

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, January 23, 2008
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senator Holland called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions

Approval of Minutes of December 5, 2007

Motion XXXIX-30: By Senator Fazel, seconded by Senator Anders, to approve the Senate Minutes of December 5, 2007. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Presentations:

Changing Demographics in Higher Education/Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Students (Jonathan Rosenthal, Office of Enrollment Management and Academic Services)

Native American Student Recruitment Issues (Ann Haugo, Theatre Faculty Member)

Documents Relevant to Presentations:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 01.15.08.01 | Enrollment Management and Changing Demographics-Excerpt from Slide Presentation (Jon Rosenthal) |
| 01.23.08.01 | Underrepresented Groups - Programs Supporting Recruitment and Retention (Jon Rosenthal) |
| 10.16.06.01 | Native American Student Recruitment and Retention Concerns: Letter to 2006-07 Academic Senate Chairperson (Senator Susan Kalter) |
| 12.18.07.01 | Native American Student Retention and Recruitment Recommendations (Senator Susan Kalter) |

Senator Holland: You may recall that a few meetings back, Senator White, our IBHE-FAC Representative, gave us a little information about changing trends in enrollment. There was a good deal of interest in it, so we have invited Vice President Rosenthal here this evening to give us a presentation about enrollment trends and challenges.

Dr. Rosenthal: I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you. The overview is as follows. Talking quickly about *Educating Illinois*, enrollment goals and trends—the demographic change is I think of most interest—our challenges in the next decade looking at those demographic changes, some other issues and then some recommendations that we might want to discuss as a group. I have asked my directors, who have expertise in much greater depth in the area of admissions, to be present this evening: Molly Arnold, Admissions, Jana Albrecht, Financial Aid, Jess Ray, Registrar, and Amelia Noel-Elkins is here from University College.

My goal is to speak maybe about 15 minutes and move along quickly to questions and answers so that I can

direct the conversation in ways in which would be most useful to you. I know, too, that there is interest in the issue of underrepresented groups, how we recruit them and how we retain them. I will address that in sort of a big picture issue in terms of statistics, talk a little about recruitment initiatives and retention programming at the end of this presentation and we can jump off with detailed questions on that, as well.

So, *Educating Illinois* gives some very broad goals:

To work collectively with the campus community to recruit high-achieving, motivated students, while maintaining the University's historic commitment to opportunity and access. The indicators or markers that *Educating Illinois* is looking for are increased admission standards, retention and graduation rates. We have a good story to tell there, in general.

Increase the number and value of scholarships. We have considerably good news on the need-based scholarship programs that we have been able to do over the last five years.

Reducing student debt load. Because of reductions in state support for public universities, we have not done as well as we would like there. In fact, we are going in a bad direction, if you are a student.

Finally, increased minority student, faculty and staff recruitment, retention and graduation rates. We will address some of those points in more detail later.

President Bowman is quite specific with me when we talk about enrollment. We are to be a university of between 20,000 and 20,500 students. That means that we admit about 5,000 new undergraduates every fall; 3,200 of those are new freshmen and 1,800 of those are new transfers, in general. How did we do this past fall? We stand right above 20,000 at 20,104 students with an overall headcount of 3,145 freshmen and 1,725 transfers. We are a little bit below our goals for a variety of reasons that we can get into if you would be interested in that detail. About 17,500 are undergraduates and about 2,500 are graduate students. About 11% of our population is from underrepresented groups; that's for this past fall.

This chart (power point slide) is a bit deceptive because of the scale, but over the last ten years, our enrollment has gone from about 20,000 up to about 21,000, back down to about 20,000. That's a five percent range; that is really a very narrow range. Our goal for enrollment is stability. It is not to grow as some other institutions have done. Our goal, I would say, has been stable enrollment with an increasing quality of students, as measured by the ACT. The bar graph (power point slide) charts our ACT progress over the last eight years, going from the mid 22s up to over 24. This is a remarkable achievement. I will talk a little more about our market position within the state, but we are in an extremely competitive position. We have really made remarkable strides as a campus in the last 20 years, in the last 10 years in particular.

How do we maintain that stable enrollment? We work on a very complicated model that comes to us from Planning and Institutional Research. It looks at all of the inflows and out goes of students graduating, stopping out, leaving the university, transferring in, transferring out. We, in Admissions, think a lot about our applications, our admissions and our enrolled numbers. The chart that you see here (power point slide) is just a representation of one segment of our underrepresented freshman student enrollment. The blue line represents applications. Our admissions staff has been successful in increasing the number of applications to the university from underrepresented groups. We have also been more aggressive in admitting students from underrepresented groups. Our enrollment, on the other hand, from underrepresented groups, has remained relatively flat and we can talk later about why that is.

This is the part that I think you might be most interested in. On this chart (power point slide), you don't have to look at the numbers, but the shape of the curve is important. This is WICHE, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, data. Looking at the number of high school graduates in the State of Illinois, we are at the peak, or just beyond the peak actually, of a very long increase in the number of high school graduates in the State of Illinois. As much as I respect Molly Arnold and her great team of recruiters, it has been relatively easy to recruit students over the past decade. In the next decade, it will be relatively much more difficult. Will it be catastrophically more difficult as it was in the late 80s, late 90s? No, but we will have a 7% decline in high school graduates in the State of Illinois. So far, as we are headed down on that curve, our applications to Illinois State University are up 8% to 9%, so we are bucking the trend.

Complicating that statistic of declining numbers of high school graduates is the changing demographic of those graduates. White high school graduates are currently about 72% of high school graduating classes; in just ten years, that will decline to 60%. The growth in the state is in the green (power point slide); that's the Hispanic population. The African American population looks relatively stable; the population of White graduates is declining. What do we know about those differences in population? About half of White, non-Hispanic students in the State of Illinois go on to higher education. About 41% of African Americans go on. About a third of Hispanics go on. As you think about these demographics, in particular, we talk about loan aversion—the issue of affordability and the perception of affordability. We have to work very hard with Black and Hispanic students, particularly first generation Black and Hispanic students who don't necessarily have experience with the system, about financial aid opportunities.

The income disparity in the State of Illinois is growing. Overall, the state is growing richer, which is good news if you are paying a tuition bill, but, in general, the poor are not benefiting as much as the other income quintiles. Our state funding, I don't have to tell you, has declined remarkably over the last two decades. President Bowman used the figure this morning of 26% of our total budget being covered by the state. These are appropriated funds, so, essentially, we are responsible now with our general revenue income and our university income, just those funding streams, for about 50% of our costs. Because of that, we have increased tuition quite dramatically.

This chart (power point slide) needs some explanation because the cost is exaggerated on the chart. Because of truth in tuition, these are fixed rates, so it looks like our tuition has gone up much more than it has. However, for an incoming freshman, in FY01, versus now, this is the sticker price for tuition and fees. So, we have compensated for the decline in state funding by increasing tuition and fees. Still affordability is a challenge and an issue that we have to face as a campus.

This chart (power point slide) is hard for you to read, but it tracks how our students' incomes track our tuition, I would say. This is a chart by family income quintile and you can see that our richest families, \$100,000 income and above, are coming to us in greatly larger percentages. That quintile sends its children to us 60% more than it has in the past. Since it is a fixed 100% pie, other quintiles decline. Where are those declines? They are really in the middle. The richest two quintiles can afford to pay our tuition. One of the things I am very careful to credit President Bowman with, with the support of Vice President Bragg, is our support for the most needy families through MAP supplemental funds. Those are campus-based funds we have increased from essentially \$0 five years ago to over \$5 million of campus-based aid to our neediest families. That is a real testament to our commitment to access for lower income students, as indicated in *Educating Illinois*. Other state universities are not making that similar commitment.

