

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, March 4, 2009
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of February 18, 2009

Motion XXXX-: By Senator Mason, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of February 18, 2009. The minutes were unanimously approved.

IBHE-FAC Report (Prof. Lane Crothers, IBHE-FAC Representative)

Professor Crothers, IBHE-FAC Representative: We met at Northwestern last month on the 20th. In terms of how universities are funded and function, it turns out that the drug Lyrica, which is for fibromyalgia, was invented by someone at Northwestern. They managed to license it and commercialize it. Since they have done so, the university has cleared a billion dollars. We did have both Northwestern's lobbyist in Washington and the U of I's lobbyist in Washington come to the meeting to kind of trace through the details of what is in the stimulus package and what may or may not come to us. Frankly, I don't think that a lot is likely to come to us. One part may come more than the other.

There is a big package called the State Stabilization Fund and, of that, about 2 billion dollars is supposed to come to education in Illinois. The way it is funded is that it turns out that we are not in bad enough shape to get it. It is intended to supplement budgets that have been cut in the last year or two to bring them to what they were when they were not yet cut. As it happens, the State of Illinois' education budget has, at least technically, gone up in the last year or so by some minor amount. There are other little twists about whether or not you count the money that goes for retirement systems and what have you. Therefore, the rep from U of I, who traced all of this through, does not think much of money is likely to come to education, particularly higher education, in Illinois. The other twist is that in the original House package, there was a set aside for higher education. So higher education institutions were only going to compete amongst themselves for a particular pot of funding. That got changed in the final bill and, thus, all education, from kindergarten on, is in the same pot. As a consequence, we are now competing in that context and it seems quite likely that relatively little of that money will come to us.

I should make a broader point also. Many of us, kind of in the back of minds, have the fantasy that the stimulus package was really kind of a sign of a better tomorrow, rather than trying to stimulate funding, rather than trying to jump start the economy, and that perhaps it was going to be a long-term systematic attempt to reinvest in the public sector of the American life that we have spent 30 years disinvesting from. It is very clear, at least from the representatives from Northwestern and the U of I, that that simply is not going to happen. This is a two-year jumpstart, have a nice day, and move on. So the bad buildings, the bad roads, the bad everything else is not likely to change. This is merely an attempt to jumpstart things.

The rep from Northwestern spoke more about particular kinds of granting programs that are out there. Some universities in Illinois will benefit from this. I don't think that we will benefit a lot, just because of the way the money is structured, but there will be some areas in which we surely will benefit. Again, these are all

simple pump-in for two years and pull-back-out kinds of things, so this is not necessarily a long-term fix for any issues that have been ongoing for quite awhile.

There is a fair amount of money aimed at support for students. We are likely to see at least a little bit of that. Pell Grants are going to be increased for the first time in a long time. Not only is the amount of money in the Pell Grant system going to be increased, but so is the actual amount of the Pell Grant Awards. It will go up \$500 this year and \$550 the year after. Illinois is online to get about \$280 million of this and, to the degree that students can receive support from federal authorities, we may obviously be able to distribute aid around our own campus a little better.

There is supposed to be an increase in college work-study of about \$200 million. That, I should point out, is nationally. That is mostly aimed at community service projects. They are going to change the way the higher education tax credit works from a two-year hope tax credit to a four-year tax credit of \$2,500 per year. That actually also involves refunds, which, if I understand the process, means that if you do not make enough to pay taxes, you can still actually claim credit on your taxes for a refund. Finally, there are the 529 savings plans where you save for your college education in advance. You are now going to be able to include the price of computers in your pre-tax savings plans so that when your child goes off to college, he will be able to purchase a computer out of the money that you have saved.

There was some discussion about infrastructures. There is \$180 million for research building construction and \$200 million for computer centers. I should add that all of this money, by law, has to be sent out of Washington in 60 to 120 days, so these are fast-start, jumpstart kinds of things. A rather substantial amount of money is going into scientific research. This was mostly in response to the Senate's pressures. The National Science Foundation is looking at an increase of three billion dollars, \$2.5 billion for research, \$400 million for infrastructure and \$100 million for education. NASA is due to get an extra billion dollars, with something like \$400 million of that aimed at climate research. You can thank Senator Specter of Pennsylvania for this next one. The National Institutes of Health picked up an extra 10 billion dollars, \$8.5 billion for research and \$1.5 billion for university research facilities. Senator Specter is a cancer survivor and pumped a great deal of money into the National Institutes of Health aimed at cancer research. The Energy Department is looking at about an additional 2 billion dollars, some of which is aimed at alternative energy sources.

There were a few other things. Job training programs are due for about 4 billion dollars, AmeriCorps for about \$200 million, teacher quality about \$100 million, preparing healthcare workers about \$500 million and support for state data systems, trying to create integrated data systems, P-20 and also for healthcare systems, \$250 million. Finally, the original plan from the House had a 50 million dollar increase for the National Endowment for the Arts. The Senate took it out. The final compromise plan put it back in, so there is an extra 50 million dollars for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The stimulus package is 787 billion dollars and it is virtually nothing in the grand scheme of where we are. 787 billion dollars is an incalculably large amount of money, except when you spread it among the 50 states and all of the various needs, it is pretty rapidly swallowed up. So I would not expect giant jumpstarts. Perhaps, at least at ISU, things like nursing programs and so forth will benefit, but given that we are not a kind of research institute that does enormous amounts of health and other kinds research, it seems to me that we are only going to see a limited amount of that.

The IBHE is, at least allegedly, going to be around to get math and English faculty across the state to come up with standards that all high school graduates ought to have before they go to college so that there is kind of a universal college prep curriculum and universal expectations about what it means to have a high school

diploma and, therefore, be prepared for college. They did not really have much in the way to say about how that was going to be forthcoming, but at least, hypothetically, that is going to be out there.

