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***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Welcome to Martha Horst. She's our new senate secretary. Thank you. And, as she said, she's sitting in the same place where she used to sit, what was that, three years ago or so? Something like that?

Senator Horst: Yeah. I picked the same seat.

***Oral Communications:***

Senator Kalter: So we have one oral communication that's on the agenda and one that's not. I just wanted to get a gauge of the discussion about the Civic Action Plan from the Senate last time and whether or not you all feel that it is or is not ready to move forward towards the March 1 deadline. In other words, you remember there were some questions about should we revise it, should we get fuller faculty feedback, fuller student feedback, before we hit the deadline, or should we separate what we're submitting to the Campus Compact from the campus working document. So I just wanted to get a sense of what you felt the tenor of the room was, because only a few people talked.

Senator Lonbom: What I heard was people wanted to see some changes in the language. Wasn't there separation that it doesn't matter if the Senate endorses it? I mean the deadline is there. People thought the endorsement could come later, or did I misunderstand?

Senator Haugo: I thought that's where we had left it was that the Senate could come back and endorse it after it had been submitted to Campus Compact with changes made to it.

Senator Kalter: And revised.

Senator Haugo: And revised.

Senator Horst: That we could continue working on the document and it would be like *Educating Illinois* and that we would always be building a better document, and now we have the better sense of how to do that, you know, Michaelene makes a lot of great points about including more, but we can't get that done before March 1, so I thought everybody was in favor of submitting the document as is, but then endorsing it and improving it in the future.

Senator Haugo: Yeah. I don't think I heard dissenting voices after that.

Senator Kalter: In terms of listening to what Jan was saying and saying yes, we can separate the submission on March 1 from the working document that will happen.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. They have made… I think they made all of the editorial changes, so those they were able to make any of the suggestions off the floor. I talked to Jan Patterson and you know they found out all campuses received this charge in late November with a due date of mid to late March. It's like the third week in March that it's due.

Senator Kalter: November 2016?

Provost Murphy: Yes. Yeah. Late November. They were out at training. So, yeah, I mean it is a short time frame. All campuses received that charge then, so given the time frame, they kind of went to known stakeholders. So that's kind of how they thought they might do it is to go ahead and go out, and there was a list of all the stakeholders they went out to that all of those groups to kind of gather information to work on that draft based on everything they got from those stakeholders. So the draft that they brought to the Senate they felt like was the complete draft based on what they heard from all of the stakeholders. What they do know is missing is that kind of open session, and they weren't sure just how to build that into the time frame. They said they still could do one open session if they tried to time it like the day or two after spring break and incorporate suggestions then and still have time to submit that. It's a tight turnaround, so they felt like they could still do one open forum if they got the invitations out sometime later this week or next week, before spring break, and then have that open forum right after spring break comes back. It would give them the rest of the week to make changes. Unless the open forum they find the campus really is not supportive of the document, then that tells them they shouldn't submit it anyway. So they could still do an open forum if that would be helpful.

Senator Kalter: I don't know how other people feel, but I feel like for them and for campus, that's also too abbreviated a time frame, and I'd rather have them have the ability to plan that for a fall open forum set of sessions or session, whether it's one or multiple, so that they can do it thoughtfully and it's more leisurely. It's very nice of them to offer that. So I wanted to get the sense just because, you know, as Michaelene pointed out, the document is a pretty far reaching campus-wide document and there are always, especially in this time, and even though this is essentially a grass roots kind of initiative, it can also seem like a top-down initiative, and so I wanted to make sure that everybody's sense around the table was yeah, they're moving on a tight time frame, but they are going to be acting to get further campus buy-in and publicity and that kind of thing so that we're all feeling good about them moving forward to the March 1, rather than feeling like yeah, this is going to come out and then people are going to start saying, well why did, you know, the president do this or what have you, but it sounds like you all are pretty solid in having them meet that March 1 deadline.

Senator Lonbom**:** I just have one additional question based on what you just said. So you could… I'm not discounting what you're saying, Susan, about having the thoughtful period maybe in the fall, but would it be helpful to have a session just to offer like a first session the week after spring break just…

Provost Murphy: They're glad to do that, I think. You know, they feel like what they tried to do was hit all of the stakeholder groups that work on civic engagement, but they are more than happy to have an open session. I think they really want to do what the Senate wants them to do. So, yeah, I think they're open to whatever you guys think they should do.

President Dietz: I guess I would encourage us to do an and versus an either/or, and if they can have one, and that's the only thing they can do at this point in time, to me it's almost like, you know, kind of a… It's not a compliance and it's not a legal issue, but in order to meet some national deadlines, that's what's pushing all of this, but after that I think if you said they can have one now and have several others in the fall as kind of a soak-in. One of the things we want to have happen is that we want buy-in from all the quarters, and the reason that we have a center isn't control, it's coordination, because we're doing a ton, but we tend not to know about what all we're doing collectively, we know individually, so I think that would frankly just give us more visibility if we had one now and then had one in the fall and brought it back. I think Jan Patterson certainly would be amenable to that. She's tickled to death that we've got a facility and some energy behind this, so she would do whatever it takes to get even more energy behind it. So if you did both, I think it would be terrific.

Senator Kalter: Both/and sounds good.

Provost Murphy: Okay. It's a plan. All right. That's a plan. She may need help. How will she do. Do we work with Mark Walbert to get the student list server? Does she work with you guys? I know she met with SGA, she and Noha, or did Noha meet with SGA? Jan did, okay.

Senator Walsh: Yeah, we met with Jan before.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. But to get a student listserv message out, is that Mark Walbert?

Senator Walsh: I can do it.

Provost Murphy: Do you do it?

Senator Walsh: I can do it.

