
Senators Absent:  L. Giordano (B. Cass, AP Representative), B. Siddiquee, M. Van Vossen

Ex-Officio:  H. Berman


The Senate was called to order at 10:03 am.

Approval of the day’s agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was offered by Fisher & seconded by Hall. The motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of January 29, 2010

A motion to approve the minutes of January 29, 2010 was offered by Martin and seconded by Bogle. The minutes were approved with corrections to lines 33, 421 and 473 by unanimous voice vote.

Announcements

Smith announced that the Staff Silent Auction would be held on March 31st.

Casinova reported that the statewide coalition that established last fall to address the MAP grant issue is reconvening, and he will be meeting with them and the IBHE-Student Advisory Committee regarding an important announcement, though it was not clear what that
announcement would be. The Chair of the IBHE-SAC has established a series of breakfasts with legislators in March. In April there will be a lobby day comprised of students, faculty, staff and parents as well.

**Reports:**

**A. Chair – T. Ting**
The Senate office sent out the nomination forms for next year’s Senate. The deadline for nominations is February 18th at 4pm. Please nominate willing colleagues soon, as we have received just one nomination to date.

The Senate Committee Chairs met for a luncheon on February 4th to confer regarding each committee’s work and to address any concerns or bylaw issues that required discussion. The Senate officers and the entire Senate are looking forward to the end-of-year reports from each of the committees.

Ting stated that she recently sent out an email link regarding the Illinois Connection, an advocacy network for the University of Illinois. Upon joining one can access their online resources, which include sample letters to send to elected representatives and media, and Illinois Connection will help to identify your representatives. This is an effort to coordinate and advocate not just for the University of Illinois, but for public higher education overall.

The Illinois Public University Presidents and Chancellors held a press conference and sent a letter to the Governor and State Comptroller requesting establishment of a payment plan to address the outstanding balances owed to the universities. This has gotten a fair amount of media coverage.

Ting wished to note that Murphy did us all a service in alerting us and Human Resources to the delay in claims for those in the HealthLink Insurance plan. They are evidently about 16 weeks behind in paying the claims. The issue appears to be that insurance money is not routed through the University, but comes directly from the state’s Central Management System. CMS did not inform the University about this problem, and so neither HR nor central administration knew this was happening. Ting thanked Murphy for bringing the issue to our attention and the HR staff at both UIS and in university administration for their work by quickly sending out the memo to clarify and explain the situation.

**B. Provost – H. Berman**
Berman stated that most of his report would be reserved for his later presentation. He wished to remark upon the investiture ceremony at the Old State Capital last night of Professor Burlingame as the Naomi B. Lynn Chair of Lincoln Studies. Over 300 people attended the ceremony, which was held in the old House of Representatives. There is a remarkable passion and knowledge amongst the Springfield citizens for Lincoln, and this ceremony represented a very valuable moment of connection between UIS and the community.

**C. Student Government Association – M. Van Vossen (not present – C Olivier, D Felix responded on behalf of SGA)**
No report.

**Old Business:**
Resolution 39-15 Campus Presence for Full-time Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty
[2nd reading]
A motion to open discussion was offered by Eisenhart and seconded by Olivier.

Ting asked if Kirkendall wished to begin the discussion with any comments, and Kirkendall declined stating that she sent an email to the Senators yesterday explaining the Personnel Policy Committee’s position so as to avoid taking up time today. Ting stated that this revision to the resolution clarifies that this policy would apply only to tenured and tenure-track faculty, and the heart of the policy is to ensure the equitable distribution of teaching and service assignments across faculty members.

Hall stated that his college is concerned by this policy. Much of his program is online, all of his advising is online, and he often teaches online or in Peoria, yet he maintains a presence on campus. These kinds of expectations would naturally vary by department, but for his program most of the “presence” required for completing service and advising is accomplished without physical presence on campus. He is concerned that he and many of his colleagues would have to be filling these requests out every single semester. He asked what kind of absence would trigger the need to make such a request?

