

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**(Approved)**

**May 7, 2003**

**Volume XXXIV, No. 17**

***Call to Order***

Vice-Chairperson Ryan Meister called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

***Seating of New Senators***

**Senator Meister:** Congratulated new Senate members on their election to the Senate.

**Newly Elected/Re-Elected Faculty Senate Members**

**CAS**

Group A:

Jinadasa Gamage, MAT 03-06

Dan Holland, PHY 03-06

Group B:

T.Y. Wang, POL 03-06

Group C:

Christopher DeSantis, ENG 03-06

Jim Reid, FOR 03-05 (Replaces Brasseur)

**COB**

Farzaneh Fazel, MQM 03-06

**CFA**

Marian Hampton, THE 03-06

Kim Pereira, THE 03-06

**COE**

Rod Reigle, EAF 03-06

**MILNER**

Rosyln Wylie 03-06

**MENNONITE**

Eileen Fowles 03-06

**NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE**

Mary Jo Adams, KNR 03-04

**FACULTY ASSOCIATE**

Kathy Oberhardt, University High School, 03-06

**Newly Elected Student Senate Members**

Amy Attivissimo

Bryan Carper

Beth Chinderle

Nicole Darden  
Jeff Dutton  
Mike Fryman  
Josh Garrison  
Sara Genta  
Adam Ghirst, Student Trustee  
Candice Harvey  
Ryan Meister, Student Body President  
Keith Mueller  
Ben Myers  
Darion Page  
Enrique Rebolledo  
Megan Rice  
Josh Rinker  
Mike Roberson  
Barry Tolchin  
Pierre Woods

### ***Roll Call***

Senator Meister called the roll and declared a quorum.

### ***Election of Academic Senate Officers/Executive Committee Members***

**Motion XXXIV-130:** By Senator Razaki for the election of the Academic Senate officers and faculty members of the Executive Committee. Elected as Chairperson of the Senate was Senator Lane Crothers. Senator Paul Borg was elected Secretary. Faculty members elected to the Executive Committee were Senators Mohammadi, Pereira, Winchip and Reid. Student members of the Executive Committee are Ryan Meister, Barry Tolchin, Josh Garrison and Josh Rinker.

### ***Approval of Minutes of April 23, 2003***

**Motion XXXIV-131:** By Senator Fowles, second by Senator Tolchin, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of April 23, 2003. The minutes were unanimously approved.

### ***Chairperson's Remarks***

**Senator Crothers:** Congratulations to all of the new senators on their election to the Senate. We are going to continue the General Education review next year. Also, we have continuing issues from this year such as program review questions and the Consensual Relations Policy, which still has to come before us. It looks to be a very interesting and important year in the midst of also serious budget debates that will be ongoing.

### ***Student Government Association President's Remarks – No Report***

### ***President's Remarks***

**Dr. Bowman, Interim President Designee:** The transition activity is underway with President Boschini and I. We have always had a good relationship and things are moving along quite smoothly. On the legislative side, we have been working very closely with our local legislative delegation and also with key individuals who are a part of the governor's inner circle in order to express our views on all of the important issues. The University is very happy with at least part of the governor's recommendations and that includes the capital funds that were recommended for Stevenson and Turner. We were one of only three institutions that had capital projects recommended in the 04 budget. The concern right now revolves around Schroeder and whether or not that project will move forward as planned. As of today, we have no reason to believe that it won't, but we don't have any new information. Our Comprehensive Campaign this week crossed the \$65 million threshold. There is no reason to doubt that we will reach and even exceed our goal of \$88 million. The tuition plan was referenced in news outlets. However, the Senate and other governance groups did not receive the proper consultation that I think has characterized the administration

over the last few years. There was a communication break down, but I assure you that that will not happen again. There is a Board meeting on Friday and one of the questions that has been asked fairly frequently is why we did not recommend a substantial across the board increase. After modeling a number of different tuition scenarios, the plan that we put on the table actually generates more revenue for us over the long haul than a large across the board increase. We make that statement under the assumption that it is very likely that in 05 there will be some sort of legislative restraint on what we can do regarding tuition.

**Senator Razaki:** Can it now be said with certainty that all of the summer school courses listed are going to be offered?

**Dr. Bowman:** The \$833,000 that was budgeted for summer school is there. I can't say for certain if departments will offer everything that is in the schedule book because some of those courses are funded by non-general revenue funds.

