

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

April 9, 2003

Volume XXXIV, No. 15

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 March 26, 2003

Motion XXXIV-107: By Senator Reynolds, second by Senator Mehta, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of March 26, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: The Governor gave his budget address today. We are going to have multiple opportunities to discuss it. It does look like it is going to be a lean few years.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Meister: Thank you to Chairperson Crothers. He gave the student senators direction in the orientation meeting this evening.

President's Remarks

Dr. Bowman, Interim President Designee, spoke in President Boschini's absence.

Dr. Bowman: A number of transition activities are underway in the President's office. The President and I are working very closely on a number of items, particularly the budget. One point I would like to make about the governor's recommendation is that this is the first round of a long and very difficult process. These numbers are not etched in stone. We don't know what our final appropriation will be. The budget recommendation for higher ed was 1.3 billion in general funds, which is about 7.9% less than FY03. The governor has shown a willingness to work with the higher education community. I think that is evidenced by his flexibility on the FY03 reserve proposal, which was originally at 8% and was revised downward to 2.9%. That was a major factor in allowing us to move forward with our summer school plans.

One of the few capital projects recommended for 04 included our \$22 million Life Safety Project for Stevenson and Turner. That will involve replacing fire alarms and upgrading electrical systems, plus some major asbestos abatement work. There has been a lot of discussion about the Schroeder project. I have every reason to believe that that project will move forward just as planned.

A question I would anticipate is 'will there be lay offs?' That issue will depend in a large part on what our final appropriation is. I think it is safe to say that we will employ fewer people in fall 03, but the magnitude of that reduction will really depend on the final appropriation. Given the dire circumstances, things could have been much worse. I am mildly optimistic that we will be able to get through the next year or two or three without injuring the institution and with continuing our forward progress.

Senator Mohammadi: Given the proposed budget cuts, some of the departments have been thinking of getting rid of their graduate programs. What is the University's position on the graduate programs?

Dr. Bowman: The graduate programs add to the distinctiveness of Illinois State; I think that it would be a mistake for us to back away from our commitment to those programs.

Senator Razaki: Is the summer school funding totally intact and will the full summer schedule be offered?

Dr. Bowman: There was \$833,000 set aside for summer school and that will go forward.

Senator Razaki: Can we lower enrollment to less than 20,000 students?

Dr. Bowman: I think it is worthy of discussion in this body to look at what the appropriate enrollment is for the institution. That said we have a bond rating and future obligations that are built upon a stable enrollment.

Senator Kurtz: Are we going to get any guidance from you about what the institutional priorities are when we make these cuts?

Dr. Bowman: We certainly don't expect departments to make those kinds of decisions without input from central administration and without some relief on the budget side. You will get lots of guidance from me through the vice presidents, particularly the Provost. We have the capacity to manage this budget in a way that shields the academic side from the worst of the cuts and that is the way I plan to proceed.

Senator Virgil: A number of graduate students have been concerned about the number of graduate assistantships that might be offered next fall. How will that be affected by these cuts?

Dr. Bowman: Right now, I don't know, because I don't know what our final appropriation will be.

Senator Jerich: At a previous meeting, President Boschini said that if we had further budget cuts, enrollment in classes would increase. If that will be the case, faculty will be spend more time dealing with more roles and responsibilities from the instructional side. Will the University considering a lessening of the scholarship requirements and/or service requirements as far as the ASPT processes?

Dr. Bowman: Everyone is going to have to sacrifice somewhat to get through this. What I am not willing to do is to alter those things that make us attractive as an institution. I think the scholarly activity and the scholarly expectations are part of what have allowed the University to advance.

Senator Crothers: The ASPT process is housed within the Senate and not the President's office.

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's Remarks – No report.

Vice President of Student Affairs's Remarks

Senator Mamarchev: Welcome to all of our new student senators. I want to remind everyone that we are exactly one month away from six commencements.

Senator Razaki: Obviously, there are going to be substantial cuts in your area in terms of student services. Has your division been working on how to meet those budget cuts?

Senator Mamarchev: Yes, we have.

Senator Razaki: Will there be a substantial cut in services provided to students?