Kirkendall noted that the key language here is “extended period of time” and those with online teaching assignments and most of those in Hall’s program would likely not be subject to this. Ting stated that her understanding was that an absence for a semester or more would serve as a trigger.

Borland stated that the policy does not state an absence of a semester or more is needed before triggering the policy. Instead it says that you must be physically present on campus. If the policy said that you must do the service your department needs you to do, then she would be in favor of it, because that is her perception of what this policy hopes to address. She expressed appreciation for the PPC’s attempts to clarify this resolution, but was concerned about the vagueness of the language and its stated purpose. The stated purpose in the resolution does not solve the problem as stated by Ting in her opening comments. For that reason, this resolution will not serve the ends it purports to serve.

Wang noted that when people face a bad situation they tend to overreact, and his feeling is that this resolution is an overreaction. That overreaction can then end up as a new rule or regulation that can have both positive and negative impacts on organizations. We need to weigh the negatives against the positives, and his view is that the negatives outweigh the positives in this resolution.

Eisenhart stated that she is concerned for departmental autonomy. The department should be the unit that establishes the expectations for teaching and service expectations. A problem she observed in her department is that faculty took the merit review process very lightly, yet that is a time when colleagues can evaluate each other. She expressed the desire to ensure that departments determine who teaches what and when, not the Dean – that is not their job. Regarding service, how many people do we know who work on ground or who live five miles away and do zero service? Those are mostly tenured people, and until we have a clear list of who is doing service and who is not doing service we should not be targeting people who may be off campus. This should be a department issue.
Wassenberg expressed feeling some internal conflict about this resolution. She noted that the law school part of her agrees that the vagueness of this language can indeed be problematic. She stated that she has been here long enough to have seen people who would abuse this policy terribly, though she noted that none of those people are at UIS presently. However, and despite her position of supporting departmental autonomy, she has seen in many departments that senior faculty members cow the junior faculty members into avoiding judgment of their service and making the kind of recommendations that are needed for those who do no service. We run the risk of losing many junior terrific faculty members who end up pulling more than their fair share of the weight. While this is not a perfect solution, it provides a hook that would allow for intervention and prevention of harm to the junior faculty. Martin replied that instead of offering a hook, he would prefer to see this issue confronted head on.

Gilliam stated that he is not entirely clear about the nature of the problem or where the problems genuinely lie. We have not openly discussed the individuals and departments that are affected. In his classes he describes differentiating between micro-level and macro-level problems, and in his view this is a micro-level problem that is being addressed at a macro-level. In his opinion that tends not to work well.

Headman stated that, if this is truly a tenured-faculty problem, then perhaps this policy should be targeted at tenured faculty. The junior faculty are already in a position of needing to “keep their ducks in a row.” Also, if these kinds of arrangements are desired then perhaps they should be codified in their hiring contracts, rather than having to go through this process every year.

Borland asked about the nature of the problem. Nobody is saying that the problem is that “UIS is a ghost town.” The problem appears to be that certain faculty are not pulling their service activity weight, and this resolution will not solve that problem. In fact, it may create new problems in particular with junior faculty feeling as though their autonomy is threatened. In departments with many junior faculty then perhaps the dean should be reviewing service activities and making recommendations for change.

Kurtz stated that she agrees with all of the previously stated criticism of this policy, and noted that this solution appears to be targeting a problem at a particular point in time. Presence can occur both virtually and physically, and the previously described problems deriving from physically present but non-contributory faculty indicates that requiring physical presence will not solve the problem. She suggested some language that would support departmental autonomy and flexibility, allowing for the department to negotiate terms of absence of greater than one year provided that the department, dean and provost were in agreement.

Bodenhorn stated that UIS has a long tradition of intentionally vague policy, and the Senate is now asking for much more specific language, which is new and probably good. With regard to the request for specific information about personnel he would not want to reveal that in open session, but would be willing to provide that information in an executive session if desired. He noted that the problem is not specific to service, but the impact has a broader effect on departments as a whole. If a department has two or three such faculty away from campus, it will have a dramatic effect on those who are left behind. Those left behind are often junior faculty. In one 9-member department that he wishes not to name we have already lost one junior faculty and
three more are on the market because of this issue. If the problem with this resolution is the language, then fix the language because a policy is needed.