Provost Murphy: Okay. So we'll work. That would be great. Thank you. Okay.

Senator Walsh: As long as somebody, whatever it is, needs to go out. I usually need about a week in advance to get it through the approval process.

Provost Murphy: Okay.

Senator Walsh: If there's a quicker way to get it to all students, then by all means go ahead and do that.

Provost Murphy: That's great. Thank you very much. Cool beans.

Senator Kalter: That was kind of my sense, but I wanted to make sure it's not legal, you know, compliance, and it's not, but sometimes perception is everything, and so maybe also in that first session they can continue to talk about the draft as a draft, even though it's been submitted already, so that it's sort of like a working document, right? Because I think that presenting it as yes, this is the final draft, might not help with that buy-in and that sort of wanting the campus to embrace it.

Provost Murphy: Okay. Thank you.

***Oral Communications: Use of a search firm for the Provost search: pros and cons***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. The second one. This is also… Well maybe that one was easy and this one is hard. So Jay Groves is beginning to think through the details of the upcoming Provost search and said to me that I get to make the decision about whether we have a search firm or not. And I thought, no. It's not going to happen that way. Why don't I ask Exec what they think? So this is an interesting question. Those of you who were on Exec two years ago, I believe, we had a rich conversation about this, because it was sort of in the aftermath of everything that happened with the President and the presidential search and sort of the statewide, you know, publicity about that, and we had people, some faculty, saying that the faculty as a whole, for example, don't really want us spending that money, you know, on a search firm and some complaints about some of the ways that some of the search firms have conducted the search, so there was that. There was also the sort of sense also coming from, you know, both faculty and students, that if you don't get a search firm, how are you getting the greatest reach and the greatest sort of publicity and headhunting essentially for the search? Jay made the decision, I think, probably in concert with Larry, that this search that's going on right now for the Vice President of Finance and Planning would be a totally in-house search without a search firm. And when he came to my office he said, you know, that's really going terrific, and so was kind of saying on his end that he wasn't sure that we wanted to spend the, I think it's, $200,000 on the search firm, some percentage of the starting salary, but that he also was sensitive to the idea in particular that faculty may feel short shifted. Right? That they may feel like well, you didn't think well enough of us to get a search firm and make sure that we were getting all of the services.

Senator Walsh: Can’t win. I guess my question is what was the process for bringing in Provost Krejci? Did they hire search firms?

Senator Kalter: Search firm. Yeah.

President Dietz: What was that?

Senator Walsh: Bringing in Provost Krejci.

President Dietz: Search firm.

Senator Horst: I talked to somebody who's been on four of these searches who I know rather well…

President Dietz: Is he real tall?

Senator Horst: Yes, he's very tall. I mean, this might be different because of the process we just did, but he said just the coordination of the airport interviews is very intricate, and it would take a lot of manpower, and so if we don't have a search firm, somebody has to do all of that work and it can be quite difficult. And he also said that just the search firm can be asking questions or doing some behind-the-scenes thing that perhaps a search committee wouldn't be totally comfortable doing.

Senator Kalter: Thank you for reminding me, by the way, that when this came up two years ago, I asked both the previous Senate chairs about what did they think, and both of them were in favor of search firms, so you just articulated one, and Dan Holland was also in favor of them in general, although I didn't ask him today when I saw him what he thought about this issue, and he's on the search that is not using the search firm, so I should have taken that opportunity.

Senator Hoelscher: I'm on that committee, and prior to that experience I would have said go with a search firm, and I suspect that the reason that I’ve changed my mind some has to do with Lisa Mason, who has just done an outstanding job. That particular committee, and you would really have to ask the candidates to make sure, but I think that has been conducted with the utmost in professionalism, and she has done a tremendous job in all of her coordinating. So the question comes up, can we get enough depth in our pool without a search firm? If we can, then I would be in favor of not using one. If we cannot, then we obviously need a search firm. And since it is traditional to use search firms, I'm suspicious that it would be very difficult for us to get that depth. I would say we ended up with three or four -- I forget how many are coming to campus -- amazing candidates, but I was a little worried to begin with, because our pool was not as deep as I would have expected it to be or would have liked it to be, but we have some outstanding candidates coming to campus, and it doesn't really matter if you can get three outstanding candidates. So with that being said, I did what I always tell my students not to do, on the one hand this, on the other hand that, but if we think we can get a depth, I think Lisa in HR has the professionalism covered. So the question is the depth. One other quick point. We were able to do our airport interviews here, because we did not use a search firm. So it saved us all of that bother and hassle of going all the way to Chicago, which is where a search firm would have done it. Oh, money too.

Senator Kalter: That part I would hope would be our choice, not the search firm's choice.

President Dietz: Well it's all our choice. I mean they work for us. I would echo what was just said. But Lisa, we had her consciously follow around the last search firm process, so she learned a ton out of that and what to do and what not to do, and it probably centrally took some extra staff time of Dave and Vickie a little bit more, but we did save a lot of money, and I think the depth was there. I think if we don't, I think it's incumbent upon all of us to use our networks that we have with other institutions to make sure that you know your department. If your department head, you know a department head at another place very well, that we put out the word, because that's really what the search firms do. And the search firms will already start out with a stable full of people that they've been working with that haven't won the race yet. And so that's the first group that they go after. In some respects, this is a purer process if you don't, but you've got to have the contacts and you've got to be able to use your networks and get the people in the pool. That's the critical piece.

Provost Murphy: I worry that at the provost level, are those networks out there?

President Dietz: I don't know.

Provost Murphy: I don't know either. You know, if I know a chair at another institution, are they necessarily going to say, oh, we have a great provost, why don't you try to poach him. I mean, I just don't know. Boy, you should really take our provost. Then you start to think, oh, I don't know.