Senator Mamarchev: Yes, because most of our money is in people and people provide services.

Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks

Senator Bragg: I do want to elaborate on the Schroeder Hall situation. We were informed by Capital Development that they are moving the date for the opening of the bids from the prime contractors to May 1. Then the opening of the bids from the general contractors would be May 8. We are confident that they are going to move forward, but I can't guarantee that that is going to happen.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Lindblom: The committee met with the Council for Teacher Education and talked specifically about live text e-portfolio recommendations for all teacher education students throughout the University. The larger purpose of the meeting was to establish a more open and frequent communication between the Academic Affairs Committee and the Council for Teacher Education. The Senate's representative to CTE is vacant.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Boser: We met this evening briefly to discuss the role of Administrative Affairs.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Winchip: We did meet tonight, but we did not have a quorum to resolve some of the issues that we have been working on.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Kurtz: The first action item tonight is out of our committee. It is the report of the committee's discussion of institution goals and priorities based on *Educating Illinois*. This is the committee's first attempt at establishing institutional priorities according to which budget decisions can be made. Next week, the four vice presidents will be meeting with the committee to talk about the current budget situation.

Rules Committee

Senator Reid: The committee has completed our work on the College of Education Bylaws. They will come to you at the next meeting. We also worked on a revision of the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance document and amendments to the bylaws and Blue Book.

IBHE-FAC Report

Senator Jerich: The full group of the Faculty Advisory Council met at Trinity College. I will share with you four major issues that we are very assertively dealing with. House Bill 2805 has passed. This now recommends that a faculty member from a public institution become a member of the Board of Higher Education. The FAC has been very diligent in trying to promote this. In the past, the only body not represented on the Board's membership was from the faculty itself. The FAC considered the ramifications of the reconstitution of boards, especially in relation to SURS. One of subcommittees is going to address that issue in earnest. The third major initiative is the Illinois Articulation Initiative. There seems to be a lot of concern about the connection between community colleges, four-year institutions and privates. Finally, the

FAC is requesting that individual institutions consider the endorsement of the Seventh Commitment. The FAC has recommended that a seventh goal be added to the *Illinois Commitment*. The Board of Higher Ed, thus far, has looked at it very favorably. I have asked Senator Crothers to place it on the next agenda of the Senate.

Action Items:

08.13.02.01 College of Fine Arts Bylaws (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid: We had a number of questions last time about the College of Fine Arts Bylaws and we have invited Dr. John Urice to speak to those issues.

Dr. Urice: We had no difficulty changing *Robert's Rules of Order – Revised*, to “the most recent edition of *Roberts's Rules of Order*”. There apparently was a clerical error in the copying of the revised bylaws that were sent out, which lacked the recognition that we had conducted a college-wide referendum concerning the bylaws. They were approved in the referendum that was conducted between April 19 and April 23, 2002 with overwhelming support from faculty, students and staff. We feel that all due process was followed and that it was just improperly recorded on the copy advanced to you last August. There was a question raised about why students were recommended to be appointed by the directors in our schools as opposed to being elected. In the past, there has never been a within our college a formal mechanism for such elections. Elections are held within schools usually during the first week of the fall semester. Traditionally, we have had little or no student representation as a result of that process. The appointment process, which was used informally this year, has resulted in an attendance rate very close to 90% for our students. The bylaws specifically state that the directors of the schools should consult with faculty and students before making an appointment. We think this is a way to assure that we will have student representation, which we so greatly value.

Senator Razaki: How do the names come to the dean or whomever? Do the faculty members recommend students they know?

Dr. Urice: Directors are required to consult with the faculty. This is normally done at the first faculty meeting announcing what vacancies exist and seeking recommendations. The same conversation is held at the students' first collective meeting, at least in the School of Theatre, announcing that these positions are open and that anyone who is interested should contact the director. There is generally is not a rigorous screening process. The ones the director believes will best serve the student constituency are usually asked to serve.

Senator Maroules: From which students does the director seek out advice?

Dr. Urice: In most schools, there is an orientation meeting to which all students are invited. It is at that point that the announcement is made that we are seeking members. Those interested will usually identify not only a faculty contact, but a student who may have served on the council to provide additional information.