As we look ahead, how do we maintain our market position? What is our market position? There are lots of

indicators that say—we like to believe it and it's true—that we really are the institution of choice after the University of Illinois at Urbana. I would say that we are the institution of choice for undergraduate education. That is really borne out by statistics. We rank second in retention from freshman to sophomore year, about 83% this year. That is an extremely good number for the sort of institution we are. Our graduation rate has increased by 10% in the last decade; just that increase is a remarkable achievement. We are number two in graduation rates in the state, second only to the University of Illinois. Our ACT (average) for the incoming freshman class is second only to the University of Illinois in the state. So, those are all very good things and they are things that we talk about as we go out and market the university to high school students and their parents. So, it is important, I think, to try to maintain those numbers as we go into those more challenging times.

Things that we don't have a whole lot of control over are the changing demographics, the declining state financial support, the increased cost to students that is necessitated by the decline in state funding and also the increasing competition. Increasing competition comes not only from other institutions in the state, but the decline we see in the demographic composition of the state is exacerbated, exaggerated and enhanced by other states around us. Illinois is the number two exporter of college students in the nation now, second only to New Jersey. We send a lot of students to Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Arizona. We will have increasing competition from other areas in the Midwest, whose populations are declining faster than ours, who are already very competitive, who already have more recruiters in the Chicago area than we do. Community colleges, in terms of price point, will be competing with us.

Those are the things we can't control so much. One of the things we can do on our campus is to look at our program capacity and how we can make our programs accessible to students. This has been a real issue for us. We have, every year, very qualified students, 3.0, 3.5 students that we can't accommodate in programs that they want to be in. We have about 3,800 spots for the 5,000 students we enroll every fall. Does this mean that they never get into a major? Obviously not, because our graduation rates are very good. But we put up lots of entrance barriers to students. We have lots of requirements to get into a major. I think that we have to address that as a faculty and as a campus and try to turn that back just a little bit. Where that is a problem in particular is not for freshmen, who come here who have the time to perhaps experiment for a couple of years to find their path. Where we have real trouble is with transfer students.

Seventy percent of transfer students who we accept into a program come to Illinois State University. For students that we have to accept as General Students, undeclared, not because they don't know where they want to go, but because we don't have the capacity to let them in or we have entrance requirements that they have not quite met, that transfer show rate for undeclared students is 25% lower at 44%. That is a dramatic difference. That really tells us something about the students we can and cannot get on this campus.

The University of Illinois, as you probably have heard, just received a \$900,000 grant from Lumina to increase their efforts with transfer students. Transfer students have not been accepted to the University of Illinois with under 60 hours in the past. They will now be accepting transfer students at under 60 hours, so this is a real difference that we are going to have to adjust to sooner rather than later.

Recommendations: I think we need to continue to define how we are different. That's that number two market position in the state. *Educating Illinois*, which you will be looking at this evening and ongoing, is the right step to define that difference.

Target recruiting to changing populations;

Provide ongoing support to retain students to graduation;

Work with donors to provide increased merit-based aid to recruit.

Our merit-based aid is small on this campus, as is it is on most public campuses. However, our Presidential Scholar Program, which just a few years ago paid 90%, is now down to 50% of cost. Now, that said, we are still fairly competitive, but we don't have the numbers of merit-based scholarships that other campuses do, particularly those we want to compete against.

We also need to work with donors to provide support for recruitment scholarships on intake rather than prizes for exceptional students. It's great to reward students for exceptional performance, but it does not help us to recruit them for our campus. We have been working with Dianne Ashby and her staff on that issue. We need to continue to expand the need-based aid as a proportion of our income to support access for lower income students and we need to increase access to majors wherever possible. We need to step back from the barriers that we have erected in the last five years and be a more welcoming campus, particularly for transfer students. This is one of the things I talk a lot about because I think it is one of the most critical things that we have on our agenda in the next few years.

I am going to talk a little bit about persistence in graduation rates. Our graduation rates over time are very positive. This (power point slide) tracks by cohort, so the last bar graph which is up there above 64% is the cohort of students who entered in 2001. For an institution of our size, scope, mission, funding, this is a very good number. As I said, it is second in the state only to the University of Illinois. When you disaggregate this by male, female, Black, non-Hispanic and Hispanic, the numbers change. The yellow line represents female students; the line below it, all students, the line below that, male, the line below that, Black, non-Hispanic; and the line below and then above that line, Hispanic students. Should we be doing better? Yes, we should. Particularly in the last two years, the graduation rate for Black, non-Hispanic students has fallen. That is a subject of concern, obviously.

Our fall-to-fall retention rates: We started off in the mid 70s back in the mid 1990s and hit a high of 85% retention from freshman to sophomore year. Again, in comparison to other Illinois public institutions, other institutions of our size and mission, those are extraordinarily good numbers. We have backed off the highs. Again, a subject of concern. Increasingly, the concern is when you disaggregate by racial and ethnic groups. All students are represented by the top line; the next line down is Hispanic students and the red line, Black, non-Hispanic students. The last two years are a subject of real concern.

I'll talk a little bit about recruitment and I invite questions on this particularly to Molly as the expert. A new initiative in 2007 was getting into *Student Paths*, which is a publication that goes, notably, to all Chicago public schools and other high-need school districts to help teachers present the college choice, the college selection, the college affordability issue to students. That touches every student in the Chicago public school system. That is paying off for us, that and other initiatives, in the number of applications that we generate among minority students.

"You Can Do ISU" is a new collaborative program with Admissions and Financial Aid on affordability. We just rolled that out this fall. We hired an additional recruiter in Admissions for underrepresented groups. We replaced a specialist position in Financial Aid with someone who is tasked, specifically, to work with minority candidates, follow up and just to make sure that their issues are addressed. We have increased by 30% our application workshops in targeted high schools and top feeder community colleges. Those tend to be in high-need schools in and around Chicago. That, again, is an indication of the importance of that region and underrepresented groups to us. Again, we have been very successful in increasing the applicant pool among those groups at Illinois State. Financial Aid and Admissions are on the road together, not only in "You Can Do ISU", but in lots of other programs. Financial Aid is increasingly involved with outreach as our costs go

up; it is just what we need to do. Furthermore, with first-generation families, we need to provide them with the support and financial planning tools necessary to allow them to understand that college is still a very affordable option.

We have partnered with some of the local community colleges, IVCC, Heartland, ICC, on names of students with 45 hours and above to help us recruit in community colleges. The University of Illinois is partnering as well. This is sort of our response, but we have excellent relationships that were built over a long period of time, I would say second to none in the state, with community college and high school counselors. This serves us extremely well. Many of you are familiar with the "First Look" program, which brings minority applicants to campus in April to kind of seal the deal.

In terms of retention, addressing that decline in minority retention over the last two years, I convened in late fall 2006 an at-risk-student task force. That was composed of Academic Affairs specialists, Student Affairs specialists, folks from across campus who deal with at-risk populations. The result of that was Success 101, University Success Skills, which was piloted this fall. I think the thing that is innovative about it is what happens outside of class. We have reassigned half of an admissions counselor, who develops relationships with at-risk students, preadmission. He follows that cohort of students through the first year and maintains a point of contact, not only for the student, but for their families. So, there is one point of contact, a person who can be relied on to provide answers.

Also, around that course is a team case-management approach, which again brings some of the folks in that at-risk task force around the table to provide some pretty "high-touch" intervention and advocacy for these students, as the case arises. So, represented outside of that group, looking at the progress, are folks from housing, folks from Financial Aid, folks from Academic Support Services, to try to address any issues before they become real issues for that group. That was a pretty successful pilot. We will be looking into changing it based on the assessment of it next year, but we are committed to probably about doubling the size of that pilot next year.

