

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING AY 2009/2010
January 29, 2010
10:03 AM – 12:16 PM
PAC Conference Room “G”

Senators Present: L. Bogle, S. Borland, K. Burton, J. Casinova, D. Felix, K. Eisenhart, L. Fisher, J. Gilliam L. Giordano, J. Hall, N. Headman, W. Kline, E. Kullick, J. Martin, C. Olivier, B. Siddiquee, T. Sullivan-Stewart, H. Thompson, M. Van Vossen, T. Wang, P. Wassenberg, and T. Ting presiding.

Senators Absent: P. Salela

Ex-Officio: H. Berman

Guests: D. Barrows, J. Berry, A. Fitzgerald, Y. Lin, S. Longo, D. Matthews, A. McEuen, Y. Mhaskar, M. Payne, L. Price, S. Schwark, H. Seif, E. Staley, R. Ringeisen, E. Rundle-Schwark, K. Rutherford, and A. Shures

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion was made by Hall to approve the agenda and was seconded by Martin. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of the minutes from the meeting of December 4, 2009

A motion to approve the minutes of December 4, 2009 was offered by Wang and seconded by Hall. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Announcements

Olivier offered his congratulations to Martin on his recent scholarly work and subsequent appearance in the student newspaper. Casinova also offered his congratulations.

Reports:

Chair – Ting

Ting welcomed everyone back from their break and stated that we began the year with some big news regarding furloughs. The Chancellor will be joining today's discussion at 10:30am to address the budget and furlough-related issues.

Ting also reported that the Illinois Open Meeting Act applies to all governance committee meetings. The meeting dates, times and locations of all senate committee meetings will now be posted on the UIS Calendar and on the Senate website.

Provost – H. Berman

Provost Berman stated that he wished to address four topics today. The first is to touch on the budget. Looking back on the minutes from our previous meeting highlights the dramatic change that has occurred since then. The state continues to lag behind in payments, and consequently the budget situation has worsened. He showed a pie chart demonstrating how far behind the state was in its payments to the University of Illinois – in terms of payments from the state, they have paid the institution what we would have expected to have received by the second or third week of the fall semester. As we discussed last semester, the decision was made to set aside an equivalent of 8.5% of our budget to protect against these state shortfalls. However, the worsening state situation has resulted in the decision to pursue furloughs. With furloughs the institution has now set aside an equivalent of 11% of resources owed by the state. Should the state provide the funds they owe us President Ikenberry has committed to finding a way to restore salary dollars that were lost due to furloughs.

The Provost announced an agreement reached with SURS as of yesterday that would allow those who take furlough days to be able to make up lost payment to their SURS accounts. That will allow those affected to make up the payments that the individual would not make during furlough days.

For FY 2011, the Policy Council, comprised of the President, the Vice President, and the Chancellors, decided that the University of Illinois will prepare for a reduction in the state appropriation to the university of 15%. Because the UIS budget is derived in equal parts from the state and from tuition, the reduction is roughly equivalent to a 7.5% reduction. There are, however, some things that cannot be reduced by 7.5%, such as our Medicare payments, utility bills, debt obligations, and so forth. There are also things that require some judgment, such as scholarships. Would we want to cut our institutional aid by 15%? Probably not. Thus, with some things coming off the table the amount that needs to be cut from elsewhere rises. The Colleges and Divisions have come up with plans to accommodate these reductions with the idea being that the cut is shared across the board as much as possible. However, with a cut of this magnitude it is almost certain that some elements of the campus will be more affected than others. Thinking of our operations as concentric circles, teaching and the “securing of students” would be at the center and would be the highest priority. Our institution engages in many activities that are very worthy, but not at the core, and those will be affected to a greater degree than the core.

The other half of our budget comes from tuition, and of course an increase in the number of students we enroll and the amount of tuition they pay will help to offset the state's reductions. Improving enrollment will thus be the key.

There has been frequent discussion about the need to make the best use of our instructional resources. There is good news on that front: this year we have approximately the same number of online sections as we had in spring 2009. However, we have 500 more enrollments in that same number of sections, which is precisely what is meant by improving the use of instructional resources. That is a product of faculty being willing to increase online course caps. This is an enormously significant contribution by faculty to the financial well being of the institution.