#### ***Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost's Remarks – No Report***

#### ***Vice President of Student Affairs' Remarks – No Report***

#### ***Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks***

**Senator Bragg:** We have no new information about Schroeder and Femley except that the Bureau of the Budget still has not authorized the Capital Development Board to release the funds. As a result of that, the Capital Development Board last Thursday moved the bid dates on Schroeder for the prime contractors to the end of May and for the general contractor to the first week in June. We actually had bids in hand for the Femley project that were very attractive. Because they did not release the funds, the contractors had twice agreed to hold their prices on those bids. This last week, however, several contractors said they could no longer guarantee those prices. As a result, the Capital Development Board has cancelled that bid. They will issue a new bid date later this year and the contractors will have to bid again. The only good news in that is that the majority of work on the Femley project is scheduled for next spring, not this fall.

The University has been participating in the downtown renewal program. The Town Council recently decided to reevaluate the hotel project and is now in the process of meeting with the developer and financial consultants to look for alternative financing operations for the hotel. They haven't given up the idea, but are looking for ways to finance it without direct public funding. We will be giving them opportunities to explore financing, but at some point in late summer or early fall, we are going to have to make a decision. Our financing is in place for the parking ramp that is scheduled to go there and we plan to move forward with that. Speaking of parking, there will be no increase in parking rates for next year. We will also again provide free parking for Senate members during Senate meetings.

#### ***IBHE-FAC Report***

**Senator Jerich:** The Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council met on May 1 and 2 at the University of Illinois in Chicago. We had a very interesting and productive session. You have received an e-mail of our unapproved minutes. The FAC would like to thank the ISU Academic Senate for their endorsement of the Seventh Goal. We have a handout coming around that shows the institutions to date that have endorsed the implementation of the Seventh Goal as part of the *Illinois Commitment*. They are Eastern Illinois University, Lincoln Land Community College, McHenry College, Northeastern Illinois University, Northern Illinois University, University of Illinois at Springfield, Western Illinois University and Illinois State University. I think it is very important that we took the initiative and became one of the leading institutions in the state to endorse the Seventh Goal and other institutions are expected to follow suit.

#### ***Action Item:***

***11.19.02.02 College of Education Bylaws (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Reid:** There were two major changes in the COE bylaws. One was the elimination of a technology committee that was done a couple of years ago but not taken out of the bylaws. They have found other ways to take care of those issues. We did have some questions the last time when it was an information item about page 10. This has to do with the College of Education Diversity in Education Committee. The College of Education has made some proposed additions. The additions are meant to add Faculty Associations from the Laboratory Schools to this committee. The question that you had last time was “is ex-officio voting or non-voting?” They wish the dean to be voting.

The Senate unanimously approved the College of Education Bylaws as revised.

**Information Item:**

**Approval of Senate Calendar for 2003-04**

**Motion XXXIV-132:** By Senator Borg, second by Senator Reid, to move the approval of the Senate Calendar to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXIV-133:** By Senator Crothers, second by Senator Reid, to approve the Senate Calendar. The calendar was unanimously approved.

**Advisory Items:**

**Academic Plan**

**Dr. Jan Shane:** The Academic Plan comes to you from the Academic Planning Committee, an external committee of the Senate. Joe Rives serves an ex-officio member of the Academic Planning Committee as the University Planner. The primary function of the Academic Planning Committee is to develop and review long-range academic plans. We typically put in the Academic Plan the University Heritage Mission Value Statement. We have a University Mission Statement that is prepared by the Academic Planning Committee. This year, we did not modify the University Mission Statement because it was significantly modified in February 2002. The plan also includes the Board of Trustees’ Vision Statement for the year 2007, which I believe has a May 1998 date on it. The colleges submit their mission statements to the Academic Planning Committee for inclusion in the Academic Plan and then we always update a University profile to make sure that the number of accrediting agencies is correct and the number of degree programs is up to date. There is a section on institutional priorities that has two components. The component on page 13 is curricular priorities that we foresee colleges and departments working on in the upcoming year. We always do an update of our strategic plan, *Educating Illinois*. The last inclusion in the Academic Plan is the program reviews. This year, we had nine academic programs that underwent program review. Academic programs must go through the review process at least once every eight years. The process for program review is that a department goes through a process of self-analysis that should involve faculty and students in the department. They then develop a program review document that is submitted to the Provost’s office. It is copied and distributed to the Academic Planning Committee members and then we throughout the year do a very thoughtful and careful review of each program and develop recommendations. We meet with the departments and then modify if we need to the summary and recommendations. That is what is included in the Academic Plan. The full program reviews can be found in the library. They are on reserve until July 1. The Academic Plan goes to the Board of Trustees for approval in July.

**Senator Mohammadi:** What is the nature of the recommendations that you make for the programs?

**Dr. Shane:** All of those recommendations can be found in the Academic Plan. If you look at each of the summaries, the recommendations are bulleted there for every program.

**Senator Adams:** Are the consequences for failure to meet the recommendations departmental, college or university wide?