Hall agreed that the broader impact is important, and perhaps we should consider creating alternative arrangements for faculty who wish to be off campus. One example from a previous senate discussion was to have faculty who wish to be away from campus teach four courses instead of three. Ting replied that the PPC did deliberate about possibilities such as teaching four courses per semester and decided against it. Kirkendall added that this issue was also addressed last year in a resolution regarding collegiality as a way to ensure everyone is carrying their weight and it was rejected.

Kline stated that the collegiality issue and the present issue is like comparing apples to oranges. He found the collegiality issue to be very different, exceedingly vague, and was focused on interactions between individuals. He also noted that alternative forms of language were suggested to the PPC and they rejected them, as is their right. He disagreed with the sentiment that the rejection of the collegiality resolution justifies the removal of specifics from this resolution. He wished to see more specifics.

Sullivan-Stewart explained that we tend to trust our colleagues and assume they have integrity. To her, this addresses a lot of this conversation – that we tend to trust each other. Also, this year we have new information about the economics of the institution and are now learning about incentives for people who do not wish to be here. Those who do not wish to be here could explore those possibilities. Ting stated that the Provost could address that later.

Headman stated that what we are really talking about here is engagement, not physical presence on campus. He asked, who sets that standard if not the department?

Martin added that those who behave in ways that are hurting the department or institution should in his view already be subject to dismissal for “just cause.”

Kline stated that this resolution expresses a presumption of presence on campus. That would make it clear to those who are going through the hiring process that they are expected to be physically present. That is in his view not a bad thing. He also observed that he ends up wasting time in committee meetings trying to get absent colleagues caught up, which he did not appreciate. He does not think that the issue raised by this resolution is entirely irrelevant and does not view it as the ‘great Satan rearing its head,’ but shares some concerns of other senators regarding departmental autonomy, post-tenure review, service commitments, and vagueness.

Felix stated that it is important for us to step back a bit and note that this policy would not affect those of us who are at the table. We are all people who get involved, but there are some who do not. For the future development of this campus it is important to have faculty present to be involved with students, participate in student activities and even extra-curricular activity attendance.

Bodenhorn addressed departmental autonomy and the issue of the “nuclear option.” He noted that a lot of departments do not like to make tough decisions regarding their colleagues, but the only alternative is to schedule off-site faculty for on-site courses and dismiss them for cause if they do not show up. This resolution is an attempt to provide another option. It is an attempt to
reach an intermediate solution, and if anything the lack of such a policy undermines departmental autonomy as Deans offices end up having to make course scheduling assignments.

Provost Berman noted that he appreciated this discussion, understands the concerns many have regarding the language, and in particular appreciated Wang’s comments about how organizations work. He had stated when this resolution first came to the Senate that he felt there was a place for articulating the expectation regarding faculty presence on campus, but ultimately it would be the decision of the faculty and Campus Senate to determine if they wish to articulate this expectation in Personnel Policy. The second half of this resolution addresses procedure, and his expectation and advice to deans who receive such requests would be to make sure that they get input from the department, whether this resolution passes or not.

Ting summarized the issues laid out by the Senators, and stated that we can either table this to address the vagueness of the language or we can vote on this as a second reading. Hall offered a motion to table, seconded by Eisenhart. Martin stated that he would prefer to see this resolution move forward to a vote and start over if we wish to review this topic again. Ten voted in favor of the motion, eight opposed, with no abstentions. The motion carried and the resolution was tabled.

**New Business**

**Resolution 39-17 Suspension of MPA Concentration in Criminal Justice [1st reading]**

A motion to open discussion was offered by Eisenhart and seconded by Kline. Eisenhart asked how long it has been since this program has been active. Hall stated that he was the only representative from Graduate Council present, and noted that this request came from the MPA program. Wassenberg stated that she has been cancelling 500-level courses in Criminal Justice that this program would need for the last four years.

