

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, February 18, 2004**  
*(Approved)*

**Volume XXXV,**

**No. 9**

***Call to Order***

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

***Roll Call***

In Senator Borg's absence, Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2004***

**Motion XXXV-61:** By Senator Koutsky, seconded by Senator Fryman, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of February 4, 2004. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Chairperson's Remarks:***

**Senator Crothers:** I want to express my appreciation for the substantial University participation in the presidential search process. As a member of the search committee, I had an opportunity to read the evaluation forms of the participants, which were thoughtful and extensive.

**Senator Wang:** I would like to thank Senators Borg and Crothers for their service on the Presidential Search Committee and Senators Fowles and Armstrong, who did a marvelous job in summarizing the Senate's opinion.

***Student Government Association President/Student Body President's Remarks:***

**Senator Meister:** At the last Student Government Association meeting, the SGA declined the Budget Review Committee's student fee recommendations for the upcoming year. There will be another meeting of the BRC this Saturday to form recommendations according to what SGA thinks students fees should be in the fall. We will have a final draft of our recommendations by Wednesday. One troubling issue that was brought up at the meeting concerned graduate students. Currently, as I understand it, student fees will be allocated to graduate student as if they are new incoming students each year. That is troubling to a lot of graduate students so SGA is looking at how the "Truth in Tuition" legislation is interpreted or if there is a better model to follow. We will keep you updated.

***President's Remarks:***

**President Bowman:** I was in Springfield today for the Governor's budget address. He proposed further cuts for higher education for FY05. Vice President Bragg will fill you in on the details. It was disappointing to everyone because the Governor did not endorse the IBHE's recommendation that we would be level funded for FY05. The Governor cited cost increases including a Medicaid increase that will approach \$800 million as well as his proposal to spend \$500 million more on K-12 education. He did propose spending \$2.6 billion in State General Funds for higher education. That is a decrease of 5.1% or \$141 million. The General Funds reduction for public universities is proposed at \$26 million or just under 2%. It is important to remember that there are a lot of steps to take between now and when that final budget is passed. However, if these cuts are ultimately reflected in our appropriation, our campus reductions will be focused on administrative and support functions and, as we have in the past, we will try to minimize the impact on undergraduate instruction, graduate programs and research. As you know, we have incurred layoffs, a continued hiring

freeze for non-faculty positions, cutbacks in equipment purchases, travel and maintenance projects. We have larger class sizes in many colleges, tuition increases and a decrease in some services such as the library and dining center hours. As we go through this process, we will make use of our shared governance constituencies to plan and budget and we will do everything we can to meet our educational mission and our priorities for ISU. Our top priority remains faculty and staff salaries and maintaining our academic enterprise for students while keeping their investment in Illinois State as affordable as possible. Finally, we continue to emphasize to the legislature and to the Governor that it is critical that the investment in public higher education continue because of the impact that we have on the future economy of the state. The Comprehensive Campaign is moving into its final phase. We have just surpassed \$77 million toward our goal of \$88 million. I not only anticipate that we reach \$88 million, but go beyond it. Certainly on the corporate side, many doors have been opened recently.

**Senator Koutsky:** How does the legislature feel about the Governor's proposal to reduce the IBHE's recommendations? Are they focused more on K-12?

**President Bowman:** Our legislators are very sympathetic, although I think that the condition of many school districts across the state is so severe that they are going to get a lot of attention. But our supporters are there; they recognize that we have taken substantial cuts over the last couple of years and that our flexibility is limited. I think that we will need to work closely with our supporters in the legislature as we go forward with the FY05 budget. This one is critical for us. We have gone from General Funds' support of \$92 million down to just over \$80 million and that is not counting the \$3 million that we are spending on health insurance premiums. That is a lot of money to remove from the budget and still serve the same number of students. That is the point that we are going to drive home.

**Senator Jerich:** Do you have a sense of our local legislative support?

**Senator Bowman:** Our local legislators are very, very supportive. We could not ask for more supportive people representing the campus. Certainly, there is going to be a lot of conversation as we go forward.