Senator Mehta: Are freshmen asked to be on this committee?

Dr. Urice: To best of my knowledge, they are made aware of the council; but it is extremely unlikely, either through an electoral process or an appointment process, that freshmen would want to serve or would be considered viable to serve in their first year.

Senator Mehta: Is there anyway that you can put out applications for students, who may be interested later on, but who don't have the interest in the beginning? A selection could be made from that instead of just appointing a student from recommendations or just interested students.

Dr. Urice: We do a variation of that as any student may self-nominate. We have tried in the past various forms of written documents to communicate, but, generally, freshmen are not particularly interested.

Senator Mehta: According to this, freshmen can't even be on the council. Couldn't there be an application process? You have a whole year to tell freshmen that there is a great opportunity to serve on the council.

Dr. Urice: Yes, that could easily be done.

Senator Mehta: Would elections not be something that would be feasible?

Dr. Urice: No, we do not believe so based on past history.

Senator Maroules: Was the whole problem with the election process that they did not get students who were dedicated to serve? Do you think that the appointment process is going to rectify that?

Dr. Urice: I don't know what the reasons were. I know the electoral process was seen by students, faculty and directors as being inefficient. We do feel the appointment process has yielded students who have demonstrated excellent commitment and very strong representation of the student perspective.

Senator Mehta: What was the reason it was inefficient?

Dr. Urice: There is no mechanism within our college for such elections. We don't have student organizations set up to conduct elections for college-wide or school-wide positions.

Senator Mehta: Actually you can go through the portal to do that.

Dr. Urice: When we are confident that is fully functional for our needs, we would be certainly happy to revisit it.

Dr. Walker, Associate Dean of the College of Fine Arts: It was inefficient in the sense that it was inefficient for the council to operate. We were having problems with having enough students for the council to actually function as a council. This process allows us to find students who have an interest in this who know what is going on within the college.

Senator Jerich: Would freshmen be able to serve later on either by appointment or election?

Dr. Walker: I believe your question is about midyear appointments. I believe it is the intent of the council to have beginning year appointments so that students can serve the full year.

Vote on Approval of Bylaws: The College of Fine Arts Bylaws were approved by the Senate. There was one no vote from Senator Mehta. All other votes were in the affirmative.

03.19.03.01 Institutional Goals and Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee)

Motion XXXIV-108: By Senator Kurtz to approve the Institutional Goals and Priorities Report from the Planning and Finance Committee.

Senator Ghrist: I have a question about the differences between item 27 and 28. They seem closely related.

Why are separated so far apart as priorities. Item 27 is to raise faculty salaries to enable the institution to attract and retain top faculty.

Senator Kurtz: The highest priorities were what we were talking about for next year and the year following. You are right. They are very closely related, but please take into account that when we are talking about the next three to five years, that also includes the next one to two years.

Senator Crothers: There are different needs sometimes for different faculty on a host of issues. So, we are making a statement that if you are biology professor and you would like a new lab, this document, as it is written, would tend to tell that professor that what we are likely to do, if we can, is give you a pay raise, but we might not have enough money to help you out upgrading your lab space. You might have to wait a couple of years for that. That might indeed harm their retention, but we are drawing that distinction.

Senator Ghrist: So, the distinction lies in raises within the next one to two years and aiding money for research and facilities within the next three to five years.

Senator Crothers: That is a very specific example to a general phenomenon, so please don't characterize it quite that way.

Senator Kurtz: The highest recommendations don't disappear over the next three to five years. Those remain priorities.

Senator Lindblom: It is a bad time for us to put forth a document that is announcing that we want to increase faculty salaries without making sure that we are making ourselves clear about that. If you remember the SGA President's comments at the last meeting turned very quickly to why, in this context, are faculty just taking care of themselves essentially. In the section 'recommendation for highest priorities for next year', I think we should consider being more rhetorically sensitive to the fact that it is a difficult time to make this kind of a statement. We could make the second paragraph in that section, which starts, "The subcommittee is recommending...", the last paragraph of the section. Therefore, what comes before the actual recommendations are all of the arguments giving the context for why those recommendations make sense.