The elimination of the printed schedule of courses was announced via email a few weeks ago. The Provost stated that he had consulted with deans and college executive committees about this, but neglected to mention in that email that he had also consulted with the senate executive committee. Everyone was in agreement about elimination of the printed schedule, and this will help to ensure accuracy in the information students have access to.

Finally, the deadline is approaching for faculty awards. In these hard times, one of the nicest things we can do is to celebrate the contributions of our colleagues. These include the Faculty Excellence Award, the Pearson Award, the Spencer Award, the University Scholar Award, and the Online Teaching Award. The latter is in a different category and faculty can self-nominate, but the other awards require nominations by others. The Provost encouraged faculty to nominate their colleagues for these awards.

Hall asked about Ikenberry's statement of a 9.5% increase in tuition and the possibility of doubling it. He asked if Berman had heard anything further, and Berman indicated that he had not. He stated that such a tuition increase would only affect incoming undergraduate students, as current students are guaranteed their current rates of tuition. There would need to be further discussion about graduate tuition, as we might want to limit the tuition increase for them.

Martin asked about the new SURS information and how it affects those who take voluntary pay reductions. Berman indicated that those who take voluntary reductions would not be able to make up the SURS contribution.

Kline asked what a 7.5% reduction in state allocation would be in dollars. Berman estimated it would be about \$3 million, and Shures confirmed that.

Felix asked how our enrollment numbers look compared to last year. Berman stated that our enrollment is a very bright spot. Giordano stated that we are up 226 FTE and 323 headcount. Enrollments are up at all levels – undergraduate, graduate, new students, continuing students. These increases are in comparison to last spring.

Martin stated that there are two committees out right now working on reports, the Instructional Resources Task Force and the Committee to Investigate Athletics. Berman stated that the IR task force will be filing its report before spring break. Ting stated that the Committee to Investigate Athletics Task Force will be submitting their report on February 15th as currently planned. Ting added that there is another committee working on the governance approval process and they are likely to bring their report before the Senate before the end of the semester.

Rutherford stated that she just received an email from Kathy Debarr who stated that she was sorry she could not be in attendance as she had to take her husband to the hospital.

Student Government – M. Van Vossen

No report.

Committee on Committees – L. Fisher

There is one faculty committee candidate to approve. The Undergraduate Council has been operating without a library faculty member. Sarah Sagmoen of the Library has been nominated by the Committee on Committees. The candidate's nomination was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Public Safety Building Update – D. Barrows, J. Gilliam, and M. Van Vossen

Ting thanked Barrows and the committee for their work, and Barrows thanked all of the committee members. While they did not produce a unanimous agreement, they did arrive at good set of recommendations and a preferred site. Based on the input from this committee as well as from the Student Government Association, site number 2 was selected by the Chancellor. This site is located at the intersection of University Drive and Eliza Farnham Drive. The desirable aspects of site number 2 include vehicular access, being easily located by visitors, its proximity to critical assets and student housing, and being located midway between east and west housing complexes.

Casinova asked of the status of the project, as he had read in the student paper that it might be in jeopardy because of the state budget crisis. Barrows indicated that this is an approved project and will be allocated funding when a capital budget is approved. That of course is tied up with the state budget situation.

BOT Meeting – T. Ting

The Board of Trustees meeting last Thursday elected a chair and Executive Committee for the next year. They retained Trustee Kennedy as Chair. The Executive Committee members were unchanged as well, and include Trustees Strobel, McMillan, and Kennedy.

On previous boards there were approximately 14 different committees. This board is trying to consolidate those committees into a more manageable number. They received committee chair reports from the Committees on Hospitals, Academic and Student Affairs, and Audit, Finance

and Facilities. All committee chairs also reported on the key issues before their committees to assist the board in learning about the university and its operations. All committees make their meetings open to the public with exceptions for personnel issues.

A variety of University Administration executives also presented to the board, including much of the information that Ting had distributed in a recent email. That included a link to a presentation by VP Rao regarding the institution's response to the budget crisis. Another link was provided to a presentation by CFO Knorr regarding fiscal health of both the state and the university. A third presentation was about administrative review and restructuring. The central administration wishes to reduce costs at the administrative level, and they have identified a variety of specific functions for review. Those functions include information technology, facilities and capital programs, business operations, human resources, development, alumni affairs, procurement, space utilization, energy and utilities, auxiliary operations, printing and related services, and public affairs/communications. They also want the campuses to review horizontally for restructuring – e.g. UIUC currently has a public relations person for nearly each unit, and the UA wants to know if that is really necessary. There is a committee to review this that has been established with representatives from all campuses. UIS' representatives include Berman and Associate Chancellor Ed Wojcicki. They have begun meeting and are preparing a report for the President to be delivered on June 15.