We continue to offer LinC and target that to student populations that would benefit from it. That's the Learning in Communities program that has been around for awhile. That has been positively linked to good educational outcomes. My office supports the MASAI (Minority Academic Scholar Achievement Initiative) mentorship program, which is actually delivered out of the Student Affairs Diversity Advocacy Office; that is a peer-to-peer mentoring program that has been shown to increase retention. UCLA and the Minority Student Academic Center continue to provide the sorts of programming that they have in the past.

"Project Success" through my office is a program that is actually becoming quite nationally known. We have had invitations to present at a variety of conferences. This is a high-intervention program for students on probation to help them get off academic probation. It has demonstrable effect on retention of students. Its assessment, in other words, is very positive.

Academic Advisement is the first line to help students who have any questions regarding changing programs, course requirements, policies, deadlines. We don't often give them enough credit, but academic advisors are really the front lines to, if not answer questions, refer students to folks on campus who can answer those questions.

In the long term, we have been talking about a summer bridge program. Other campuses in the state have such programs. They are difficult and expensive programs to run; it would be a real commitment for the university to do that. We did a pilot with the College of Education, with their Little Village partnership, this

past summer and we will be repeating that, but that is a small-scale program for something that could be much larger.

So, those are but a few things that we are doing on the recruitment and retention side. I said to Cynthia that I would be happy to address Native American recruiting and retention, but I saw that Ann Haugo is going to present, so I thought that I might best present more broadly on minority recruitment and retention issues. I would be happy to respond after Ann's presentation or to questions you might have specifically on that.

Senator Wilkinson: To what do you attribute the increase in ACTs that we have seen over the last several years and why have we become the clear alternative to the U of I in about the same period?

Dr. Rosenthal: Well, certainly, the statewide demographics have been in our favor—a growing pool of qualified candidates. Unlike other campuses, we have chosen to grow in quality rather than to grow in size. However, I think we have been more successful at marketing our difference; marketing the quality of programs that we have; marketing our national reputation. We have a very positive message. Molly may have more insights than I do and I invite her address this. I think the buzz about us, sort of an intangible, has just been growing and we have been trying consciously to grow it whenever we can.

Molly Arnold, Director of Admissions: I would probably say that the students in this room, if they are having a good experience, their graduation, their interaction with the professors—they tell their friends, then that attracts more students. The way faculty and students interact are different now. I think that faculty and staff see that the students are truly our customers; that they are the reason why we have jobs. We are that big school with that small school feel. People are amazed that at a school of this size, they can meet with their professor; that you have listed office hours; 'that if I e-mail them, they will e-mail me back; that they truly care about me as an individual.' That kind of interaction is the reason why people come to Illinois State. It is the trickle-down effect. We have over 30,000 people a year, 10,000 just through our office alone, who visit our campus. The campus visit is the number one way students make decisions about where they want to go to school and it is because of everybody's effort that all of that trickles down.

Senator Wang: If you compare the peer institutions in terms of ACTs, I know that it is rising, but comparing with other institutions...

Dr. Rosenthal: Ours is rising faster.

Senator Wang: Could you give us a perspective?

Dr. Rosenthal: Over on the right (power point slide), is the University of Illinois at 27.7. They are clearly in a league of their own and always will be. We don't want to be in that niche; that's not our mission. At a 24.2, we are distinctly higher than the next one, UIC, University of Illinois-Chicago. We are considerable higher than Northern, which most students consider as sort of direct competition. Western is at 21.2; Eastern 21. We stack up pretty well and we have really made dramatic progress, purposely so, in increasing the quality of the student body within the last ten years.

Senator Gudding: I am thinking about the upper left power point graph on the second page (document 01.15.08.01). You mentioned that though our applications have gone up drastically for minority students, acceptances are up only slightly, and then enrollments are actually flat. Would you speak to the reasons for that?

Dr. Rosenthal: The top line is an indication of how successful we are in soliciting applications. We are out there talking with this community. As I said, we have added another recruiter to talk to students of color just recently. They are interested in coming here. We know, based on experience, that they are not coming here at rates that we would like, so we have been admitting more of them. I think the story here on why the enrollment is flat is twofold, at least. Structurally, with the given ACT range to 24, that's a very good score. If you are an African American or Hispanic student with a 24, you will have lots of college options; you will be very heavily recruited, in state and out of state. So, we are in a very competitive, increasingly competitive, portion of that market.

What gets students to go those other institutions very frequently is merit-based financial aid. For example, if you are a National Merit finalist, you will get a full ride at many universities; if you have an ACT over "x", you will get this financial aid package. In competing with private institutions, our tuition really is our tuition. As you know, at private institutions, there is a sticker price and a real price. If you take \$10,000 off the sticker price, the total price for an education that might be in many ways inferior to ours at a private institution will still be higher, but it will look like 'I'm getting \$10,000 from there and only \$2,000 from Illinois State.' So, there are financial reasons that students of color tend sometimes to go elsewhere, but it is a very, very competitive part of the market that we are in.

Students below an 18 ACT are just not very competitive here. We are not in the business of recruiting students, accepting them and having them go away after a year with no prospect of graduating with us. That's not what we want. We want students, first, who will be able to complete their degrees here. Those are the students we recruit very heavily and those are the students we have been relatively successful in getting, despite the increased difficulty in getting them over the years.

Senator Alferink: I would like to follow up on the show rates for the transfer students in terms of those who are accepted and declared in their major of choice versus those who come in as General Students. Could you provide a little finer analysis of the characteristics of the transfer students and whether that difference holds up, for example, for those who have 60 hours when they arrive here versus those who have 30 hours or are there differences at different community colleges? Do some community colleges have a different acceptance rate into majors versus General Student categories and what are the characteristics? Those finer grain analyses suggest very different kinds of answers in terms of how you approach the problem.

Ms. Arnold: We are one of the few state schools that are looking at our program capacity. No one else is monitoring it so they are bringing in those transfer students, throwing them in psychology, throwing them in biology. 'We don't care what you all do with them, just figure it out; we are making our numbers.' So the fact that we have a very strategic approach to how we do that makes my job a little more difficult.

Number one, when we compare to other schools, some of our benchmark institutions, in terms of GPAs, lots of departments will set a particular GPA. Several schools at our benchmark institutions don't even have GPAs to get into departments. If you get into the university, you get into the department, with the exception of units like schools of nursing and perhaps the talent schools as well. But it is a very difficult problem for Illinois State and we stand out because we are looking at it and no one else is. So, it's kind of like we are airing our dirty laundry for ourselves, but the community colleges will say, 'you would get more students if you could get them into majors.'

We want to keep our native students happy, but our transfer students do as well, if not better, than our native students, compared to some of the information that we received. So, sometimes that two years at the community college, getting those study skills honed in on or something of that nature, turns out to be a really

good choice for them. Does that answer your question?

Senator Alferink: No, it's a different question. I am not so concerned about what other schools in the state are doing. I am concerned about sort of the population of students that we admit as undeclared or into a major and whether that proportion of undeclared versus admitted into a major is different at different admission points. In other words, some students come in after one year at a community college; some come in after 45 hours; some come in after an associate's degree. Does the admission into a major differ at those different hours?

Ms. Arnold: It depends on the department.

Senator Alferink: Just on aggregate across the university?

Ms. Arnold: With the 75-hour rule that we now have here, we will not admit a student as a General Student if they have more than 75 hours. We used to say if you really want to come with 90 hours and couldn't get your major, we will take your money, but that was making U College a little crazy trying to figure out what to do with them and it just wasn't the right thing to do.

