

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

April 23, 2003

Volume XXXIV, No. 16

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 April 9, 2003

Motion XXXIV-116: By Senator Fowles, second by Senator Mehta, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of April 9, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: This is Administrative Professional Day, so we all owe a great thanks to Cynthia. Additionally, I wanted to extend my thanks to all of the retiring and departing senators. After talking with the Executive Committee and looking at the extensiveness of tonight's agenda, we are tonight going to re-institute what was once a common practice, the two times rule. You get two questions per topic. We have a lot to do tonight so we decided that that would be a way to help us expedite our activities.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Meister: To the student senators, I apologize that you didn't get your packets through some sort of miscommunication. The mailboxes in the SGA office got relabeled for the new senators, so I don't know where those packets were sent. Most of the new student senators that will be seated here in two weeks are here tonight.

President's Remarks

Dr. Bowman, Interim President Designee: The comprehensive campaign is still moving forward. Despite the gloomy economic news, we have had several six-figure gifts come in. We are also very close to securing several million plus gifts that we are very excited about. On the Schroeder front, there is nothing new to report, which is very good. We have not had any indication from Springfield that that project will not move forward. I expect the date for the opening of the bids to occur on schedule. We have had a running dialogue with a number of key people in Springfield regarding our budget, tuition issues, income fund retention and appropriation issues and I am very optimistic that we will be successful and able to move forward as an institution. Relative to the fall 03 freshman class, we are on track to admit the most academically talented class in our history. Our minority numbers are not only better in terms of percentages, but we have been able to attract a more academically talented pool of minority applicants. This is the first year that we have attracted a pool of minority applicants with ACT composites above 28.

Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's Remarks

Provost Presley: Along with the other vice presidents, I have been meeting with campus groups, including the Senate's finance committee, as we work to put together a plan for the budget next year. We are on track for that. We have a very fast schedule that we are going to have to meet. When we put it together for the Board of Trustees, it is necessarily going to be a very short and generalized plan.

Senator Razaki: Have you narrowed down the options in terms of where budget cutting will take place?

Provost Presley: No, I think that that would make useless one of the things we are making use of. You have seen a call for ideas to be e-mailed to Dr. Richard Dammers. There has been a heartening response to that, probably some 40 or so suggestions at length. We are still collecting information and ideas. If any of you have ideas, please send them to us.

Senator Jerich: Will this additional data be interfaced with the extensive data we collected when we had our special budget meeting earlier this year?

Senator Crothers: On February 19, the Senate held a special Senate meeting solely dedicated to questions of the budget. There are a number of sources of information, some of which I can forward to Provost Presley. Also, each of the vice presidents made statements at that meeting. The dean's representative and the Chair of the Chairs Council made statements at that meeting as well.

Provost Presley: I do have most of that material, but I would like to check it over with you to make sure I have a complete file.

Vice President of Student Affairs's Remarks

Senator Mamarchev: Similar to Senator Presley, we have been having conversations with Senator Meister, Senator Maroules and Senator Ghirst in keeping them posted on our thoughts and asking for their thoughts on priorities from the student perspective concerning the budget. We think that we may be having a record number of graduates from the College of Arts and Sciences this year. Right now, we have 1005 signed up to participate.

Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks

Senator Bragg: I would like to express my thanks to Martha Burk and the Civil Service Council for bringing to our attention the issue of identity theft and the wide spread use of social security numbers on this campus. As result of the letters that we received from the Civil Service Council, we have established a special committee to document all the use of social security numbers on campus. This is a prelude to a series of committees that we will establish as a result of that, which will look at how we can tighten the use of identifiers. That committee is being chaired by the University Data Administrator, Bill Cummins, and has representation from the Senate on it. We will probably take those results and form smaller groups to look at opportunity for implementation. Related to that, I had an opportunity to participate with some other members of the administration in a round table discussion this past week with members of the federal law enforcement agencies to discuss the USA Patriot Act. Last year, the federal government passed this in the aftermath of September 11. This gives the federal government much broader powers to investigate potential threats of terrorism, including looking at data and information sources on campus. We had a very helpful discussion with representatives from federal law enforcement agencies trying to understand how the USA Patriot Act affects other statutes that are on the books about privacy of information, the ability to subpoena information, or in some cases just garner information without subpoena in the context of the Homeland Security Act.