Senator Walsh: Do we know what the cost has been for our vice president of Finance and Planning Search Committee?

Senator Hoelscher: It's just the committee.

President Dietz: It's just the committee expenses, which are basically lunches and travel.

Senator Walsh: Going to the DoubleTree and things like that. So nowhere $100,000.

Senator Laudner: I've never seen proof that a search firm is better. I would agree with President Dietz. I think sometimes you get more candidates, but I don't think they're always better candidates.

President Dietz: I will say that the… We don't have a choice on firms, by the way. That's determined by CMS, and it's Witt/Kieffer. In the past, it's been Greenwood/Asher. In my estimation, the Witt/Kieffer firm has done a really terrific job when we've used them, and they would be still at the top of the list that we'd have to use. So, for a position like this, you've got… And the firms vary between about 25% and about 35% of the first year's salary as a minimum, and expenses are on top of that.

Senator Walsh: I know that time is of the essence of this search, but…

Provost Murphy: Did you just look at me?

Senator Walsh: Right at you, Jan. But my thought is why not try it without an outside firm and see if we can find a candidate that we genuinely do like, and if no one really sticks out to us, then look elsewhere.

Senator Horst: Because there's a lot of time and expense of the faculty who are on that search, and we all go to these forums, and…

Senator Laudner: And it looks really bad if you have to advertise it again.

Senator Lonbom: What is the timeline for the search?

President Dietz: We're wanting to get the committee together this spring. I'm not expecting them to really do anything this spring or this summer, but we want to hit the ground running in the fall, and we'll advertise the position in the fall and have screening processes done in the winter, interviews probably in the spring with a start date somewhere around July 1 or something of that nature.

Senator Haugo: Okay.

Senator Kalter: We found with the last search that it took almost half or more than half of fall semester to get the search committee together, so we didn't want that to happen again.

Senator Walsh: Does the search firm expedite the process?

President Dietz: They can. They can, but part of that expediting the process is going to their stable first. They all do. They won't talk about that, but I've been on both sides of that.

Senator Hoelscher: An awful lot of bridesmaids in the stable.

Senator Horst: I would encourage you to talk with some people who've been on these VP searches, the President searches. I don't have that kind of experience, and so just to see how they interacted with the search firm and whether or not it was valuable, because I do think there's a lot to be gained from having the search firm there.

Senator Kalter: We have also had complaints about the search firms, but I think it's sort of the…

Senator Horst: I think there was one main search where they were not effective. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: I know of two. I know of two.

Senator Lonbom: I was on the last search for the provost, and the thing that I wondered when your question came up was the large numbers of candidates in that pool, and it would seem that the search firm helped winnow that down, but maybe we had that large pool because, as you're saying, they have a pool of people that they're already looking at, so I don't know. President Dietz, do you have a sense one way or the other what your preference would be?

President Dietz: My preference is that we get the best person we can for this position.

Senator Kalter: I want to hear from Beau, Morgan and Sean.

Senator Grzanich: You do want to hear from us?

Senator Kalter: I do.

Senator Grzanich: All right. I'm on the side of no search firm. I think as long as the searches are going well and you're finding viable candidates, I don't see why you would have to increase the cost of a search.

Senator Snyder: Yeah, I would agree. Even if we're having less candidates, if they're more qualified, and not coming out of a stable, as you were saying. I think that is more beneficial and more cost efficient.

Senator Walsh: Have we had bad experiences without search firms before?

President Dietz: Without?

Senator Hoelscher: We certainly are having a good one right now, and that's a fairly high level position.

Provost Murphy: Would it be worth looking like kind of watching the Chronicle a bit and seeing if there are institutions of our stature that are running their own searches to see if that… Would it be a red flag at all for candidates who would normally see a search firm running it, and who would say what's going on with Illinois State that they're not…

Senator Horst: That they're broke. Now they can't even afford a search firm. Yeah.

Provost Murphy: You know, and I don't know if anyone would think that or not, but will it look odd if our institution…

Senator Laudner: That's some of the criticisms is, one, they don't value the position enough to hire a search firm, which I don't know if anyone is going to say that about a provost spot. And the other thing is some people when they see that there's no search firm, they think it's an internal candidate.

President Dietz: All kinds of weird questions come up.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I'm really torn.

President Dietz: You do something, some folks will go why are you doing that? What does that mean? You read a lot of things in there.

Senator Laudner: I don't think those are reasons to hire a search firm.

Senator Kalter: Ann, what about you?

Senator Haugo: I would lean toward probably not hiring a search firm, knowing that the search is going well, that we have a process in place that is functioning well, and the concerns that you stated about CMS maybe taking into that.

Senator Kalter: Kathleen, did you say yes or no or maybe.

Senator Lonbom: Unfortunately, I'm sorry, I'm probably on maybe. I'm going to go back too there was a really, as I recall, and I can't remember any numbers, there was a large number in that last search, and so it was helpful, but Martha said of course there's less cost, but it is the cost of all the time that faculty and students put into a search. That's a big time commitment, as Mark can tell you right now, with the searches. So I don't know.

Senator Kalter: I'm kind of where you and Jan are, right? I'm torn, because I think both arguments have a lot of weight. Do people look at it as though you're not valuing it, or is it you're sort of too cheap to go out there, but I also really agree with Kevin that there's a stable, you know, and what you said. You don't necessarily get better candidates, you get more candidates. But I also agree with what Jan said that do we have the networks like we would have for the Vice President of Finance and Planning for a Provost search. That's a hard one.