***Provost's Remarks:***

**Provost Presley:** After this current cycle of promotion and tenure considerations, my office will work with the University Review Committee (URC), partially in reaction to events of the last couple of weeks and at the request of a Faculty Hearing Committee of the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee (AFEGC), to suggest revised language for the ASPT guidelines that underscores the absolute necessity for confidentiality regarding the deliberations of College and Department Faculty Status Committees. There have been alleged violations of the confidentiality of those deliberations and it is time that we re-endorse that central principle.

Since the late 1980s, it has been clear that academic personnel proceedings and documents are obtainable by subpoena, but short of subpoena, virtually every institution treats them as confidential. We will be inserting some language that reinforces that. We will also be suggesting the addition of some language to the URC that indicates that any faculty member on a committee who disagrees with the conclusions of that committee has the right to submit a minority report, but we will define minority report as making the case that person wishes to make, not attacking the deliberations and certainly not breaching the confidentiality of the committee proceedings.

In the ASPT guidelines, it is mentioned often that documents are to be treated as confidential. The deliberations, however, do not get quite as much attention. We will be underscoring that the deliberations are

also confidential. At the same time, this has to be balanced with the right of any employee at the institution to serve as what we will call a “whistleblower”. You have that right and you have the right to certain protections. If any member of these committees sees violations of human rights, it is his or her obligation to report that to the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action for their inquiry and, of course, anyone doing that will be protected. I will be suggesting language along those lines. I do not believe that we can have an autonomous and faculty-governed personnel system for very long if we open it up to the kinds of attempts to pressure and the kinds of discussions that have been alleged to have occurred in the last two weeks.

In addition, at the request of the Chair of the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee, my office is putting together for that committee’s consultation a list of acceptable, recommended sanctions that the AFEGC can use. We have a list of five categories of sanctions and within two of those categories, there is a progression. So, this is a list of progressive sanctions that are available to that committee for its suggested use and that are based on precedent according to our standards of governance and our own documentation.

**Senator Crothers:** I can only endorse the Provost’s comments about confidentiality. I did not so fully appreciate the value that a University Ombudsperson might have until last week. I have been the central clearinghouse for many allegations on campus; I don’t know what is true and what is not true, but we have some issues that we very seriously need to address on this campus. In many ways, the model does need to be last year’s provost search or this year’s presidential search, which, if we did we did our jobs right, you may have been frustrated about how late the names came in, but you didn’t know until they came. That is perhaps a stronger model than what may be going on on campus. It is also possible that the Faculty Caucus will hold a special hearing on this very issue. Also, anything that URC suggests will eventually come to the Faculty Caucus.

***Vice President of Student Affairs’ Remarks:***

**Senator Mamarchev:** Founders Day is on February 19. The ringing of the Old Main bell will commence at 10:00 a.m. and the Founders Day Convocation will be held at 3:00 p.m. in the Old Main Room. As we continue to celebrate Black History Month, on Monday, February 23, Tony Brown of *Tony Brown’s Journal* will be at ISU for a dinner and as a speaker. On February 28, the Black Student Union is sponsoring its annual Black Heritage Ball. March 1 is the kick-off of Women’s History Month.

***Vice President of Finance and Planning’s Remarks:***

**Senator Bragg:** I am distributing information to you at this time that will provide more details on the Governor’s proposed budget recommendations for higher education. Table 1 shows the Governor’s proposed budget for all of higher education and the State University Retirement System. Table 2 shows the allocations for the individual public universities. As the President indicated, the Governor is proposing a reduction in the higher education budget of about \$141 million; that is just under 6%. About half of that is in the contribution that the State makes to State University Retirement System (SURS)—about \$78 million. That reduction is due to two components. One component is the reduced funding necessary because last year the State borrowed money, \$1.9 billion, and put it into the retirement system. That increased the asset value of the system such that it did not need as much money this year. The second component is a reduction of about \$36.6 million that is based on anticipated investment returns. Beyond that, the two other major budget reductions are pretty much an evisceration of the Workforce and Economic Development Grants Act and about a \$26 million reduction to public universities. All public universities were treated similarly with respect to the percentage reductions. It is 2% across the board. You will see that Northern and Western Illinois Universities only show a 1.5% reduction. That is because some monies were added back into those institutions that were earmarked for several projects.

