

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, January 25, 2006
(Approved)

Call to Order

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

Roll Call

Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions

Approval of Minutes of December 7, 2005

Motion XXXVII-42: By Senator Schnepfer, seconded by Senator Van Dyke, to approve the Senate Minutes of December 7, 2005. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: The administration will discuss the implementation of the salary plan's first phase tonight. That information has gone out to at least some of the constituencies affected. Finally, I only know this from a news report, but I am hoping that someone tonight will explain the report about the budget concerns regarding Dining Services at ISU.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Garrison: Maggie Rienbolt, one our SGA senators, has had to resign from the Senate. I want to thank her for her service to the Student Government as well as to the Senate. In her place, we have elected Ben Brockschmidt. He was the Co-Chairperson of the Administrative Affairs Committee last year. On February 8, SGA will be holding a realtor forum, hopefully, the first of many. This will allow realtors and students to discuss issues that concern them. Specifically, the first topic will be "open leasing". Finally, SGA is sponsoring two "Pack the Place" events. One is occurring tonight while our Men's Basketball Team takes on Indiana State. We will be sponsoring another one a week from Saturday for the women's team.

Administrators' Remarks

President Al Bowman

President Bowman: I will start first with the salary process that is underway. In September, during the State of the University Address, I referenced our longstanding problems with competitiveness in salary and charged Vice Presidents Bragg and Presley with putting together a plan that would begin to address that problem over a multiyear period. In early December, we announced the first phase of the long-term plan to bring the average salaries of all our employee groups up to at *least* the median for our peers. That phase is currently in implementation and those who are affected by this initial step should have been notified and the increase will appear in their checks at the end of the January pay period.

We focused first on those groups that were furthest below the median and that included full and associate professors, as well as non-negotiated civil service employees. A total of 1,015 employees were eligible for the program. That included 558 non-negotiated civil service employees, 214 full professors, 211 associate professors and 32 department chairs. Not everyone in the group of 1,015 received an adjustment, but they were all eligible and they were all evaluated. We used about 1% of our personal services base for each of the

groups for the allocation. The total was about a half million dollars. We used funds that had previously been set aside for a possible state cut.

The decisions about who received the salary increases were delegated to the managers, who were obviously most familiar with the employees. For the faculty, the DFSCs and CFSCs were consulted and then the actual decisions were reviewed by the deans, the Provost, the four vice presidents and then ultimately me. 61% of civil service staff received salary adjustments and 93% of the faculty, associates and full professors. The increases ranged from a high of 17% down to a low of 0.1%. The range was largely driven by how far away an individual was from the median as well as a review of performance. The next group that we will look at will be administrative professionals and we will make an announcement about that group very soon. It is a long-term process; we can't make up multiple years in one step. It would take about \$7 million to bring just faculty and civil service employees up to the median if we were to do it today. Over the next 3 to 4 years, if we do a midyear adjustment, as well as the annual increases, we will be able to get our salaries at least to the median and then move beyond it. These increases go into base salaries and so while the implementation rules are such that the raises begin at midyear, that raise will remain in the individual's base. For many people, that will have a major impact on retirement.

Senator Mwilambwe: Is the raise, even though it happens midyear, retroactive?

President Bowman: No, it is not. We could have done it that way, but we wanted to move. If we did that, it would dilute the pool and it was just a management decision. A follow up question that I might ask if I were you is 'As we do the AP group, will theirs begin at the point where the analysis is done or will it go back to January?' and it would be retroactive back to January 30th.

The AP group is a little more complicated because the data is harder to get. We have AP classifications that don't show up in national data bases and it is just taking the staff a little more work to do the analysis. About half of the classifications have been analyzed, but we still have more work to be done.

Senator Fazel: Will the AP group get the raise this year?

President Bowman: Absolutely.

Senator Fazel: Does that mean the people who get raises this year still would qualify for raises in the future?

President Bowman: This will have no impact on the regular, annual process for raises; the funds available for that process as we go into FY07 will not be affected by the raises we distributed in January 2006.