The representative from U of I explained that they have been told that all faculty and staff from the U of I will be furloughed for two or three days, meaning that they will take two or three days of their contracted pay away. Because they are so brave and strong, they are probably going to do it during spring break. It should be very interesting to see what happens at a university like the U of I, or with the U of I system, if all of a sudden every employee on campus isn't paid for several days. There are any number of other possibilities, but I know you have a large agenda. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Senator Van der Laan: Who made the decision about furloughing?

Prof. Crothers: That wasn't clear, but I think the decision came down from the center of the system. They have a central system and they have three campuses. The central system is the president and the university chancellors.

President Bowman: The system has a president, Joe White, and then each campus has chancellors, so this would have come from the president's office.

Prof. Crothers: It will be interesting at the next meeting. The three campuses are meeting both with their VPs for Academic Affairs and for Budget. Also, they have a senate on all three campuses, which delegates from each campus attend, and they are having a meeting amongst those various constituencies right about now, in fact. I will be curious to hear what they have to say and report back at the next meeting.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: We are nearing the point in the semester when committees should be trying to wrap up their work and get anything in that they are going to be submitting to the Senate as a whole. Keep in mind that it has to go to the Executive Committee, then it's an Information Item and then an Action Item. So you are looking at least four weeks and that is getting toward the end of the semester. I would like to thank people who have been giving communications to the Senate. I have been to a number of events this last couple of weeks. Finally, be safe during spring break.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Mason: SGA's second Pack the Place of the year is coming up on Saturday, March 21st. It is going to be a gymnastic event. We decided to move towards gymnastics because it is a sport that most students don't go to, so we are hoping that with our free admission and advertising that we can help to get a great number of students out there. We have officially voted to put the Collegiate Readership Program as a referendum on the student elections on March 31st and April 1st. That is a program that is at over 450 other universities across the nation. Pending student approval in the student elections, and the President's, Vice Presidents' and Board of Trustee's approval, the referendum will call for having *U.S. Today* and the *New York Times* on campus and available to students next year. We are looking forward to putting out more information about that after spring break. Lastly, our Civic Engagement Committee is sponsoring a Town of Normal Candidate Forum on Thursday, March 26th. It will have both mayoral candidates, Chris Koos and Andrew Mathews, as participants, as well as all four Normal Town Council Candidates, Adam Nielsen, Cheryl Gaines, Jason Chambers and Scott Preston. Please keep that date open and come out to see what the candidates have to say.

Administrators' Remarks

· President Al Bowman

President Bowman: There is quite a bit going on right now. You may have seen news reports about Senator Bill Brady announcing a run for governor. During his fly-around-the-state on Monday, he talked about the fact that the state has a 53 billion dollar budget, that we are facing a 4 to 5 billion dollar deficit this year and the same next year. His campaign proposes that with cuts, that 4 to 5 billion dollar deficit this year could be managed. The part of the state's budget that can actually be controlled by Springfield is about 28 billion dollars and all but \$3 billion of that is spent on healthcare and education. The ability to somehow squeeze 4 to 5 billion dollars in cuts from the state budget without having an impact on education and healthcare is going to be virtually impossible.

Lane Crothers mentioned President Obama's stimulus package. The Obama administration just released the 2010 budget proposal and it does include some interesting features for higher education. One that he mentioned was the Pell Grant Program. That actually will become an entitlement if this budget is enacted with the maximum grant indexed to inflation. Another major change would be that the federal government would lend directly to students and funds would not flow through banks. The estimate is that that would save about 4 billion dollars a year.

Harvard's President, Drew Foust, sent a memo out to her campus yesterday. She said something that I think you might find interesting. She says, "What has become clear is that we are living through much more than a bump in the road. Our economic landscape has fundamentally changed for Harvard and many other colleges and universities. Our challenge is to confront the new economic realities and intelligently adapt ourselves to them." In many ways, our economic landscape changed in the 70s and it certainly took a sharp turn in 2002, but our reality has been gradually changing for several decades. Steve Bragg put together some numbers a couple of weeks ago that showed that 25 years ago, tuition revenue was 24% of our unrestricted funds. Today, it is 58%. That is a dramatic change. The news from many private universities, including places like Harvard and Yale, is very different than ours, not because we have more money; we certainly don't, but the operating revenue for many of those institutions depends on earnings from their endowments. For Yale, 44% of their yearly operating revenue comes from endowment earnings. So the major downturn in the market that we have experienced in this last year has had a major impact. To use Harvard as an example, 1.8 billion dollars of their 6 billion dollar budget comes from endowment earnings. Their endowment has lost 8 billion dollars.

In our situation, we certainly use endowment earnings for all kinds of projects across campus. Lots of student scholarships come out of our endowment, but we don't pay, for the most part, operating expenses out of the endowment. Our operating revenues, since the 70s, have tilted more and more toward tuition revenue and we are, certainly like many privates, heavily dependent on tuition revenue, but certainly not dependent on our endowment for our operations.

There is a lot of bright news for us. So much is gloomy in what we hear, so I thought that I would just briefly walk you through five or six areas that I think we can feel pretty good about and that I think represent strengths for us going forward. First, our total operating budget is 47 million dollars higher today than it was in FY04. Since FY03, we have provided over 20 million dollars in faculty and staff salary increases. Our debt is in fixed rate instruments, not variable rates. Earlier in the year, you may have heard stories about institutions that were scrambling to deal with variable debt instruments. We have provided financial assistance to students whose families are in the lowest income quintile. We now have a governor who values higher education. We have the strongest student demand in our history. Over 17,000 individuals, including freshmen and transfers, have applied for next year. It is likely that Springfield will do a capital bill, which

will bring us a much needed Fine Arts Complex. Our reputation in Washington is very good; I was just there a week or so ago and the Omnibus bill that is being voted on right now includes a number of our projects. The President is due to sign that in the next few days. Two weeks ago, we just allocated 1.3 million dollars in new, nonrecurring university funds toward a 2.8 million dollar upgrade in Stevenson to replace plumbing, deal with exterior windows and window systems that I think will make that building much more livable. So there is a lot to celebrate. We certainly have challenges ahead of us, but the gloom and doom that is, unfortunately, a fixture doesn't entirely apply to us.