Martin asked what suspension means, and Pardie indicated that suspension means the program would not be published in the catalog any longer, but the Banner coding would still be in place to allow current students to complete the program. IBHE guidelines are that a suspension would be in place for five years. Ting asked if it would need to return to the Senate in five years, and Pardie indicated that it would. The program would come back later, as this is not a vote for elimination.

Wassenberg noted that removing this from the catalog is essential to the MPA program. Their accreditation agency has flagged this concentration as “false advertising” and they have been given until the end of the academic year to address this.

**Resolution 39-18 Integration of a Third-year Assessment Report into the Program Review Schedule [1st reading]**

A motion to open discussion was offered by Hall, and seconded by Bogle. Eisenhart asked when this resolution would go into effect. Ting clarified that this is a policy resolution and does not address the implementation. Cordell stated that her committee has provided a reporting cycle that needs some revisions due to delays in their work. The hope is to have CASL training workshops in 2010-2011, and the policy would then be implemented starting 2011-2012. Fisher added that this assessment is to be done by departments every three years, which would replace the current
practice of annual reports. Headman asked Cordell to confirm Fisher’s understanding that there would be no more annual reports, and she did. Cordell stated departments would only be required to do reviews every three years if their last review indicated that they needed to work on some things. If the review is good, they can go seven years before submitting another report.

Presentation: UIS Financial Planning – H. Berman

Provost Berman began by thanking Shures for helping him develop this presentation. They have worked together for 15 years on budget and planning issues. He also thanked the SEC for their consultation regarding the information that would be most useful for this presentation.

Berman and the SEC agreed that today’s review would cover the following topics: the Big Picture Context for the UIS budget, the FY10 Budget Development and Planning, FY11 Planning Philosophy and Process, FY11 Preliminary Assessment, and Long Term Financial Sustainability.

Big Picture Context for the UIS budget

The state of Illinois has a state budget of $50 billion, $26 billion of which constitutes the “General Funds” category, which provides most of the state funding for higher education. The University of Illinois appropriation is about $750 million, which is less than 3% of the overall General Funds. The total University of Illinois operating budget for FY10 is $4.6 billion. The UIS total operating budget is $73 million, which is less than 2% of the overall University of Illinois budget, though he stated that it is of course a very important 2%. He presented a graph that demonstrated the trend of state funding for higher education over the last 10 years. Compared to allocations for other areas, higher education has decreased 11.6% overall in real dollars during that time period.

The UIS budget is comprised of $21.995 million from GRF, $23.157 million from the income fund (primarily tuition), self supporting services generate $15.279 million, Grants & contracts generate $10.307 million, Gifts are $1.830 million and indirects are $341 thousand. This totals $72.909 million. The top two categories are what we concern ourselves with. The part of our budget that funds our instruction, student affairs, and the chancellor’s division are drawn from the state GRF and Income fund, which totals $45.152 million. A reduction of 15% in state GRF would translate into an approximate 7.5% cut to the overall (GRF + income fund) operating budget. There are some things that we cannot cut by that amount, such as utility bills, Medicare contributions, and scholarships. Consequently, a 15% reduction in state funding effectively translates into an 8.3% reduction in the operating budget that can be reduced.

Another big picture element is the constant growth in enrollment at UIS since 2000, particularly at the undergraduate level, which has seen a 42.9% increase. Graduate level enrollment has also increased by 6% and overall we have increased enrollment by 21.9%. We have also increased faculty from 170 about five years ago to 211 presently.

Ordinarily, one would expect that as enrollments increase that the state’s appropriation would also increase, as that is the principle of Public Higher Education. This is a public good, and so the burden is shared both by the students and their families, as well as by the citizens of the state. That has not been the case, however, as he demonstrated in a graph from 1999-2009 contrasting dollars from the state, dollars from tuition, and enrollment. State contributions have stayed level.
for 10 years, while student contributions have had to increase. Another graph demonstrated the change in state support per income fund dollar over the last 10 years. In 2000 the institution received $4.70 per $1 of student tuition. That has since declined to a ratio of approximately $1 to $1 at present.