Dr. Rosenthal: There is no easy answer to your question. It's a good question. We have 15 pages of supplemental criteria. Every program, and there are 160 program, wants a C or better in this or a B and a C in five courses, but an A in this one and these are the sorts of obstacles that we have set up over time, well intentioned, to bring in students that are going to be successful. But the students who are penalized by that are generally those who have higher hours, who don't have anything to take while they taking the one last course that you in psychology say that they have to have to get into the major. They are going to be admitted; they have a great profile, but you won't let them in because they are missing that one course, so, differentially, it affects higher hour students.

We work with our community college partners all the time, but the chances of you getting into a program vary a lot by when you apply. We have tried to pool applicants and look at them at a point in time, but transfer students just, historically, apply late in the cycle. Departments want to fill their numbers, understandably, but we have some very well-qualified students who are denied admissions to programs, sometimes with 3.8 GPAs simply because they applied late. So, we have an issue of deferring students for a semester or for a year. We know that they will get in, but we won't let them in because they have simply applied too late. We cannot get that message out to the community colleges enough. We repeat it all the time; we have tried to change that behavior, but we can't.

Senator Kalter: I have two intertwined questions; one of them sort of coming off of this conversation. I was wondering, in terms of university-wide shared governance structures, how individual faculty can participate in recruitment, admissions, retention and if there is nothing there, if there is a possibility for somehow creating that interface. I was also intrigued by this other problem because it is my understanding that we recruited a fair number of underrepresented minorities through transfers, so this is a particular problem that they can't get into majors. That may be incorrect. It sounds like this is across the board; there's no one particular department or college that is doing this, but it's sort of building up everywhere over time? Also, is our attempt to keep class sizes low part of that picture?

Dr. Rosenthal: Let me try to go backward—class size: we have to figure out, given our pedagogy, how to accommodate the students that we have. We would like to teach seminars of 8 to 12 students, but that does not work if we are going to accommodate the number of students that we have. Do we have to increase class

size dramatically? No; I say, without having data to absolutely back me up, that we have a 6% to 10% problem. If we added two seats to every class of 23, we would be done. I have been a proponent for incremental change over time. We don't need to do anything dramatic, but we do need to address that problem.

Is it across the board? Yes, every department, from the most in demand to the least in demand, thinks that it only should have students with 3.5 GPAs or higher, because that is the quality of students that they want. Back in the early 90s, we had a very bad situation where you were a student in good standing if you had a 2.0 GPA, but it took a 2.5 GPA to get into any major to graduate. We are reproducing that now and I think that we need to address that as a campus. There are certain departments that are more sticking points, but I won't point any fingers. There are programs that are in demand, and have historically been in demand, where we have not been able to have the flexibility to raise capacity. We ought to be thinking about that.

The University College and Amelia's staff spends a lot of time trying to redirect students from one major, which is in demand, to another major, less in demand, that might have much better workforce opportunities in a related field that students haven't thought about. We do a lot of that. That is one of the things we have done over the last two years—have a preadmission advising task force, so advisors are talking to students even before they are admitted, saying, 'Ron Gifford can't admit you to History Teacher Ed right now, but if you wanted to talk to English, we could talk to them.'

How can faculty and staff participate in recruitment and retention? Certainly, in recruitment, there are opportunities that you can talk to Molly's staff about, being available to talk to students when Admissions calls to set up a department visit for a Presidential Scholar or someone else. But generally, we do a very good job of selling the institution. The institution is very easy to sell. We work with departments that have aggressive recruiting programs to build their enrollments; we have very successful partnerships there. Regarding retention, teach good classes. Let students in when they ask for an override every now and then. That sure helps. But retention, particularly of minority students, and all of the literature backs this up, depends on relationships with faculty. So, take the time to chat with students out of class; to call students proactively; 'I notice you were not in class for two days. Why was that?' There is a lot of data that suggest that those faculty contacts are just extraordinarily important in retaining students. It's obvious, but as we are busy with our research and service, sometimes we don't take time to do that.

Amelia Noel-Elkins, University College Director: I can give you two specific examples where faculty can be involved, particularly with underrepresented populations. The University Scholars Program, which was renamed this past year, is one example. It used to be called the Minority Academic Scholars Program. It is now being run out of the Minority Student Academic Center and has a mentorship program for those students. We would prefer faculty members; we do have faculty and staff mentoring at this point. In addition to that, the LSAMP, the Louise Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation, works with underrepresented populations in the sciences. It also has a mentorship program that is very successful for some of these students in terms of making that one-on-one contact with faculty members.

Senator Borg: Part of my question was addressed by Senator Alferink, but I would like to pursue a little bit more this matter of access to a major, especially on the part of transfer students. How much of that is a function of really necessary requirements rather than just simply the impression that we don't want to have more students in any particular department? I do see, individually, a general lack of preparation on the part of certain students from certain community colleges in particular. They have passed "x" requirements, but it is not what I would expect from someone who has actually accomplished that course here.

Dr. Rosenthal: Addressing that point, specifically, Julie Huber in my office did research last year that lead to a policy change. It used to be, and this made us very unfriendly to transfer students, that we would say, 'You got a 4.0 at a community college, but we don't believe it, so establish a GPA here and then we will consider allowing you into a major.' Then, in that semester, they did not have much to take. Did we retain that student? Not so much. The research that Julie did showed that if you have a 3.0 transfer student and a 3.0 ISU student, that transfer 3.0 from a community college is just as predictive for future success at Illinois State.

Are there certain exceptions to that? Undoubtedly, there are. Now, how do you address those? That is another case where faculty can be very involved. If you repeatedly see a course articulated as Music 152, which is your prerequisite for Music 153, and the students from community college "x" are consistently unprepared, then you let the Registrar's Office know and we will look at that articulation agreement and/or work collegiately with community colleges.

Senator Borg: I also would address certain issues, especially in terms of the arts, in which an accomplishment of a class is not necessarily representative of the work of a particular student, either in an artistic accomplishment or in a performance status and we suffer directly because grading is difficult, at best, in those instances.

Dr. Rosenthal: You have portfolio reviews that go on top of the articulation.

Senator Borg: Exactly, and sometimes they do not coincide with a GPA.

Dr. Rosenthal: I understand and that's a complicated issue that causes particular strains. I don't know if we need to address that here, but we can address it.

Senator Campbell: I have two unrelated questions. I had an earlier history with the Presidential Scholars, which is a merit-based entry program. I wondered how that was surviving. The second one is I wonder if you are taking your presentation or sections of it and sharing it with academic advisors throughout the campus because that seems to me where a lot of the conversation might need to start for them to bring it back into the departments so that they can start talking a little bit more realistically about maintaining the size of the classes and admission of students and what it is that we are really after.

Dr. Rosenthal: I presented much the same information to advisory development sessions. I gave an AP brown bag, which was not this presentation, but similar in the key slides. I don't diminish the role of advisors as the folks who start these conversations in departments. It is faculty and chairs, however, who set the policies and we need to have that conversation throughout. Advisors do understand this as they do get these cases, often turning them away and they don't like doing that because their role is to assure that a student is successful and graduates. So, that is a good suggestion; I have done some of that already and we will continue to do that. For those of you who are faculty and policymakers in departments, please have those conversations with your advisors.

Senator Campbell: The chairs and deans need to be brought up to speed to start the conversation from the bottom up, in that sense, and from the top down.

Dr. Rosenthal: Yes, I have talked to chairs and deans at each of the college meetings. In regard to your question about Presidential Scholars, it is a good program. We continue it; we have a pretty stable new cohort every year at 30 students at \$8,000. That's been stable for five or six years. It is not as much of a percentage

as it used to be, obviously, of our total cost, but compared to other state institutions, it is still very competitive. It brings top-quality students to us.