· **Provost John Presley**

Provost Presley: I would like to continue keeping you updated on the admissions process for our next freshman class. Our total freshman applications received after the priority filing dates are up 13%. We have not admitted 38% more students; so, the one is not driving the other. 8% more students have been offered a wait list and 38% more students have, in fact, not been admitted. The result of the kind of selectivity that that can afford us is that the academic profile is much the same as last year's at this time for admitted students. The average ACT is 24.3 and the GPA is 3.48; the ACT is the same, the GPA is up. The average class rank is up to 73.1. The percentage of those students who were in the top half of their high school class, in the top quarter and in the top 10%, all those figures are up as well. Again, it is a strong class that we are looking at.

Minority admissions are equally strong. The total applications received from minority students is up 21%. That is, frankly, 193% for American Indians, 19% for African Americans and an 18% increase in Hispanic applications. We are admitting 10% more of those students than we did last year and their average ACT is up slightly. The average GPA is up. The average class rank is up, so those are very, very strong signs of the kinds of students who are applying to ISU and the kind of reputation that we are beginning to project around the state.

Here are some statistics about academic probation and reinstatement. With the stronger academic preparation of the incoming classes, we have seen a large decrease in the number of students who were dismissed or on academic probation. The number for fall 2005 was 25% lower than the number for fall 2002. The Reinstatement Committee is working as they usually do. The total number of petitions submitted to them was 109. They reinstated 40 of those students; that is a large decrease from 161 in 2002, so there is selectivity operating there as well.

Concerning the subcategory of formally dismissed students who petition for reinstatement, in 2002, we reinstated 51 of those students. In 2005, we reinstated only 10. So, there is quite a change there as well.

We think that some of the reason for that is an initiative that I have mentioned before. The Office of Enrollment Management has initiated something they call Project Success in which students who are identified as at risk of being placed on academic probation and those who are on probation are offered workshops, follow up, assessment. They sign contracts. There were 275 students on academic probation for the first time. 230 of those students attended what is called a "Success Workshop". 205 of them submitted a "Success Plan". I think that this kind of attention to the services that are available to these students is paying off.

Finally, I want to mention another service being offered by Enrollment Management, but specifically by the Registrar's Office. An online degree audit is now available to students through the I-Campus Portal. It is called "Progress Toward My Degree" and it provides personalized information on students' progress toward meeting their requirements for graduation, their requirements for General Education, the requirements for majors, minors, the requirements for professional education for Teacher Education candidates, as well as a semester by semester list of courses. It includes courses transferred to ISU and their ISU articulations. We think that this new service will allow students to become more responsible for their course planning and we hope that it will contribute to timely graduation. This online degree audit represents a great deal of work and collaboration among the staff members from the Registrar's Office, the Administrative Information Systems and Institutional Web Support. I want to thank them all and commend them for their hard work.

Senator Schambach: Related to our improved ACT scores, ISU qualified for ranking in *Kiplinger Magazine's* list of top 100 colleges in the US.

President Bowman: One of the things I like about the *Kiplinger* survey versus *U.S. News* is that the *Kiplinger* survey does not include a "beauty contest" component in that two-thirds of the survey is based on academic measures, things like student-faculty ratio, amount of expenditures on the library, instruction, percentage of faculty at the highest degree in their field. Only one-third of it is based on cost. I think in some ways the survey has some advantages over *U.S. News*. Twenty years ago, our peers, as an institution did not include William and Mary, James Madison, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. These are very prestigious institutions and to be included on a list of schools like that is a very different place for Illinois State to be.

· ***Vice President of Student Affairs Helen Mamarchev***

Vice President Mamarchev: Today was the start of our Wednesday music series, sponsored by the University Programming Board, upstairs in the seating area between Burger King and Pizza Hut. It is going to be every Wednesday from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Featured today were some of our local student musicians. That will be the primary focus of this series, but, occasionally, some national talent will be brought in. There was a real good turnout today. The number of requests for books in alternative format, such as Braille, continue to increase with our Disability Concerns area. So, they are quite busy in the production of those materials.

I am not sure what Senator Crothers' specific question is regarding Campus Dining, but I can give you a summary about what I believe he is asking. At the end of the semester, we always reconcile through our own internal audit system the transactions that occur when people go to the dining centers, regardless of the location, to swipe their cards. We use a debit card system. This is called the microsystem, which is, in essence, the cash register system you see whenever you go to any of the residential facilities or at McAllister's, etc. We found that the transactions were being recorded so we knew who had been swiping their card, but the amount of money that was being spent was not being debited from their accounts. We found this out the week after commencement. So, all of the students who were impacted by that were sent an e-mail explaining what had happened, explaining how much needed to be debited from their account, if they had any questions, who to contact, and so on.

