

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, April 9, 2008
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions

President Bowman's Remarks

President Bowman: As a foreground to the state budget discussion, we had our Senate Appropriation Hearing last week and had a good audience with the Higher Education Committee. They are very complimentary about our progress and very sympathetic to the funding situation since 2002. It was clear that they are concerned about three things, one being the huge drop in our operating appropriation, or GRF appropriation, since 2002. Secondly, they are concerned about rising tuition rates, but they place the blame squarely where it belongs and that is that it is a result of declining state support. Thirdly, they had lots of question about deferred maintenance and the condition of our buildings. Our growing backlog of deferred maintenance is probably well beyond \$450 million and that was a couple of years ago. State finances, as you know, are tight right now. The economy is slowing; tax receipts for the state are also slowing, although they are running about \$500 million ahead of where they were last year, so the state is actually taking in more dollars than it did last year. Unfortunately, like many homes, it is spending more than it is taking in.

The current issue, in addition to all of the political posturing, really is a short-term cash flow issue. The state, depending on whose estimate you believe, is about \$800 million in debt and needs to cover that gap by June 30. In many years, that is a routine issue handled by sweeping some accounts, balancing the books and moving on into the next fiscal year. Because of the tension between the Governor's Office and the General Assembly, particularly the leaders of the Assembly, that process is not going well, so you see universities and all kinds of groups sort of being placed on the table and used as leverage with members of the General Assembly. I would like to assure you that there is just a great deal of political posturing; our budget is sound; we have a great deal of support in the General Assembly. While it sounds like gloom and doom in the press, I think that we need to take a deep breath and let this process play out. We are certainly watching it very closely.

The state's cash flow problems have had a direct impact on the campus. You have heard us talk about Veterans Grants and the fact that \$600,000 from last year has not been reimbursed. This year, \$1 million has not been reimbursed. We certainly are supportive of veterans on campuses and that will never change. The state should make those payments on their behalf. If it doesn't, we certainly are not going to ask those students to leave. It's another cost that the university has to absorb and the money has to come from somewhere.

I was in Washington last week at a meeting of the American Council of State Colleges and Universities. I am the Illinois representative to the national group and I was able to hear firsthand from other presidents about the situations in their states. It was no surprise that there are a great many states in the same situation that we are in, although there were some bright spots. Ohio is one; the governor has made higher education a priority

despite declining state revenues and some good things are likely to happen. Certainly, New York's former governor was ready to invest a very large amount of money in higher education and the presumption is that the individual who is taking his place will carry that plan forward.

One other Springfield issue is House Bill 4380, which is a bill that we are trying to influence. It is a bill that would require universities to buy equipment that would control illegal downloading. We certainly support reigning in that use of the network. Unfortunately, the systems that are commercially available are not very effective and actually cause problems with legitimate network traffic. We have made our concerns known to David Miller, the Chairperson of the House Appropriations Committee. It was his amendment that concerned us. We have a personal relationship with him and we think that we will be able to prevail.

I want to compliment the College of Education and the College of Fine Arts for their graduate programs being ranked in *U.S. News and World Report*. That is another external validation of the work that is going on here on the campus. The fundraising so far this year is going very well. To date, \$7.2 million in cash has been raised and we are on track to raise nearly \$10 million in this fiscal year. Our long-term goal is to raise between \$7 million and \$10 million, get to \$10 million and then take it to \$15 million. This is a huge step forward for us. I think that we are getting better at it and we have a very good staff that has been especially productive this year.

Finally, I want to compliment the students who won the elections last week. We have a new Student Body President, Ted Mason, and a new Student Trustee, Geno Bagnuolo. We look forward to working with them in the next year.

Senator Horstein: I was on the committee that originally established the Digital Citizens Project and I was wondering if that had any weight on the House bill you referred to.

President Bowman: It did; in fact, we submitted data from that project to support our position. The data is very compelling. Another piece of information that they were not aware of was that college students using university networks are responsible for only about 3% of the illegal downloading that occurs across the country. We are an easy target, but we are not the group that is responsible for the largest share of that.

Senator Wang: Do you expect a budget cut in the forthcoming fiscal year? If you do, how much do you expect that will be?

President Bowman: I don't expect a cut this fiscal year. Next year is a big question mark. There is so much at play right that it is virtually impossible to predict, but I believe that we will go into the next fiscal year whole, with this year's budget going forward. That's not a great scenario, but it is certainly one that we have had to live with for the last couple of years.

Approval of Minutes of March 26, 2008

Motion XXXIX-61: Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Griswald, to approve the Senate Minutes of March 26, 2008. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Presentation: Green Team Update (Chuck Scott, Director of Facilities Management)

Chuck Scott, Director of Facilities Management: We appreciate the opportunity to provide this annual report on the Green Team to the Academic Senate. I am pleased to announce that it has been eight years that the Green Team has been in existence. We, as a campus, can be very proud of our increased recycling, our reduced energy consumption, and, certainly, our overall reduced waste generation. There are two people

joining me this evening. With the approval of President Bowman, this year we were able to hire a Sustainability Coordinator, Enid Cardinal. She will provide an overview of what the Green Team's accomplishments have been this year and what are goals are for next year. Kevin Gaughan, a senior honor student, will provide you with an overview of the President's Climate Commitment.

Enid Cardinal, Green Team Sustainability Coordinator: When I came to speak to the Academic Senate in the fall, I gave you the United Nations' definition of sustainability. Since that time, the Green Team has adopted one that better fits our community: "Sustainability at Illinois State University is an evolving process, which enhances quality of life and meets economic, social and environmental needs of the present without comprising resources for future generations. At Illinois State University, this is accomplished through teaching, research, service and administrative efforts that benefit our various communities." It is a broad definition, as are our efforts within the Green Team.