**Senator Wang:** Will the budget reductions impact Schroeder Hall renovations?

**Senator Bragg:** No, the Governor has delayed his capital budget presentation for another month. However, the funds for Schroeder have already been released to us.

**Senator Mohammadi:** How will the 2% cuts affect ISU?

**Senator Bragg:** We will focus the majority of these reductions on administrative and support services. We have been in a three-year program to reduce administrative and support costs at ISU by 25%. This is a program that the Chairman of the Board of Higher Education initiated three years ago. We have accomplished that to about 18.2%. I suspect that we will earmark those administrative reductions to meet that cut.

**Senator Koutsky:** Why is Southern Illinois University's funding higher than that of other universities?

**Senator Bragg:** These numbers represent system lines. SIU has three campuses and U of I has four. The funding is for combination of those campuses.

**Senator Jerich:** Student services has already taken a big cut? What type of administrative services will be cut or is it too premature to ask that?

**Senator Bragg:** Each division has been working through a plan over the last three years where we would reduce our costs. It is as varied as you can imagine across all of our divisions. When we finish these rounds of cuts, I would be happy to bring that report to the Senate.

#### ***Committee Reports:***

##### ***Academic Affairs Committee***

**Senator Fowles:** Dr. Joe Rosenthal, support staff on the Council on General Education, met with Academic Affairs to discuss the recommendations for changes in General Education. The committee's discussion on the General Education report will continue.

##### ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

**Senator O'Donnell:** The committee had a planning session this evening to prioritize tasks that are pending.

##### ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Senator Wylie:** The committee discussed the Faculty Productivity Report. We are in agreement with the report that Senator Jerich brought to us from the IBHE-FAC. The committee is unsure if the Senate wants Faculty Affairs to expand upon the recommendations in the report with specifics. We don't know what the wishes of the Senate are.

**Senator Crothers:** Please send me an e-mail and I will respond to what I recall was the charge from the Faculty Caucus to be.

##### ***Planning and Finance Committee***

**Senator Crothers:** The Planning and Finance Committee met with Senator Bragg and began some questions on an analysis of long-range financial planning for the University, given the trends that are being discussed tonight. Last year, the Planning and Finance Committee charged the NCA Accreditation Team with taking some of the ideas that emerged from Planning and Finance and developing new ideas for planning and budgeting on campus. That committee met yesterday and finished something that I found to be extraordinary.

At the very least, we now have a central, readily accessible resource by which we can actually describe what the different parts of the University do for budgeting. Now we have to discuss where we want to go from there.

### **Rules Committee**

**Senator Coliz:** Mark Walbert, Associate Vice President for Technology, met with the Rules Committee to explain the Mass Electronic Communications (Mass E-Mail) Policy. I think that we exhaustively discussed it and have some understanding of what the policy does. We will be ready to do something with the policy shortly. We are also starting the process of revising and modernizing the Ethics Code.

### **Presentation**

#### **12.04.03.01 2003-2010 Educating Illinois (Joe Rives, University Planning)**

##### **12.04.03.01A Educating Illinois Summary of Changes**

**Dr. Joe Rives, Director, University Planning:** This has been a very successful year for *Educating Illinois*. ISU has benefited from six major themes of accomplishment during the past year: 1. ISU as the First Choice Public University in Illinois; 2. Minority Student Recruitment; 3. The Active Pursuit of Learning and Scholarship; 4. Celebrating Faculty and Staff Accomplishments; 5. Asserting Statewide, Regional, and National Prominence; 6. *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*.