Discussion: Budget, Furlough, Furlough Timing, and Temporary Pay Reduction – Ting and Chancellor Ringeisen

Ting presented a summary of the information presented previously by VPs Rao and Knorr addressing funding and higher education. The key concerns include ongoing uncertainty regarding taxes, which are tied up with the upcoming primaries. The ISAC funding cut of more than 50% was restored last fall but not funded, resulting in an unfunded mandate. The state remains months behind on payments to the university. Further, the stimulus funding that has been used for higher education will not be available next year. There are also rumors of benefit charges to university, which could result in the state asking the universities to pick up some of the expenses currently covered by the Central Management Services. Finally, there is the lingering problem of a dramatically underfunded pension system. Our colleague Charlie Wheeler has an article on this point in the current issue of Illinois Issues, in which he describes that analysts indicate the state requires \$131 billion to fully fund the pension system, while we currently fund it with just \$46 billion (35%).

Illinois is also a fairly weak state in terms of GDP growth over the last 10 years. We are below the US average, which has implications for the tax base and the growth thereof.

State appropriations when broken down by agency show that higher education funding has decreased by 24% over the last 10 years, with other state agencies receiving little or no reductions. Consequently, state support per tuition dollar has declined dramatically from FY 1970 to FY 2009. The state provided \$12.8 to every \$1 in tuition in 1970, and in 2009 that ratio has become \$1.1 to \$1. The University of Illinois' direct support from the state has also declined dramatically in recent years. In FY 2002 the University received nearly \$950 million from the state, compared with current appropriations of \$743 million.

The institution has consequently had to increase tuition funds (that go into the Income Fund), which have risen from just \$200 million in FY 2000 to \$700 million in FY 2010. The majority of the state and tuition dollars that are received go to instruction. That reinforces the notion of instruction being at the core of our mission.

Ting also described monthly receivables – money that we should have received from the state but have not received – has increased from an average of about \$50 million per month in 2006 to nearly \$450 million at present.

The current level of late payments has resulted in the ongoing efforts by the institution to conserve cash. Ting presented a variety of documents listing those ideas bearing on cash conservation, and wanted to make sure that everyone understood that those ideas all received input from faculty governance. In particular she wanted to clarify that the furlough idea did not come out of the blue, this has been part of the discussion for quite some time, and that governance input was provided. Her feeling was that while first-year faculty members might find the furloughs to be a surprise, which would only be because they just got here and have not been a part of the conversation. But those of us who have been here should not be surprised, as this has been discussed for quite some time.

Ting proceeded to describe how faculty governance interacts with administrations. Each campus has a senate, and UIS senate executive committee includes Provost. Members of the Senates then also serve on the University Senates Conference. The USC then interacts with the President, and the President interacts with the Board of Trustees.

There was also a Furlough Advisory Committee at both the UA level and at the campus level. The UA level had three subgroups – a Logistics and Scenarios Committee, a SURS Committee, and a Grant Funds Committee. Eisenhart and Martin served on the Logistics and Scenarios Committee, and Eisenhart is also the chair of the USC and was vice chair of the USC last year. Ting served on the SURS Committee. We can all tell you that there was considerable consultation on furloughs. The SURS Committee began meeting in August, but the initial work did not go anywhere largely because they had difficulty getting SURS to work with them. At the campus level we had a UIS Furlough Advisory Committee convened by Provost Berman with representation from dean, faculty, AP and CS.

Returning to state appropriations from 2009 to 2010, we had level funding. We had a \$19 million rescission in 2009. However, \$45 million of our FY 2010 \$743 million appropriation is from stimulus funding. With the elimination of stimulus funds, it looks increasingly likely that we will have a cut in FY 2011.

We thus need to engage in financial planning. The question is, how will we do this planning? A second question bears on furlough timing. We have an obligation to ensure that our students have a complete and excellent educational experience. We must also have a coordinated advocacy plan with the university system. It is important to avoid sending out conflicting messages, especially messages that might communicate willingness to harm to the educational process, and thus hurt our cause. VP Rao is sending a memo to the UA governmental relations director to

communicate about lobby days at the legislature. Ting also hopes that the USC chair will follow up with central administrators on that.