For FY08, we received an Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Recycling Grant for \$60,000 to purchase a recycling truck and recycling bins. We have purchased several bins and there was actually money left over; we are awaiting approval to reallocate those funds to purchase additional bins for other areas of campus. In August, we hosted the Illinois Green Governing Coordinating Council Sustainable University Symposium. It was the first of its kind. This coming year, it will be hosted at the University of Illinois in Chicago. The Lieutenant Governor spoke at that event. We also joined the Association for Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. In February, we held our first business community sustainability group meeting. Last month, we became an Energy Star Partner, which is part of the commitment that we made through the Sustainability Compact, which President Bowman signed in 2006. Currently, we are working with the Communications Department, specifically, the Environmental Communications class. The students in the class are working on various campaign projects for us in the areas of energy and water conservation, transportation, recycling, purchasing and sustainable dining.

For more on the Green Team's history, please visit: <http://www.greenteam.ilstu.edu/about/history.shtml>. Other activities in which the Green Team is involved, as well its complete report (when it becomes available) may be found at: <http://www.greenteam.ilstu.edu>.

Kevin Gaughan, Green Team Member: I have been researching the different climate commitments that are available to universities and there are some exciting opportunities available. First, a "climate commitment" is an agreement or a contract to which an institution commits to reduce their carbon or greenhouse gas emissions by the amount they deem appropriate. Many universities have decided to create their own climate commitments, but there are many commitments already in place that universities can join, such as the Chicago Climate Exchange and the President's Climate Commitment.

The President's Climate Commitment is a particularly interesting option because it a commitment that is designed for and by universities. This commitment was launched in early 2007 and its goal is to get 1,000 universities to join by the year 2009. Over 500 universities have joined it already, including seven in Illinois, two of which are our peer institutions, the University of Illinois in Chicago and Chicago State University. When a university joins this commitment, they make an agreement to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by the year 2050. This is in line with what the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate has recognized as what society needs to do in order to avoid some of the catastrophic effects of global warming. Those who established the President's Climate Commitment believe that universities need to answer the social mandate to do something about global warming and to actually educate society on how to avoid the impacts. While universities, themselves, are achieving climate neutrality, they are also fostering knowledge and giving society the tools to help solve this problem.

The commitment requires a comprehensive plan with an oversight body, such as our Green Team. A greenhouse gas or carbon inventory must be completed. The President's Climate Commitment actually gives universities the tools to be able to accomplish that. They have a carbon calculator that is made available and students can actually do the inventories themselves. It's a simple process and it takes about a year to complete. Universities need to publish an institutional action plan which includes target dates by which to achieve the 80% reduction, how they are going to include this into their curriculum, what research they will be involved in, and how they are going to track their progress. Within two years of joining the commitment, universities need to have completed two of seven tangible actions. Illinois State University has already completed two of those actions. The action plan and progress need to be made public on the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education website.

You become eligible for the Clinton Climate Initiative when you register for the President's Climate Commitment. There is a lot of money available through the initiative. It is a \$5 billion partnership and it offers universities anywhere from \$5 million to \$150 million to help with retrofits within their buildings. There are also other grants available.

Director Scott: The Green Team has a relatively ambitious agenda and, after Kevin completes his research, the Green Team will deliberate in detail before we make our recommendations to the university's administration on the direction we should go in as it relates to the President's Climate Commitment.

For more on Illinois State University's commitment to sustainability, please visit:
<http://www.greenteam.ilstu.edu/initiatives/commitment.shtml> or contact the Green Team at GreenTeam@IllinoisState.edu.

Senator Borg: In regard to the proposal that will go forth, to whom it will go, when will it be made and what are the methods of further communication with us, perhaps in advance of it being agreed to?

Director Scott: The Green Team is an advisory group that ultimately reports to the President and to the Senate. So, the proposal would come to this body and to the President's Office. As to when that will be accomplished, certainly it will be after we have those discussions, which I expect would occur over the summer months after Kevin has completed his research.

Senator Borg: I think that we would appreciate communication, perhaps by way of the Senate secretary, about the findings and perhaps take part in the discussions. I am sure that this would be of interest to the Senate early in the fall semester, which is typically when we have less of our Senate business to address.

Senator Horstein: With a 42-year commitment, who would typically be charged to see it through to the end?

Mr. Gaughan: That could be the Green Team or a separate oversight body. We have a lot of subcommittees through the Green Team, so it would be the oversight body that we decide upon.

Senator Campbell: The enthusiasm at the institutional level is obvious. I am wondering about what you are seeing in terms of responsiveness from the student body and the faculty.

Ms. Cardinal: There has been a significant increase in awareness, especially during our Focus the Nation Events. As students were trying to figure out Earth Day presentations, most of them were saying that they were very interested in finding out more information about what the university is doing regarding climate

change, what other people are doing, and what the issues actually are. Both of the student body parties that were running in the student government election had sustainability platforms.

Senator Crowley: Is the Green Team departmentally or collegially connected?

Director Scott: The Green Team was established in April of 2000. A group of administrators was appointed by the President's Office representing each of the vice presidential areas. The team continues to have representation from each VP area and there are also faculty and student members who have joined the team through their regular attendance of our monthly meetings.

Senator Gifford: How hard is it to get the money that is earmarked for green improvements?

Mr. Gaughan: The Clinton Climate Initiative is to add retrofits to the old buildings already on campus. A representative said that it is very easy to get the money once you sign up from the President's Climate Commitment. The details would have to be worked out, but he said that the money is available.

Ms. Cardinal: I spoke with the Lt. Governor's Office. They have also been having conversations with the Clinton Climate Initiative. They were hoping that participation in the Chicago Climate Exchange or with just an independent commitment would be valid to have access to the funds. However, the Clinton Climate Initiative representatives said that there must be a commitment to the President's Climate Commitment. They will be coming out with recommendations this summer, probably in June, on how to receive the funding. Right now, they are piloting it with, I believe, five or six institutions. I also would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Senator Winter and the Wind Team for winning the Environmental Stewardship Award.