The $45 million of the UIS budget is distributed thusly: $30.440 million goes to Academic Affairs, $4.887 million goes to Student Affairs (from state dollars), the Chancellor’s division gets $3.452 million, utility and Medicare costs are $3.577 million, and Administrative Affairs gets $2.796 million.

**FY10 Budget Year**

In Spring of 2009 the state began slowing down their payments to state universities, which was unprecedented. In July of 2009 the University of Illinois decided to hold back $20 million to protect against the potential for a worsening budget situation, at which point the institution began interim furlough planning and changed the language in Notices of Appointments. In September of 2009 a soft hiring freeze at UIS continued, with a few positions getting approval to proceed after close scrutiny. In October of 2009 the Cash Crisis emerged as the state fell behind in their payments to the University of Illinois by $250 million. In November of 2009 the three campuses were required to begin planning for a 6% reduction in state funding. In December of 2009 the state receivables reached $436 million, which triggered a hard hiring freeze and the furlough policy was implemented. On January 4th of this year the President sent a message to the campus regarding these developments.

The university had those previously mentioned reserves of $20 million, which accounts for 2.5% of state shortfall. The campus pullback was 6%, which resulted in a $1.5 million reduction for UIS. The furlough policy was implemented, which the university targeted to save us $17 million. This resulted in an overall set-aside of up to 11% of operating Budget for FY 10 – approximately 1.5 months of non-payment. The 6% set aside for UIS came from an income fund carryover of $860,000 from a previous set-aside in FY09, from a budgeted reserve of $550,000 (intended to do special things but also to protect against disaster – a “rainy day” fund), and utility savings of $90,000 (thermostats were turned down two degrees in winter and up two degrees in summer). When the 6% set-aside was announced in November administration did not have to go back to the Colleges to ask for more money, as we had these funds reserved. However, at the beginning of the fiscal year they did need to request an additional 1.3% set-aside from the colleges to balance the budget.

Eisenhart asked if the Provost knew how long the $17 million in furlough savings would keep us afloat. Berman stated that the combined set aside would keep us operating for 1.5 months. Schroeder asked how likely it would be that the state would come through with funding for this year, and Berman stated that he would address that question later in the presentation. Rutherford asked about the $17 million figure and if that included the Civil Service furlough figures, which have not yet been finalized. Berman stated that figure does include the anticipated CS figures.

Martin asked about the planning philosophy, and if this was a “middle-of-the-road” orientation, in that it is not a worse-case scenario but also is not operating on the assumption that we will get full funding. Berman replied that this 11% set-aside is indeed operating on the assumption that the state will get us the remaining 89%, and that is by no means certain.
FY11 Planning Philosophy and Process.
The University of Illinois is planning for a reduction of state support of 15% in FY11. We know that a component of the state appropriation will not be available as the State Stabilization element of the Federal Stimulus Package will expire. That loss results in an effective 6% reduction in state appropriation. However, many respected people within the institution who follow the state closely have opined that there is no way the state can fund higher education with just a 6% reduction, as the revenues are simply not there. Consequently we must plan for a cut at a higher level. A frank look at that revenue gap could push that planning level beyond 15%, but the question for us in planning is: how pessimistic shall we be? How deeply shall we go? The Policy Council decided that a prudent level of planning would be a 15% reduction in state appropriations. For UIS that translates into an 8.3%, or $3.3 million, cut.

We are operating on the assumptions that we wish to protect our core instructional mission, which includes student recruitment and retention efforts to the degree possible. Those recruiting and retention efforts must be viewed as essential to the core mission, or we will not have the students to teach. Some units will thus take a higher percentage reduction while some will take a lower reduction depending on their centrality to our core mission.

The process for implementing cuts involved having the Chancellor and Provost consult with Deans and Division Heads. The Deans have in turn consulted with college executive committees. We started with an assumption of level reductions, and then added to that the assumption of preservation of core areas. The Deans were thus mandated to come up with a plan for this level of reduction. However, with cuts at this level there is no way to avoid impact on instructions.