Becoming the first choice university in Illinois encompasses attracting high-achieving students and accomplished faculty and staff. We are comparing favorably with premiere institutions nationally with our ACT interquartile range now at 21 to 26 with the goal of *Educating Illinois* of 22 to 27. Another measure of higher quality students are the characteristics of our transfer students. From fall 2000, the percentage of transfer students with an Associates Degree increased from 35% to 42% and their average GPA increased from 2.86 to 3.01. Currently, faculty salaries are 92% of the IBHE peer group median. You can find the institutions in our peer group on the Planning and Institutional Research web site, which is a list of 30 schools. Currently, we rank number 22; however, I do expect that we will increase our status ranking. Civil service salaries are 94% of their peer group, which would be all other public universities in Illinois. Again, I do expect that comparison to increase. We do not have comparable data for an administrative/professional peer group.

In terms of minority student recruitment, Dr. Kerns has set a \$1million goal for minority scholarships and we are halfway there with \$500,000 already being achieved. The goal of *Educating Illinois* is to raise minority enrollment. This year we are up 25% in our minority applications. Minority student admissions have increased by 5%.

Our third theme is the active pursuit of learning and scholarship. Our freshmen exceed our national comparison, which is all other doctoral-research intensive institutions, on two levels—level of academic challenge and active and collaborative learning. Freshman retention rates have never been higher. Currently, 83% of freshmen return for a second term and it continues to build. The news is equally as good in terms of graduation rates, which have never been as high as they are now at 60%. African American graduation rates have risen from about 37% to 46%. After a one-year decline, Hispanic student graduation rates are rebounding. We did have a slight decline in external grants and contracts and the reason for that is the economy has reduced state and corporate support. However, 90% of the Illinois Capital Budget for public universities is at ISU. ISU was the only public university cited by the IBHE for “Best Practices” in each of the categories of the *Illinois Commitment*. ISU was listed among “Kiplinger's Top 100” schools, which bases its rankings on academic quality and cost of education. ISU will host the second biennial Carnegie Conference at which participants will attend from across the nation.

There are similarities and differences between *Educating Illinois 2003-2007* and *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*. In *2003-2010*, we have reduced our goals from 15 to 7. Those seven goals are the Board of Trustee's 2007 Goals for ISU. That brings a tight coupling between the BOT and the campus community in defining how we will achieve their goal statements. *Educating Illinois 2003-2010* retains the five core values of Illinois State University. The "Active Pursuit of Learning" is now the "Active Pursuit of Learning and Scholarship". The last core value was changed from "Creative Response to Change" to "Innovation". Because our number of goals has been reduced, the number of actions has been reduced from 79 to 16 and have become much more focused.

An *Educating Illinois* Coordinating Team will remain, which has representation from each vice presidential area, the president's office and faculty and staff. I will go to each of the chairs of the governance groups to work with us on *Educating Illinois* so that we continue our mission statement. The overall goal of *Educating Illinois* will remain the same—faculty and staff salaries, instructional capacity and the commitment to affordability. *Educating Illinois* will truly involve all members of the campus community.

I have received the endorsement of the Civil Service Council, the Administrative/Professional Council and the Student Government Association. At this time, I am asking for the Senate's endorsement.

**Senator Crothers:** Please note that this draft of *Educating Illinois* has been through the Senate's Planning and Finance Committee for discussion on a number of occasions, so the Senate has been closely involved in its evolution.

**Senator Mohammadi:** The percentage of minority students at ISU is very small at only 5% of 21,000 students. What steps are you taking to attract quality minority students?

**Dr. Rives:** Representatives from the Office of Admissions have gone to many high schools with high concentrations of minority students and established person-to-person contact. This is not a one-time venture. They establish a face-to-face interaction that carries through to application, admission and enrollment. A second strategy is that Dr. Kern has established a goal of \$1 million for minority scholarships through the Capital Campaign.

**02.09.04.01 Sense of the Senate Resolution: Endorsement of 2003-2010 Educating Illinois (Senator Crothers)**

**Motion XXXV-62:** By Senator Crothers to endorse the Sense of the Senate Resolution from the Senate Executive Committee: "Inasmuch as *Educating Illinois 2003-2010* reflects the goals and principles of Illinois State University, the Academic Senate endorses this document. Further, the Academic Senate encourages the Illinois State University faculty, staff and student members of the campus community to support and work diligently toward achieving the goals set forth in *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*."