Presentation: *Educating Illinois (Deb Smitley, Jan Murphy/Educating Illinois Task Force)*

03.27.08.03 *Educating Illinois 2008-2014 - Revised Draft*

Deb Smitley, Educating Illinois Task Force Co-Chairperson: When I visited with you last October, I provided an overview of the task force and its work, as well as the context in which that task force was working to develop the university's next strategic plan. Since then, the task force has had the chance to talk with several of you and your colleagues about the draft we released last November and the plan before you this evening. This evening, I will provide a thumbnail sketch of *Educating Illinois 2008-2014*.

Educating Illinois 2008-2014 builds upon the mission that was adopted by the Academic Senate in 2002 and it is designed to solidify the university's position of strength and visibility. I know that you have discussed the inclusion of public service in the mission statement and, on behalf of the task force, I want to thank you for doing so. The new plan promotes five core values: pursuit of learning and scholarship, individualized attention, public opportunity, diversity and civic engagement. The five goals in the plan include strategies necessary for the advancement of the stated goals and examples of actions necessary for implementing the various strategies. The plan is inclusive, with linkages to faculty, staff, students, alumni and the broader university community. Importantly, the plan is designed to sustain and to solidify the advancements that the university has made over recent years and to keep us moving forward.

The five goals of the plan are: to position students to excel in a globally competitive, culturally diverse, technology and ever-changing environment; to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching and learning; to enhance faculty, student, staff, alumni and community pride in, and allegiance to, the university; to be accountable and fiscally responsible to both internal and external stakeholders; to promote a healthy, safe and environmentally-sustainable environment.

Conversations with the university community over the last several months suggested that the task force needed to make some changes to the November draft. Those changes are reflected in the document before you this evening. The changes were primarily structural; we moved some goals and strategies and we converted some strategies into actions or activities. We included more in this document on the scholarship of teaching and learning, on the university's honors program, international opportunities, and the use of financial aid for recruitment, and we better explain how we intend to monitor the university's progress in implementing the new plan. Overall, however, the plan is consistent in both its focus and its content with the draft that was shared with you last November.

People throughout the university community, who were involved in reexamining *Educating Illinois*, particularly members of the Senate, helped the task force identify our challenges and opportunities, to better understand them, and to develop a new strategic plan for Illinois State University. On behalf of the Educating Illinois Task Force, I thank you for your help in this endeavor and ask for your endorsement of *Educating Illinois 2008 – 2014 Priorities for Illinois' First Public University*.

Senator Borg: I am pleased to see that we have continued this process that started almost ten years ago. I am especially happy that it has guided many of the decisions of the university over the past eight years and helped see us through our ongoing financial problems. I am also pleased that the core values have remained, essentially, the same, starting with the initial value, pursuit of learning and scholarship.

In the earlier iteration of this document, goal one was to make Illinois State University the “university of choice”, especially for undergraduate students in the state. That covered a lot of ground that supported things such as academic endeavors and those intangibles that are not measurable by employability. Goal one has now changed to one that will position students to excel competitively in things that have to do with technology and success. Also, the underlying strategies virtually all have to do with soliciting students and providing a diverse student body. It is a good goal; however, it does not, necessarily, mean supporting the various academic interests of a diverse faculty nor does it, necessarily, demand the support that that requires. I would like to know what went into the decision making to change something that was broader in an academic sense to something that strikes me as being somewhat narrower.

Ms. Smitley: You are absolutely right; the first goal has changed somewhat. We still, as part of the vision of the institution, include as part of that goal our desire and willingness to be an institution of first choice for a diverse pool of students. So that aspect, in my mind, has not left the plan. It does not appear, necessarily, in the fashion that you might like to see in goal one, but I think that there are aspects of it that carry through into other areas of the plan.

Senator Borg: I do notice in goal two, under strategy two, that you include those very points that I was bringing forth.

Ms. Smitley: Right, they appear in different areas of the plan. We talk in goal one about positioning students to excel, but we also talk in, for example, strategy five not only about professional lives, but also about personal lives. Those may include some of the types of activities that you are talking about. I would ask you also to look at goal three wherein you have more of an emphasis, perhaps than in earlier iterations of the plan, on cultural opportunities for individuals within the university community.

Senator Holland: Also, the first sentence under goal one is: “As an institution of first choice for high achieving and motivated students...”

Senator Borg: That assumes that it has been achieved and I would prefer to keep that as something that we strive for.

Senator Holland: But we are providing students with a transformational learning experience, which I am not sure is related to spreadsheets.

Senator Wilkinson: Illinois State University's fortunes and reputation have certainly increased over the last ten years and they coincide with the institution of the *Educating Illinois* plan by Vic Boschini and Al Goldfarb around that time. Is there any evidence that *Educating Illinois* is responsible for this kind of enhancement of the university over the last decade? Is there any way we can know that?

Ms. Smitley: I think that there are particular things that you can look at in prior iterations that, without the references in the plan and without the concerted and focused attention of the institution, perhaps progress might not have been made in those areas. I am wedded in believing that this plan was able to focus the institution and lead it through not only some pretty difficult times, but also to make some advancements. I do believe that the focus and the priorities that were established by this plan were instrumental in those advancements.

Provost Murphy: For me, almost as important as the plan, is the process that gets you to a plan. I believe that one of things that *Educating Illinois* has done on this campus is to reaffirm a commitment to shared governance. To me, shared governance is the quality of an institution. I think the very process by which the very first *Educating Illinois* was developed was a bottom-up way of thinking about strategic planning that involved all of the communities that are part of a campus in determining what our vision and mission are. I do a lot of site visits to other campuses and some of the things I see on campuses that I consider to be dysfunctional are dysfunctional shared governance and top-down planning. That was not the case here. So I think that the plan is important, but as important is the process that gets you to that point.

Senator Wilkinson: I do think the plan has been very important, but it's tough to know for sure.