FY11 Preliminary Assessment
The plans for a 15% reduction that were provided by the Deans would see a reduction in vacant faculty lines or non-renewal of clinical/visiting positions (18.2 FTE, $698,000). There would be a reduction in AP positions, including moves of some positions to non-state funds (16.1 FTE, $803,000). There would be a reduction in staff positions (17.5 FTE, $525,000), in centrally funded GA positions (13 positions $106,000), and in part-time & summer budgets (282 sections, $532,000). The reduction in part-time and summer budget also has a potential associated loss in tuition revenue of up to $4.7 million if none of the affected students can register in other courses/sections. Operating budgets would also be reduced (equipment, commodities, travel - $706,000), but these are not sustainable over the long term. Some of these positions that would be eliminated are currently vacant and will not affect actual people. Some clinical instructors have already been informed of the possibility that their contracts will not be renewed, although they do not have notice rights. Some APs are being given notices of non-renewal now because they have notice rights (1 year for those with at least 4 years of longevity, 6 months if employed less than 4 years). A notice will also be sent to the campus APs when that notification process is complete, which will be very soon. This summarizes the full-impact, worst case of a 15% reduction in state funding.

Berman described some mitigating factors that could cushion the budget crisis. One is the reallocation of funds from non-instructional units. There are many very worthy things we do (he mentioned the Center for State Policy and Leadership and Sangamon Auditorium, specifically) that will get reductions at a higher level than the 8.3% if needed. This will help to reduce the cuts to core areas.
A second potential mitigating factor is that we may see a cut of less than 15%, as we currently have a gubernatorial candidate that has publicly stated that he wishes to see universities get their FY10 funding and, if anything, he wishes to improve higher education funding. However, where that money would come from is still unknown.

Another mitigating factor is the tuition program, which will increase in FY11. The president has publicly stated and informed the Board that such a thing is necessary to offset the impact of state reductions, and he has set the figure at 9%. In Illinois, students have a tuition guarantee, so this increase will not affect current students but will rather affect incoming students. The 9% increase would translate into approximately a 2% increase per year. Graduate students are not guaranteed tuition, but it is unlikely we would want to have them experience a full 9% increase. A 6% increase is more likely, and with a 9% undergraduate tuition increase, a cohort shift from lower to higher tuition students, and a 6% increase in graduate tuition would produce an extra $1 million for UIS. That would eliminate about a third of the anticipated cuts.

Finally, FY11 enrollment improvements could also help us to “grow” out of the crisis. Right now our applications for freshmen F10 are about even with last year, which is not the bumper crop that would be ideal. That could change, as we have upcoming events such as Preview Days, and we are hoping to improve the ratio of applied to enrolled students and the Student Affairs division has many great ideas for ways to do that.

**Longer Term Sustainability**

Berman stated that he has been publicly addressing the management of instructional resources (faculty teaching time) since last fall. A committee that has been working on this and they will be filing a report. The real action for managing instructional resources will be at the college level, between deans and departments. The committee hopes to offer recommendations and new ways to measure performance.

Administrative review and restructuring reform must also occur in the system as a whole. Such things include improving the procurement system via the expanded use of I-buy and IT changes.

Recruitment and retention improvements are also essential. A Geographic Diversity Program is being vigorously advocated by the Chancellor to make UIS more attractive for out-of-state applicants, which would put us on a more competitive playing field with Western Illinois University and SIU-Edwardsville. The priority for this campaign is focusing on private scholarships. International and transfer recruiting have also seen increases in the energy expended on their efforts, led in particular by Lane. This year we have had a breakthrough in international recruitments, including ESL opportunities to bring up TOEFL scores to get them into school here. The focus has been heavily on China, and while we have just a few students recruited that way so far, it is only going to grow. Marketing is also important, and while we do not have marketing funds like the University of Phoenix we do have 40-years of relationships with community colleges and we can capitalize on those by improving our 2x2 agreements.