Senator Wilkinson: We have heard about Illinois exporting students for quite awhile. I wanted to know if you knew anything about the characteristics of these students who choose to leave the state and what it is that they find lacking in the choices of colleges and universities in the State of Illinois.

Dr. Rosenthal: Lots of answers to that. By definition, these are students that are willing to move. They generally come from higher income brackets. They generally are students who are better prepared. IBHE studies, as well as our studies through the College of Ed Center for Policy Study, indicates that we lose over time tremendous tax income by exporting our best students to higher education elsewhere and they do not return to the state. So, it is a subject of great concern.

Another issue, and there is no easy resolution to this, is that we do not have, like some other states, other than the University of Illinois, some place that is very highly selective. That is to say that the public perception is that there is Western, Eastern, Northern and Southern, and there is not a lot of difference. That does not serve us terribly well as a state. We haven't differentiated, as a state, universities for different niches, which is why I come back to our market position being very important to us going forward.

Senator Wilkinson: So, another way to say it is that one of our problems in Illinois is that we don't have two research universities in the state, like Purdue and Indiana, Michigan and Michigan State, Iowa, Iowa State?

Dr. Rosenthal: I would agree with that. To an extent, we are that alternative, but to get that into the public's perception is a long process. We are getting there and we are at a very critical point in the public's perception, which is why I insist that we need to be welcoming to our undergraduate population particularly, which has increasingly competitive choices financially. As we are teaching our classes, maintain our standards, but have that mentoring relationship and kind of reestablish that small college feel that we look for. That's what sells.

Senator Schambach: Earlier, you indicated that affordability is a particular issue for minority students and on page three of your handout, the graph on affordability shows that our tuition and fees have basically doubled over the past seven years. I was wondering if you could address how we compare to other institutions in Illinois and our peer institutions.

Dr. Rosenthal: I think that this is a very good place for us to be for a tuition price point. The University of Illinois is at \$19,000. We are not talking total cost for attendance; this is just tuition and fees. We are \$3,000 lower, but pretty close to places like Eastern, which has a 21 ACT profile. If you are looking for value, we are a very good value.

Ms. Arnold: I would add, just to be overt about it, that many colleges and universities that we are standing next to at these college fairs are buying these students. They have endowments that are just huge. The University of Alabama can be next to us and they say, 'Top half, 18, and you're African American, Native American or Hispanic; you get a full ride.' At Illinois State, you'll have a welcoming environment, you'll get a better education and you won't go far from home. Those kids will go to other colleges and universities and will end up coming back home because 80% of the students in the nation go no more than within a 250 mile radius of their home. It's very sad, but as a student, you may think, '\$8,000 versus nothing? I might take that.' So it's tough to get them to think about some other things. Think about how often you will get home; think about the kind of experience you are going to have in Alabama. It's sad because they forget about the student's need. It's really about the fit, but the money gets in the way because costs have gone up

tremendously.

Senator Crowley: One of the things that I found fascinating is that we are looking to have an increase in Hispanic students and an increase in the other one that you mentioned, Jonathan, and then we are noticing also that they are the students that don't complete here at ISU. That is a terribly serious situation because we will be relying on them for enrollment numbers and yet they are the very ones that we are not able to serve right now very well. So, perhaps we need to be taking seriously about what it is that just falls apart for them while they are here and what can we learn so that we can put something in place. Perhaps it's not just money; perhaps it's other things that they might be looking for.

Dr. Rosenthal: It's a good point and that's why I think that sort of team case management approach is a good one. Once students get through a freshman year, they tend to persist, but that is different by racial and ethnic groups. Hispanic students persist through sophomore year very close to the average. However, they do not persist to graduation. Why is that? Some of it is cultural; some of it is financial; some of it is academic. But that answer is different for an African American population; is different for an Asian Pacific Islander population.

Senator Ellerton: I was part of the summer program, the Chrysalis Program, which was an intensive, short-term, less-than-two-week set of activities mimicking the real thing. We gave them classes; we gave them assignments; we gave them grades. It was, in a sense, tough love. They had to tow the line, but there was huge support. Will that very intensive type of program, specifically aimed at Hispanic and underprivileged students, as opposed to other types of summer bridge programs, be continued when given that the funding for that came from outside of ISU?

Dr. Rosenthal: Robert Lee, the person who was responsible for the funding, is coming down next week to talk about this coming summer. So, the question always is how to institutionalize small programs that are grant supported. As I mentioned, we just had a first meeting looking at a sort of Chrysalis Program. When you talk about bringing that program to scale, not only in the classroom, but also what happens outside of the classroom for students who are coming from very different environments, how do you keep them busy 18 hours a day?

Those are tremendously complicated programs to run and to fund. So, I am not disagreeing with you; this is something that we need to be increasingly concerned about and we need, as an institution, to figure it out and to figure out the funding. What is our role? In addition to bringing students through the doors with the \$4 million in supplemental funding for need-based aid, what support do we offer students when they get here and how do we help to transition them in an intensive summer program, but also through the first year?

President Bowman: I have studied the data on graduation and retention rates for underrepresented groups pretty closely for a long time and the national numbers are not very good. Actually, we are better in both of those areas than every other institution in the state except for the Urbana campus. Nationally, the graduation rate for African American males is 36% and for females, it's 43%. For Illinois State, our graduation rates for African Americans are now above 50% and there is no other school in the state that is above 50%, except the Urbana campus. The historically black institutions tend to have graduation rates that range between 30 and 45%, with the exception of the more prestigious, well-endowed schools like Howard, Morehouse, Emory. So, it's a national problem, but in terms of how this campus has responded, I think that our numbers are trending in the right direction.

The retention rate two years ago for African Americans, I believe, was 74% and that is an astounding

number. The graduation rate at Carbondale for African Americans is in the mid 30% range. So, I think that we have an opportunity here, as our funding allows, to provide better financial aid packages to get the numbers up. I think the environment is such that students can thrive here, and I really want to compliment Molly and her staff for getting this larger pool of students to draw from, but I think our biggest challenge will be enrolling those students with our financial aid challenges. We are going to involve African American alumni in our recruitment efforts and we are beginning to roll out a program this spring that I think will make a difference in improving the number of students that enroll. But, in a nutshell, I think we are going in the right direction and if we can swing that number another 10 points, I think we will have won the gold prize.

Dr. Rosenthal: I'm sending around a one-page, front-back handout (document 01.23.08.01) with just some of the initiatives through Enrollment Management and Academic Services and its units on recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups so that you will have something to take away with you to look at. I would be happy to provide you with more detail on those programs.

Ms. Arnold: All departments get a list of all students who have been admitted as incoming freshmen, as well as transfer students. One thing you can easily do is share that list. A phone call from a professor saying, 'Congratulations, I heard you got admitted' to get them to matriculate is wonderful. I know that several of you do that and that is a huge bonus. We have students that will call other students. We have chat nights. We help them to get their financial aid, remind them about housing. We have these freshmen information nights coming up, but a call from a professor is just an amazing thing, especially on a campus of this size. So, you have all of that at your disposal. Call our office and I will give you names and e-mail addresses, home addresses, cards to fill out, whatever you need.

Senator Wang: I have a suggestion. When you send out those enrollment figures, could you send an electronic file rather than a hard copy. It is much easier for us to disseminate information that way.

Jess Ray, Registrar: No promises, but we will see what we can do. We will try to get support from the technology folks and see if we can get that done.

Ms. Arnold: It's a mainframe thing, but we are working on it.

Senator Holland: We also have Ann Haugo here to talk to us about Native American student recruitment issues.