Senator Kurtz: That sounds like a friendly amendment, but I did not quite follow it.

Senator Lindblom: On page 2, "The subcommittee is recommending..." Place the whole paragraph, including the bullets, at the bottom of that section.

Senator Kurtz: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Mehta: I see a lot of things about recruiting faculty and future students. What about the current students? What does the committee see that would benefit the current students?

Senator Kurtz: First, if you had before you the list of action items in *Educating Illinois* that are already completed, you would see that the vast majority of those do pertain to students who are already here. Secondly, as a department chair, who is dealing with issues of faculty recruitment and retention, the most important part of my job is putting high quality faculty in front of classrooms. Even though it looks to be faculty centered, of the essence, it is delivering on our core mission to our students.

Senator Maroules: I completely agree and I think the University should continue to do all it can to retain

topnotch faculty to make sure that students get the best education possible. As a student looking at this document, it is kind of misleading. Why did the committee decide to separate action items 27 and 50 from the other eight recommendations for the next three to five years? The only concern I have is that this indicates that the only thing we should consider right now are faculty salary increases--no matter if that means slowing the process down on all of the other action items. I don't think students should go on record as saying that is what they agree with.

Senator Kurtz: This document was initiated and virtually completed during the fall semester in the context of what were then being declared to be the top institutional priorities by the President, who in his State of University Address, said that raising faculty-staff salaries was the institution's top priority. In part, the committee in making these recommendations was trying to put itself on the same page as the President. If we were doing this document now in the face of the current budget crisis, we might not formulate it in exactly the same way.

Senator Crothers: I disagree with Senator Kurtz on that point.

Senator Ghrist: I would like to reiterate what Senator Maroules said. As a student, it is kind of misleading, considering the budgetary issues that we are coming forth with, that these items are separated from our other distinctive items.

Senator Crothers: I don't think that the document is misleading. What you may mean is that it is putting the emphasis disproportionately on faculty-staff salaries. That is true, but it is not misleading.

Senator Maroules: I think it is misleading in the sense it gives a false impression of what we think the aggregate is of all the different priorities.

Senator Crothers: Then you disagree with the document as drafted. The document is still not misleading.

Senator Schilb: With the current the governor talking about administrative bloat and we are talking about increasing faculty and staff salaries, what kind of message is that sending to Springfield? I agree with increasing faculty salaries, but I don't know if staff salaries are a priority.

Senator Kurtz: Staff includes civil service as well as administrative professionals. When he refers to administrative bloat, he is not primarily, I believe, referring to the salaries, but rather to numbers.

Senator Meister: If you raise faculty salaries, that alone in itself is an attempt to recruit and retain faculty. Why did you later include item 28, 'allocate additional resources for recruitment and retention'? It seems much of the same.

Senator Kurtz: I can only reiterate what Senator Crothers said. Salaries are only one element in recruitment and retention. I failed utterly to recruit two faculty members and some of the reasons they gave for turning us down were not just that the salary was too low, but that there was insufficient research support here and there was insufficient opportunity to teach summer school. There are a whole host of things that are involved in recruitment and retention.

Senator Razaki: There will be a large number of faculty who will be retiring in the next few years. You are not going to be able to recruit new people without much higher salaries. The number one priority has to be increasing faculty salaries.

Senator Fowles: A lot of the student items that are in *Educating Illinois* have already been accomplished. Much of the funding for those comes out of student fees. What we are trying to say with these priorities is if there are any monies left out of the general funds, we would like that funding to go to faculty and staff salaries.

Senator Barone: I think what is unsettling to the students is looking at the highest priorities and seeing faculty and staff mentioned and students omitted. Students are part our University and symbolically not having an item there with their name on it is unsettling. The theme of our highest priority should be trying to retain the good people we have here. Therefore, as a friendly amendment, I would like to recommend that item number 16, 'develop a comprehensive student retention plan', be moved up into the first group.

Senator Kurtz: I accept the amendment, but it will take some rhetorical tweaking because the text in the first section deals with the loss of instructional capacity.