Senator Razaki: I read that some academic institutions have explicitly stated that they are not going to participate in that and will not provide information until they are subpoenaed. Does ISU have a stand like that?

Senator Bragg: It is not quite that simple. You can't actually say that we are not going to participate in

something. There are a variety of approaches and methods that law enforcement agencies can use and a variety of consultation methods that can be used to access information.

Senator Razaki: Will ISU do its level best to protect the privacy of those individuals without violating the law?

Senator Bragg: Absolutely.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Lindblom: The Academic Affairs Committee hosted two forums on FOI, one with faculty members and one with student members. We had attendance of about 15 to 20 at each event and had lively discussions of about 90 minutes. Several of us took notes at both of those forums and we are currently now going through that information and trying to generate useful summaries, questions and suggestions, which we will bring back to the General Education Council. With that council, the Academic Affairs Committee will negotiate a page or two on where the information from those forums and other data have brought us over the summer or early next semester. We will then bring it to the Senate as a communications item. At that point, we will move into the second year and second phase of the five-year review of the Gen Ed program and begin looking at the program as a whole.

Senator Brasseur: I noticed that the time of the forums was around 5:00 p.m., which was a difficult time for me and other people to make. Would your committee consider in the fall having meetings at a variety of times?

Senator Lindblom: What we decided to do rather than hold several meetings at different times was to make my e-mail address available to people so that they could submit directly to me any comments they wish to make. I will continue to accept those comments and work them into the process throughout the five-year review. I will bring it to the committee's attention that we should consider hosting more than just two forums next year when we discuss the Gen Ed program overall.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee – No Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Winchip: We did come to a number of resolutions—the Distinguished Professor Policy, the ombudsman position and we also approved the Domestic Partners Resolution. All of those issues will be brought to the Senate.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Kurtz: I would like to express thanks to my colleagues on Finance and Planning. This is a committee that has met weekly for two years. I would also like to thank the student representation on the committee this year and single out Senator O'Brien for her particularly vigorous participation. The four vice presidents met last week with Planning and Finance. We want to thank them for a frank, open and productive discussion of institutional priorities. You have before you in the packets the revised version of the committee's final report on institutional goals and priorities, which is an action item this evening. We will also be bringing forward at the final Senate meeting as an advisory item the current version of our recommendations concerning how the University should go about establishing institutional priorities and our

provisional model for integrating more closely planning and budgeting on the departmental, collegiate and University levels and also making shared governance bodies more intimately involved with those processes.

Rules Committee

Senator Reid: I would to thank everyone on the Rules Committee, particularly those who have been on it for two years. We have worked on a number of documents. This year we met every week until late in the spring. We not only worked through over a two year period the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee Policy, but we have finally finished revisions for the time being to the Constitution, Blue Book, bylaws and many other documents. People have been just great.

Action Items:

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

Senator Kurtz: What you have before you is a slightly revised version of a document that had gone forward in your previous packet. There were just two slight changes, both accepted as friendly amendments. One was a rhetorical tweaking to the initial section that was suggested by Senator Lindblom. The other was a friendly amendment from Senator Barone to move item 16 to the list of the highest institutional priorities for the next one to two years. The committee discussed and agreed that we bring forward for your consideration as part of the discussion some data from the *American Association of University Professors*, which publishes annually the "Economic Status of the Profession." It recently appeared. This is their annual survey of faculty salaries nationwide. Illinois State ranks in the bottom 20% nationally on faculty salaries and faculty benefits among all doctoral institution. Among the public institutions in the State of Illinois, we rank next to last on faculty salaries and faculty benefits when all ranks are taken into account. The only institution that is worst than Illinois State statewide is Northeastern University. So, we can see our competitive position on faculty salaries and benefits nationally and even within the state is steadily worsening. The committee introduces this data as one more item to be considered as context for this report.

Motion XXXIV-117: By Senator Kurtz to accept the Institutional Goals and Priorities Report from the Planning and Finance Committee.