Ting then asked Martin and Eisenhart to discuss the consultations they had on their furlough committee sub-group. Martin stated that the committee met via video conference about half-a-dozen times about scenarios. Nobody shied away from giving input in these discussions. Everybody was throwing out ideas and there was open discussion about pros and cons of various scenarios. Martin stated that if asked last fall about the likelihood of furloughs he would have, based on his understanding of how logistically difficult furloughs would be, stated they would be very unlikely. However, he stated that the flaw in his reasoning was due to a misunderstanding of the magnitude of the budget crisis. Ting added that there were a number of furlough options that were discussed, including up to 20 furlough days. There was also initially no flexibility for faculty with regard to furlough timing, and that idea originated in this committee – the human resources members initially thought this would be too difficult. Martin confirmed that the minimum cutoff and maximum flexibility originated in this committee. He added that the voluntary pay reduction was discussed in the committee, though not in detail.

Ting addressed the origins of the voluntary pay reduction option, which some have interpreted as a slap in our face. This idea was suggested by faculty at other campuses, especially personnel from the UIC hospital who don't think they can stop caring for their patients. They initially asked to be exempted from furloughs, which was not viable, but the voluntary pay reduction was offered as a way to allow them to come to work while still taking the pay reduction.

Siddiquee sought to clarify the pay cut vs. furlough distinction. In addition to the differing pension implications, furloughs are a default option. If you want a pay cut instead you need to initiate that yourself. Ting stated that was the case and the deadline for declaring the voluntary pay cut is February 8th. Ringeisen added that this is an “all or nothing” arrangement – you can either choose furlough or voluntary pay reduction, but you cannot mix the two.

Kline asked if we are further behind in state payments than other agencies. Gilliam stated that his wife works in a state supported agency and they have also had substantial delays in payments that have resulted in the need for short term loans to meet payroll.

Ringeisen indicated that most lawmakers do not even know how far behind they are in our payments, and it is likely that if the state had the money to pay for it they would not be turning out incarcerated criminals. The money we have received has come in trickles, and coincidentally our most recent receipt of \$45 million occurred on the date of our last Board meeting. Also, for this last fiscal year we did not receive our final payment until September. We will ~~also~~ soon have a website that will allow for instant monitoring of the percentage of appropriations paid.

Fisher stated that she liked the final questions Ting posed at the end of her presentation. Fisher had a couple of points, including her appreciation for the work that faculty and staff did on the furlough committees, raising a lot of faculty viewpoints, and in particular appreciated the “win” that is embodied in the flexibility of furlough day scheduling. Regarding faculty choice of when to take furlough days there has been a lot of discussion about whether or not to cancel class; she wanted to return to a comment by the Chancellor acknowledging that there is never really a day

that we do not teach. She stated her understanding that most would opt for furlough days, and Ting noted that Berman had opted for a voluntary pay reduction. Fisher acknowledged that is indeed his choice, but asked that we maintain our focus on the importance the freedom we have to make these choices. Shielding the student experience is of course desirable and we are all trying to do that the best we can. She stressed the need for faculty to be able to work those things out themselves. However, there are now bigger fish to fry. There are some ways in which we could involve Senates more in the planning process, and this is something the university as a whole should reflect on. It might have been better, over the past year, if the initial planning for the interim furlough policy had come down to the Senate level. However, the idea was to get an interim policy in place without having to go through governance. One of the first questions asked at the USC when furloughs arose was, “what does interim mean” with regard to the furlough policy? We still have this question – are we now going to have a permanent, rather than interim, furlough policy?

Martin indicated this furlough policy is for this year. One of the reasons why there is so much budget planning going on right now is so that we can avoid using a furlough policy next year. Ting added that furloughs are a short term solution, and we have a long-term problem. In her interactions with (Interim) President Ikenberry she has learned from him that he does not want to do furloughs next year, and she finds him to be very straightforward and credible. If he has his way, he would not do furloughs again. He recognizes that it is a temporary solution.