President Dietz: I think also if we were doing it ourselves, and frankly it probably ought to happen whether we're doing it ourselves or we hire a firm, we're members of the American Council on Education, we've got a fellow that's been a part of that for the last year who should have met some other people during this time frame, and I know he has, we're involved with AASCU, state college university group, and so those are two national entities that we can make some inquiries and see if… Because oftentimes if you're looking for something and you have connections within those organizations, they have their feelers out and there's conversations. Then you get to the point of whether or not it's a confidential search or not. A lot of presidencies anymore are confidential, because there's a concern they're not going to get candidates for presidencies if their home institution knows that they're looking, and I think some VPs and some Provosts are in the same situation with that, but this will be an open search.

Senator Kalter: Well, so we have given you inconclusive feedback. I mean the majority of us are saying no firm. Not all of us have served on those kinds of committees though. I wonder, you know, how much time Jay has, because one other thing that he could do is once the committee is formed have them give feedback about it as well. Right? Sort of to say, you know, we've got the panel of 10 search committee basically formed, let's find out from them what's their view of this. Especially because I think, you know, there's also some footwork that could happen in the fall in terms of getting faculty aware and getting their feelers out to the universities they've just come from, etc., and maybe by the middle or end of spring we would have sort of a better sense of whether that's going to be a viable way to go or if you really just need many more, you know, much more power to get in people. Because, I mean, the other thing I think that you would have to decide, Larry, is do you think AVPs tend to make good candidates or are you looking for a lateral move of a provost, right? And you may not have an opinion about that right off the bat, but what I've seen in the previous searches we've done is that we'll bring in some who are provost, some who are AVPs, and we almost always go for the ones who have been provosts, which I think is kind of fascinating, you know, and I'm not necessarily sure that I agree with it, but that's sort of been the way that it's worked.

President Dietz: And I think those things go, you know, in both directions in that you can have a number two at a larger institution who wants to be a number one and they may have to step to, you know, if they're at Arizona State as a number two, that's one thing, if they're at, you know, one of the candidates the last time was the Provost at Northern Iowa, and that person wanted to come in to a larger institution than he was in as a sitting provost, so that experience, again until you kind of sat in the chair you haven't sat in the chair, but for the same token I think that's why we have interviews is that, you know, you can make a case for each person. You know, a number two coming from a larger place or a number one coming from a smaller place, and variations on those themes, but what really happens during the interview process is usually we figure out what's the fit, what does the personality bring in addition to their experience.

Senator Kalter: All right. Well, thanks everybody for their feedback.

Senator Hoelscher: Clear as mud?

Senator Kalter: Clear as mud. Absolutely. I'll go right into Jay's office and tell him what our decision is.

Senator Hoelscher: We have made a non-decision.

Senator Kalter: Yes indeed.

***\*\*Approval of Proposed Senate Agenda for 3/8/17 – See pages below\*\****

Senator Kalter: All right, we're going to move on. There is actually no distributed communication under this, but we’ve put the approval of the proposed senate agenda for March 8 first, because we are proposing to get rid of it. No agenda. And I wanted to just make sure that that's all right, so do we have a motion to approve the non-agenda?

Motion, by Senator Walsh, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve the cancelation of the March 8 Academic Senate meeting.

Senator Kalter: Excellent.

Senator Hoelscher: Not real sure what I seconded, but you know.

Senator Haugo: We're not adjourning yet. That's all that matters.

Senator Kalter: So is that all right with everybody if we're canceling that meeting?

Senator Grzanich: I will survive, I think.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I know it's really rough to have it during the week before spring break.

Senator Horst: I've been practicing saying the roll. My big moment.

Senator Grzanich: Do you have my last name yet?

Senator Horst: It's with the C and the K and the R and the…

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, a couple of those. Grzanich.

Senator Horst: Grzanich.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, yeah.

Senator Kalter: How many times did it take me the first time we met?

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, I don't think you still get it.

Senator Kalter: I actually think you're right.

Senator Grzanich: I just let it go.

Senator Kalter: Grzanich.

Senator Grzanich: Grzanich, yeah.

Senator Kalter: Okay, I've been saying Grzanich.

Senator Grzanich: Yeah, yeah.

Senator Kalter: All right. So all in favor of deleting the agenda, please signify by saying aye.

The motion to cancel the March 8 Academic Senate meeting was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right, so we have no meeting. We'll have a Faculty Caucus meeting. We'll talk about the format for that.

***02.07.17.01 from Martha Horst: Email Regarding Economic Well Being Committee (Dist. Executive Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Let's see. Two weeks ago, we forwarded the email from Martha about the Economic Well-Being Committee. We didn't talk about it last week. We're talking about it this week. So Martha, do you want to give us your thoughts on the Economic Well-Being Committee.

Senator Horst: Yes. It resulted from you and I going over the external committee charges, and as we were doing that, we came across this Economic Well-Being Committee, which is in the Senate Blue Book, and it is a committee that can be constituted only with a charge, and you have the description of the kinds of things they could address, and I spotted it right after we had that news about the insurance. But one thing that is very specific about this committee is who is on the committee, the membership. And so I asked Exec to consider whether or not given the lack of budget and bad news about insurance if we would ever want to constitute this committee, this might be the time, and if we choose not to constitute this committee, perhaps we also might want to discuss whether or not to delete this committee, whether or not this sort of specific committee that the Senate came up with in the Blue Book previously is a little too specific, and it would have to have a specific charge that would be hard to define.

Senator Hoelscher: I can just see that 30 years ago somebody said in the year 2017 we're going to not have been two years without a budget and we need this committee. I can't believe that happened.

Provost Murphy: So when I looked at that and I wondered, because what I was thinking about was having, you know, we had our HR pinch… I can't think of her name and I should, I'm so sorry…

Senator Kalter: Janice Bonneville.

