

This item will come before the Senate as an action item at the next Senate meeting.

05.28.02.04A *Council for Teacher Education Bylaws (Rules Committee and Academic Affairs Committee)*

Senator Lindblom: We only made one change, which we pointed out during the meeting. On page two, three lines from the bottom, we added, “Reporting: Council for Teacher Education reports to the Academic Affairs Committee and to the Provost.” That is verbatim the line from the Senate Blue Book.

Senator Reid: The major changes are on page 7, 8 and 9. You will notice an entire new procedure for student appeals.

Motion XXXIV-89: By Senator Reid, second by Senator Lindblom, to move the revised Council for Teacher Education bylaws to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIV-90: By Senator Lindblom, second by Senator Reid, to approve the CTE bylaws. The bylaws were unanimously approved.

03.29.02.01 *Graduate School Bylaws (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid: In the revisions to the Graduate School Bylaws, they have deleted the sentence referring to annual meetings and left in the sections referring to special meetings.

Senator Borg: I noticed in the struck out portion that it mentioned that a quorum was the number present, but that stipulation is no longer a part of this. Should that be included?

Senator Reid: I would be glad to ask that question before the next meeting and find out if they would like to have that added.

This item will come before the Senate as an action item at its next meeting.

Budget Session

Senator Crothers: The President has required the University to hold back \$2 million, but at this point, there is no requirement that the money be sent back to Springfield. Is that correct?

Senator Bragg: That is correct.

Senator Crothers: The question is whether they are going to ask for \$7 million this year or next. Is that correct?

Senator Bragg: That is correct.

Senator Crothers: Perhaps you could help us understand where the \$2 million that is currently being held is coming from and if it is likely to change any of our current operating plans.

Senator Bowman: The whole university has a contingency fund for just this very event. So, a portion of those funds have been placed into that \$2 million reserve. In looking at the impact that would likely have on URG's and summer school, it appears that summer school would be able to move forward as planned even with the \$2 million held in reserve.

Senator Fowles: You said that summer school would be ok, but you did not speak to URG's. Was that intentional?

Provost Bowman: No, that was unintentional. Much of the URG spending has actually already taken place.

Senator Crothers: You are then still intending to fund promotion pay increases?

Senator Bowman: Absolutely. I think it is safe to say that we will not go back to the days of dry promotions. I think that is a mistake. If our appropriation is cut again in 04, it will make it that more difficult to provide promotions, but we will find a way to do it.

Senator Crothers: What happens if they ask for \$7 million in the next three months? How can the Senate help you clarify where such monies might be discovered?

Senator Bragg: In the short run, there is very little that you can do to help us identify where we would find \$7 million of the \$28 million that we have in General Revenue Funds, of which we have committed \$26.9 million for salaries. Frankly, we would be looking at personnel; 78% of our expenditures are in personnel, so we would have to look there.

Senator Crothers: Whatever rescission might come would likely be permanent?

Senator Bragg: Everything is very fluid right now. We have to mitigate downside risks, but there is going to be a lot of process to go through before this is final.

Senator Reid: If we have to cut that \$7 million this spring and we have to cut personnel, could that mean cutting or reducing faculty salaries; does that mean firing someone at that the last minute?

Senator Bragg: We have not even modeled what we would do on salaries or layoffs. I am just making the assertion that 78% of our expenditures are in personnel, so we would have to look at personal services. It is really premature to speculate.

Senator Razaki: When do you think the situation will be finalized?

Senator Bragg: We have been told to expect multiple hearings this year in the House and in the Senate, so I suspect we will be asked to come back in April and testify again. Given the complexity of the budget, my best guess is that this General Assembly session will go past its expected May closure date and we won't know much about our appropriation until June this year.

Senator Borg: If the \$7 million rescission does occur, will that be between now and July 1?

Senator Bragg: The process that they have intimated is to put the \$7 million into a reserve against which we could plead necessity.

Senator Mohammadi: Do you think that the \$2 million or \$7 million is going to be a cut just for one year or would this proceed to future years.

Senator Bragg: I think that this will proceed into the FY04 appropriation.