We cannot count on the state to come through. With hypothetical student and faculty growth of 5% and 2% per year we would get to 4000 FTE students in 2013 and 282 faculty, which would change the student:faculty ratio from 12.7 currently to 14.2 in 2013. The 12.7 ratio is very low, lower than the average for COPLAC institutions and is certainly lower than other public universities. A figure of 14.2 would still be below the COPLAC average. However, that value of
small class sizes we have must be balanced against the need to keep the place afloat. Such a change in growth would put us in a much better financial condition.

Hall asked about the current status of transfer/graduate student applications. Berman stated that transfer applications were down a bit from last year and graduate applications were up slightly. Ferrara asked if he could elaborate on what he would restore with improved funding. Berman stated that the restoration would depend on the ways the colleges have prioritized their cuts.

Olivier asked if the recruiting initiatives are coming out of the CARR committee. Berman stated that they are providing input on that matter, but the ideas are not entirely coming from there.

Salela asked about the overall student:faculty ratio of COPLAC members. Berman stated that it was between 16 and 17 to 1.

Martin asked if Athletics is being considered for deeper cuts, or if it is part of the recruitment/retention. Berman stated that it is not being considered for deeper cuts because of its utility in marketing and recruiting. Each newspaper article on athletics helps us. Last fall there was a large Cub Scouts contingent at a game, and in the spring we will have a high school sectional meet on our campus. Gilliam asked if this was most important for students we are recruiting to be athletes, or just those who will be students. Berman stated that its importance goes far beyond just student athletes.

Kline noted that the figures in a previous graph on hypothetical students began at 3200, and wondered where that number came from. Berman noted that this is a unique way of counting students that includes both full-time and part-time students that is used for the Common Data Set methodology. The idea is to get a total FTE equivalent of 1000 additional students over that time period.

Casinova asked about the potential for cuts to the GPSI program. Berman stated that the GPSI program gets very little state funding, with most of that money coming from the particular agencies with whom we contract. As state funding deteriorates it may be that those agencies themselves find that they do not have the money for internships, which is a separate issue. Casinova remarked that student leaders on campus would be willing to participate in grassroots efforts to reach out to students to impress upon them the severity of the current crisis.

Morsch asked if the $1 million savings from the tuition program would come immediately, and Berman stated that it would. ??? clarified that a few years later that figure would continue to improve and Berman noted that was a good observation.

Garmil asked about the cuts to the summer courses, and the approximate percentage of total summer courses that would be affected. Wassenberg stated that figure would vary quite a bit from college to college. The summer money that is available would depend in part on how many open positions each college had. Berman added that this figure is a pre-mitigation number, but it gives us a good starting point for discussion.

Fisher asked about the timeframe for the mitigating factors, especially as they bear on the summer session. Berman stated that they would be making decisions about how to proceed with summer in the next few weeks. He also noted that the Board of Trustees will not be acting on the
tuition increase in March, and it would probably be May at the earliest before that is finalized. The legislature leadership has stated that they will complete their work by the end of May, so we should know by then.

Morsch asked about the loss of those summer sections, and the differential between the low cost and the substantial income that would be returned. Berman stated that such cuts do indeed have a multiplier effect. However, if the money is not there to pay people, those sections cannot be offered. They wish to try to protect those summer courses precisely because of the multiplier effect.

Hayler noted that many faculty have expressed a willingness to have their summer pay come out of FY10 rather than split across two fiscal years, which may help. Berman stated that this is a very challenging issue, because summer pay bridges two fiscal years. It may be possible to decide to pay this summer from FY10 and if things “go south” we might then cut more from FY11.

Gilliam asked if there were policies regarding the ways in which summer sessions are structured. Some institutions use specific formulas for approving sections based on salary of instructor and likely enrollment. Berman replied that we do make money on our summer sessions, but that the management of summer sessions is non-centrally controlled by colleges and the deans have their own opinions about how to do this.

Adjournment

Eisenhart offered a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Martin. The motion was approved and the senate adjourned at 12:18pm.