Senator Crothers: The friendly amendment is accepted; we will bring this back as an action item in two weeks.

Senator Ghirst: I don't think that anything has been said by the students here that we question the importance of faculty raises. However, we question the separation of the items in this document, not the importance of the items.

Information Items:

Panel of 10 Vita (Election of Panel of 10 on April 23, 2003)

Senator Crothers: You received in your packet Panel of 10 vita. For those of you who do not know, the Panel of 10 is an annually elected group of faculty from whom the chairs of search committees for senior administrators can be selected, with the exception of the President. In two weeks we will have an election.

Senator Razaki: Membership on the Panel of 10 is a very prestigious thing because these people, if selected, are going to lead major searches. Yet, I see people without too much experience applying for these positions. Do people really know what is being asked for and the kind of stature that we need?

Senator Crothers: I don't know. Would you like to ask the Executive Committee to place on the Rules Committee's agenda an item to reconsider the rules for eligibility?

Senator Reid: I do not believe that we decide the description of this. It is an administrative committee.

Senator Crothers: That conversation can also be initiated.

02.04.03.01 Social Work Proposals (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Lindblom: This information item is coming from the Academic Affairs Committee. It is in regard to three Social Work program proposals. Those program changes briefly are as follows: the first proposal moves one course that is currently a 'hidden' prerequisite to the status of Foundation courses. It makes it more visible to the majors in the program. The next two changes are related. They are transforming their B.A./B.S. degree to a BSW, a Bachelor of Social Work. That requires two changes—eliminating the B.A./B.S. and then creating the BSW.

Motion XXXIV-109: By Senator Lindblom, second by Senator Crumpler, to move the approval of the Social Work proposals to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIV-110: By Senator Lindblom to approve the changes to the Social Work programs.

Senator Lindblom: I would like to invite to the table Professor Diane Zowsky, who is the director of these programs.

Senator Reid: I find it very disturbing that, in recent years, not only in this department, but many others, we are abandoning a liberal arts education by getting rid of B.A. degrees.

Professor Zowsky: I would like to point out that we, too, would be concerned about a diminishment of a liberal arts education. Therefore, we have asked that the requirement that formally students would have had with a B.A. or B.S. would be continued in the BSW.

Senator Reid: So you are requiring both of those?

Professor Zowsky: No, we are requiring one or the other just as our students now chose a B.S. or B.A.

The motion to approve the changes to the Social Work programs was unanimously approved.

03.27.03.05 Blue Book Revisions (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid informed the Senate of the major changes to the Blue Book. The Planning and Finance changes will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

Senator Lindblom: Is there an inconsistency on page 12 of the Rules Committee, item 9? It says that the Rules Committee will appoint the chair of the Academic Standards Committee each year and the first sentence of the Academic Standards Committee states that the chairperson is elected annually by the entire committee.

Senator Reid: I will make that deletion to the Rules Committee section.

Senator Mehta: Do you know why “student welfare” was taken away from the functions of the Athletic Council?

Senator Reid: I will find out before the next meeting. The only new change to the Faculty Caucus section is number 2. There were misunderstandings in terms of the relationship between the Faculty Caucus and the University Review Committee. Therefore, the proposed new wording is, “Proposals to modify the ASPT policies may initiated by the University Review Committee or the Faculty Caucus.” This is true now; we are just making it clear. The changes also include: “After consideration of a proposed modification, the URC will forward initial or revised wording to the Faculty Caucus. The Faculty Caucus may send a URC proposal back to the URC for further consideration. Final recommendations shall be made by the Faculty Caucus and transmitted directly to the office of the President.”

Senator Armstrong: Does the caucus make its recommendation to the President or to the Provost?

Senator Reid: To the President.

Senator Armstrong: I was just of the opinion that the chief academic officer would receive the ASPT modifications.

Senator Reid: That is the old wording, but we could consider that.

Motion XXXIV-111: By Senator Reid, second by Senator Aper, to move the Blue Book revisions to action. The Senate unanimously approved moving the item to action.

Motion XXXIV-112: By Senator Reid to approve the Blue Book changes, with the exception of the Planning and Finance Committee and Athletic Council sections. The document was unanimously approved.