Provost Murphy: I don't think that you ever do. One thing we can point to is that *Educating Illinois* changed the way that we look at admission of students; it changed all the processes we used for admitting students. To me, that is huge because I think we have a different student body today than we did 15 years ago. I sat on the first working group that looked at the admission processes and we would have never gone that route had it not been for *Educating Illinois*, which really mandated that we do that. So that's maybe one tangible piece of evidence.

Senator Borg: In the original iteration, there was a process by which each goal was monitored and tracked on a website with measurable assessments. What that proved was, I think, something twofold. One, it revealed that that process was cumbersome and perhaps not as accurate or as useful as it could have been. Also, it pointed out that there were certain things that could not be easily measured. I wonder if the current *Educating Illinois* Task Force would consider some way of reviving that measuring stick, in a more flexible manner, to provide at least some of the kind of information that Senator Wilkinson is asking for. It was there for at least the first four or five years.

Ms. Smitley: You are absolutely right. I think that with the benchmarking process and some of the indicators that were developed, we did find ourselves in a situation where it was difficult to assess and to determine that. We know that that is one of our challenges. We will begin working this summer to identify the exact indicators that would be used to determine our progress in implementing the plan; so we are cognizant. I

think we have learned from our past experiences about establishing those indicators to monitor the university's progress.

Senator Holland: In one of the early editions of the current plan, it actually listed who was going to be responsible for what. That caused quite a bit of confusion, so we removed that, but we will determine accountability measures.

Senator Wang: I think it is important for all of us to recognize the contributions of *Educating Illinois*. At least from the faculty perspective, the university is totally different from what it was almost 20 years ago when I first came to campus. Student SAT scores are much higher and we have a very good faculty body. Our scholarly productivity is high; our teaching quality is high. So I think that these are the tangible indicators that speak for themselves in terms of the contribution of *Educating Illinois*

Senator Ellerton: With reference to setting measures of performance or meeting goals, I would particularly urge caution in over quantifying such measures. There are many examples of systems which have gone overboard on such approaches to the distraction of what was intended. So while I would support documenting progress, some of which might be quantitative, I would urge caution in trying to set up very fine indicators.

Senator Nippa: In light of some recent racially motivated concerns on campus that various minority groups have experienced in reaction to, for example, Black Star, can you comment on where this document focuses on the concerns of students of mainly minority backgrounds, who may have safety concerns on campus, and the diversity of faculty or their support lines when they have these concerns?

Ms. Smitley: The task force really did spend a lot of time talking about those concerns and those proposals. I would suggest that you will find it in several places in the document. Goal one focuses more specifically on students and the environment in which they learn, so you see comments about individuals being in an environment that is inclusive, respectful of differences and where people feel safe. You also see some of that in the goal in terms of safety on campus as well. So there are several places throughout the document where that is specifically addressed.

Senator Kalter: In goal one, strategy four, "increase enrollment and improve retention and graduation rates of underrepresented students", I would hope that it is implied with that statement that if we are going to improve retention and graduation rates, we are going to address those kinds of issues. I would hope that most people would read it that way. I would suggest that if it is not read that way that we put it in explicitly.

Senator Holland: I think that that is definitely part of it.

Senator Wang: In case this body has any recommendations after this evening's presentation, what is the process for providing those to you?

Ms. Smitley: This summer, a coordinating team will be constituted that will be working to identify the units that will be responsible by goal and by strategy for really identifying actions and strategies for implementing what's in the plan. So that summer group would be the next group to really begin working on the plan, assuming that it is endorsed by all of the governance entities, the President and the Board of Trustees in May.

Senator Borg: When this was undertaken, long-term planning was viewed as a problem. The goal of the original plan was to have it examined again within the timeframe that it was aimed at, 2000-2007. So we have a series of overlapping renewals of *Educating Illinois* and it is the obligation of the governance groups

to see that things are renewed. I see this plan being looked at again in 2011 at the very latest; that is one of the checks and balances that I think we need to remember.

03.27.08.04 Sense of Senate Resolution in Support of Educating Illinois (Senate Executive Committee)
Motion XXXIX-62: By Senator Murphy, seconded by Senator Waterstraat, to approve the Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing the work of the Educating Illinois Task Force and the document, *Educating Illinois 2008-2014*.

Senator Borg: In the first clause of the resolution, “In as much as *Educating Illinois 2008-2014* reflects the goals and principles of Illinois State University...”, I question whether “principles” is the appropriate word. I don’t see the word principles anywhere in the document that we are endorsing and I wonder if the word “priorities” might be a better substitution for that. I would propose that as a Friendly Amendment to both the Senate member who proposed the motion, as well as to the Senate member who seconded the motion.

Provost Murphy: I would accept that as a Friendly Amendment.

Senator Waterstraat: I would also accept that.

Senator Wang: May I make a Friendly Amendment to your Friendly Amendment? Since we use “strategies” throughout the document, why don’t we substitute “strategies” for “principles”?

The Friendly Amendment to substitute the word “strategies” for “principle” in the Sense of the Senate Resolution was accepted by both Senators Murphy and Waterstraat. Without further recommendations for revisions, the Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing *Educating Illinois 2008-2014* was unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: Congratulations to the student government elections winners and to everyone who participated in the elections. The turnout was phenomenal; I have never seen 6,500 students vote in student body elections. Also, congratulations to SGA on its constitution.

Last week, we had the Council of Illinois University Senates on campus, which is an organization originated by our past Senate Chairperson, Curt White. The group has met here twice this year. It was an incredibly useful meeting in which the chairs from all of the Senates around the state get together and talk about issues that are common to all of our universities. We don’t actually produce position papers, but we learn quite a lot. That is how we were able to provide a much more meaningful evaluation of the President. This year, we talked about a lot of things, such as faculty responsibilities in emergency situations. We discussed state funding of private universities. I imagine if that were not in place, many of our budget problems would go away.