Senator Crothers: Thank you; I had only heard a news report about it.

Vice President Mamarchev: I asked Campus Dining today if they had gotten many inquiries about it and they said just a handful.

Senator Garrison: I know that there have been many questions from students and I don't want to open up the floodgates right now, but the question I have is, was the error with the computer system for an entire year?

Vice President Mamarchev: No, that is not what I was told. It was during the fall semester. It was some type of software glitch.

· ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg***

Vice President Bragg: We are gearing up for appropriation hearings later this spring and for budget recommendations. The IBHE will be issuing their budget recommendations in a week or so. I think their meeting is set for the first week in February. While we are realistic about it, we don't expect to see any recommendations for major increases for public universities. We are also optimistic that this will be the second year in a row where budgets will not be reduced and, hopefully, we will start to turn this financial picture around. In the meantime, we continue to plan for our own destiny and our self-help. The President and I had two conference calls today; one with Standard and Poor and one with Moody's, the two major rating agencies, preliminary for us to go out with a bond issue in March. We will be taking that issue to the Board of Trustees in February seeking authorization to borrow funds in the form of issuing bonds to augment our auxiliary facility systems, primarily to continue work on the long-range housing and dining plans. The conference calls went very well. We are optimistic that the rating agencies will decouple our financial situation from the State's financial situation. The State has been downgraded in ratings recently and we are hopeful that that will not extend to us.

Committee Reports

- **Academic Affairs Committee**

Senator Borg: The committee received back matters that we sent on to the Executive Committee, one for some editorial changes. We will forward that back and I hope that you will see it in two weeks. The other was for more substantive changes that we were unaware of and we will address those issues in the future having to do with the withdrawal policies that are being combined.

- **Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee**

Senator Smith: We reviewed the annual commentary on President Bowman. We are working on a summary draft of that set of comments and we will be forwarding that to the Executive Committee probably shortly after the next meeting of the Senate.

- **Faculty Affairs Committee**

Senator DeSantis: The committee discussed the results of its recent survey on faculty retention. We received a good response with 312 faculty members participating. The survey generated over 30 pages of substantive comments by faculty, which the committee is in the process of categorizing and summarizing for presentation to the Senate and eventually for recommendations to the administration. In the near future, we would like to make the results from the survey available to the entire university community.

- **Planning and Finance Committee**

Senator Burk: The committee did not meet tonight, but the subcommittee has talked to the four vice presidents about university priorities and to two of the deans about planning processes in the colleges. That subcommittee wound up that process right before the holidays. The report on those six meetings will be out later this week and then, at our next meeting, we will begin to discuss the form of our priorities document for this year.

- **Rules Committee**

Senator Holland: The committee did not meet this evening. We will meet again after we receive comments about our communication item on this evening's agenda, the Faculty Code of Ethics.

IBHE-FAC Report

Professor Curt White, IBHE-FAC Representative: We met at Bradley University last Friday. It was a very tense meeting, but not necessarily an eventful meeting. It was tense because there is considerable controversy within the group over what kind of group we should be. There are some people who think that we should return to a traditional, bureaucratic committee structure, generating white papers. However, some people are not happy with that because they don't see where these papers are going to go and where they are going to have any kind of effect. Others feel that the organization should be a little more aggressive, more of an advocacy organization.

The draft of the thesis on higher education that I wrote, basically as a thought exercise, which had no official function at all and that I shared with you last semester, actually caused a rumbling in the state. It got leaked into some newspapers and the IBHE staffers heard about it and asked 'when did you pass these things?' Everybody became very anxious and angry, which was an interesting lesson about what happens when you move outside of conventional committee structures. The bottom line on that is that a much revised and leavened set of theses will probably be approved by the group and I think that they will make some splash in the media and get into public some of the views of the faculty.