Provost Everts will talk about the applications report, but I will end with saying that the application surge for us obviously began before this economic downturn. There are institutions, however, that are benefiting from the downturn right now. There was a *New York Times* article a couple of days ago that talked about the beneficiaries today and they are public universities that are well regarded. They are seeing a surge in applications from students who are considering how far the dollar will go. So I think that there is a lot to feel good about.

Senator Lonbom: You mentioned that 25 years ago, 50% of the income at ISU was from student revenues and it has dropped to 25%?

President Bowman: Just the reverse. 25 years ago, tuition revenue was 24% of our unrestricted funds. Today, it is 58%. This is the first time in our history that tuition revenue is higher than our state appropriation.

Senator Holland: Since we are nationalizing banks, does it matter if the Pell Grants come from the banks?

President Bowman: Not to us.

· **Provost Sheri Everts**

Provost Everts: As the President mentioned, yes, new freshmen applications are still up over this time last year. Applications received from Black-Non-Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islanders and Hispanic student populations are also up at 7, 3 and 30%, respectively, over this time last year. Also, since I was not at the last meeting, I would like to mention the University Scholars Program event that was campus on February 16th. As you may know, this program is designed for academically talented incoming freshmen from traditionally underrepresented populations or first-generation populations. This year, 144 qualified students applied for the scholarship and the 67 selected semifinalists were invited to the University Scholars Day. These were fabulous young people and when I met them for lunch, they were still enthusiastic after a very full morning and anxiously looking forward to visiting what they hoped would be their future home colleges and departments. I am hoping that we welcome all 67 of them to campus in the fall. Another dean search update—the nursing dean search committee recently conducted airport interviews and the search committee anticipates on-campus interviews the week of March 23rd. Finally, during that same week, the program planning and budget presentations for Academic Affairs will occur on Tuesday, March 24th, and Wednesday, March 25th. I am hoping I will see all of you there.

Senator Kalter: Did you mention the statistics on Native-American applications?

Provost Everts: No, I did not mention those, but I can get those to you.

· **Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams**

Vice President Adams: Let me begin tonight by thanking you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the

Senate for inviting Chief Ron Swan to present his state of the ISU Police Department and the state of the Crime Alerts to you last week when we were all at events for Founders Day. I read the minutes and it certainly impressed me that there were so many questions from the members of the Senate and I trust that Chief Swan answered those questions to your satisfaction. I also understand that his presentation was very well received and that he talked a lot about the resources that the police department has and the efficient use of those resources. Certainly, campus safety and campus security is first and foremost and I think the ISU Police Department is one of the many resources that we use to keep our campus safe.

I would like to provide some clarification on my remarks that I made at the Senate meeting on February 4th regarding the program and services provided by the Career Center. As I read the minutes, I can see where there may have been a misunderstanding there. I know that there were a couple of members of the faculty who also made comments to that effect. So I want to make it clear tonight that companies, business, both large and small, and school districts are still coming to Illinois State University to interview and hire our students. I think that there may have been the perception that they are not coming and certainly if that was the impression on the 4th of February, I did not mean to imply that no one was coming. I think that this is what I said, "It is likely a sign of the economy, but the Career Center is beginning to notice a downturn in the number of companies, businesses, large and small, and school districts signing up to attend the 2009 on-campus spring fairs." Just to give you some specifics, there was an internship fair on February 17th, which was after that meeting on the 4th, and slightly more than 40 companies attended. That compares to 60 last year. Then the job fair was held on February 18th and about 110 companies, corporations and other businesses attended the program on campus. That compares to about 160; so that is a drop from 160 to 110. Then yesterday was the Mid-American ISU Schools Fair and 150 school districts attended that fair. That compares to about 200 that we had last year. So we are seeing a downturn, but companies, businesses and school districts are still coming to campus. They are still very much interested in our students. They are hiring our students and our students are having opportunities to see those companies right here at Illinois State.

I have one more clarification and I do have some specific numbers for this. I had mentioned Caterpillar a couple of weeks ago and we have had quite a bit of contact with Caterpillar recently. Many people are familiar with their situation. The exact figures are these. Nine students were offered full-time positions, beginning either in the summer or the fall, and 18 students were offered internships, either in the summer or the fall. Those have been rescinded by Caterpillar. Most of the students were from the College of Business and a few were from Industrial Technology. I am told that the School of Communication and several others have been successful in having students take their internships and also in the hiring of some students, so I wanted to make sure that that was clear since there was, perhaps, a misunderstanding and some language that was in the minutes that I wanted to be sure was straight.

I want to mention that President Mason of the Student Government alluded to student elections. Student Affairs and the Dean of Students Office assist SGA with those elections. They are coming up, as Ted said, March 31st and April 1st. There will be a series of debates, if I am not mistaken.

Senator Mason: That is correct.

Vice President Adams: We do have an electronic mechanism for students to vote in the ICampus Portal and I think that that increases the percentages of students who have the opportunity to vote for the President of the Student Body and for the Student Trustee candidates. The Vice President runs with the President and is

not elected separately. Finally, I would like to offer congratulations to Senator Cassie Lund for her election as the President of the University Program Board. The University Program Board is one of the most powerful student organizations on our campus providing countless opportunities for our students to participate in events and programs. Cassie, you have a major task ahead, but I know that you will certainly meet that challenge. There have been some outstanding presidents of UPB, so we look forward to working with you in the year ahead.