The Senate unanimously endorsed *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*.

**Action Items:**

**07.18.03.01 Alcohol Policy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)**

**Senator Crothers:** There was a recommendation when the Alcohol Policy was last discussed concerning the Tailgating Procedures. Senator Ghrist's recommendation to extend the length of time for tailgating activities has been forwarded to Leanna Border, Department of Athletics, who will discuss this recommendation in April with other representatives from the group that developed the procedure. The group is composed of representatives from Intercollegiate Athletics, ISU Police Department and Parking Services.

**Senator O'Donnell:** The Administrative Affairs Committee addressed the other questions that were raised about the policy at the Senate meeting of January 21, 2004. In the Student Conduct section, a question was raised as to why “expected” rather than “required” was part of the sentence reading, “It is expected that all student organizations will have their activities approved by the group’s faculty/staff advisor.” “Expected” was used because it sometimes very difficult for students to have access to the group’s advisor; many have very limited contact with their advisors. The question of the faculty/staff advisor’s liability also arose. On page 10, at the bottom of the form, the signature of the advisor is required to encourage students to get help with planning and to identify major pitfalls prior to moving forward with an event. If the advisor is acting officially within a University capacity, which is true for advising, they would be protected as is everyone in performing officially sanctioned duties. On page 11, there was concern about the transport of alcoholic beverages. The third paragraph on page 11 reads, “...alcohol may be transported to and from student rooms by individuals over 21 provided that all alcoholic beverages are in the original container and remain sealed by the manufacturer.” The last issue raised concerned serving alcoholic beverages during events at Ewing Manor. We are told that Ewing Manor is not considered University property, but rather is owned by the ISU Foundation, so it does not actually fall under the University Alcohol Policy.

**Senator Crothers:** The ISU Foundation is a private corporation with which ISU contracts to run its Foundation; so, as a consequence, the property it owns does not belong to Illinois State University.

**Senator Fowles:** You were going to check with legal counsel about the sentence that, “it is expected...” on page 2, but yet on the signature page, page 10, requires a faculty advisor’s signature. There seems to be a conflict.

**Senator Mamarchev:** Sometimes the signature page is left in the department for the advisor’s signature, but there is not necessarily a discussion that occurs. We would like that to happen, but in many cases, that’s not possible. The signature there becomes the opportunity for the faculty advisor to be aware that the event is going on.

**Motion XXXV-63:** By Senator O’Donnell to approve the proposed University Alcohol Policy. All Senate members in attendance voted their approval of the policy, with the exception of Senator Fowles, who abstained.

**02.02.04.01B Consensual Relations Policy - Revised (Rules Committee)**

**02.02.04.01C Code of Ethics Revision - Excerpt Regarding Consensual Relations (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Coliz:** The policy presented to you this evening has only minor differences in the policy presented to the Senate on February 4, 2004. In the policy that applies to civil service and A/P, the first sentence is changed very slightly in accordance with the suggestion Senator Wang made last time. The sentence now reads, “Illinois State University employees are expected to be aware of their responsibility to avoid apparent or actual conflict...” The sentence previous read that “...faculty, administrative/ professionals, civil service and students employed by the University are expected...” We specifically wanted to delete “faculty” from this sentence as the policy does not apply to faculty, rather the Code of Ethics governs faculty consensual relationships. There is somewhat of a minor issue concerning confidentiality related to this document. Even though we agreed in the Rules Committee to not insert language about confidentiality, we also agreed that there be a requirement by civil service and A/P staff to keep these types of information confidential. The Rules Committee is going to look at that in a broader context to make sure that there is something at the University requiring us to keep all personnel information confidential. In the second paragraph of the additional proposed language in the Faculty Code of Ethics, there was a small wording revision and

explanation in the first sentence defining “or others” as “or other member of the University community.” In the second paragraph of the proposed addition, in the sentence “...not initiate consensual...”, we in error omitted “nor enter into”, so we inserted that phrase. Additionally, I received a message that we were using an Ethics Code that is old and outdated. I want to assure the Senate that the Rules Committee will have at least an updated version of the Code before the end of the year. Depending on time, I don’t know if it will be a complete rewrite or simply an updated and modernization of the existing one.