Please notify your constituencies in advance that there is going to be a lot of construction going on here on campus this summer. There are going to be road closings and the bridge between Schroeder and Milner will be closed for a good while. At our next Senate meeting, we will have a much more detailed discussion about this.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Horstein: As has been mentioned, the new SGA-elect membership has been announced. Our

“Passing of the Gavel” will be on Sunday and I will become Student Body President Emeritus. That does not mean that we will have been a lame duck SGA. I am proud to say that, today, President Bowman signed our constitution, as well as a Memorandum of Understanding that formally establishes SGA as a part of the shared governance process and which states that we have the authority to recommend policy to the President and, ultimately, to the Board. Thank you to those of you who came out in support of that.

Tonight, we will have an emergency meeting concerning several large bills. One of the big issues is the Budget Review Commission’s recommendations. I am sure that several, if not all, of the departments represented here this evening have put in requests for the General Student Activity Fee. The Budget Review Commission has worked for quite some time to see if the priorities of the student body have changed in ways that we need to reallocate funds. Once that bill is passed by the Assembly tonight, we will forward it on to Vice President Adams.

SGA has also been active with community service lately. On Saturday, several of us attended the “Giving Back to Normal” event. We went out into the community and cleaned up the homes of local residents, which the residents, themselves, were unable to do so; it was a great experience. Others participated in our Emerging Leader Program by going to a retirement home. These are a few of the ways in which we are giving back to the community. Friday, we are having our last “Pack the Place” event of this administration. It will be for the baseball game, so if you are at the game, please stop by. With that, this is my last report to you as Student Body President.

Administrators' Remarks:

Acting Provost Jan Murphy

Provost Murphy: I had the opportunity to attend the Research and Sponsored Programs reception last night. That organization recognizes faculty and staff who have submitted applications and received grants and contracts this year. To date, we have received about \$18 million in contracts and grants for the university. We are hoping that we might reach \$20 million by the end of the year. Grants and contracts support outstanding programs of research, of creative activity, of public service and truly enhance the undergraduate and graduate experiences on this campus. They help us attract better students and faculty. So that’s just a note of appreciation for those faculty and staff who participate in those activities and go that extra mile to get those grants and contracts. It is not an easy endeavor.

Dr. John Shields will give his Distinguished Professor Lecture on April 28 at 7:00 p.m. in the Prairie Room. Distinguished Professors are one of our finest groups of colleagues and I hope that we will be there in support in this next phase of Dr. Shields’ academic career.

Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg

Vice President Bragg: I, too, would like to add my congratulations and thanks to Student Body President Horstein, your cabinet and your fellow student senators. Your participation in the shared governance process is very important and it has been a pleasure to work with all of you. Your approach has been very professional and we have learned a lot from you, so thank you very much.

Senator Holland mentioned increased activity in capital improvements on campus this coming summer. As we are finalizing those plans in the next couple of weeks, we will be getting information out to all of the shared governance groups in various forms of communications, as well as a creating a website that will provide the most up-to-date information. I believe that Senator Holland has graciously invited Dick Runner, our Director of Facilities Planning, to come to the next Senate meeting to give a more detailed update on

those activities.

Let me respond to one project in particular; I was asked at the last Senate meeting to provide some details about the moves to and from the Stevenson building as we transition from the top two floors to the first two floors during construction. The moving out of faculty members in Stevenson will begin on May 13 and continue through the 25th. We will be moving people into Williams Hall and Stevenson will be completely shut down during the summer. As we finish the work on the top two floors, we will be moving faculty out of Williams and back into Stevenson starting on August 4 and continuing through August 15th. The first part of that move will be moving the faculty back into the Stevenson. The second part of that period will be used to move faculty around in Williams Hall, itself, into assigned office spaces. All of this work has been coordinated through the move coordinators. They had meetings in March and April and those meetings will continue through May. We have been working with Ann Beck and Chuck McGuire, as well as Michelle Kieseewetter in Facilities Planning. So that is the current plan.

Senator Kalter: I wanted to call your attention to the fact that May 13 is, I believe, the day that grades are due. If they can work around that in some way, that would be appreciated.

Senator Bragg: Is that the last day that grades are due?

Senator Kalter: On May 13th, the move out date, I believe that grades are due at noon. Also, if you have any control over the August 4th through 15th, can we move during the week of the fourth?

Senator Bragg: Yes, that is the timeline. During the week of the 4th, the faculty will be moving back into Stevenson.

Senator Kalter: So that next week that ends on the 15th is for the other part of the move?

Senator Bragg: Yes, for the moving around or reassigning of offices within Williams Hall.

Senator Borg: How are you dealing with the elevator in Stevenson for floors three and four while floors one and two are under construction?

Senator Bragg: I believe, and I will confirm this, that they have set up a pathway to get to the elevator so that it can be used.

Senator Borg: I was surprised last week by the fact that Fell Avenue was blocked off between Hovey and North Streets for at least two days. What is the communication with the Town of Normal about their construction activities? Can you provide that information to the university community?

Senator Bragg: Usually, we have ample notice when they have scheduled closures of that street. In that particular case, I was caught by surprise as well. I don't know the exact cause, but there was an unplanned construction activity at the hotel site for which they had to close the street.

Senator Stewart: I received an e-mail about the closure. I somehow got on a list and get e-mails regularly from the Uptown Normal Committee or Council.

Senator Bragg: On that particular day last week?

Senator Stewart: Yes, I received it about a day or two before the street was closed.

Senator Bragg: Would you share that information with me? I usually get them, but I missed that one.

Senator Ellerton: It has come to my attention that there are a few people, but definite numbers of faculty, who will still be teaching at that time in Williams Hall, who are affected by the move. While we understand that nothing can be changed for those few people, could some arrangements be made just so that they have access in another college, another department, for printing and duplicating purposes?

Senator Bragg: Let me make sure I understand the question. This move involves about 288 faculty, so a few of those faculty will not have access to support services during that August 4th through 15th period?