Senator Mason: I forgot to mention in my report, but the Student Body Presidential and Student Trustee candidates for next year are on Monday, March 23rd, from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. They will be in the Brown Ballroom of the Bone Student Center. There will be a lot more advertising for that coming out, but please encourage your students to go to those.

Senator Lonbom: Chief Swan did give an informative talk two weeks ago, but one of the things he did mention is that they are under-resourced in terms of their sworn personnel. He made a point of talking about the fact that their presence is not very high on campus and it is because they are stretched pretty thinly. They have been relegated to doing work that is not actually part of sworn personnel work, such as locking and unlocking buildings. I just want to make that statement. They do a great job and they were complimented on the job they do, but Chief Swan did indicate that their numbers are low.

Vice President Adams: I read of that in the minutes and I am aware of that based upon a number of conversations that I have had with the Chief. He has made comparisons between Northern Illinois University's Police Department and Illinois State's Police Department. Let me answer that in two ways. First, with the change from Finance and Planning to Student Affairs, Vice President Bragg was very generous in allowing us the opportunity to hire two or three new officers, which we are in the process of doing. A third officer will be on board to up the number of sworn officers to 24. We will be adding a 25th and hopefully a 26th by the time the next fiscal year rolls around. Nonetheless, those numbers are low, certainly in comparison to Northern Illinois. However, my second point is this. Illinois State University is very fortunate to have an excellent relationship with the Normal Police Department, Bloomington Police Department and McLean County Sheriff's Office. Those three agencies, along with the ISU PD, do provide security for the campus, though more so the Normal Police Department than the other two. The fact that we have a much larger city than DeKalb and the fact that we have a lot more officers to assist us in a number of different ways does provide some type of cushion. That is not meant to say that we are not understaffed; it is only meant to say that we do have that opportunity.

President Bowman: I read police reports from around the state for college campuses. To use Northern as an example, their proximity to Chicago probably explains why they tend to have more incidents than we do. If you look at our crime stats from 2006 through 2008, in 2007, there was a 20% drop; then in 2008, another 10%. So when you look at the total amount of crime that occurs on our campus, it is still very, very small and much smaller than you would find in a city that had 25,000 people in it. Most campuses are patrolled by only the city police departments, like Wesleyan and other schools like that, so I think we do have a clear advantage having uniformed sworn officers on our campus.

We make pretty widespread use of undercover officers, so there is a police presence that is not immediately apparent. I have had a number of students e-mail about why they are not seeing more police visibility on campus, and that is part of it. A lot of their good work is done undercover. The last point I would make is that this recent terrible incident with the attempted sexual assault, and that suspect was apprehended, is a very unusual incident for this campus. Most of the crime on campus is property crime of various kinds and the

usual drug offenses that you find on any campus, but there is very little violent crime on our campus and it has been that way for 50 years. I hope it never changes. It is easy to debate whether 50 officers make it safer. More is always better, but on balance, compared to other big campuses, this is a very, very safe place.

Senator Mallory: I, too, was very impressed with Chief Swan's report. I guess one of the things that makes it difficult to know where we stand is the lack of information about benchmarking. Whether Northern is an appropriate benchmark institution is just a question in my mind. I had sort of the same response about it's proximity to Chicago, etc., so I am wondering if it might be possible for Senator Adams' division to make available to the Senate benchmarking information about appropriate institutions that we might compare ourselves to.

President Bowman: We can do that, but I don't think that matters. I think what matters is how much crime occurs on our campus and the level of reported crime here is just very small. If we double the size of the police department, I guarantee you that you would be no safer. It would be a lot of money and I just don't think it would make you that much safer for the amount of investment it would require to really scale up. I say that knowing that my wife and two daughters are on this campus. The oldest lives in a residence hall and I feel completely safe having her walk across this campus, ride her bike, get into her car, spend a lot of my money.

Senator Mallory: I don't feel unsafe, President Bowman; I just want to clarify that. But I do think what is unclear is a good understanding, at least on my part, of what the crime statistics are, how we compare to other universities and how our police force compares to other universities of our size in relation to those crime statistics. So I think if I had a better understanding of that, I would be in a better place to make recommendations with regard to that.

President Bowman: That makes perfect sense. Compare us to Champaign. It's a larger campus, but that campus has a lot more crime on it than we do, particularly rapes. I read their police reports everyday. We just don't have a problem that even approaches theirs. They are not only a bigger campus, but they are in a different kind of community than we are.

Senator Lonbom: Just once again referring to Chief Swan's report when he was here two weeks ago, he did not ask us to double the size of the police force. He said that in his ideal world, he was looking at 30 as an ideal number.

Senator Holland: I think that one of the things they were asking for was more assistance on things like unlocking doors to keep the official officers on their duties.

Vice President Adams: That's a good point and I certainly meant to answer that question. That is something that we are fully aware of and we are taking a very close look at what the options are to take that burden away from the police. We would much rather have them have an even greater presence on campus than locking doors and checking windows and that sort of thing, but we would not sacrifice that by not doing it. We would have someone else do it if we were able to find the resources to do that and we are examining that.

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

Vice President Bragg: I just want to piggyback a little bit on the excellent overview of the budget and financial situations that President Bowman gave you. He did a very good job of describing the national and state context that we are in. Like you, we are waiting for more information. We don't know what the extent of

these budget cuts that we will face are going to be. We hope to learn a little more this week. Tomorrow, the President will be testifying in front of the Senate Appropriations Committee in Springfield and, a week from tomorrow, he will be testifying in front of the House Appropriations Committee and meeting with various senators and Chairman of House Appropriations Committee. So we hope to know a little more after that. Also, the Governor will be presenting his budget address and presenting his budget for the coming year on March 18th. So over the course of the next three weeks, we hope to learn a little more.