03.28.03.01 *Constitution Revisions (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid informed the Senate of the major changes to the Constitution.

Senator Jerich: On page 3, B.1, under Termination of Appointment by the University, it reads “teachers or researchers”. Does that mean tenure appointment, probationary or non-tenure track? If they are considered a teacher, as a non-track person would be, and if you are a tenure track person, you could be dismissed for teaching and/or research?

Senator Reid: I believe the “or” is meant to say that cause for dismissal can relate to one or the other. It does not have to refer to both.

Senator Fowles: On page 2, B., non-tenure track do not hold academic rank. I know in our college some of our non-tenure track are considered instructional assistant professors.

Senator Crothers: As I understood it, those are titles that the University acknowledges are appropriate for such persons, but they do not have academic rank.

Senator Fowles: And they are not subject to ASPT?

Senator Crothers: That’s what I understand.

Senator Reid: That was a part of a change in terminology several years ago that went through the Senate for non-tenure track employees so they would have different grades.

Senator Crothers: On page 3, B., you will notice that there is a number 1 and a number 3, but there is no number 2. Also on page 4, Article 5, we have two paragraphs and then a number 5 and no item B.

The Constitution revisions will come before the Senate as an action item at the next Senate meeting.

03.28.03.02 *Academic Senate Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid informed the Senate of the major changes to the Senate Bylaws.

Senator Razaki: On page 10, item 7 at the bottom, the Athletic Council is under the SGA. Does that mean that the Senate still has some overview through SGA of the Athletic Council?

Senator Reid: The SGA is technically a committee of the Senate, but generally it would not come to us, I

would assume. There has been no proposal to change that.

Senator Razaki: It used to be that the Director of Athletics would come to the Senate once a year and give an overview about athlete graduation rates, etc.

Senator Reid: This says nothing about that. This is not a change; this is the way it has always been. One could propose a change, but we made no change in that.

Senator Razaki: On page 13, it reads that only full-time and part-time faculty shall be eligible to vote. My question has to do with the part-time Faculty Associates. What if they are teaching just one course? Are they still eligible?

Senator Reid: I can only say that this was the will of the Lab Schools, but it doesn't mean we have to accept it.

Senator Razaki: I think only full-time Faculty Associates shall be eligible to vote.

Senator Crothers: Since this is an information item, you could go back and ask them.

Senator Razaki: And whether they wanted a percentage associated with it, like 50% or 75% part-time.

Additional proposed revisions to the bylaws included changing "entire year" to "academic year" in Article 3, B.5 and a proposal of the determination of the Administrative and Professional Council and Civil Service Council representatives to the Senate.

Budget Session:

Senator Razaki: Is the Financial Exigency Committee going to be meeting soon in case there are layoffs planned?

Dr. Bowman: Unless the budget changes dramatically from what we know today, I don't see any reason to invoke financial exigency.

Senator Crothers: The two things that I noticed listening to the Governor's address were a linked set of proposals to cap tuition increases at 5% and to institute the guaranteed four-year tuition model, which when you are taking 10 or 12% cuts is an interesting combination.

Senator Bowman: The Joyce Bill and the tuition guarantee is less of a concern for us after we looked at the numbers. It is certainly something we can live with. Given the amount of support in Springfield for that bill, it is probably a foregone conclusion that it will pass. The more significant concern though is on caps. That is something we will work very hard to deal with. Caps at 5% would be problematic, particularly if inflation were to advance. Through our lobbyists, our area legislators and through every means possible, we will try to deal with that.

Senator Deutsch: Has there been any consideration given to the possibility of raising tuition more than a planned 10% in order to compensate for the possibility of tuition caps.

Dr. Bowman: Given the reductions we have suffered so far, we can get through this year as long as we have

the capacity to raise additional revenue. I am under the assumption that we will be allowed to do that. There is a realization there that we can't be expected to deal with a declining general revenue budget and to have our hands tied on the revenue enhancement side. I think that what we will be held to is to only make modest increases in tuition. After hearing the budget message today, it doesn't look that grim to me.