Senator Ellerton: That is correct.

Senator Bragg: I will ask Ann Beck, Chuck McGuire and Michelle Kiesewetter to survey all of the faculty and find out who and how many are in that situation and see if we can make some alternative arrangements.

Senator Lonbom: Senator Holland mentioned that we will not be able to cross the bridge to get to Milner Library for some time during the summer. How are disability accessibility concerns being addressed?

Senator Bragg: We have been working with the ADA Office and an alternate pathway has been identified. Unfortunately, it is a bit convoluted. It involves coming through the Bone Center, using the elevators here to get up to the mezzanine level and then out onto the plaza that way. We will try to keep the closure as short as possible. Right now, the current plan is to have all of the work done within 30 to 45 days. This was a project in which the funding developed late in the year and, frankly, with the long winter that we had and the freeze-thaw, the material on the bridge just deteriorated very quickly this spring. So, we moved it up on the priority list.

Committee Reports:

· Academic Affairs Committee Chairperson

Senator Waterstraat: The committee discussed the ten-year limit for courses as prerequisites proposal and we are going to draft a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Hopefully, we will have that to the Executive Committee by Monday so that the Senate can vote on it at our next meeting. It deals with the fact that we will limit the number of years a student can use a prerequisite course for credit at this university. That limit will be chosen by individual departments at their discretion and it will be within a ten-year period of time.

· Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Chairperson

Senator Lonbom: This evening, our committee met with Provost Murphy and with Assistant Provost Kay Moss to discuss the current state of the Academic Impact Fund. To summarize our discussion, the fund is currently healthy. There have been some interesting things that have happened over the past year that are related directly to the large number of retirements that have taken place. Assistant Provost Moss indicated that there is speculation that we are possibly at the beginning of the "baby boomer bump", in which we will start to see a large number of retirements. We may be at the very beginning of that curve and perhaps that has contributed to the retirements that we have seen lately. How that affects directly where we are now is that it

has opened up 74 tenure-track searches that have been authorized for FY09. To put that into perspective, 74 positions are authorized currently, while FY08 saw only 55 authorized and only 43 in FY07. So the number 74 is a significant increase.

The other benefit of the large number of retirements is that it has offered opportunities for candidates to be hired from underrepresented groups and spousal hires have been accommodated, as well as additional hires in program areas of growth and student demand, which benefits us all. The other thing that the Academic Impact Fund will cover is the estimated \$700,000 in unused sick leave and vacation payouts that will occur in FY08. One other positive note about the AIF is that currently new assistant professors are at 105% of the hiring rate of peer institutions; associate professors are at 101% of peer groups. One thing, if I understood correctly, that is possibly problematic is that the AIF is currently funding approximately 60% of non-tenure track faculty positions.

Senator Holland: The faculty will hear more details about this in the Faculty Caucus.

· ***Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson***

Senator Borg: We are bringing before the Senate this evening our position paper having to do with library funding and we will ask for the Senate's endorsement.

· ***Planning and Finance Committee Chairperson***

Senator Fazel: Planning and Finance has finalized its Priorities Report, which we will be presenting to the Senate later this evening.

· ***Rules Committee Chairperson***

Senator Alferink: The committee reviewed a revision to the Appropriate Use of Information Technology Resources and Systems Policy. At one time or another, all of us on this campus have agreed to this policy whenever we used an e-mail account, received a ulid or used a computer or any other information technology resource. We have recommended that this go forward to the Executive Committee and be placed as an Information Item on next week's agenda.

Information Items:

03.27.08.01 SCERB Grievance Committee - Proposed Addition to Blue Book (Rules Committee)

Senator Alferink: The Student Grievance Committee is referenced in the Student Code of Conduct. It is also a committee whose membership, at least for the faculty members on the committee, is staffed by the Academic Senate through the Rules Committee process and through the Faculty Caucus. It is not included in the *Blue Book* and that has resulted in questions from faculty members. The Rules Committee was asked to take this up as an addition to the *Blue Book*. The language in the proposed addition is lifted from the Student Code of Conduct.

Senator Horstein: SCERB is possibly considering a name change to SAB, the Student Appeals Board. I don't know if that has happened or not, but if it has, I would ask to have it reflected in this document.

Senator Alferink: We are aware of that. The Student Code of Conduct is under revision and is subject to future approval. Once that future approval occurs with that change, then this would have to be updated.

Motion XXXIX-63: By Senator Alferink, seconded by Senator Krug, to move the item to action. The Senate unanimously approved the motion without debate.

Motion XXXIX-64: By Senator Alferink to approve the proposed addition of SCERB to the *Blue Book*. The Senate unanimously approved the addition without revision.

04.03.08.01 2008-09 Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee)

Senator Fazel: Every year, the Planning and Finance Committee develops a set of priorities that we believe the university should pay special attention to for the next few years. We have developed a set of priorities for 2008-2009. This year, we have six priorities in the document before you. Priority number one is continuing efforts to improve competitiveness of faculty and staff salaries. This is from last year's report and has been a priority item for a number of years. We felt that it is still a priority, so we kept it on our list. We have added a few points to this recommendation. One is that we are asking the university to continue using median salaries as a way of judging our progress of being comparable to our peer group. Using medians is a more equitable way of distributing funds as compared to using averages. The other thing that we are asking for is to maintain transparency in this whole process—making sure that faculty and staff know how the decisions were made and what kind of criteria and methods were used. So we are basically asking the deans and the chairs to communicate the midyear raise decisions to the faculty and the process that was used. Also, there are many graduate assistants who teach courses or do other work at ISU and their incomes are very low. For some, their salaries are below the level of our peer institutions and even below the poverty level. So we are asking the university to also take a close look at the salaries of graduate assistants, non-tenure track faculty and, in general, all of the salaries, even negotiated employee salaries, to make sure that they are all fair, equitable and comparable to our peer institutions.