Let me just add a little perspective on this. I agree with the President. We are in as good a shape as we can be facing the upcoming budget turmoil and budget shortfalls. Please don't take that to mean that we are not going to have some challenges ahead of us. We are going to weather this as best we can, but they are coming. We are going to face some budget issues as we move forward and I think that we are in a fairly good position. As I told you at the last Senate meeting, we hope to absorb half of the cuts by moving them off to other funding sources and through some new revenues and then accommodating about half of the cuts through some strategic adjustments in each of our divisions.

It is also likely to be the case that these cuts will extend on beyond just the appropriations process this year. That has been the pattern in past recessions. One of the challenges in planning for these things is that we get the cuts in drips and dribbles. I don't see anything out there to anticipate a different scenario. I don't expect to hear all of the bad news all at once and then have it all be over with. If you have been following the national financial situation, everyone is talking about this being a protracted recession. It is more likely, again, that we will be receiving cuts in small doses as we move forward, which actually, if you know that going into it, is a little easier for us to absorb, so I am actually hoping that that is the case.

To reinforce what the President said, we are not going to pray at rest because of this. We are moving forward. We have a lot of initiatives. The President mentioned the expansion in scope of the Stevenson-Turner project. That's moving forward. He sent a letter to the Capital Development Board requesting their authorization to expand the scope of that project. It is a Capital Development Board project, so they really have to provide that permission. We fully expect them to do that, either in their March or April meeting.

There were also two other items on the Board of Trustees' agenda that they approved. They approved a consulting contract for a three-year consulting term for a group that has a wide range of experience in implementing software and implementing the human resource system that we have just purchased. They have also authorized the purchase of an enterprise-wide Oracle database, a very big thing for those of you who are into information technology.

We are moving forward in facilities as well. The student fitness, kinesiology and recreation facility is moving along on schedule. We ran into some issues as we were putting footings in, but they recovered from that very quickly and we are still on schedule there. We just released two requests for information for academic office space near campus. One of the problems that we had in the Stevenson-Turner project was the lack of surge space, so we are looking for local developers to provide us some ideas about how we might be able to expand surge space in the future and some selected classroom and office space. We will also be going out next week with a request for proposals for something called an ESCO. That is essentially an energy systems audit process. We will be inviting firms like Honeywell, Johnson Controls and Siemens to come in and do a comprehensive audit of the university's utility systems and energy systems, everything from lighting to airlocks, etc., to find out where we might be able to save even more money and get some significant payback by making strategic investments in our systems. So we are looking forward to a good response to those RFPs and building in some savings for the future.

The silver lining in all of this is that there are some prices that have come down. Commodities have come down. We just decided to sign an extra year on our electrical contract for the year 2012 at a 3% reduction from what we are paying today. So that is some built-in savings in the out years that we can count on and we will keep looking for those opportunities.

Senator Van der Laan: I am curious to know what you think our gravest challenges will be in the next year or few years. You mentioned drips and dribbles. My little part of the university has been asked to find a 19% savings, which is quite a huge amount. That seems to be a pretty grave situation right now.

Vice President Bragg: I don't know who has done the requesting; it certainly has not come out of our office.

Senator Van der Laan: At the departmental level.

Vice President Bragg: There may be other issues at the departmental level that we are not aware of. I think the thing that we have to do most is to not panic and to not think that this is something that we haven't handled before. The university is 152 years old. We have been through these things before. Yes, this one is going to be a little bigger storm than we have hit in the past, but we have staff who have been through these situations before. We know what to do. We have made a lot of changes in the way that we do our budgeting after the 2002-2005 recession and we have some shock absorbers built into this system. That doesn't mean that there won't be some pain; just stay the course and we will get through it.

There is one other perspective on that that we have to think about in a little longer term. With a higher proportion of our revenue coming from tuition and fees, that puts a greater emphasis and a greater importance then on enrollment, on recruitment and on admissions, so all of us need to understand that we all have a role in marketing the university and making sure that we continue to recruit students to the institution.

Committee Reports:

- ***Academic Affairs Committee – No Report***
- ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee – No Report***
- ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

Senator Borg: The Faculty Affairs Committee had a good discussion with two members of a subcommittee of the President's Taskforce on Diversity that is looking into the current state of things, broadly defined, and recommendations. We had a good discussion, especially about faculty opinions, but I will say that our student members contributed as much or more than most of us dealing with issues specifically having to do with the campus. If you have any questions about the taskforce, that is the President's purview. I can assure him that things are ongoing, both at the committee level and also at the subcommittee level, in information gathering. That is the stage that we were in tonight.

- ***Planning and Finance Committee***

Senator Holland: We had a very nice meeting this evening with a good discussion about what our institutional priorities should be in the coming years as we are trying to finalize our institutional priorities document, which will be coming to the Senate in hopefully two more meetings as an Information Item.

· ***Rules Committee – No Report***

Action Item:

02.25.09.01 ***Withdrawal Policy – Withdrawal from Courses/Withdrawal from University-Draft 3 (01.23.09.01 Withdrawal Policy-Draft 1 was an Information Item on 2/4/09) (Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Stewart: When we brought this as an Information Item, we had some very good questions, so we made alterations in the wording on page 3, the gray highlighted area. “A student may be granted permission to withdraw officially from a course for health-related or other extenuating circumstances after the official withdrawal period after receiving approval from the University Registrar or his designee. Students may be asked to provide written documentation supporting the need for withdrawal from a licensed healthcare provider in the case of health-related circumstances or from other authoritative sources if the circumstances are not health related. If approval is granted, a grade of WX will be awarded.” I think that took care of some of the concerns that Senator Mallory brought up.