Provost Murphy: Yeah, came to the Senate, and I felt like she was, you know, she seems like such an advocate for faculty, staff, employees. I mean, I'm wondering are there things that this committee could do that she can't already do with more resources. Am I saying that very well? In other words, you know, explore problems and study projects related to the financial, you know, including like pension, insurance, but I think they'd be going to her for that information anyway. Right? So is this a committee that's going to kind of redo something that we've already got someone employed to do, and that may or may not be the case. I'm just wondering.

Senator Horst: It's hard to see how this committee could ever be effective, but it's not hard to imagine a situation where we would need to discuss the economic well-being of the faculty and the University as a whole. It seems like now is the time, but I'm not sure this committee could ever be effective doing that.

Senator Walsh: We'd rather have that be a discussion for the entire Senate?

Provost Murphy: Or the Caucus if it's a faculty. I mean, it seems like there’s... Yeah.

Senator Hoelscher: The only think I can see the committee doing would be writing these resolutions as needed. The Sense of the Senate kind of things that it might bring a little order to that, but I'm not necessarily arguing for reconstituting the committee. That's just about the only thing I can see, because we already have the data gathering in place, we already have the analysis in place, right? Is that what I heard? You know, it would be the resolutions and that sort of thing.

Senator Horst: Well you and I talked about studying the problem in a little bit more depth. Could you elaborate on that?

Senator Kalter: I'm not sure I remember that conversation.

Senator Horst: You talked about people at U of I who delve into…

Senator Kalter: I was just about to say that. So to me, in looking at this more closely, you know, since Martha brought it up, there's a major structural problem with this committee, which is that we are an Academic Senate and we advise the President… The President doesn't have control over our pensions, over our insurance, or really over most of our other economic benefits besides salary, and we already have, you know, mechanisms for ASPT types of things, and in fact we've got a committee, an ad hoc committee that's going to come around next year to look at the equity stuff on that for ASPT, and what I had said to Martha, now I recall, was there are whole, you know, academic institutions or centers that do this kind of work. Stevenson Center did the looking at how the University itself impacts the local economy. There is a center at the U of I -- I'm trying to remember what it's called -- the University of Illinois Economic something Center, and it's just a group of economics faculty who study issues from around the State; you know, pensions and benefits and the budget, and they've given recommendations, and of course they've been ignored, you know, at the State level, even though they're pretty sensible. You know, there's some sensible stuff in there, so whether, you know… I think the real problem here, though, is the structural one. So they're going to explore problems and explain the results to the faculty, and the faculty are going to be no further down the road in terms of getting a no you won't double our health insurance premiums, and yes you will get a pension, than we were, you know, six months before, as you said, for the provost search after spending a whole bunch of faculty and staff time. And, as you said, Jan, if you've got staff members who are already experts in these areas and the Senate wants them to look at that, we can make a recommendation to charge, you know, Janice Bonneville to bring together some people to do those.

Senator Hoelscher: Making a strong argument for getting rid of it.

President Dietz: Well, I was just going to say even a Janice Bonneville is not going to impact this at all. The issues are going to be at the IBHE level or at the presidential level trying to influence through our lobbyist activity in the capital, and we all know how that's been going the last two years. So I don't think a committee is going to help with that.

Senator Kalter: I was sitting next to Jonathan Lackland at the open forum and was learning sort of more about the plethora of bills that are coming through about higher education, because -- what is that expression -- idle hands, right? They're just… Because they're not talking about the budget, they feel like they need to do something, and so they're monkeying in, you know, university business essentially.

President Dietz: Admissions work.

Senator Kalter: Right. Telling people that if they furlough their employees they have to furlough the students first without thinking about the fact that that student may need that in order to stay in school, and so that causes an enrollment drop problem for the institution.

Provost Murphy: Furlough their student workers?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Provost Murphy: That's a great plan, isn't it?

Senator Kalter: Isn’t that beautiful? They've already passed the law! Unbeknownst to us because we haven't done furloughs, but Northeastern wanted to furlough, and then they found out that there was a law that said no, you have to actually let your student workers go first before you furlough any of your permanent staff.

Senator Haugo: Good Lord.

Senator Kalter: It's as though they'd never set foot on a college campus.

President Dietz: Many haven't since they graduated, if they did graduate. We have to remember some didn't.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to keep off tape what I'm thinking. So should our step be to recommend that Rules. I think it would be appropriate to send it to Rules to recommend decommissioning of the policy, or the Blue Book page, I should say. Great.

***2.23.96.1 from Susan Kalter: 1996 Academic Impact Fund Review Committee Report (Dist. Executive Committee)***

Senator Kalter: All right. The next thing. So I put this one on here digging stuff out of the 20-year-old archive, because the AIF came through the Senate last week and two weeks before that, and I had been talking to Alan Lacy about various things, and so I just thought it would be helpful for us to know where the parameters of AIF came from, you know. I don't know if you can glean this, but you might have noticed that sort of lingering vote of no confidence in Urice is sort of in the background. You can tell, because there was a faculty meeting, a full faculty meeting, rather than just a Senate meeting, and so the AIF came in in the midst of that sort of just, you know, displeasure with that provost, but, in any case, it has stood the test of time. Some of the things that you can, or what I wanted to point out, so this is a reminder of how instructional capacity was thought of 20 years ago, how it was defined when the fund was created, and it was created essentially by redirecting things that had been base budgeted in departments, redirecting those monies when faculty leave, centralizing them to the provost office.