**Dr. Shane:** If it is a program review does not require a short turnaround on a follow up report, really those consequences don't show up until eight years later. At the next round of program reviews, we look specifically to see if those recommendations have been met. The consequences of that are stronger recommendations or a program could be flagged. The committee could recommend that a program be put on probation. The Academic Planning Committee is not a committee that is going to sanction a department by any means. The follow up really comes through the recommendations that we give to administrators of that unit. Faculty also see these recommendations.

**04.29.03.01 Preliminary Model for Budgeting and Planning (Planning and Finance Committee)**

**Senator Crothers:** This model on first look seems a seemingly complicated document about building new models of planning and budgeting at ISU. However, it is actually not as complicated as it looks if you understand the underlying theory. We are bringing this to you, first, because it is time for the broader Senate to be aware that it is going on. Secondly, it is possible that this is going to go to the Provost Advisory Council retreat this summer for at least initial discussions. Before sending it there, we wanted to bring it to you. The idea is that there ought to be University, college and unit program goals; that programs ought to align with those goals; that resources ought to be provided to help align the programs with those goals; and that people ought to be accountable to make sure that happens. That doesn't always happen in a systematic and consultative way across the University. What you are really seeing here is a first attempt to build a process which will encourage all kinds of new conversations about priorities. We are trying to build a model for planning and budgeting that is linked to the NCA re-accreditation process and the distinctiveness exercise, a model that helps the University, in good times or bad, stay focused on the things that truly matter to it.

On the left in the model, you have above all the notion that some set of bodies, such as the Senate in consultation with others, establishes a sort of broad context for the University. That broad context then has to be given empirical meaning in actual budget lines and program actions. In the left column is a process by which the University administrators articulate how their plans seem to align with the University's goals in the short, medium and long term. In the right column, we are essentially asking that there be a regular process of consultation with appropriate constituencies in establishing unit priorities and plans, changing unit priorities and plans and continuously updating those programs in light of changing priorities and plans.

**Senator Lindblom:** On the right side of the flow chart in the section that has three columns across, it reads, "College Councils...provide recommendations..." Should the Faculty Caucus also be listed there?

**Senator Crothers:** The general assumption is that much of this will come through the Planning and Finance Committee and through the Senate in general. That is a fair question, but we have not discussed that.

**Senator Lindblom:** I think that the committee should discuss that. I see that the SGA is listed.

**Senator Crothers:** We can consider that.

**Senator Reid:** In the right column, after the different councils provide their recommendations on University priorities to the Planning and Finance Committee, it says that the Planning and Finance Committee just summarizes for submission to the Senate and thence to the President. Does that mean that there will be no discussion in the Senate about those priorities and any changes to those priorities?

**Senator Crothers:** That was certainly not the sense that emerged from the conversations.

**Senator Reid:** The word "summarizes" communicates that. You might want to put in some word like "deliberate".

**Senator Wang:** It seems that you want to institutionalize the budgeting process.

**Senator Crothers:** Institutionalize it in a more broadly consultative and accountable way.

**Senator Wang:** How much binding power will this process have?

**Senator Crothers:** It's true that administrators are hired to make decisions, but there is also the possibility of creating a culture in which certain kinds of decisions become impossible not to make. That is, you can create a culture in which, after broad consultation, it would be administratively unwise for a senior official to make a choice against the will of the broader body. It's a two-track process. There is an institutional process and also a cultural process. There is no way that an institutional process can fully substitute for a cultural one.

**Senator Wang:** Is this an action item?

**Senator Crothers:** No, tonight it is purely advisory because this is still significantly incomplete. The NCA accreditation team is going to be meeting for two more years on this matter. This is our first cut of a year of conversations trying to flesh out some of the complications.

**Senator Reid:** Toward the bottom of the flow chart, it says that the President reviews recommendations. Will he be synthesizing those into a document?

**Senator Crothers:** That would be my sense. Under this process, he or she would be obliged to provide feedback to the Senate.

**Senator Reid:** How would this be different from the Academic Plan?

**Senator Crothers:** This would be much broader in its consultative basis and would also bring in budgetary issues.

#### ***Communications:***

##### ***Legislative Lobbying by Faculty***

**Senator Hampton:** Today was lobby day at the legislature. Six faculty members went to lobby our legislators. The faculty who went were Sharon MacDonald, Paul Dennhardt, Jill Josephson, Harry Deutsch, Pat Francken and myself. There is a joint meeting tomorrow of the Senate and House Appropriation Committees meeting to begin discussion of issues that we all face. We were very fortunate to have two lobbyists from the IEA go with us. We talked at length with the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Patrick Welch, and the Vice Chair, Senator Jeffrey Schoenberg, as well as Dan Rutherford. We were also able to talk with representative Keith Sommer. We were unable to meet with either Dan Brady or Bill Brady. We were asked by Representative Sommer to fax him a letter of our concerns, which we did when we returned from the Capitol building. We were also told by Jeff Schoenberg that he is recommending that some of the dedicated funds, which he referred to as kind of the shadow budget, be used to help repay budget cuts at the universities. They are set on moving forward with the line item budget and tuition caps. We tried to tell them all of the reasons those things would not work well for us. We were urged by the IEA people, who went with us, to do a call in campaign tonight to the Appropriation Committee Chairs, senators and representatives. They need to hear facts from both faculty and students.