Ting reiterated the complete freedom for faculty to take their furlough days whenever they wish. Nobody should feel any pressure about the timing of their furlough days. At USC our colleagues at the other institutions were expressing concerns about the perception about taking the common furlough days in an attempt to shut down the university to send a message to lawmakers. That has been perceived by some of our colleagues in the University system as more disruptive than is necessary, and there is some sentiment that there are other ways to get our message to legislators. However, President Ikenberry did not say that he would clamp down on faculty taking common furlough days. The policy is that faculty have complete freedom in selecting their furlough days.

Siddiquee followed up on the “what now” question. With UIS’ dwindling state allocations we are now at 50% and will soon be at 25%. Currently the University system overall only receives 25% of their funding from the state. Is there any strategic thinking currently about proposing to legislators that we become a kind of quasi-private institution such as Colorado and Penn State? That idea would need to be crafted very carefully, but this would probably be a good time to begin discussing this topic.

Ringeisen stated that it is important to bear in mind that the 25% allocation of appropriations is in part a product of the millions of dollars of research grants our other campuses have, and those dollars can only be used to support research. We do not have those resources, so for UIS to go private we could potentially do so if we doubled our tuition, however that is not feasible for two reasons: 1) nobody could afford it; 2) there is a guaranteed tuition law. The other complication is that the examples of major institutions that have gone private all had considerable other resources at their disposal (research overhead). There are other larger problems, such as the recent law passed regarding institutional purchases through a single officer, which is problematic for all purchasing but especially for purchases made through single sources, and the continuing

failure to fund the veterans grants. The other major costly change the state has imposed has to do with the Freedom of Information Act, and the resultant increase in FOIA requests take up administrative resources. It would be helpful if the state could reduce our burdens, rather than increase them, while reducing our funding.

Ting stated that the issue of privatization came up at USC as well. Two major issues were raising the revenues to buy back the buildings, and the reduction in access. By becoming private we would be pricing out a lot of people. The 25% allocation is still a lot of money, and eliminating it would create a major tuition burden.

Ting added that an administrative review and restructuring is the first step, but the next step will be the academic side. However, that does not translate into layoffs for faculty. President Ikenberry stated that we have fewer faculty now than we had a decade ago, so he does not want to reduce faculty any further as that would adversely affect the quality of education. For example, UIUC is looking at cutting the graduate assistantships and having faculty teach lower division courses. Faculty are essential, but we must have different expectations about what we can do and will do to weather this crisis.

Ringeisen clarified that UIS is a counterexample of dwindling faculty resources university-wide, as we have grown up to 211 full time faculty at present. There are reasons for that, as we added lower division coursework. We also have people who teach only at the Junior, Senior and Masters level, while we have adjuncts teaching the Freshmen and Sophomores in that area. Those are issues Berman and the Deans are struggling with.

Hall asked about the stimulus funding requirement that the state maintain level funding in order to qualify for stimulus money. Berman stated that the requirement was that states receiving stimulus funding maintain a minimum of 2006-level of funding to qualify. However, the reality is that the state's financial condition is poor and the money might not be there, and there are mechanisms to request exceptions based on state financial conditions. Ringeisen stated that the Governor's budget would fund us at 2006 level, but that would still be a cut for us. However, the reality is that there is still no money. When we spoke with the Governor's office on income and budget they were very keen on supporting higher education, but they are pinning their hopes on an income tax increase. Most think that is unlikely to happen. Consequently, we are planning for a 15% reduction in state support for this fall, equivalent to a little over \$3 million.

Hall also noted that other campuses have considered early retirement as a cost-savings measure, and asked about UIS' approach to such possibilities. Berman stated that this was discussed a bit at the open forums. UIUC is offering a sort of "fire sale" deal for a one-month period only. We are not going that route. We are talking to individuals and we have a policy for making early retirements possible. We might be able to help people who wish to retire early to buy back years from SURS. These discussions are open to faculty, APs and Civil Service. Ringeisen stated that the short answer is that we are indeed working on the early retirement or voluntary separation arrangements. The thing to remember is that we make these arrangements to help the university, not just because we are great people. The good thing about a separation agreement is that next year's reductions will be permanent, so we have to find ways to cut our budget severely and forever. The Urbana separation program is very complicated and we did not want to get into

those levels of restrictions. Ting asked if Berman could send out an announcement to everyone, as her feeling was that early retirements were the only options under consideration. Berman stated that he has been handling this through the Deans, and would have to think about whether sending out emails would be desirable.