Motion XXXX-: By Senator Stewart to approve the policy. The policy was unanimously approved.

Information Items:

Academic Impact Fund Documents from Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

02.17.09.01 ***“Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Recommendations to the Academic Senate Subsequent to the Ten-Year Review of the Academic Impact Fund”***

02.17.09.02 ***Statistical Table for Above Report***

02.17.09.03 ***Academic Impact Fund Summary of Funding Sources, Assumptions and Authorizations, November 2006***

ADDENDUM: 06.27.08.01 ***AIF Guidelines and Allocations Memo/AIF Guidelines-Revised (Distributed by E-Mail on 3/3/09)***

Senator Kalter: My committee is charged with oversight of this thing called the Academic Impact Fund and a quick description of that is that it is the budget mechanism that allocates and then reallocates money for tenure-track faculty. A quick description of what tenure-track faculty means is that in a tenure-track faculty member's contract, they are required to deliver not just instruction to the university and its students, but also scholarly and creative productivity. So that is just a little description of what this is. Around last April, the Provost's Office did a thorough analysis of the ten years that this particular budget mechanism has been in existence and made a couple of changes to the policy over the summer. We then took that up this fall to take a look at whether there were any further things that we would want to recommend, given that that is our charge.

I am just going to go through the first five or six things actually on the Executive Summary since you have a lot of detail here. I think seven and eight are fairly straightforward. The first thing actually has to do with the economic discussion that we have just been having. We are recommending that the Provost follow up on the policy changes made in June of 2008 just to add program quality and program review to make it explicit that what we are trying to do is reallocate or make sure that funds are allocated toward the strongest programs. Obviously, we hope that those are also the programs with high student demand so that we are positioning ourselves as well as we can for the future.

The second item has to do with the assumptions that the originally proposed fund, when Provost Urice proposed this fund, had in place and which seemed, after analysis, not always to be working. The assumption was fairly straightforward. If somebody is retiring, they are probably making more than the person that is

going to be hired to replace them. That has not always been the case and, over several years, there has been something of a build up of issues where a person left their job and the person hired into that particular line actually made more than the person who had left and so the fund was shrinking, figuratively speaking. So, what we are recommending there is simply to see, as soon as fiscally possible, and that was very carefully worded in these kinds of budget times, if we can reallocate funds that over the last ten years may have gone to those kinds of expenditures and then to try to do that as they happen so that they don't build up.

The third item is about the use of non-tenure-track faculty and what we are recommending there is that we keep somewhat closer track of when a tenure line is vacated where the temporary dollars are going, whether they are going to hire simply replacement non-tenure-track faculty for a couple of years, or one person in that department, and the rest of funds are being used in another department or even in the same department for two hires, or what have you, and to enforce a sunset rule so that eventually, not eventually, but fairly quickly, the money gets reallocated to tenure-track rehiring rather than going towards non-tenure-track allocations over and over and over again.

The fourth recommendation has to do with the fact that over those ten years, it would be rather a miracle if some of the allocation patterns had actually not been somewhat disrupted by some of the economic times that we have seen. So we are recommending that the data, and you will see some of this data on the sheet that we sent around, just be looked at carefully in terms of if we are, in fact, where we want to be, or are about to go to be where we want to be, in terms of the levels of allocating tenure-track faculty to particular departments and schools. That one is pretty closely linked to number six on the second page—trying to right now take a look at where we are in terms of the numbers of majors, the head counts and the credit hours that are being produced by each department and do we have a way to figure out somewhat optimum ratios for how many tenure-track, how many non-tenure-track and how many graduate student instructors there should be in each department. That is going to vary a lot depending on the kind of program you have. It is going to be different if you have a doctoral program, a master's program or a major and minor program solely. There are all kinds of configurations that we have. We also have programs that have only graduate programs with no undergraduates or very few undergraduates.

Then the final thing that I just wanted to call your attention to is that when the fund was originally set up, another set of assumptions or sort of directives went into it. In addition to reallocation, the fund was set up to maintain instructional capacity when people retired or left, to enhance it where we needed it, to use it for summer school funding and also to use it for sick leave payouts. Before a certain year, and I think it was 1997, there was a lot of accumulation of sick leave. So a person would build up their sick leave and then when they left the university, the university was responsible for paying that out. Those payouts are diminishing and we kind of estimated that around 2015 or so, that function of the fund will essentially pretty much go away. In addition to that, summer school has been rethought and summer school no longer comes out of this fund. So that would leave maintaining and enhancing instructional capacity. What we are asking is for the Provost, the other Vice Presidents and the President to take a look at whether or not this is going to still be a working mechanism once that second assumption, the assumption about sick leave payout, also goes away.

I also need to point out that there are a couple of larger issues that we are asking the university to take a look at. Probably the most important one of those is whether we are allocating human resource dollars in the optimum way. We apparently have about 500 more people working here now, and I think that that is both part-time and full-time workers, compared to where we were in 1990. So it might be a good time to take a look at whether those people are allocated in the right places.

Senator Holland: This, indeed, is an Information Item, so it is time for questions. There is a lot to think about.

President Bowman: I appreciate the recommendations. I am glad to hear the committee endorse the concept of a centralized pool of academic positions. When this was proposed in the 90s, it was very controversial and it was viewed as an attempt by central administration to sort of usurp the control of the deans and the colleges and because of the lack of trust, that was just part of the background of the campus back then, it was difficult to sell the principle. At the time, I thought that the principle was sound, but it was the people controlling the purse strings that we had questions about. You do need a mechanism that allows you to sort of plan rationally and plan for the whole campus and I think that it ought to be located in the Provost's Office, which works closely with the deans to distribute the positions out as people resign and retire. So the fact that your committee has endorsed the concept I think is very important.