So two questions that I had, do we at this point… So one of the things that has come in since the AIF was put in place is the use of strategic budget carryover. That was not in place 20 years ago and it is now. So do we need to clarify how strategic budget carryover can be used and what it can be used for? The second question is do we need further clarification of what instructional capacity can be used for it, and I have a couple of examples. And I also wrote currently the AIF uses permanent funds. In other words, the ones that are, you know, that are not just one-year funds. They use permanent funds for counter offers. So if a faculty member goes out and gets an offer in, you know, San Francisco where the cost of living is very high, and comes back, we use this for counter offers. Can they, therefore, then be used for regular compression and inversion, addressing that, or for equity. Is that a viable way, because then that begs the question, and this has come up in several meetings over the years, are the faculty more interested in having more faculty or would they prefer to have higher salaries. Right? That's a very interesting question. Right?

So let me go back, though, to the instructional capacity. For example, can start-up packages be partially funded through instructional capacity, given that they might fall under somewhere in there is something called “purchase of equipment for faculty needs.” Can major equipment recapitalization. Like right now the Academic Planning Committee is looking at Physics, Geology, and Chemistry, and every single one of those departments has major equipment that they need to either replace or that is new and they need to buy, but they don't necessarily always have the funds in the department to buy them, and part of the reason for that is that they used to -- and Theater and Music, and I think probably in CAST -- and one of the things you see here is that a worry of this on the Senate's part was that colleges would have less fiscal flexibility when the AIF came in, because what used to happen is that a department, and usually it was the larger departments that were able to do this, a department was able to take, if somebody resigned or retired, they would take that variance money and be able to spend it on something bigger, and so that has become more restricted. And the other thing that has happened in recent years is that they used to have a Provost Enhancement Fund, but with the budget situation going on, those dollars are now not there to help out departments with one-time needs.

So the big question is, you know, is everything clear? This was put in place 20 years ago. Is there anywhere where those kinds of things need to be clarified so that we are in agreement about how these, especially the IC money. Right? It's pretty clear that we want to continue to use the fund to reauthorize tenure track positions and that that's the highest priority, but when you have instructional capacity money, can you use… And especially when you have strategic budget carryover, how can you use those? The other thing that I should note also is that in recent years, and it's been very, very necessary, we've been using the strategic budget carryover to hedge against the State and say we don't want to be firing, you know, essentially not rehiring the non-tenure track faculty, so this helps us if there is a major hole in our budget, which we currently have, to ease people out through attrition rather than saying we don't have a job for you, and it helps to keep our class capacity up. Right? It helps to ensure that we are offering to students the courses that they need essentially.

Senator Lonbom: Susan, I'm just curious about I guess maybe why we're talking about this today, especially in light of Senator McHale's question at Faculty Caucus last week, because this sort of feels to me like something that could be discussed in Faculty, appropriately in Faculty Caucus. I may be wrong. I don't have this…

Senator Horst: Every time we talk about the Academic Impact Fund, we're always talking about a specific report. We never really get into the discussion of the concept of the Academic Impact Fund and the best ways to use it going forward. So if we could separate those two discussions and not have to be tied to his report, it could be quite productive.

Senator Kalter: I agree. So you're recommending that we do that in the Caucus.

Senator Haugo: That we send it to Caucus.

Senator Kalter: How do you guys feel about that?

Senator Hoelscher: I guess I'm trying to wrap my head around what we're trying to accomplish here as faculty, and I'm just going to ask a series of questions here, none to be really answered, but as faculty, are we just trying to determine the properness of the way the fund's being currently run? Are we trying to ask for more control over the direction or less control? When I look at the Academic Impact Fund, and I cannot help myself, I've come a long way to acclimating as a professor, but I spent a lot of time in business and it really starts to make me nervous if we take too much flexibility out of the hands of our upper level administration, because I was listening to our Vice President for Planning and Finance candidate, and I didn't say this, but I wanted to look at him and go, we're kind of expecting you to be a magician, and I mean that only partially flippantly, because it has been amazing what our upper level administration and Greg Alt have been able to do. And a lot of that, we have to recognize that a lot of that comes from an extremely conservative stance and flexibility. So I'm not sure what we want. In other words, should we buy new equipment, should we, salary inversion, take care of that, should we do all of these critical things. They're all important, but are they the most important. I mean, we have survived as an institution through two years of really stunningly difficult times, and we're strong and stable. I mean, it's not just something President Dietz says. It's something we all believe. And because we believe it, we're able to convey that to new students. Your body language conveys it if you believe it, and I'm just hesitant to get too carried away about taking away that flexibility.

Senator Kalter: Definitely not going in that direction. I'm not going in the direction of either… I don't remember what your first question was, but the answer to it was no.

Senator Hoelscher: Neither do I.

Senator Kalter: It had something to do with taking something out of the hands of…

Senator Hoelscher: Removing the flexibility out of the hands of administrators.

Senator Kalter: Definitely not. That was not where I was going. It was actually giving potentially a little bit, conservative a little bit more flexibility.

Senator Laudner: So when you talk about adding things like using this for startup costs or for equipment, or I guess equipment was already in there, or for salary issues, that would be giving more flexibility to people that already make the decisions on AIF. They would have the control where that…

Senator Kalter: Potentially, although I do think that the salary one is quite controversial. I think that one is very controversial, because it is a tradeoff between, as I said, between a higher salary for the person who's here and the faculty we need, and that faculty are always asking for in order to get the programs done. So that one I think is a stretch. Right? But I brought it in because it's interesting that counteroffers were never listed 20 years ago, and yet the fund is used for counteroffers, for Distinguished Professor, University Professor.

Senator Laudner: I thought it was.

Provost Murphy: Well I think because it adds to base, so there's no way to not have it. Yeah, there's no way to not have… Like, we don't, like an equipment counteroffer doesn't come out of AIF, but if you counteroffer somebody to keep them and you add to their base, it's got to come out of AIF. Right?

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Provost Murphy: Yeah. So that's why… I think that's why.