Item number two, “enhancing the student experience”, is a new item. One of the issues in enhancing the student experience is increasing enrollment capacity. Our understanding is that we admit students who are qualified, but also that we do not have the educational capacity to accommodate all of these students. We are calling on the university leadership to support departments and units by providing resources so that we can increase our educational capacity. The other issue related to this priority is improving communication and teamwork between EMAS and departments so that we know where we need to increase educational capacity and how we should allocate resources. Additionally, we have prioritized improving the experience for our transfer students. We have a really good program for our first-year freshman students, but our student members stated that we really need to improve the experience of our transfer students. The final issue related to enhancing the student experience is diversifying the student body, the faculty and our curriculum as a part of supporting our mission.

Item number three on the list of priorities is continuing efforts in enhancing the safety and security of the campus. We are aware of the current events and this priority supports the decisions that our administrators are making concerning safety and security, whether it is investing in technology, providing training or developing procedures. This is just to say that we are in support of the resources that are spent on that.

Item number four is enhancing library resources. There is another resolution tonight related to that. We believe that we need to assess the resources of Milner Library and compare them to the needs of our community and also to compare our library to the libraries of comparable institutions. We would then make an assessment about what resources are needed to improve the library and then, of course, allocate those resources.

Item number five is increasing the operating budget. This item has been on our list for some time; we are always short on our operating budget and we always call for an increase.

Item number six is a relatively new item. We have been talking about distance education, but this year, we have included it as a one of our high-priority items. What we are asking here is for expanded programming, offering additional distance courses and also offering additional courses during summer session and winter break. These are courses that are in addition to our current summer school offerings. During winter break and summer, we have a lot of resources on campus. We have administrators and staff who are on 12-month contracts. We have facilities that are available, so a lot of resources are there, but we are really underutilizing them. So in item number six, the number one priority is to serve our students better and offer them more opportunities in terms of taking courses at different times of the year. At the same time, we can look at this as an alternative source of funding for the university. We would not just offer courses to our existing students, but explore the possibilities of offering courses to people outside of the university as in the case of distance learning and even offering programs internationally. The major concern is whether we can offer programs of high quality and whether it is feasible. That is why we are asking for an exploratory study to look into this and see if it is possible to do those things. If the decision is made that “yes”, we need to increase our distance education, offer new programs, offer new courses, then we need to have strategic planning for that, particularly, for distance learning.

The last item on the list, which is after the priorities, is a request for administrative action. We are asking the President to share these priorities with the Vice Presidents and the deans and ask for their feedback. If they support these priorities, we ask that they let us know what they can or would do to move us in the right direction. If they do not support them, then we ask, in the spirit of the Memorandum of Understanding, that they let us know why they do not support them.

Provost Murphy: The reports that you want by November 1, 2008 are the responses to the recommendations, either agreeing or not and laying out a plan of action that we would be responsible for?

Senator Fazel: Correct.

Senator Ellerton: Under priority one, you mention the recommendation to continue, particularly, the midyear salary increases addressing the under-rewarded merit, etc. Did you discuss at all the continuing problem of salary inversions and should perhaps that also be included as a phrase within that recommendation?

Senator Fazel: We did discuss it for one college, but we thought that if this is implemented properly, in the spirit that this document is calling for, and if you compare people to the median by rank, then people who are far below the median for their rank and for their discipline will be compensated more than those who are not. The document, as it has been used up to now, addresses that for only associate professors and full professors, as far as faculty are concerned, because those are the two groups that are behind. We are hoping that every individual would be compared to the median in his/her discipline, based on his/her rank, perhaps the numbers of years at that rank, and then a decision would be made about the amount of the raise.

The Planning and Finance Committee’s Priorities Report will return to the Senate Agenda of April 23, 2008 as an Action Item for the endorsement of the Senate.

Communications:

03.31.08.02 Milner Library Resource Funding Position Paper (Senate’s Endorsement Requested by the Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Borg: During this past year, my predecessor, as chair, led the committee in a discussion and

investigation of library resources. This was largely initiated by a rather alarming letter sent to the university community by the Dean of Milner on May 1, 2007. You might have noticed that I actually refer to it in our position paper as an attachment, though it is not attached. This letter, however, is available to you. A key paragraph in the letter worth referring to in order to set the discussion that we have is, “It is worth sharing a startling set of numbers. In 1976 when Milner Library’s faculty and staff moved our collections to this new facility, our book print budget totaled \$445,142. This fiscal year (she was referring to 2007-08, I believe) our book print budget was \$418,280. That is in real dollars, not adjusted for inflation. If that same \$445,000 were corrected for the 31 years of buying power, our book budget alone would be over \$1.6 million.”

The document that you have in front of you provides something of this background and discusses the suggestions and the conferences that the Faculty Affairs Committee held during most of the last fall semester trying to investigate this. In that context, I won’t speak for the committee, but I am pleased that the Planning and Finance Committee’s priorities include the library budget. I simply wish it would have been higher on the list.

We spoke with Dean Elzy and received her presentation from a year ago explaining the dire circumstances. We did further checking after discussing potential sources of money and felt that this ought to be addressed sooner rather than later and not get mired in any sort of undue bureaucracy. We spoke with the Vice President for University Advancement about the donations that had been given for the library; I have her statistics for the last four years. The committee did note, however, that such funds are not reliable, often dedicated in advance to certain things, and certainly are not normally available for subscriptions, which account for many of the excessive increases in library material expenses over the past eight or nine years.

Our student members conducted an informal survey of students asking what kinds of things they felt were lacking in the library and it was gratifying to find that in this informal, unscientific survey, materials did come up as a significant concern on the part of the students who were interested enough to respond. To try to address this with a student fee solution would potentially provide a steady supply of money for services for which students come to this university. However, since the process for doing this—adding this to the current student fee process and the length of time that it would require to have this done—seemed impractical, we decided it was best not to press for that kind of solution, given the other needs of students in various areas of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

We finally talked with the Vice President for Finance and Planning and had a very frank discussion about what is involved. At one of the meetings in December, the question of ‘how can we get to the level of 1976 dollars?’ was raised. The response was that it would require reallocation from university funds, knowing that there are areas of funds from which you can take and others from which you cannot. If we would make a commitment to an increase above the current allocation of approximately \$250,000 a year, within four or five years, we would reach approximately what the book budget was, if adjusted for inflation, some 20 years ago, so we readily endorsed this.