Senator Kalter: I would say I can't remember whether we were entirely unanimous on that, but I think that it was near unanimity. I think that there still are people who remember the times when there was not as much trust and I think there is some sense in the departments and in the schools that they would like to have sort of more control over their dollars. In fact, I think somewhere in the report, we mention that if a department or school is planning well and has a loss in an area, especially after the sick leave payout is gone, where we absolutely know that we have to rehire, if there is a way to make that happen a little bit more rapidly than it does now. I think that, in general, we really did see the wisdom of this kind of a mechanism and that we are not just individualists standing on our own boats. We have to see ourselves as sort of members of a community and allocate our resources in a way that is wise and that benefits everybody.

Senator Wang: As a member of the committee, I should have raised this in the committee. Looking again at the "create and enforce a two-year sunset rule" on page 1 of the Executive Summary, item 3D, I am wondering if, with the June changes—the memo that changed how the AIF operates—this sunset rule is still a valid request here. Previously, the way that the AIF operated was that they gave a sum a money to a department, \$29,000 per line. Now, there is no such \$29,000 anymore and for each department, if you want a position, it would have be requested and justified. Thus, there is no linkage between the two so there is no need for a sunset rule anymore. Am I correct on that?

Senator Kalter: I may ask the Provost to clarify a little bit in terms of what you are asking, but if I could say something about that first. I think that the idea in 3A and 3B is for us to try to track where the AIF money is going from year to year so that we know when we are simply replacing instructional capacity, when we are enhancing it, and also for there to be more clarity about that. What you are referring to is that it used to be that some money would automatically go back into the line that was vacated for replacement hiring. That is no longer guaranteed and it is no longer necessarily going to be \$29,000. Some departments need more, for example, which I think may be part of what Kay is going to mention. What we are aiming for there is that when we are seeing these monies being allocated toward non-tenure-track faculty for more than two years, the question is raised as to whether we need to allocate permanent funding for a non-tenure-track line there or whether it needs to be a tenure-track line. This is sort of trying to say, 'let's keep track of where this money is going and if we see that there is still a need there for a non-tenure-track person, as opposed to a tenure-track person, let's identify that and, rather than using this mechanism, figure out what's going on with that.

Kay Moss, Associate Vice President of Academic Administration: He's right.

Senator Wang: Thank you.

Dr. Moss: There are two separate questions going on here and deans have to think through where are we in need of tenure-track faculty. One whole set of discussions is about where we have program growth and student demand. Where we have programs of excellence, new programs and new sequences is another set of discussions. One of the issues that became very clear very quickly was that we had a legacy system of allocating instructional capacity dollars based on, 'Well somebody used to be in that department, but they retired and we did not replace that faculty member there. However, we owe that line \$29,000.' It became pretty clear very quickly that we may not have replaced that tenure-track faculty member in that department because there was less student demand and so it is counterintuitive to now provide it with the \$29,000. So we have this one set of discussions and decisions about where we should place tenure-track faculty. We also have another set of discussions and decisions about where we should place that instructional capacity dollar and that has a certain set of functions, too. At this time, this spring, in fact, the deans are beginning to look at a lot of data about how we would allocate those instructional capacity dollars in ways that are transparent, in ways that are fair and in ways that enhance and move Illinois State University in the directions that we need to go. So we are cutting this data every which way that we can and taking those month after month to the deans to have a look at.

One would think that one factor in this allocation among colleges would be credit hours produced. Obviously, some colleges have fewer credit hours produced and so they would need fewer instructional capacity dollars because there is less instruction. That's just the way that is. Another factor that needs to be considered, I would think, would be the cost of production of that credit hour. Some programs are just inherently more expensive. It makes a big difference if you have certain classes that have to be very small. Doctoral programs are more expensive than programs that can have larger classes. Nursing has to have, by its nature, smaller classes because of their clinical experiences. There just are differences in the cost. So there are those two factors of how many credit hours and what's the cost of producing it. There are ways that we have to look at those and define those correctly. Those are the interesting discussions that are going on and they are complicated. We are just getting into those, but we have to continue to have those discussions so that the instructional capacity allocations are made equitably across colleges, because they have to be made equitably for the students. We can't continue to work with a legacy system that puts dollars where there was a decline in demand. It is a complicated set of decisions and we are not finished yet.

What we did do, however, when we made some changes and adjustments to these set of guidelines—I mean everybody in that Provost's Office has been either in a dean's office or an associate dean's or in a chair's and we have all been faculty—was to be all inclusive. We know that change has to happen slowly, so those instructional capacity dollars for this fiscal year were based on the previous fiscal years, because we did not want any shocks to the system. In fact, we went out on a limb, and we did not realize how far out on a limb, given the economics, but we went out on a limb for fiscal year 2010 as well. So, the allocations that deans and chairs knew that they were going to have in fiscal year 2008, we promised them in 2009 and we have promised them in fiscal year 2010. The discussions we are having now are about allocations for fiscal year 2011 so that we were not going to have a shock to the system of some 20% cut or 40% cut anywhere. This is important. I was around when we were mistrustful, so we are being very open and very careful about that instructional capacity.

Senator Holland: I think that part of the question might be that starting with fiscal year 2011, if we have been hiring through the AIF instructional capacity dollars basically an identical NTT position for two or three years, it becomes obvious that that should be a permanent position. Is there a mechanism in place, aside from the AIF, to say, 'I am going to create a permanent NTT position'? It might not be the same NTT, but the position is there. I think that is what we are kind of thinking about in terms of a sunset clause.