Senator Mohammadi: Is there any evidence of the factors that contributed to such a low growth in salaries at ISU? What has been the role of administration? Has the administration fought for a raise in salary for the faculty?

Senator Kurtz: I have no information on that. I think that question would be more appropriately addressed by members of the administration.

Senator Maroules: Is your committee recommending any particular initiatives to increase Illinois State University's competitiveness with the information you presented for the next one to two years?

Senator Kurtz: Our committee was charged with addressing prioritization and we elected to do so within the context of the action items of *Educating Illinois*. We are not specifically recommending means of implementing this recommendation. Once again, it is the administration that would implement any priority.

Senator Maroules: So the recommendation then is to increase the competitiveness among faculty salaries?

Senator Kurtz: And staff salaries. Unfortunately, I don't have any national data available on staff salaries.

Senator Borg: I notice on page two of the document as revised that the two items, items 27 and 50, plus the prefatory sentence appear twice on the page. I assume that it belongs in the lower position rather than the upper position?

Senator Kurtz: That is correct.

Senator Crothers: We will take that as an amendment that will be corrected when the policy is formally forwarded to the President.

Senator Jerich: Has consideration or distinction been given to faculty salaries for members of the ISU community who hold academic professional administrative appointments—for example, a dean or vice president?

Senator Crothers: The answer is no.

Vote on Motion: The motion to approve the Institutional Goals and Priorities Report, as revised, was approved unanimously.

03.28.03.01 *Constitution Revisions (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid: There were some questions brought up about the fact that some of the numbers on this go from one to three. That is because I just picked out the paragraph that needed to be revised and didn't think of putting the intermediate paragraphs there. The numbering is just fine; I just jumped from paragraph one that needed to be changed to paragraph three that needed to be changed. The other change that we have made in section 2, University Policy Manual has been changed to University Policies and Procedures web site. We have taken out on the fourth page "and Dean", from the "Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean".

Motion XXXIV-118: By Senator Reid to approve the Constitution revisions. The revisions were unanimously approved.

03.28.03.05 *Academic Senate Bylaws Revisions (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid: The one question posed last time related to page 13, the election of a Faculty Associate member. It was asked by Senator Razaki why part-time Faculty Associates were included in this. I have spoken with the Director and the new senator who will be seated next week, Kathy Oberhardt, about this. We are proposing that in number 6, you would add after "only full-time" the words "Faculty Associates" and then after "part-time", "Faculty Associates with a 50% assignment or greater shall be eligible to vote". I would like to ask Senator Oberhardt to explain the reasons why you would like to have part-time faculty members vote in this process.

Senator-Elect Oberhardt: In our Laboratory School, we have hired our people for an entire school year. They are not hired per semester. We have a total of 113 faculty. Fifty-four of them are at U-High and 59 of them are at Metcalf. We have only two people on our staff that fall below the 50%. I think that those of us that are hired, because it is a permanent employment we all hope when we are hired, have a high interest in the longevity of our schools and also everything that affects our Lab Schools.

Senator Reid: How many teachers do you have who are more than 50% but are still part-time.

Senator Oberhardt: We have 111 and only two that are less than 50%.

Senator Reid: Are many of these people just hired for the one year or are they generally hired for multiple years.

Senator Oberhardt: They are hired for multiple years.

Senator Reid: So, they have a long-term vision of the Lab Schools.

Motion XXXIV-119: By Senator Reid to approve the revisions to the Senate Bylaws. The revisions were unanimously approved.

Information Items:

11.19.02.03 College of Education Bylaws (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid: We do not have major changes to the College of Education Bylaws. On page 10, for the College of Education Diversity and Education Committee, instead of saying nine members, they are simply saying three voting faculty representatives from each department and there are three departments. You will notice that in C, they have taken out faculty and administrative personnel and just put full-time probationary or tenured faculty are eligible for this committee. They have simply taken out self-nomination or nomination since now it is a question of election. The only real major change is on page 16. You will see the elimination of the College of Education Technology Committee. This came to us many years ago. It took us a long time to get around to it and they had eliminated it before we got around to it. They don't feel that they need to have this committee. Senator Crumpler, can you explain what has replaced this?