Senator Kalter: But to answer your larger question, Mark, I was looking more towards clarification of the parameters, especially because you'll notice that particularly with respect to equipment, it's equivocal. This report is equivocal. On the one hand, it says yes, you can purchase equipment for faculty needs; for example, computers. And then somewhere else they say this is one of our worries about how it might be abused; too much use of personnel dollars for non-personnel things. So that seems like perhaps 20 years on, the faculty on the Senate could help, or perhaps the whole Senate, and I still want to hear what you guys have to say about this, but that the Senate or the Caucus maybe could give some clarity and direction to that kind of thing.

Provost Murphy: Could I say one thing for the record? And Susan, tell me if I'm wrong, to my knowledge we have never used AIF for anything but salary, though.

Senator Kalter: Right.

Provost Murphy: I don't believe we've ever, for whatever its worth, I don't believe we've ever… Yeah, despite what it says, I don't believe we've ever used it for equipment. I think it has only been used for salary.

Senator Haugo: Can I ask a question too?

Provost Murphy: I want to make sure… You think that…

Senator Kalter: I'm pretty sure that's right, because, like I said, there are counteroffers which are salary, Distinguished and University Professor, which is base salary, adding to the base salary. There is non-tenure track capacity. There is tenure-track authorizations. Increase in rank. And I'm trying to remember, it seems like there's at least one other thing, but it all fits into salary essentially. Yeah.

Senator Haugo: Can I ask a question for clarification too?

Senator Kalter: Let me let Martha go first, because she has to leave in…

Senator Horst: Yeah, because I do have to leave, and I apologize, but I do have two small children that will get… I have to leave right now. So I just wanted to say one thing before I left is that part of the conversation I had with the gentleman who was talking to us about the Academic Impact Fund. You know, I asked the question about the original intent of this and do you see this going forward. He's like well, of course it's going to go forward. And I think part of the thing that you're thinking of is that a shared governance decision has to happen here, that we have to have a discussion about the future of the Academic Impact Fund with the faculty and the Provost staff together so that we actually have a shared vision of how it could best be used as opposed to these decisions being made after the fact.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, and I don't see that as a future as in will it exist or won't it exist, but how will it exist.

Senator Horst: Right.

Senator Kalter: Is it… As with all things, is it keeping up with the times. Right? Is it meeting the needs that we need it to meet? And if it didn't exist, would needs be being met better. Right? Which is kind of… In other words, would you be buying those startup packages with the one-time money, with the strategic budget carryover money, because it's very hard to figure out how you're going to… Other than backfilling non-tenure track lines in a budget crisis, how does that SBC get used. Right? Is there a point at which the SBC should only go up to this much, and then we spend that much? Does that make sense? So let's say that you need 5 million dollars in order to backfill non-tenure track lines so that we can do attrition if there's a major hole in the budget, but we've got 6 million dollars in the SBC. What are we going to do with that other million, right? And one theory is just keep building it up, building it up, because the State could just drop, the bottom could drop out completely one day and we're going to need that, I mean, and that's possible. We could say that's what we want, or we could say yeah, you know this is a good cushion, but beyond that let's use this one-time money, because some of it is permanent and over and over again. Some of it is one time. Let's use some of that one-time money for this or this or this. Does that make sense? Say hello to your kids, if they remember any of us. Yes, Ann.

Senator Haugo: I think this answered, this conversation answered my question. It was more about what the purpose is of sending it to Caucus. What's the end game?

Senator Kalter: What do you all think?

Senator Grzanich: What sparked the desire to reevaluate the AIF?

Senator Kalter: Nothing in particular. It was just it came up this year. I asked to meet with Alan Lacy to talk about a couple of things I was wondering about, and as we were talking, you know, it became clear that some of these things are kind of fuzzy. Right? It's not always… And I think, you know, not everybody who's in that position has ever seen this agreement that was made. Right?

Senator Grzanich: The distribution?

Senator Kalter: Yeah. So I said to him, well let me talk to Exec to see if we have some, you know, we can either have some clarity and definition or get towards clarity and definition. So, for example, he showed me from one of the colleges that there is a request for a building, and I was like, yeah, that doesn't really fall into the AIF. You know, you can't build a building with personnel funds. But there is an interesting question about if that building got built, would the equipment inside it be fundable in some way, or does that need to come from a different part of the budget, because we want all of this money going to personnel, you know. To our President's great credit, he has put people first here at this institution in this budget crisis, and that's part of what's happening with the AIF, right, is that that money has been helping us very much to keep students with the classes that they need and the faculty that we have, especially the status non-tenure tracks and the tenure tracks and to refill those ranks and to make sure that we have those faculty in the classroom for you. Sean?

Senator Sibley: So do we have any sort of precedent from years past. Has this gone in front of the full Senate before?

Senator Kalter: Only this once, actually. Yeah. Some number of years ago they did like an interim report, and you'll notice that they had a three-year recheck, and I think they didn't do it until five years later, because it was working fine, or what have you, so every once in a while it has come before Senate. What did you all think about Senate versus Caucus? Do you have a view about that? In some ways, it is more of a faculty issue.

Senator Walsh: It is more of a faculty issue, especially if they're only really discussing salaries.

Provost Murphy: Yeah, and it's only faculty salary.

Senator Walsh: Exactly, if it's only faculty salary, then I have no problem with it going to Faculty Caucus. If it does start to include things like buying, you know, materials for classrooms and other things, other equipment, then yes, I'd like to have students involved in that discussion. But so long as it's just faculty salaries.

Senator Haugo: Salary and number of positions as well, right? Out of the AIF, the Provost determines which programs get which positions. So it's also where they might intend the allocation, perhaps.