It turned out to be rather a significant issue in the *Pantagraph* in the last week having to do with the

Governor's proposal to provide tax credits to people who are sending their students to in-state universities, whether public or private. There was a huge error in my comments, which was a total misunderstanding on my part. I thought it was a deduction, but it is a credit, so the \$1,000 would be right out of their tax bill for that year. The size of that program, \$90 million, is also disturbing. The Governor's office is always arguing that receipts are up so we have a little more money to do these things. If receipts are up and we have more money to do things, wouldn't it be better to actually invest in the universities so that tuitions don't have to go up and maybe put some money that they stole from our pension plans back in. Needless to say, the legislature, at least the democratic half, is not likely to see it that way.

Judy Erwin, the Director of the IBHE, when I met with her last semester, said that they had no intention of asking for more than a 2% increase in this year's budget, which means that it will probably at best be a flat budget and a flat budget is not good news for universities. It means that they are going to have to continue to find other ways to hold their programming at an even level.

Senator Garrison: Do the students have to have a certain GPA for their parents to receive a tax credit?

Professor White: None of this has been approved yet. Part of the proposal is that it would be only for students maintaining a B average or better. That is also controversial.

President Bowman: The conversations in Springfield about this proposal have not been all positive and a number of legislators have expressed concern about the proposal. One of the concerns was that on the one hand, this certainly promotes affordability and that is positive thing for families. On the other hand, there are better and more efficient ways to distribute this kind of benefit through the existing ISAAC system. Some of the members of the General Assembly have criticized the proposal because it will require public higher education to spend money to verify the students who are eligible for the credit. If it were to be passed, we would have to add staff to do this kind of work. It would not be an easy program to manage; we could manage it, but we could not do it with the existing staff. I don't have a sense of whether it will pass or not.

Senator Bragg: It is certainly a popular program. It affects a lot of families in Illinois. So, it is a proposal that would be easy for many members of the General Assembly to support. At the same time, the issues that Professor White and the President point out are fairly transparent and understood by many members of the General Assembly. It is just too early to predict whether this will gain enough support to pass.

Professor White: Is this something that they would have to vote on independently or could it be coupled with the budget and thus dealt with by the 'Big 5' again?

Senator Bragg: It could be just part of the budget package and dealt with as an omnibus bill at the end of the session. It does not require individual legislation.

Professor White: That seems to me to be the most dangerous aspect of it because it is at that point that, regardless of what the individual legislators think, they usually end up getting kind of strong armed into supporting what the leaders agree to.

Senator Bragg: If it comes forward as part of an omnibus bill and it becomes part of the negotiations at the end, then it becomes a chip in the negotiations. Then the question becomes what gets traded and how strongly other members of the negotiating team feel about it. Some have speculated that this is linked in some peoples' minds to the proposal for a \$500 million capital bill and somehow would get tied to that. Phil Adams, our government liaison, would have a much better read on that than I would.

It continues a process that has been in place for several decades now of a preference to fund higher education through the students as opposed to funding base appropriations of institutions. This is a phenomenon that we have seen across the country for a long time. So, Curt, that is one of the issues that would be incumbent upon the Faculty Advisory Council to debate: “How did we get to the point where it is more attractive to policy makers to support student-based financial programs as opposed to institutional-based programs?”

Action Items:

**09.14.05.01 *University Commemorative Day Policy – Deletion (Administrative Affairs Committee)*
(Information Item on 11/09/05)**

Senator Crothers: We have on the agenda the deletion of the University Commemorative Day Policy. When this was discussed on November 9, 2005, it was held off on the grounds that the President was not present at that Senate meeting. If we were going to delete something about a commemorative day, we felt it more appropriate to have the President in attendance. The approval of the deletion of the policy does need to be moved by the Administrative Affairs Committee.

Motion XXXVII-43: By Senator Smith to delete the University Commemorative Day Policy. The policy was deleted unanimously by the Senate.

**09.23.05.03 *Creation of Policy Policy (Administrative Affairs Committee)*
(Information Item on 11/09/05)**

Senator Crothers: The Creation of Policy Policy was discussed on November 9, 2005. The discussion was that the Creation of Policy Policy is inadequately titled. The Executive Committee suggests that a friendly amendment, if the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee will accept it, would be to insert into the Creation of Policy Policy’s title the word “Academic”.

Motion XXXVII-44: By Senator Smith, to approve the policy, retitled, “Creation of Academic Policy”. There were no additional revisions to the policy and the policy, as revised, was unanimously approved.