Senator Crumpler: To the best of my knowledge, there is currently an advisory group forming within the College of Education that would continue in the same purposes as the Technology Committee.

Senator Winchip: On page 10, section 3B, is the dean an ex-officio voting or non-voting member?

Senator Reid: That is unclear. In the past, we assumed that ex-officio meant non-voting, but we were wrong. Senator Crumpler, do you know?

Senator Crumpler: I will investigate that.

Senator Reid: Senator Crothers, can we bring this up next week under the new Senate.

Senator Crothers: I think so, yes. There is sufficient carryover with the indulgence of the new senators that I would think it is possible to suspend those rules.

The College of Education Bylaws will come before the Senate at its next meeting.

03.27.03.05A Blue Book Revisions (Rules Committee)

Senator Reid: In the Blue Book list on the first page, just the list of the memberships before we get to descriptions, I would like to make two additions. You will notice that the Provost manages to be on four separate committees, so we should add "or designee". So, under Faculty Affairs, we should add "or designee". The same is true for Planning and Finance. Many of these changes are just adding non-voting to ex-officio. You will notice that the Faculty Affairs Committee has added one Faculty Associate. This is where the Faculty Associate will serve. On the Faculty Caucus, the Faculty Associate has been added plus we have

added the Chair of the Chairs Council, which we believe will contribute substantially to the Faculty Caucus. You will notice that the Chairperson of the Academic Standards Committee is not appointed by the Rules Committee. Academic Standards would like to vote for their own chair and we saw no reason not to do that. On Planning and Finance, we have added the Chairperson of the Senate and the Secretary of the Senate and have, therefore, taken away two faculty members. For the Student Government Association, we have changed Student Liaison to Faculty Liaison, because that is what it was the whole time. We have eliminated the Academic Freedom Committee because we have replaced it with Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee. The Economic Well-Being Committee has been eliminated. The Faculty Elections Committee has been eliminated. We have eliminated the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee because that is now a part of the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee. We have added the description of the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee. It comes from the document. There was question from last week about the Athletic Council. The question had to do with the student welfare issues that had been taken out of the Committee on Equity. Student welfare was added to the Committee on Academic Integrity. Student welfare had not been eliminated; it had just been displaced.

Motion XXXIV-120: By Senator Reid, second by Senator Mehta, to move the Senate Blue Book revisions to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIV-121: By Senator Reid to approve the revisions to the Senate Blue Book. The revisions were unanimously approved.

04.10.03.01 *Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee Policies and Procedures Revisions (Rules Committee)*

Senator Reid: A number of people raised issues about the timeline for complaints for the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee procedures. Under the old Academic Freedom policy, I think there was a 40-day timeline between the events. There was none for the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee. I think the lawyer suggested 30 to 90 days. If you consider this less in terms of the people who might possibly abuse it than in terms of people who might have real reasons to bring complaints, then there are cases in which someone, for example, might have grievable treatment by a supervisor and felt they could not bring that grievance while the supervisor remained the supervisor. We have suggested having no statute of limitations, as was the case with the Ethics and Grievance Committee before.

Senator Fowles: What has the University lawyer said about having no statute of limitations?

Senator Reid: This did not go back to the lawyer. This would be following through with the same procedures we had with the Ethics and Grievance Committee. I think Sharon Stanford was present at that meeting and she did not propose taking it back to the lawyer. It was not the University lawyer, but the specially hired lawyer, Thomas Hustoles, who had prepared this.

Motion XXXIV-122: By Senator Reid, second by Senator O'Brien, to move the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee Policies and Procedure revisions to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion XXXIV-123: By Senator Reid to approve the revisions. The revisions were unanimously approved.

Advisory Item:

10.21.02.02 *Distinguished Professor Policy/Faculty Ombudsman (Faculty Affairs Committee)*

Senator Crothers: Advisory Items is a third category of items we recently developed that don't require

action but which we want to bring in front of the Senate for discussion and consideration. Senator Winchip also pointed out that the Faculty Affairs Committee had discussed the question of faculty ombudsman. We did not put that on the agenda. We agreed to hold that until the fall and discuss it again in Executive Committee for the fall.