Borland noted that we are focusing very heavily on cuts to balance our budget, and asked about ways that we might increase revenues such as by recruiting additional students. While we still need to see the report of the Instructional Resource Management Task Force to see what capacity we have, working on recruiting more students is one thing we could do proactively. Berman stated that there have been such discussions and the new VC for Student Affairs has many good ideas about ways to optimize the use of Admissions resources. The figures for the spring look good. Giordano stated that the numbers for the fall are looking good, with a 20% increase at the grad ~~the~~ level, 3% at the transfer level, 1% increase in applications at the freshman level but 29% increase in deposits at the freshman level, but it is very early. Dr. Barnett has been meeting with all of the Deans about recruitment and there is currently strategic planning to address use of more targeted recruiting and getting additional people involved and they are welcoming input from the academic areas.

Ringeisen added that he has engaged with upper administration and perhaps as early as the March 10th Board meeting we might have a motion that would allow us to recruit students from nearby out-of-state areas by charging them in-state rates. Another possibility is expanding our online presence which helps due to our e-tuition rates and is very popular nationwide. The other thing is that to get more students we need to grow our application base and then “reel them in” better. Urbana and the legislature often express concerns about recruiting too much from out of state, but right now UIS has nearly none. The President further understands that UIS is unique and that such a request would not need to affect the other two campuses. Giordano added that in Illinois the number of high school graduates has been decreasing, which makes it all the more important to try to recruit from out of state. International recruitment is also important, and we have hired an international admissions counselor to help in that area.

Eisenhart offered some background to ensure that everyone understands that administration and governance have been discussing furloughs for a long time, dating back to last year. She remembers having talked to Berman about furlough alternatives well before the UA began having their meetings last summer. Also, there are certain things that belong to faculty such as academic policy, and certain things such as opening buildings that belong to administration. Her view was that administration did a good job of consulting, but the final plan regarding furloughs was a surprise to everyone. It was a product of a lot of people doing a lot of talking, and she was particularly appreciative of administration’s 10-day sacrifice, which helps keep the rest of us in the classroom.

Ringeisen stated that for APs and upper administrators it is clear that you take a day off in exchange for a day’s pay. The voluntary pay reduction was suggested also as a way for upper administrators to avoid having to take an actual day off, as they did not think they could really do that. They reasoned that if a voluntary pay reduction was available to them, then it should be available to everyone.

Eisenhart added that there are two kinds of agencies: state agencies and private, not-for-profit agencies. We are in the latter category. The state agencies have to get their money or they close down. Their employees who are not unionized have already had to take upwards of 12 furlough days. Those agencies will run out of money, the state simply does not have enough money and they do not have much to sell to raise money. Some states have sold properties and buildings and then lease them back, and that is being discussed. She also advised us to remember that we do not work like car salespersons who can be fired when there are no customers. In fact, we have more customers than we had four years ago – our problem is that we have more customers with fewer resources to serve them. In a time of rescission that makes us not like a business, so do not buy the business model.

Siddiquee asked to clarify his earlier privatization comment, as he meant to refer to more of a quasi-private institution. The difference is really a matter of control – the state provides 50% of the budget but 100% of the control. Many of his neighbors have no idea that only 48% of our budget comes from the state, so some education might be needed in that regard. Can we obtain greater control? Quasi-private campuses have the ability to implement a variable pricing model based on capability to pay. Those institutions are less burdened by state regulations as well. He added that he does believe that education is a public good, is not a pure private good, and there should be state support.

Kline stated that a practical suggestion might be that top administration might want to let junior, both support staff and faculty know they can openly start looking for employment elsewhere and ask for letters of recommendation without prejudice. Many junior faculty are worried that they may be in the crosshairs but do not want to jeopardize their current situation by acknowledging they are looking elsewhere. Berman stated that they could think about that, but there is a strong desire is to retain tenure and tenure-track faculty. Kline clarified that he meant to include adjunct faculty too.