Professor Ann Haugo, Theatre Faculty Member: Thank you for the opportunity to talk with you today. It is my understanding that I am here, in part, because of a conversation that I had with the Academic Affairs Committee last year that initiated some dialogue. So, it is in part to get some information on the record and to fill in some history of what has happened in the last few years on campus.

The conversation about Native student recruitment started really out of concern about the climate on campus for Native students as one of many solutions to create a better sense of community at ISU for Native students by establishing a critical mass. It is a far more qualitative endeavor than attempting to reach a particular quota and numbers are something of interest when we are talking about enrollment numbers for Native students. At most university campuses, enrollment numbers for Native students are inflated beyond what they realistically are because of different types of information gathering and how a university sets its policy about who claims Native status and who doesn't. In the views of Native student services professionals, it is far more important than reaching a target number to create a climate on campus and it often takes the university cultivating relationships with organizations and institutions that, in most cases, we already have established

relationships with.

The conversation has been ongoing since Spokane artist and scholar, Charlene Teters, was on campus as Minority Scholar in Residence in 2002. During Dr. Teters' visit, we arranged a meeting about Native student recruitment and retention with then Director of Admissions, Steve Adams, Rick Lewis and two or three interested faculty. Then in 2005, Rick Lewis, Susan Kalter and myself coordinated a two-day visit by Dr. Donald Day, who is formerly the coordinator of Indian Student Services at St. Cloud State University in Minnesota, roughly comparable in size to our institution. He is currently the president of Fond Du Lac Tribal and Community College in Minnesota and an enrolled member of the Leech Lake Band of Ojebwi.

Drs. Teters and Day made similar observations during our conversations. Both pointed to Chicago as an obvious site for recruitment, although not by targeting high schools. Of urban areas in the US, Chicago has the third largest American Indian population. The American Indian Center of Chicago, in its own words, has been "the principal cultural resource for Indian Chicago and is a logical starting point for recruitment efforts in Chicago."

In 2003, Molly Arnold met with visiting artist E. Donald Two Rivers, who is a long-time member of the Chicago Indian community, in part, about getting a sense of the community, the center and its activities. Both

Drs. Teters and Day also commented that recruiting from an urban area like Chicago, as opposed to first developing relationships with tribal colleges or reservation communities, would be perhaps a more ethical proposition to bring students from an urban setting versus a reservation setting, with a strong and supportive community, into a campus with very little community for them. Day, whose institution is one to which we could look toward building a relationship with, said that the first question any Native administrator at a tribal college or high school will ask is "What kind of community am I sending my students to?"

In a 2004 issue of the newspaper, *Indian Country Today* (article available online at <http://www.indiancountry.com/content.cfm?id=1077213403>), which is the Native newspaper with the highest distribution in the state, there was about a two-thirds page story on one of our basketball players, Jaci McCormack, whose tribal affiliation is Nez Perce of Idaho. It could have been very good press for us. She was recruited from Oregon, originally from Idaho, and the following is a quotation from the article itself: "McCormack said she really likes Illinois State University and the basketball program. She has been able to adjust easier to the lack of other Indians at this school than she did when she moved to Oregon. She commented that there was a lot of culture shock at Oregon: "If I hadn't gone through that adjustment first, I don't know if I could have survived here." An ISU spokesperson is also quoted in the same article as saying, "We don't see many Native Indians here as the nearest reservation is probably 500 miles away."

Given all of this, I want to use this opportunity to highlight some directions and possibilities, ideas about how ISU could proceed from here with faculty investment in recruitment and retention efforts for Native students. I think that they, in part, echo some of the things that Susan Kalter has said.

In the short term:

Cultivating a relationship with the American Indian Center in Chicago, including taking a look at some of the educational programs that it offers. They partner, in part, with universities in the area.

Attending recruitment fairs at Haskell Indian Nations University in Lawrence, Kansas, which is a four-year tribal college to recruit graduate students to the campus and to help build the community in programs of distinction that we can market to that group.

Exploring scholarships and services available through discipline-specific organizations, like the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, whose mission it is to increase substantially the representation of American Indian and Alaskan Natives in engineering, science and other related technology disciplines, but there are similar organizations in many different disciplines, supported, of course, through a network of interested and dedicated faculty rather than just an initiative done by an individual department.

While mentoring of faculty has proven in studies to increase retention rates of minority students, for Native students in particular, it's about having Native faculty and staff members on campus to mentor them through that experience. That's what makes the difference.

Membership in an organization such as the Indigenous Peoples Knowledge Community of NASPA, the student affairs administrators in the Higher Education Association. That knowledge community is open to any persons with shared concerns about the betterment of indigenous students in higher education. It's a great opportunity for networking in education.

In the long term:

Cultivating relationships with tribal colleges, perhaps based around ISU's programs of distinction, programs that could make a difference in reservation communities and real communities, when those students return to those communities upon graduation.

Senator Nippa: Currently at ISU, what is the percentage of students that identify themselves as Native American?

Senator Kalter: It's 0.3% and that amounts to about 66 students this year, I believe.

Dr. Rosenthal: Right, in the State of Illinois, it's 0.2% of the population, so we are talking about very small numbers. We reflect that population and do a little bit better on campus. It is not the sort of critical mass that makes an impact on campus; I would be the first to agree with you there, Ann. Thank you for the presentation; I heard some good suggestions that we could do tomorrow and Molly and I were taking notes. I think particularly graduate programs are something we ought to be looking into. It is very hard to recruit out of state for a variety of structural reasons. Graduate programs that often come with assistantships get us around that problem. I like your suggestions for working in Chicago.

Professor Haugo: Most institutions that recruit out of state will network with tribal colleges so that it's an organized system that you are tapping into and, for many institutions, it's a viable alternative. I would also encourage the university to at least examine how it counts enrollment of Native students. It becomes a crucial issue when you are looking at scholarship dollars. Unlike other minority populations, there are more students who will claim Native American status and are not Native American. It is something that usually does not happen for African American, for Hispanic or Asian American students, but on campuses where studies have been conducted on the number of students who are claiming Native identity, it often proves to be a much smaller number. So 66 is probably higher than what it is in reality.

Dr. Rosenthal: For reasons of law, this is self-reported data and to try to dig deeper into that, it's just, legally, uncomfortable.

Professor Haugo: Some institutions do have ways to do that and it would be useful to look at how other institutions may approach that.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: Welcome back to Senator Budikova. Thank you for returning after your sabbatical. Thank you to Jed Day, who served in your place while you were away. Sandy Zielinski is replacing John Poole from CFA; she is not here tonight since she is directing a play, but we welcome her to the Senate. Senator Crowley joins us replacing Jim Thompson while he is on sabbatical. Welcome to the Senate; we hope you enjoy your time here. Last but not least on the welcomes, we welcome Senator Murphy as our Acting Provost, and welcome back as a senator.

There is reminder for everyone in your packets. There are two forums on *Educating Illinois*. One of them is tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. The other one is next Wednesday at 10:00 a.m. Both are in the Old Main Room. I would like you to harass your friends and colleagues and anyone else you can get to come and give feedback. The *Educating Illinois* document, in its original form, was almost a transforming influence on the university. It is not just the document, but the administration, faculty and everyone who backed it up. So, having the campus participation aids in having people buy into it and to keep it going.

I would like to congratulate Senator Lonbom on her work on the Presidential Commentary. It's ongoing and I am guessing you will give us a report on that. Last year, about 68 people responded. This year, we already have well over 600 responses.