Senator Lindblom: Are the positions for our new hires in jeopardy?

Provost Bowman: We will meet our contractual obligations and we will make the Governor's office aware of the impact that these cuts could have on the campus. A \$7 million cut at this late stage would make it very difficult to meet our contractual obligations and all of the state universities will drive that point home.

Senator Burk: If we have the size of cuts that we are discussing, does this mean that we will honor our new faculty and we won't honor the people who have worked here for a long time.

Provost Bowman: I just want to emphasize that the University will meet its contractual obligations and that includes existing employees and those to which we have promised jobs in writing. We will find a way to do that.

Senator Maroules: I urge all of the students to write a letter to the Governor just as a citizen attending a university that is publicly funded. We do not support a university that cannot provide the central services and can't retain faculty because of these budget cuts. Possibly that could have some influence.

Senator Bragg: In response to the question of what can the Senate do to help, in the long run, you can do a lot. We really absolutely need your participation and advice in helping us think through priorities at the institution. There are a lot of choices that have to be made. Central administration is not in the best position to make those difficult decisions at the departmental level. We need your participation.

Senator Reid: What is the best way we can discuss priorities and get advice to you?

Senator Bragg: These sessions will be very helpful especially if you go back and discuss them in your departments and colleges and bring forward your colleagues' perspectives.

Senator Reid: I don't know what the options are, so it is very hard for me to even think of what the priorities should be.

Senator Bragg: You just discussed some of them--the relative importance of filling vacant positions versus current positions. Do we support the existing array of services, programs and activities and take the cuts across the board, or do we look more selectively at where cuts should occur?

Senator Reid: It would be helpful if we could bring up possibilities and get a sense of what type of savings would actually come. How can we begin to talk about these priorities?

Senator Crothers: The Planning and Finance Committee will be bringing forward a general statement about priorities. These budget sessions are likely to be structural to every meeting. I suggest that if anyone has a question, I image Senator Bragg would be able to find a dollar answer to that question and bring it back to these sessions for discussion or contact you by e-mail.

Senator Reid: What would we save by cutting CAT.

Senator Bowman: I think it would be about \$100,000.

Senator Fowles: What about as a temporary measure abandoning our fleet of cars or is that in the other budget pot that we can't touch?

Senator Bragg: Some of it is in the other budget pot that wouldn't offset cuts, but some of it is general revenue. I can't recall what savings that would generate, but I will bring that information to the next meeting.

Senator Razaki: Can we set up a system where anyone on campus can contact your office and name a specific program and then you would provide cost information about those programs?

Senator Bragg: I hesitate to open the flood gates and not be able to deliver in that process. What I would like to do is at the next session identify a process of getting you more specific budget information associated with organizational units or functions. 78 cents out of every dollar is spent on people. You can look at all of the operating expenditures, but to make substantial, fundamental changes, you are talking about personnel services.

Senator Pryor: What is the total budget for summer school?

Provost Bowman: I believe it is \$835,000, not counting some monies that are in individual departments.

Senator Maroules: Is there a general idea of how much is spent on Academic Advisement personnel? Possibly we could look at asking the faculty if they would be willing to take over those roles?

Provost Bowman: We spend a fair amount of money on Academic Advisement. At one time, all advisement was done by faculty members and we moved away from that model because of student complaints about the quality of the advisement. To go back to that model, I think we would give up some of the efficiency and accuracy that students have come to enjoy, but when budgets are tight, that, like everything else, has to be looked at.

Senator Reid: Can you give us some sense of what we would save by cutting advisement?

Provost Bowman: Not at this point, but I can come back with that number.

Communications:

Senator Crothers: Dr. Joe Rives has asked me to ask any senator or any member of our community interested in assisting the *Educating Illinois* team and the IBHE team concerning the *Illinois Commitment* on questions of the Performance Indicator Summary, Suggested Illinois State University Benchmark Schools or Mission Specific Indicators for all Illinois Public Universities to please contact him (jarives@ilstu.edu).

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-91: To adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate
408 Hovey Hall
Mail Code 1830
Normal, IL 61790-1830
309-438-8735
acsenate@ilstu.edu