**Motion XXXV-64:** By Senator Coliz to approve the proposed Consensual Relations Policy and additional language to the Code of Ethics. All Senate members in attendance voted their approval of the policy, with the exception of Senator Baum, who abstained.

**Information Items:**

**01.29.04.01 Academic Senate Bylaws – Revisions to Article II (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Coliz:** The Rules Committee basically rearranged the paragraphs contained in Article II grouping together the rules relevant to the different types of committees. We also made some minor wording changes to make it readable.

**Motion XXXV-65:** By Senator Coliz, seconded by Senator Fryman, to move the item to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXV-66:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revisions to Article II of the Senate bylaws. The revisions were unanimously approved.

**01.22.04.01 Administrator Selection (Search Committee) Policy - Revised (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)**

**Senator O’Donnell:** The changes made by the Administrative Affairs Committee included substituting throughout the document “curriculum vita” for “brief resume”, and changing “approving” to “reviewing” in instances when it was more appropriate for the Senate to be said to be reviewing, as the President ultimately approves or disapproves. Administrative/Professional and civil service personnel are now structurally included as members of administrative search committees. A minor revision involved the “appointment” rather than the “election” of student members to the search committees, which was agreed to by SGA.

**Senator Burk:** The civil service and administrative/professional representatives are selected in the same way for two of the vice presidential searches and selected in a different way for the other two vice presidential search committees. Would you consider making that parallel?

**Senator O’Donnell:** We will make those procedures consistent.

**Senator Burk:** We would like to have the civil service representatives elected by the Civil Service Council.

**Senator Crothers:** Under the section for Vice President of University Advancement, page 7, 2a, the two faculty members are selected by the President. I assume A/Ps are selecting A/P representatives and civil service is selecting civil service representatives. Why aren’t faculty selecting faculty? Additionally, in the College Deans section, page 9, department chairpersons are not included in the committee composition. If you recall, when we searched for deans this year, the colleges asked for a waiver, for among other reasons, to include a department chairperson on the Dean Search Committees. In our discussion, we asked Administrative Affairs to consider whether or not structurally within this policy a department chair might be added.



**Senator O'Donnell:** We will have that discussion.

**Senator Thompson:** Although A/P staff are structurally included on search committees, some departments may not have Administrative/Professionals within their department.

**Senator Crothers:** That language suggests that there be A/P representation assuming that there are A/P staff within the department.

The Administrator Selection (Search Committee) Policy will be added to the Senate Agenda of March 3, 2004 as an action item.

**Communications:**

**02.02.04.02 Invitation to Senate to Attend Academic Affairs Annual Planning Presentation (Provost Presley)**

The Academic Affairs Division's Annual Planning Presentation will be held on March 16 and 17 from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. in 401 Stevenson Hall. Each dean or administrator will emphasize the important aspects of their written proposals.

**Senator Crothers:** Will the focus be on enhancement dollars?

**Provost Presley:** We have been told that there are no enhancement dollars. The focus will be on planning and priorities.

**Senator Wang:** Is there a scheduled time for each college's presentation?

**Provost Presley:** Yes, however, I do not have that information with me, but it was published in the *Report*.

**02.03.04.01 Illinois Education Labor Relations Act Amendment (Senator Bragg)**

Referencing the memo from Senator Bragg, an amendment to the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act changes the significance of signatures on a union card. Previously, signing such a card signified that the signatory favored an election in which he/she would be entitled to vote on the question of unionization. The amended law now requires that the University recognize an employee organization as a bargaining representative for a unit of employees if a majority of the employees within that unit have signed a card. In that event, unionization can be automatic and an election need not be held. Of course, the decision to unionize is at the discretion of the employee unit. The legislation is on the General Assembly web site at: [www.legis.state.il.us/legislation/publicacts/default.asp](http://www.legis.state.il.us/legislation/publicacts/default.asp). The Public Act number is 93-0444.

**Adjournment**

**ATTENDANCE AND MOTIONS**