##### ***Committee Assignments/Ad Hoc Committees***

**Senator Crothers:** Internal committee assignments have not yet come out. I will make them available to you over the summer after they are approved by the Executive Committee. We are going to have to have a few ad hoc committees from the Senate this year. We need to have some faculty senators meet and talk about bylaws for the Faculty Caucus and also about creating better opportunities for communication between the Faculty Caucus and other governance bodies on campus. There will also be meetings about evolving academic planning and what we are asking for from program reviews. I also believe that we are going to meet a couple of times more to talk about the Planning and Finance Budgeting Model.

**Budget Session**

**Senator Razaki:** I don't know if the publication in the *Pantagraph* of the planned fee structure has now set it in stone. If it has not, the one feature that I would like to see withdrawn is a voluntary freezing of tuition right away without a state mandate.

**Dr. Bowman:** One of the issues that we are concerned about is affordability. Our current students, our juniors I believe, have already seen a 17 to 20% increase since they have been here. So, we tried to come up with a plan that balanced affordability with trying to meet our needs. The current proposal would allow us over the next three to four years to actually generate more revenue than the across the board plan that Northern University has. Under the assumption that we will be looking at truth in tuition legislation next year and caps, if you compare Northern's plan with our plan, we actually come out ahead.

**Senator Bragg:** One of our objections to the proposed truth in tuition legislation is that it is a very difficult concept to explain. It is counter-intuitive to understand that you can generate more tuition revenue by freezing tuition for continuing students and increasing tuition at a higher rate for entering students. It actually generates more revenue in the long run. We have had current students already go through significant increases far in excess of the consumer price index.

**Senator Razaki:** I have an understanding of that because so many of our students pay for their education and work to put themselves through school. But one of the arguments that I have had with President Boschini over the last four or five years is that he made tuition increases which were below the change in the affordability index.

**Senator Bragg:** That is not true. Over the last fifteen years, tuition has increased at ISU at an average annual rate of 8.2%. That is four times the rate of inflation. We are the second highest priced school in the State of Illinois. Our proposal is a 13.3% increase for new students.

**Senator Armstrong:** I think I understand it from a revenue perspective and I am certainly sympathetic with the students. But doesn't this in effect transfer the present day cost of education to future students?

**Senator Bragg:** You are exactly right and that is another major objection we have to the truth in tuition bill. You load all of your costs on future generations. You load all of your costs on entering students when it actually costs more to educate upper division students, juniors and seniors.

**Senator Pryor:** This whole plan is contingent upon being able to front load with the freshman some larger increase in order to make it work. What if the state legislature prevents us from doing that kind of tuition increase?

**Senator Bragg:** One of the reasons for Illinois State University beginning to implement the concepts of the truth in tuition legislation this year when the legislation actually calls for it to be fully implemented next year is precisely for that reason. We need to front load this system by at least a 13.3% increase in order to generate the revenue we need. If caps are placed on us next year, we will at least have one class that will move through on a 13.3% basis.

**Senator Reid:** What if they pass the 5% cap? What are the long-term effects?

**Senator Bragg:** In the short run, we will be ok because of the 13.3% front loading that we have done this year, which will be compounded for three more years. If the caps program were to stay in place in the long run, we would only have a 5% infusion on new students every year. That would create significant difficulties if the pattern of erosion of state support continues.

**Senator Hampton:** One of the Appropriations Chairs mentioned something regarding out of state tuition. Will this

have an effect on graduate programs?

**Senator Bragg:** The governor proposed in his budget address an unbelievable hike in out of state tuition, the rationale being that we should not be subsidizing out of state students. We already charge a tuition rate at Illinois State University that covers the subsidy. We don't happen to enroll a lot of out of state students here, so it shouldn't have that much of an impact on us.

**Senator Radhakrishnan:** Given the budget constraints we have, when can the faculty expect a raise?

**Dr. Bowman:** We are committed to a raise even in 04. As better days return in 05 and beyond, we hope to be able to make up some of this lost ground. I am convinced that with the plan we have on the table that we will be able to do at least some small change in salary.

### *Adjournment*

**Motion XXXIV-134:** 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](mailto:acsenate@ilstu.edu)