Senator Winchip: In your packet, you will find the existing Distinguished Professor Guidelines and Procedures that are currently used on the campus. There was quite a bit of data that we tried to collect in order to determine whether the guidelines should be revised. We did look at Distinguished Professor Guidelines at other institutions and also all of the Distinguished Professors here on campus were asked for any suggestions that they might have. Approximately six Distinguished Professors responded and the few suggestions that we saw from them were not major, substantive changes. In addition, our guidelines appeared to be in line with other guidelines at other institutions. Therefore, we decided at this time to just retain the current policies and procedures.

Senator Kurtz: I would like our Distinguished Professor Policy to contain some kind of philosophical statement regarding the responsibility of Distinguished Professors to serve as role models for other faculty members. The policy as it stands stresses the privileges that are attached to the position, but nothing about what special responsibilities it holds.

Communications:

04.18.03.02 Illinois Commitment Seventh Goal (Senator Jerich)

Senator Jerich: I am seeking the support of the Academic Senate to endorse the inclusion of a seventh goal to the Illinois Commitment as offered by the FAC to the Board of Higher Education. Several other institutions have already offered their official endorsement in this matter.

Senator Crothers: All we would be doing at this time if we chose to is endorsing this resolution which will be part of the Faculty Advisory Council's work with the Illinois Board of Higher Education to create such a seventh commitment. The Faculty Advisory Council would go to the IBHE and ask it to develop such a commitment, which would then be rearticulated down to the institution level. This is essentially requesting the beginning of a process, not its completion.

Motion XXXIV-124: The Senate resolution endorsing a seventh goal was unanimously approved.

03.27.03.03A Domestic Partner Benefits Resolutions

Senator Borg: You have before you the Domestic Partners Benefits Resolution that several members of the University community have been developing over the past year. This statement has been taken to the various bodies at the collegiate level and divisional levels. We ask the Senate's endorsement of this. Domestic partner benefits are a state obligation and a state-controlled issue. This is intended to urge the state to change the rules, which at this point prevents such benefits from being offered at the university level. It is an effort that is ongoing in a number of universities throughout the state. There are a number of reasons for this, not the least of which, in my opinion, it is right.

Senator Razaki: I am strongly in support of this. Does anyone have a cost analysis?

Senator Borg: The group did do a number of researches into what the likelihood of participation might be and consequently of what the costs might be. It was negligible in comparative terms. Professor Horvath is here who I think coordinated some of that effort.

Professor Horvath: Generally speaking for universities who adopt domestic partner benefits, it costs somewhere between 1 and 3% of the cost of the health care benefits. As close as we can figure, that would be somewhere between \$34,000 and \$100,000 here at ISU. I think it would be cheap because I think enrollment would be low. For institutions much larger than we are, for example, the University of Michigan, the cost for that entire campus was less than \$100,000.

Senator Razaki: How many other states offer these rights to university employees?

Professor Horvath: There are about 100 universities that offer them. I don't know how many of them are state universities, but there are a lot.

Senator Kurtz: I also strongly support this resolution. I want to be clear about where this goes from here and that pertains to the ultimate intent. The ultimate intent is to put pressure on the state to change state law. Is that correct?

Professor Horvath: The ultimate intent is to give a very clear signal to the President or the Interim President Designee that he needs go to the Board of Trustees next and get our Board of Trustees to endorse this and then use the authority and resources of the University to lobby the state. It is our legislators who have to change the rules. We, as individual faculty members, don't have much access there. The university has lots.

Senator Meister: Several students have been concerned about possibly fraudulent claims because it might be easier to submit fraudulent claims with policies like this.

Senator Borg: I don't think that fraud would be a basic motive. The University already has in place a domestic partner statement for the benefits that the University can give domestic partners and it involves a registration process.

Professor Horvath: I would add that married people are never asked to prove that they are married. It seems much more likelihood of fraud there.

Motion XXXIV-125: The Senate unanimously supported the resolution.

Non-Tenure Track Unionization

Senator Feaster: As many of you know, there has been a non-tenure track voting process going on today. I have just discovered that the non-tenure faculty voted to unionize.