Ting reminded everyone that we are a part of the University of Illinois system, and the reason why we remain afloat is because of the tuition dollars from the other campuses. She also pleaded with the Chancellor and Provost to do not just short-term cash generation, but long-term planning for cost reductions. Deans have been doing planning since last fall, but we seem to be beyond the planning phases. Faculty need to have input on these things. Professor Swan asked at an open forum “do we have a plan?” How can the plan be made clearly visible to everyone? What is on the table? Faculty often say that they have not heard anything from the Provost. McEuen asked for more of the town hall or campus forum meetings for discussing these things openly. Ting stated that the details of the financial planning itself would likely need to be done at the unit level, and probably could not be accomplished at a Town Hall meeting. The part we need to know is the detail regarding the big picture.

Berman responded that in the last week we have just received plans from the Colleges, so that information is coming. The deans have to work with the leaders in their colleges and they participate in that planning – you cannot have every faculty member involved, you need to have a working group to do that. But then what does this look like as a whole? That is a legitimate question and I think it would be useful to provide a summary and communicate to the campus as a whole what the plans mean for us. He expressed his willingness to speak with the Senate

Executive Committee about how to do that. Ting responded that it would be helpful to know the direction that is being given to those who do the planning. Berman stated that he believes that has been articulated, as the guiding principle is to preserve the instructional core above all else. That means there are many worthy things we do that we simply will not be able to do at the level we have done them in the past. Another piece of the story is what Borland mentioned earlier regarding growth possibilities, and said that it would help to have discussions with the Senate to discuss all of the big pieces that are moving into place to address the budget problems.

Ting stated that there is much anxiety about the budgetary problems, and she wants to have the Senate be a forum for these open discussions. For that reason she is very disappointed that more faculty are not attending the Senate meetings, and wants to make sure faculty do not operate on an uninformed/rumor spreading basis. She encouraged senators to speak to the other faculty to minimize the likelihood of uninformed rumors. Faculty need to be working together with the administration.

Ringeisen asked to respond to her previous comments about priorities, and indicated that his direction to everyone is to be in a student-first mode, with teaching held as most important. He also wanted to clarify that nobody enjoys this. In his 30 years of administrative experience he has never had to take money out of peoples' pockets, so the more advice and help he gets the better. However, sometimes he and Berman get three or four changes in the same day directed either from the State or the UA. Finally, if not for us being in the University of Illinois system we would probably be closing the campus. We are currently operating on the system's rainy day fund based almost entirely on the tuition from the other two campuses. When he arrived at UIS there were no reserves and those were built up a bit, but they have been wiped out by the current crisis and it remains to be seen how long the University system's reserves can last. He expressed appreciation for all of the suggestions offered today.

Martin wanted to clarify that much of the USC discussion with CFO Knorr centered around the steps the U of I system has taken so far and indicating we will be OK through the current semester barring any catastrophes. However, the summer session is an unknown and should be on the table. We may need some scenarios out there so that faculty can be planning for course offerings and other summer activities.

Giordano added that the strategic recruiting plan that Barnett is working on also focuses on retention. The philosophy is that if you lose one student you need to recruit two to keep enrollment level.

Wassenberg stated that this summer is difficult to plan for, as the summer is funded across two fiscal years. We know how much money we will have in the current fiscal year, but we know nothing about next year.

Fisher stated that we have not yet had a discussion about lobbying efforts. Central administration does lobbying, but wanted to know if there were ways the faculty can communicate with legislators and support the notion of public higher education. Ting stated that she would like USC Chair Eisenhart to communicate with VP Rao regarding the organization of our message, particularly with regard to lobby days.

Fisher asked for a brief update on frozen searches from the Provost. Berman stated that 18 searches were authorized in the fall, and 6 were completed by the end of the fall semester. Of the 12 remaining searches, 5 were cancelled and 7 were authorized to proceed after review by the Chancellor. The AP positions are mostly frozen, but some exceptions are being made based on Chancellor's authorization on a case-by-case basis. Part of the story is that around UIS there are a variety of instances in which a position has become vacant but the duties are being taken on by those at a lower level of the unit. The organization then gets flattened out, and the person who takes on some of those additional responsibilities gets a stipend, salary bump or title change, but that only happens if it saves the institution money.

Ting closed with thanks to Provost Berman for his hard work, and reminded everyone that shared governance involves shared responsibility. Faculty governance does not just mean telling administrators what to do. Administrators are trying to do their best, but sometimes frustrations arise from transparency, accountability, and communication problems. Many times when people perceive that we are not doing our jobs, it is likely not because we are not doing our jobs but has more to do with communication problems.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Martin and seconded by Hall to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 12:16 pm.