Communications:

RE: Senate Resolution – Trustee Bergman (Senators op de Beeck and Fowles)

NOTE: Resolution in Senate Packets of 12/7/05; Documents Re: Petco Petroleum Incident in Senate Packets of 11/9/05.

Senator op de Beeck: Over the break, it came to our attention that Trustee Bergman had settled his pending case regarding the spillage of saltwater and contaminants, so we are withdrawing our Sense of the Senate Resolution because it is no longer necessary in that particular case. We did want to say, though, that we remain concerned about the Trustee’s environmental record and, in addition, we wanted to express that we really think that it is worthwhile that the Senate take an interest in the civic responsibility of corporate leaders and others associated with ISU to hold people accountable. It may be kind of a drop in the bucket and symbolic in a lot of ways, but we feel that it is a good argument to be having. We wanted to thank those who gave their help and suggestions for the resolution; we received a lot of good comments and support on that.

01.18.06.02 *Faculty Code of Ethics – Request for Comments from Academic Senate (Rules Committee)*

Senator Crothers: The Faculty Code of Ethics, revised, comes to us not as an Information or an Advisory Item, but as a Communication Item. The Rules Committee is seeking feedback from the Senate at this time and the code will come back to us later as an Information Item.

Senator Holland: One of the major charges to the Rules Committee was the revision of the Faculty Ethics Code. If you look at our current document, it is somewhat of a peculiar conglomeration of things with a fair amount of “thou shalt nots”. Included in that was our resolution of a couple of years ago on consensual relations. What we are proposing is basically the elimination of the old ethics document with this one page item before you, which is much more of what do we hold as institutional values. You will notice that there are a number of things that are referenced in it, including the AAUP Statement of Professional Ethics and academic freedom, but as far as the consensual relations part of it goes, we have taken the text of that verbatim and are proposing putting that as academic policy. This draft just refers to all of the university polices.

Senator Crothers: Can you give us a sense of what benchmarking or other kinds of things you did when drafting this so that people won’t think that you just invented it out of thin air?

Senator Holland: We looked at quite a few ethics documents from other universities. We looked at the AAUP’s ethics document. We kind of mixed and matched for what we thought was most appropriate for ISU.

Senator Crothers: Were there any big parts of the old ethics document that are not subsumed within this much more simple and much more direct document?

Senator Holland: I think we pretty much covered all the bases. Then again, we just put a big statement of ‘play nice and pick up after yourself’. That would probably cover it, too.

The Senate was encouraged to submit commentary by e-mail to Senator Holland at dlholla@ilstu.edu. The Rules Committee will discuss the document again at its next meeting and then forward it to the campus community for feedback.

Documents Approved by President Bowman on January 5, 2006

10.31.05.01 COB Bylaws – Revised

Senate Approved on November 9, 2005

10.27.05.01 124-Hour Limitation for Undergraduate Degree Programs Policy

The Senate approved the policy, as well as the Academic Affairs Committee’s request to append the policy to the Baccalaureate Degree Document, on November 9, 2005.

10.24.05.01 Academic Standards Committee on Teaching Policy-Deletion

Senate approved policy deletion on November 9, 2005.

11.29.05.02 CAS Bylaws-Revised

Senate approved on December 7, 2005.

11.09.05.01 Equitable Treatment of Students Policy-Revised

Senate approved on December 7, 2005.

11.29.05.01 Library Policy-Revised

Senate approved on December 7, 2005.

11.01.05.02 University Review Committee Revisions to ASPT Document Regarding CFSC Reporting

Requirements

Faculty Caucus approved on December 7, 2005.

On December 16, 2005, the Senate approved the following curricular proposals on its web-based Consent Agenda:

Marketing Sequences (2):

Integrated Marketing Communication Sequence Proposal

Professional Sales Sequence Proposal

Music Education Minor Deletion

Curricular proposals are available on the Senate website at: </consent.html>

President Bowman was also informed of Advisory Items.

Advisory to the Senate on December 7, 2005:

11.10.05.02 Employment in Excess of Full Time Appointment Policy

11.10.05.03 Secondary/Outside Employment Policy

11.10.05.04 Classroom Disruption Policy-Draft

12.01.05.01 Sabbatical Leave Policy

Adjournment