As our conclusion, we unanimously support the administration in its attempt to increase incrementally the library materials budget by adding approximately \$250,000, perhaps \$150,000 this year and \$300,000 the next; the absolute amounts are not important, but we would encourage that the current budget be increased by an additional \$1 million within the next few years. We are asking the Senate to endorse this position paper and help supply the university community with the encouragement to see that this gets done.

Provost Murphy: Would the committee consider adding in a statement that comes out of the Planning and Finance Committee’s priorities to this report, because I think the Planning and Finance Committee is asking

for that assessment? That kind of review of what libraries at universities of our stature should be like, I think, is a very important piece of this. I think that it is a good report and I am going to agree with the spirit of the report, but I am also going to push our library and the staff in the Provost's Office to start to do a better job of assessing what our needs are. Instead of just saying a million dollars over the next four years, I would like to know what it is that we really need to do to add to library resources and do it in a thoughtful and planned way.

Senator Borg: I would hesitate adding that to this particular report for several reasons. The library has been in a position for over ten years not of justifying budgets but of defending budgets in a way that has been quite onerous to the library staff, as well as to those of us who have served as library liaisons, who have had to make decisions about what to cut.

I agree that it is something that needs constant evaluation, but I feel that the support recommended by the Planning and Finance Committee's priorities stands on its own and was not part of our particular process. I might also add that, as part of this, I do note in the conclusion, bullet number two, that improving library acquisition resources will greatly assist the progress of ISU toward meeting its vision as the state's university of choice. If we endorse this right now, that is still currently the number one goal in the iteration of *Educating Illinois* under which we are operating.

In spite of the fact that this is a need that we have had for more than ten years, it seems to falling among our priorities. The library, unfortunately, needs allies in making this defense. I am sure that many of them would help in that planning process, but I would, respectfully, say that that is not an addition that is needed for an endorsement this document this evening.

Senator Lombom: Provost Murphy, I am certain that Dean Elzy does have those types of figures, the comparators to our peer universities. I don't have those in front of me, but what is represented there is woeful in terms of where we have fallen short with our university library.

Senator Wilkinson: Does the book budget also include subscriptions for periodicals?

Senator Borg: As I understand it, the figures for 1976 refer only to the book budget. The current figure, which is a smaller than the 1976 dollar amount, includes books, periodicals and electronic subscriptions. So if you parse it as such, if you want a \$1.6 million book budget with everything else involved, this recommendation would have to be enhanced exponentially. However, as a practical matter, I would hesitate saying that, in addition to books, we want to add another \$1.6 million for electronic resources and another \$1.6 million for journal subscriptions.

Senator Holland: In the budget hearings, I believe that it was somewhere in the order of an additional \$150,000 that was needed almost immediately to avoid further cuts in journals.

Dane Ward, Departmental Chairperson Representative: That is correct. Both Senator Borg and Provost Murphy are correct about the importance of assessment, which we are doing constantly, but it is an urgent need right now. We will need an additional \$150,000 just to keep up with the inflation costs, which run about 7.5% to 9% every year for journals. So, without the \$150,000 this year, there will be further cuts to journals.

Senator Wang: Senator Borg, I am considering Provost Murphy's suggestion. I understand your point and I also agree that this is an excellent report. As I understand it, Milner Library needs this increase in funding, so I am wondering if it would be strategically advisable to include it as a part of the Planning and Finance

Committee's report because that report requests administrative action. It requests the administration's justification to either adopt or reject. Even if you prove this need, this will merely be advisory.

Senator Borg: That's absolutely correct.

Senator Wang: So would it be advisable to include this, as Provost Murphy suggested?

Senator Borg: The Faculty Affairs Committee has been concerned for the past year and half about just what its function is. When the Senate was reorganized eight or nine years ago, many of the functions that used to flow through the Faculty Affairs Committee were given to the Faculty Caucus for approval, so relatively little legislative authority goes through this particular committee. Therefore, this is not something that we are proposing as a mandate; we cannot. We are simply offering this as information and are very pleased to have gotten the cooperation of the administration in the process. So this is a mechanism of providing an endorsement of the idea and publicity for the issue.

Senator Bragg: For those of you that know me, I have been preaching this for a long, long time. I think that it is important to add context to the minutes of this meeting in that similar reports could be written about a lot of operating needs on this campus. A similar report could be written about travel needs. A similar report could be written about equipment needs in every department. Certainly, startup costs in many of our departments have increased. The administration understands and endorses our efforts to increase operating support at the institution. We also understand the primacy of the library and the primacy of the materials budget, but I want everyone to understand that these are conversations that we have all of the time. We are working hard to figure out ways to support all of the operations of the institutions and are committed to doing that through the planning and budget process.

Senator Crowley: In relation to this issue, I am wondering about staffing because I am also aware that the library is very much understaffed and there are many positions open. So the need is not only for materials, but also people are needed.

Senator Borg: You might note in the background of this report, in the second paragraph, we talk about the complexity and difficulty of many aspects of the library, staffing, facilities, access and, certainly, the materials. In this report, we chose not to take them all on. We know that there is a long-term process for the building, itself, in particular. The necessity, though, of materials and the critical cutting because of inflation that has gone unabated for ten years, and will probably increase unless we bring some attention to this, was why the committee decided to focus specifically on materials.

Motion XXXIX-65: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Alferink, to endorse the *Milner Library Resource Funding Position Paper*. Without further discussion, the Senate unanimously approved the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIX-66: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Long, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.