Dr. Moss: There is a very good set of discussions there, too, because, very roughly, that account has \$3 million that continually goes out in instructional capacity, or has since I have been in that job. There does come a set of questions with that. If we are going to continue to pay \$150,000 into a college over and over again, does that dean really need more non-tenure-tracks? What if that college really does need more tenure-tracks? Should we think about a permanent allocation of those dollars so that the college profile looks a little closer to the way we would want it to look? Now that has ramifications. We need to think that through, because once those dollars are permanently there, they are gone. Do you put the college back at the table next year for instructional capacity dollars? That's another set of questions, but that is very important.

The other piece that becomes important here is the split between about \$3 million being put into tenure-track hires every year and about \$3 million being put into instructional capacity every year. Maybe that is not the right split. Maybe we want to walk instructional capacity down and walk tenure-track hires up. Maybe that is different college by college. Should deans have the flexibility? Maybe a dean has a particular allocation prior to our splitting it and he or she could make his or her own decisions in discussions with the chairs and faculty. All are conversations yet to be held, but we do know that we have those complicated issues in front of us.

Senator Kalter: T.Y., it seems that your question is revolving around sort of the older model of the \$29,000. I think that the idea of a sunset on this taking AIF money to pay for non-tenure-track faculty is still valid in the sense that it may be paying for it. You are thinking of a model where it was always paid to the same department, right? So a person would leave, let's say nursing, and \$29,000 would go back to nursing in order to pay for a non-tenure-track. The line, itself, may be, because of student demand, reallocated out of nursing, though that is improbable with that particular example, into another school or department. The idea is trying to make sure that when we are thinking about where dollars for tenure-track faculty are going, that they are, in fact going to tenure-track-faculty, that they are going to enhance the research and scholarly productivity of the university, in addition to its instructional capacity. So the idea of the sunset rule, whether it's in the same department or a different department, is not to be taking the dollars from the AIF, which, to a certain extent, is a kind of a fiction anyway, and using them to pay for temporary faculty, but to see where we need to reallocate those dollars for tenure-track faculty.

Senator Wang: I raised the question with regard to 3B because the reason you want to have a sunset is because of the linkage between the distribution of AIF dollars and instructional capacity. With the new guidelines, for instructional capacity, the department will have to justify it every year. Suppose we ask central administration to impose a two-year sunset rule. That pretty much tells the dean or department that after two years of a vacant line, you must give me the line. Is my interpretation correct?

Senator Holland: You don't necessarily have to give them the line. They can also say that there are not enough reasons to have that line anymore.

Senator Wang: So what is the meaning of this sunset rule then?

Senator Borg: It seems to me that the purpose is to ensure that that very decision is made—whether the line should be a tenure-track line reinstituted, whether the line should go away or whether you should investigate finding some sort of other mechanism for a non-tenure-track position. I think that a sunset is probably a good idea because it does ensure that the local unit will have to make some sort of decision.

Senator Wang: Right now, at the department level, every year when we make the budget justification, we justify how many lines we need already. Because we have so many vacant lines, in order to meet that

instructional capacity, we ask for dollars from the central administration. Previously, it was from the AIF, in terms of the name. Even though the money still comes from the AIF, we already make the justification.

Senator Borg: I am suggesting that this goes beyond simply classroom capacity. It ensures that the unit will make some sort of decision and recommendation to the dean and to the Provost's Office for this kind of position, either for the tenure-track to be replaced and they be allowed to hire, or that this line goes away, or that there is some other arrangement for a non-tenure-track position. It just ensures that it doesn't continue to go on (indefinitely). I do know that your department has been low, without enough tenure-line faculty, for a number of years. That is a problem institution-wide, but you can't generalize from that for other departments, because it does not work the same way. It is simply ensuring that the question be asked. If the resolution doesn't come about, that is an issue for the dean and the Provost levels, frankly, to determine whether or not there needs to be more tenure lines in Politics and Government. That may be the necessary thing, but up to this point, the rollover of NTTs has been the solution. This simply states that that is no longer an adequate solution.

Senator Wang: I am not sure that I understand that because, right now, with the new set of rules here, if the line is vacant and you don't have any instructional capacity needs, the line is gone. There is no line attached to the department, right? So, if that is the case, there is no need for a sunset. There is nothing to sunset.

Dr. Moss: They all sunset. So deans are making those decisions now about where they need to push the tenure-track lines in, but once you decouple instructional capacity from a vacant line, well it has sunset. Another way to think of it is that every line is a new line.

Senator Holland: I think that pretty much we are all saying the same thing here, that you do have to justify everything, but what we don't want to see happening is a department that really does have instructional capacity needs coming in for 15 years in a row saying, I need this person for this particular class. So if we have to hire this one person every single year to do it, sometime after two years, we are going to make a decision that either we are not going to teach that class anymore or we are going to hire a permanent person to do it, whether that is a permanently funded NTT or a tenure-line. Are there any further questions?

Senator Borg: These are recommendations to the Academic Senate and we have been discussing them as Information Items. What happens now?

Senator Kalter: Paul, I was going to ask you that question as our Parliamentarian.

Senator Borg: I assume that the Senate will either endorse or not endorse this as recommendations, but I do think the committee needs to determine to whom we are addressing the recommendations, which seems to me would be to the Provost's Office.

Senator Holland: That would seem the logical group of people. Further questions? Seeing none, we will move onto Communications.

Communications

Autism Services Provided at New Facility

Senator Thompson: We had a great event today at what is called the Autism Place. Dr. Bowman was there and made a short presentation, along with Representative Brady. ISU has been funded for several years to provide autism services as well as professional development for future professionals. We did move into a new facility in January and we had the dedication today. The Autism Place is located at 706 Oglesby Avenue,

Suite 303. The phone number for the center is 846-2799.

Adjournment

Motion XXXX-: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.