Budget Session

Senator Crothers: We have two processes ongoing at the University right now. One, there is a short-term budgeting processes in which the actions of these budget sessions, the other governance groups, the Planning and Finance Committee and then the ongoing communications that will take place over the summer are going to be crucial in determining the short-term budget choices that get made. There is also a longer term process by which we are trying to establish planning and budgeting models, which will hopefully make sense in the short term and in the long term regardless of whether or not the University is on an upswing or a downswing budget wise. Our talks, so far, have centered on the short-term budget costs.

Senator Bragg: The vice presidents have privately thanked the three governance groups and the Planning and Finance Committee that we have met with so far. These meetings have been extremely helpful. They have crystallized our thoughts. They have given us new ideas. I will give you a very quick summary of some

of the ideas that came out in these meetings. In the Planning and Finance Committee of the Senate, the members were uniform in suggesting that we do targeted cuts rather than across the board cuts. Cutting programs was suggested as preferable to across the board. There was a sense that salary increases are absolutely necessary in fiscal year 2004. Enrollment management and layoffs were suggested as ways to provide dollars for salary increases. It was suggested that we review the last ten years of program reviews to help determine what the weak programs are at the University. We had an interesting discussion on differential teaching loads--the flexibility that is needed in course loads and research combinations among faculty members.

When we met with the AP and Civil Service Council, there, too, they suggested that targeted cuts were preferable to across the board cuts. We heard from AP and Civil Service staff that layoffs were not necessarily preferable in order to provide salary increases. There were questions about whether we should charge differential tuition rates by program, encouraging AP employees to contribute to the instruction program; requiring AP employees to teach classes; reducing contracts to shorter months rather than layoffs; job sharing; if there was a need for a reduction in force, to make sure that we provide retraining services to staff that would be affected by that.

We had a very good meeting with the Student Government Association. There was a sense that preserving class size to a reasonable extent was a very high priority. The three most important things that they cited were class size, core instruction General Education and undergraduate instruction. They also suggested that reasonable and fair increases in tuition are understandable. They would rather see tuition go up slightly rather than services and the quality of their education experiences decline. Among the services they would like to see protected are weekend dorm maintenance, dining services, health services and UCLA. They made the point that computer labs are very important. Some students felt that academic advisors did a better job in giving them advice; others felt that faculty did.

I would also like to thank Senators Bowman, Maroules, Meister and Crothers for their willingness to appear last week in front of budget hearings. Senator Brady and some of his colleagues, each of whom have a public university in their district, held a very interesting set of budget hearings on this campus and our senators spoke very eloquently about the contribution that Illinois State University makes to our higher education program and the impact of the governor's proposed budget cuts.

We have a very short time line in order to meet the President's charge to present him with a plan for cutting \$10 million out of the budget. Of necessity, it will be more of an architectural sketch than it will be a detailed construction blueprint of what we are going to do. We will make some broad general recommendations by the May 9 Board of Trustees meeting and then we will begin the very hard work of working out implementation details of that plan over the next coming months. We will have to figure out a way to stay in touch with our shared governance groups over the summer.

Senator Mehta: Have you heard anything about the tuition cap?

Senator Bragg: No, I haven't. There was a bill introduced previously that would limit tuition increases to the consumer price index or 5%, whichever is less. It has not moved out of committee. The governor in his budget address commented on the 5%.

Senator Fowles: Would you be able to present to the Senate on May 7 what you might be presenting to the Board of Trustees on the 9th.

Senator Bragg: The report goes to the President, so it's he who will be making that presentation to the Board of Trustees. So, it's really up to the President.

Senator Crothers: Generally, they tell the leaders of the governance groups, but they don't come to the full group. It is a good idea, though.

Senator Brasseur: Our dean has told all departments this is the percentage that you have to cut. The College of Arts and Sciences delivers the vast majority of General Education. When the dean gives us this charge, we are often in a quandary as to how we can do this and meet the needs of General Education as well as our own majors. Have you brought this into your discussions?

Senator Bragg: Absolutely. This is a recurring theme in every discussion we have. One of the easy things about across the board cuts is that it is politically palatable. Obviously, doing targeting cuts means that you have to come up with a rationale for doing that. Everybody has a rationale of why their program should be spared those cuts. These are recurring conversations we have. The list of priorities is extensive and that is the challenge in putting the plan together.