Senator Reid: Concerning the guaranteed tuition proposal--over the last four years, how much have we raised our tuition?

Dr. Bowman: Up until last year, the number had been in the 4 to 5% range average.

Senator Reid: Which meant that a student who came in would be paying 15% more by their senior year, whereas now they would only pay that original amount. That seems like a lot of money being lost over those four years.

Dr. Bowman: You can make the math work on the four years as long as inflation doesn't move ahead and as long as long as we are not capped at 5%.

Senator Crothers: It means that each incoming freshman has to be priced at what we believe our four-year needs would be for them.

Senator Brasseur: What do you think will be the status of faculty hiring and how that will be affected by the budget? We had some retirements and we were not allowed to fill those lines. If we have other people leaving, are we going to be able to replace positions?

Dr. Bowman: Given what is on the table right now, there is no question that many of those positions will be replaced. The question is how many of those we will be able to authorize and that will depend on our appropriation.

Senator Maroules: The SGA I believe unanimously approved as a recommendation a 5% increase in student fees. Where does that stand? Is that something that probably won't happen for the next year?

Dr. Bowman: I think that it is very unlikely that that would go through.

Senator Mehta: Assuming the 5% cap does not go through, what kind of recommendations would you give for an increase in tuition?

Dr. Bowman: It will depend on what our state appropriation is. Once we know what our number is, then we will know how much revenue we need to raise.

Senator Kurtz: I do appreciate, as any department chair would, the desire and intent to shield the academic side from the brunt of the cuts. I have to say though that in our college we have been asked to do a 5% budget cutting scenario for next year. There is very little leeway in where I can take that. I can give up a vacant tenure-track line, or I can decimate my NTTs or I can decimate our graduate program. I would say with even a 5% cut that we won't be shielded.

Dr. Bowman: I understand that. You are going through an exercise that presumes that there would be no relief and that is not the end that I have in mind. I hope that it is purely an exercise and we can provide some relief that will have discount whatever that number is.

Senator Kurtz: So you are hoping for less than 5% to the individual academic departments.

Dr. Bowman: Absolutely.

Senator Razaki: A number of faculty members have raised the issue over the years about administrators going on 11-month contracts rather than 12-month contracts and administrators teaching more courses. Is any consideration being given to those two issues?

Dr. Bowman: I have certainly raised the issue of having an expectation that administrators teach. How much, we can certainly debate. The 12-month issue is certainly worth putting on the table. Having served as a department chair, I know that the workload really doesn't diminish during the summer. But in tight budget times, we have to look to see if this is where we can save money temporarily until better times return.

Senator Razaki: I think that the University needs to look at all release time assignments. It should not just be left up to departments and colleges, but there should be an overall study of how release time is being used.

Dr. Bowman: That is something I have been concerned about for sometime, particularly release time that is used for administrative functions. Some of it is certainly worthwhile, but if our instructional capacity has been diminished, that is a place where we need to think about pulling back, at least on a temporary basis.

Senator Reid: Many academic advisors do very little in the summer. Is there any way to reduce their load?

Dr. Bowman: Dr. Thomas could speak more precisely to what the contracts are for people in the U-College. Certainly that needs to be on the table. I am not familiar enough with that budget to tell you if most of those people are on 10-month contracts or more. The Preview activity that takes place during the summer does require a certain level of advisement.

Senator Brasseur: The advisor in the English department probably doesn't have enough time to satisfy all of the things that need to be done. I think it varies by department.

Dr. Bowman: There is probably a difference between the advisement that is funded by department versus that funded by U-College.

Communications

Literary Presentation

Senator Burk: Milner Library and the Ames Library are sponsoring Joyce Carol Oates on Monday, April 21, at 7:00 p.m. in Braden. It is free and open to the public. There will be a book signing after the presentation.

FOI Forums

Senator Lindblom: There are two forums on FOI in the next week. Tomorrow there will be a faculty forum from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Faculty-Staff Commons and on Tuesday there is a student-faculty forum on FOI in Student Services 375.

Theatre Production

Senator Hampton: I have been asked to announce upcoming productions. *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way Forum* is starting on Friday.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-113: 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