Student Body President's Remarks:

Senator Horstein: Sitting directly across from us here, next to Senator Cekander, we have new Senators Candir and Menzies, so, welcome to you two to your first Senate meeting. We have a lot of activity going on at the beginning of this semester. I will start with the huge revisions to our governing documents. One of them that I have spoken to you about is our constitution. It is in its semifinal draft right now. It just got sent out today for student input and it is starting to look a lot better than the document we had in the past. Last Wednesday, we passed revisions to our Executive Branch Bylaws, but those will not be ratified until April 13th. Also, thank you to Acting Provost Jan Shane-Murphy for coming to our Assembly meeting last Wednesday. It is definitely a privilege for us to be able to include the student voice in the campus Master Plan.

We are engaged in some larger initiatives as well. With the passing of the Truth in Tuition Act, we froze student fees at the university and Student Government passed a bill saying that we would periodically review that student fee freeze. That has definitely come up on our radar and is something that we will be looking into in the very near future. Leadership from Student Government and the Association of Residence Halls has been working with Campus Dining Services to come up with a new dining plan that meets the needs of various lifestyles, which allows now for three carryout options a day for those who are on the unlimited plan. Faculty, staff and students that live off campus will also be able to take advantage of this new meal plan, so I think we are definitely making some strides there.

In terms of off-campus housing, we have begun looking at the models of Chicago's ordinances. They have a very large document that grants rights, as well as responsibilities, to both tenants and landlords. That is something that we can, hopefully, work on as both a university and within the Town of Normal, to start helping out the student body here. Along with that, we have our off-campus housing survey, created by our off-campus senators, and we are gathering feedback from the student body on the property managers in the area so we know where to go with that. Senator Broderick has begun organizing a student tenant union so that we can start taking action in numbers.

We continue to assess the parking and transportation situation on campus, working closely with Parking and Transportation on feedback that we receive from students. To add more feedback to what has already been collected, we handed out about 500 parking surveys today. Vice President Kevin Martin has been working with a group of senators on quite a few issues: night operations, the late night policy here in the Bone, the possibility of bringing co-curricular transcripts to students on campus and looking at the enforcement of the 15 feet from the door smoking policy we have here.

Other than that, Sunday, we are going to be hosting our “Pack the Place” with Men’s Basketball facing Indiana State. At 12:30, we are having students out for free pizza. We have purchased 350 tickets to handout and we are hoping to draw a crowd.

Administrators' Remarks

President Al Bowman

President Bowman: We will issue a press release tomorrow on the midyear raises that are part of the salary enhancement program. I did talk about it on WJBC earlier in the day, but there probably won’t be anything in the print media until Friday. The midyear raises were directed toward full professors and associate professors. Four hundred and thirty four individuals will receive an increase for this January pay period. The increases range from about a half percent to 8.5%. Those of you who have been around for awhile know that this is the third year we have done midyear raises. We began the program in 2005. At that point, our full professor salaries were 14% below our peer group averages. They are now 10% below. For associate professors, they were 10% below and they are now 7% below peer group averages. Assistant professors are slightly above comparator group averages, so they were not included in this round. Civil service salaries are about 1.2% higher than peer group averages at universities that have similar civil service classifications. AP salaries, as a group, are at or above comparison group averages. There are pockets of AP employees and non-negotiated civil service employees who are below averages and we will address those. We feel pretty good about the program; we have put \$2.4 million into it since 2005. We still haven’t caught up, but we are gaining ground and we will continue the program for the foreseeable future and as long as our finances allow.

Acting Provost Jan Shane-Murphy

Provost Murphy: It has been about 18 years since I answered a roll call at the Academic Senate. Back in those days, I used to sit between Paul Borg and Len Schmaltz, so doesn’t that date me. We have a great group of people working in the Provost’s Office, a great staff, and we will continue to keep moving forward on all of the initiatives that are out there. My goal is to work with the Provost’s staff, to work with the president, the vice presidents, the deans, to keep moving down the path that *Educating Illinois* has set for us and to try to keep things in as good a shape as possible for when Dr. Everts comes to campus on July 1.

This is the time of year that you usually start to get admission updates. You have heard a lot about admissions tonight, so I will keep that pretty brief. Currently, we have received 12,500 freshman applications, 9% over last year to date, and we have admitted about 10% more of those students than a year ago to date. As you looked at the demographics, you know that we are trying to very aggressively admit students at a little bit faster rate than a year ago to make sure that we capture those students. So far, the average ACT of admitted students is 24.4 and that compares almost exactly to where we were a year ago. In terms of new freshman underrepresented student applications, we have received 2,700 applications from underrepresented students, which is a 17% increase over last year at this time. So, we feel that that is very good news and we have admitted 11% more students from underrepresented groups than a year ago to date. Then for new transfer applicants, we have admitted about 13% more new transfer applicants than a year ago and that’s trying to hit

that target of those who will actually commit and come to campus. I think that Admissions has done an amazing job and is really working with the pool of applicants we have.

The President mentioned the midyear salary enhancement and I just want to say to the President, thank you for your ongoing commitment to addressing faculty-salary issues. You have made improvement in faculty salaries a top priority and it is a significant commitment of university funds. Recruiting and retaining faculty is really a high priority for our division, but we cannot do it without the support of the President and the Vice Presidents in the divisions that they represent.

Finally, Senator Kalter sent me an e-mail with a few questions about the Stevenson move. Senator Holland said that it would be appropriate for me to close my administrative remarks by turning the microphone over to Dr. McGuire. He is going to have his Assistant Provost hat on, because he is the person who has been working on the move with Ann Beck from the College of Arts and Sciences and Ed Ramos from Facilities Planning. Any move like this is a difficult move and we don't under estimate what that is going to mean to the faculty and grad assistants, who are going to have move in and out of offices, and for some faculty, there are going to be a couple of moves involved. So, he wanted to share a bit of information and then answer any questions that he can about that move.

Assistant Provost Charles McGuire: I wanted share a little background information about this life-safety project. This is a life-safety project that involves asbestos, fire sprinklers, plumbing, electrical and other things like that. It is a \$20 million plus program that is going to continue over three years. The first two years involve Stevenson Hall and, as we sit here right now, the top two floors of Stevenson Hall have been moved out and work is progressing nicely on those top two floors. The faculty and other occupants of the top two floors have been moved into Williams Hall, largely, though the Philosophy Department has been moved to Turner Hall. In August of this year, those faculty will be permitted to move back into the top two floors.

In May of this year, you will notice the overlap, the bottom two floors of Stevenson Hall will move out. That means the entire Stevenson Hall will be vacant during the summer of 08. This is the most critical part of the entire program. We need six weeks roughly with Stevenson Hall vacant. It was absolutely critical that this take place during the summer. During that period of time, they are going to be doing some massive electrical work and they have to have the entire place vacant. What that means, then, is that we have to find surge space for the faculty and the other activities within Stevenson Hall.

Just for statistical purposes, there are 211 faculty, 51 staff and 62 GAs in Stevenson Hall. We have identified 150 office spaces to house those faculty; that doesn't fit. The proposed solution, that Ann, Ed, I and others have come up with over the last three years, is going to department chairs and move coordinators that have been identified in those departments, and there are seven departments, and ask them to identify and solicit names of the faculty requiring offices during the summer of 08. There are faculty who may not need an office; they may be out of the country, they may not be teaching, etc. Initially, the plan was to only assign space to tenure-track faculty with summer 2008 responsibilities. Several tenure-track faculty have volunteered to forego office space during the summer and their office equipment will be placed in off-site storage from this point forward.

The bottom line is that every faculty member who needs an office will have an office. It may be necessary to double up occasionally. Graduate assistants will not have offices during the summer. There will be some bullpen space available for those graduate assistants. NTTs, who ordinarily don't teach in the summer, will not have office space available to them except in exceptional circumstances. All in all, this has been an incredibly complicated project, especially this summer. It gets much easier from this point forward and my

hat is off to both Ann and Ed for the way they have handled this project.

Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams – Absent

Vice President of Finance and Planning Stephen Bragg

Senator Bragg: We are watching the world-wide credit and financial markets closely to see how they might affect Illinois. Frankly, the picture is mixed. ISU has not been asked to pick up any payments to vendors from the tuition funds, but there has been a slight delay in paying bills, which is an indicator to us that cash flow has slowed down. We are hopeful that we will weather this current uncertainty in the market with no continuing problems. The Board of Higher Education is in the process of formulating its fiscal year 2009 budget recommendations. We have no firm numbers from them yet, but indications are they are fairly optimistic and will put together a set of budget recommendations that shows some small growth. Of course, we are all waiting for a capital bill; it has been some six years since a significant capital bill has passed the appropriations process and we are looking for favorable consideration of our fine arts complex when that bill does pass.

Yesterday and today, we had visits from two bond rating agencies. Moody's was here yesterday; Standard and Poor's was here today to review our financial numbers and to hear from the President, Jonathan and from Dianne Ashby about overall campus performance, enrollment management and our foundation and fundraising efforts. They were very good meetings. They were very engaged and very interested in Illinois State University's story. So, we are hopeful that we will have a favorable bond rating. The flip side of that is that, as a state entity, of course, they will also be looking at the State of Illinois' underlying rating, which is not as favorable, and the global credit markets are introducing a lot uncertainty. We should know before the Board of Trustees meeting on February 15th what our credit rating will be. That's important because we will be taking to the Board of Trustees an authorization for another set of borrowing. It will be a combination of traditional bonds and something called certificates of participation, but the total package will be about \$51 million, largely to support the construction of the Student Fitness, Kinesiology and Recreation Center.

Right after commencement this year, we will begin the process of decommissioning and demolishing the Walker and Dunn-Barton Residence Halls. We will prepare that site and then begin construction on the center, which is scheduled to open prior to the beginning of school year in 2010. We will also borrow a small amount of money to build an associated south campus power plant that will be done in stages. The first stage will provide chilled water to that student fitness center to provide air conditioning. There will be another small amount of money to do planning for renovations to the Hancock Football Stadium and about \$2 million to augment some reserves we have set aside to purchase a new human resource and payroll system. I have talked to you about that before. We issued an RFP last fall; we have had six respondents to that RFP for HR systems and excellent, world class companies have responded to that. We will be working through those and probably bringing finalists to campus in April. I will say more about that later.

Finally, a little more than a year ago, the State of Illinois passed a new disposal of electronic equipment bill. Essentially, this legislation authorizes and requires all state entities to ship all surplus electronic equipment to a vendor in the quad cities to have them clean it and dispose of it or recycle it. I mean everything—from computers and monitors to desktop calculators, cell phones, everything. The down side of this is that we will be charged, I believe, \$35 per item. The rationale was that a lot of state agencies were not doing a good job of wiping clean the hard drives before they were sent to surplus. We did, but we are still subject to that law. We petitioned for an exemption, because we did have such a stellar track record in cleaning the hard discs, but we were denied. We also asked for an exemption because we are proposing to participate in the Town of

Normal's recycling effort. We have not heard back from Central Management Services on that yet. Assuming that we are denied that, we have already put together plans to build those costs into our procurement cycle and I will keep you informed on that.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Waterstraat: The committee met this evening. We picked up where we left off last semester and went right to work. There were two issues that we discussed coming out of the Chemistry Department. The Chemistry Department wanted to create a policy that would give a student seeking a major in chemistry a maximum of four repeats in their department across eight courses required in their bachelor's program. So, essentially if a student took a class and wanted to retake the class, they had essentially four "get out of jail free cards". The committee discussed this at length. The university has a policy wherein a student has the ability to repeat a class once and then petition the department to take the course additional times. We felt that if we allowed the Chemistry Department to do this, they would be setting precedent that each department or each section in the university could then set standards for how many times a student could repeat a course. We felt that that would really fragment this policy and, therefore, we found in favor of the university policy, that a student can repeat a course once and then petition to repeat it additional times.

The second issue that we discussed came out of the Chemistry Department as well. The Chemistry Department wanted to set a policy that courses must be taken within ten years prior to graduation for them to count toward a BS degree. Again, we had extensive discussion as to the value of a course taken ten years previous. It all depended on the course, what the student was doing, whether they were in the same major, whether the course had technology that was going to change over time. We believe that that is a good foundation to consider as a university policy. There was a discussion about why ten years; it sounded it like a nice number. We wanted to do a little bit more research on that, so I will be working with Jonathan Rosenthal and the Registrar to put together a policy and bring it back to this committee on taking courses and allowing them to count as a credit toward a BS degree.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee

Senator Lonbom: We are right in the middle of administering the request for presidential commentary. Thanks to Senator Holland for the support he has shown for us moving to an electronic survey this year. It was a unique step for the committee to take. We have had a high and significant response. The survey will be out until February 1st and the campus community will receive another e-mail reminder next week. I would just like to say, process wise, especially being new to the Senate, it has given me a new appreciation of just what shared governance can mean. It's incredible to me that when we were researching what other universities do, I don't know if we found any universities that actually query their students, staff and faculty about their president's performance. It is really a unique exercise, perhaps, one that we take for granted. We really need to applaud our campus community and especially our students. We talked to our great, great students on our committee tonight. Student participation has been quite high; in fact, they are still surpassing staff and faculty responses, which was surprising and really gratifying to see. So, thanks to everyone who has participated.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Borg: The committee discussed our agenda for the spring semester and we hope to bring a discussion before the Senate before the end of the term about our project on dealing with library materials and the issues surrounding the funding of those sorts of things. So, we will get back to you in a month or so.

Planning and Finance Committee

Senator Fazel: Tonight, the committee met with Provost Jan Murphy and Assistant Vice President Deb Smitley, who are the co-chairs of the Educating Illinois Task Force. We discussed the latest version of *Educating Illinois*. We had two purposes in mind, one was to provide feedback to the task force as a committee, and also for the committee to be informed about this document and to look at the impact of the document on our future work.

Rules Committee

Senator Alferink: The committee met this evening and worked diligently and very hard to make lots of progress. Thanks to all of the members of the committee. The first item that we discussed was the Service Awards Committee that was an Information Item at the last Senate meeting. The Provost pointed out at that meeting that there was a contradiction and that there were two places that the committee was supposed to report, something that we overlooked when we drafted the policy. The Rules Committee has clarified that issue and also clarified in that discussion who they will report to. That will go back to the Executive Committee for a potential Action Item at a future Senate meeting. Finally, we also looked at the request to consider making the University Hearing Panel an External Committee of the Academic Senate and made some progress there. There are some things we have to check on in terms of reporting functions, but we are well along on that document as well.

Communications

01.18.08.01 *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*

01.18.08.02 *Educating Illinois 2007-2014 –Draft*

Senator Holland: We have one communication for you. You will find in your packet two copies of *Educating Illinois*. One of them is to compare and contrast the new draft with *Educating Illinois 2003-2010*, which is the current document. The current document is kind of rewrite or editing of the original *Educating Illinois*. The draft is the document that will hopefully be the next incarnation. You will notice that it is considerably shorter with many more bulleted items. This is the one that we will discuss in the two forums. One of the forums is tomorrow, at 3:30, in this room; the other is on the 30th at 10:00 a.m., also in this room. You are all invited to come and make comments or suggestions. All are welcome.

College of Fine Arts Events

Senator Borg: As we begin a new semester, I would like to invite you all to go to the Center for Visual Arts and see the wonderful faculty biennial that opened a week ago Tuesday. The concert session has begun and you are welcome to come and hear the first of the faculty chamber concerts tomorrow evening.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIX-31: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Anders to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.