Senator Brasseur: How are you looking at enrollment management?

Senator Bragg: Enrollment management came up in every meeting we had. One of the reasons that the President asked us to consider a \$10 million cut over two years than one year is the recognition that in the short run, very little can be done. In the long run, we have much more flexibility. There is very little we can do that will affect the entering class of the coming year. There is a lot we can do to affect the entering classes of 05 and 06.

Senator Jerich: Do you have any insights into the extent to which the governor may say it's going to be a 10% cut?

Senator Bragg: The governor has already made his recommendation and that would cut \$7.2 million off of our appropriation for fiscal year 04. That is on a base appropriation of \$87 million. Also suggested is an internal reserve out of our income fund of \$5 million. That is just the governor's proposal. The appropriation bills are working themselves through the various committees of the General Assembly. The scheduled end of the session is not until May 23.

Senator Kurtz: Dr. Bowman, in terms of the enrollment deposits thus far made, do we have any idea what the size of the incoming freshman class will be?

Dr. Bowman: I believe it is close to 2,500 enrollment deposits so far.

Senator Thomas: I don't remember the exact number, but I do recall that we were very much on track with last year. We are close to the same number that we had last year at this time.

Dr. Bowman: We expect to end up pretty close to 3,000.

Senator Razaki: What percentage of educational costs does tuition cover per student?

Senator Bragg: Tuition now covers about 48% of what we consider instructional costs.

Senator Razaki: We have discussed enrollment in Planning and Finance and you have always warned us that cutting enrollment may not be the best practice. In terms of cost, it does seem like it would be good.

Senator Bragg: No, I have warned just the opposite--that adding students in an attempt to generate tuition revenue does not solve the budget problems.

Senator Razaki: We were talking about cutting back on enrollment. Do you think that is more feasible in terms of being able to provide better academic services?

Senator Bragg: The enrollment at Illinois State University is academic issue. That is an issue that you and your colleagues in academic administration really need to discuss. It ought not to be driven primarily by budgetary concerns. If you decide 20,000 students provides the optimal educational environment, then my charge is to make sure that that happens.

Senator Mehta: Do you have a range of what kind of tuition hike we are looking at?

Senator Bragg: We have discussed a variety of options. There is something called the Truth in Tuition legislation that is passing through the General Assembly right now. Tuition would be charged at a certain rate for incoming students and that rate would be frozen for the next eight semesters. It makes comparing rate increases much more difficult. So, we are looking at all options.

Senator Plantholt: One of the components of the governor's proposal was a drastic increase in tuition for out of state students. Is ISU planning a drastic increase for the out of state students?

Dr. Bowman: Our out of state tuition reflects the true cost of educating a student at Illinois State. We believe it is priced at the appropriate point and that is the case we have been trying to make in Springfield. It is the administration's position that our out of state tuition should stay where it is.

Senator O'Brien: A lot of this going to be decided over the summer. Is there a way that we can inform the students of the decisions that have been made?

Senator Bragg: It is our intent, if we do take any action on tuition, to do that soon, before you leave from campus. On the general nature of the budget, Jay Groves has set aside a portion of the ISU home page where you can get the latest news on the budget. There is also an e-mail address (rdammers@ilstu.edu). If you have any ideas about how we can control costs, cut the budget, raise revenues, please send those in.

Senator Jerich: If we had a substantial decrease in enrollment, how might it affect our current status as a doctoral-intensive institution?

Senator Presley: I have said at each of the meetings that we have gone to that while I think I agree with the people who have brought up the issue of managing enrollment, I think that the last thing we want to be seen doing is downsizing or cutting the programs that make Illinois State distinctive. There are a lot of institutions that have downsized in the last ten years and I cannot think of one that profited from doing so. But that is not an argument for growing or even staying the same. I believe that given our successes with admission, this is the time for us to become more selective.

Senator Kurtz: In terms of institutions that have downsized, didn't Miami of Ohio successfully downsize?

Senator Presley: They are also raising tuition about 100%.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIV-126: 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