Senator Hoelscher: It is amazing. I had long conversations with Alan Lacy on this, and for Alan it's matter of fact. There's no wiggle room. This is the way it is. This is how it works. And I hear us talking about it and we discover all this stuff that needs clarification. That's the first statement I would make. And the second is, I would be very hesitant to do anything but salary with the Academic Impact Fund, because I credit it and all the decisions that are made regarding it and with it for a lot of the help that we have in terms of we've not heard the word furlough yet. And you let a furlough occur and the damage to us is far greater than not getting a raise. People don't really realize that, but you can lose an awful lot.

Senator Haugo: It seems like, you know, one of the things we may want to address then if we take it to the faculty caucus is the slippage in the language that allows AIF funds to be used for equipment and to further clarify that. Those kinds of issues.

Provost Murphy: I think that's a great point, you know, that guidance I think will be real important, because that would be a huge shift, and I think that's not a shift that the Provost office would ever make on… You know, I don't think that's a decision we would ever make. It's sort of like Alan saying no, it's always been used for salary and we just think of it that way, you know, so to pay for equipment I don't think we would ever make that decision without guidance on the policy, yeah, the change in the…

Senator Haugo: In the document.

Provost Murphy: Oh absolutely. That would be hard for me to do without the Senate saying, oh no, that's probably where you should go with it, because I just think of it as faculty. You know, it's faculty to me. So that's a great point.

Senator Kalter: One other thing that we should say is that were it ever to get to a point where the Caucus was recommending something, the Chair's Council also needs to weigh in on this, because they're the ones who are most impacted by how the fund is operated. I mean, obviously, all faculty are impacted by it, but they're the ones who put into operation the decisions that are made and who suffer from the yes I made the request, but no it didn't get filled kind of… And what do I, how do I find the non-tenure track faculty member when I don't have enough money to hire them. You know, you see that very interesting discussion about apparently Urice was offering $2500 or something like that and they were like…

Provost Murphy: Even 20 years ago they said ooh.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, they were like no.

Provost Murphy: You know, the hardest thing we do with that is figuring out which positions to fill, and yet what AIF originally did, that kind of pulling that money centrally, I truly believe is why we've been able to maintain enrollment, because without that, CAST and College of Business, CAST would have probably 7, 8, 900 fewer students, because we've had to, you know, think of Department of Ag where they've tripled in enrollment over five years, and we've been able to slowly but surely provide them with some faculty lines to help that.

Senator Haugo: On the other hand…

Provost Murphy: Yeah, I mean it. Yeah.

Senator Haugo: You know, coming from the College of Fine Arts, there's a feeling that we have hemorrhaged faculty over time, and not just in the last three years in response to declining enrollment, that in fact our declining enrollment is a response to declining faculty numbers, you know, so I find it interesting that there hasn't been necessarily a study over time -- and I'm talking about faculty and not a conversation with my dean -- and it's ironic, because, you know, John then came and became a member of our faculty after the vote of no confidence.

Senator Kalter: John Urice

Senator Haugo: John Urice

Senator Kalter: Yeah.

Senator Haugo: Yeah. Now I lost track of what I was saying. There hasn't been, as far as I know, and correct me if I'm wrong, any kind of study done about the reallocation of faculty and where positions have moved and, you know, who's grown and who's shrunk.

Provost Murphy: I think the Factbook would have that data, because it really isn't, you don't track a position and say, well position X went from here to there, but the Factbook would look year after year after year, the FTE of faculty in different departments, so that…

Senator Haugo: But we have to study it.

Provost Murphy: Well yeah, I mean, but that, I think that data, I'm just saying, Ann, I truly believe that data is out there and it's faculty FTE data.

Senator Kalter: And actually that was what started the conversation with Alan Lacy is that I asked him do you have more detail on, because what we get in the Senate is the college level detail and not the department level detail, so I had asked him, you know, hey do you have this and do the chairs and directors get it? That was really what I wanted to know, like do they get to look at that so that they can kind of take a glance at where reallocations might happen and if they have those files over several years they can say yeah, this is where our trend is going. And he provided me with something very nice that Destini puts together where they actually have a trend line over five years of not just faculty, but credit hours, and I think it was graduation, right, or number of majors I think it is. And so that was where that conversation started with. We used to do a report that included that information, you know, with sort of where is everybody and where have they been and, you know, sort of comparison stuff, but it took a lot of work. It was mostly me when I was the budget committee, Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee chair that was doing it, and then I think we also ran in one year to PRPA and the Campus Solutions System going haywire, so not having matching data as has happened in so many places. But you're right. It does need to be studied.

Senator Laudner: Alan relies a lot on the chairs to make that argument, and he wants to see, he requests hard data; I mean, what are your numbers, what’s the NTT, what's, you know, credit hours generated, and that's what he relies on heavily to make those decisions, so it's kind of up to the chairs and directors to make the argument for do you really need this position.

Provost Murphy: And we look at program review, so we're reading, we actually read the program review documents again so the most recent program reviews. I mean, there's a lot that goes into it. Jim will sit in on that and talk about any new initiatives, anything the department is trying to do to move forward.

Senator Haugo: I think it's still worth having a conversation about a STEM environment and funding allocations for faculty hires, you know, and where the numbers have gone.

Senator Kalter: That's a very good point. I think the other thing that I was responding to is that even though chairs do, you know, rely on him, they also come to me sometimes. They don't really come to me, but sometimes I'm talking to them and they say we're really not sure what it is that we're not or, you know, why our arguments are not convincing. You know, why we're not getting the position and somebody else did. And it's usually not… I don't think there has been one where it's like I don't think that department deserves the position, I think we do. It's more like everybody is in need, but we really, you know, we really have needs and we're not getting them filled. And then they say we're not really sure. We don't get necessarily the feedback loop of could we have made a stronger argument or are you just saying no, that position is gone and you're going to have to reorganize your department.

Provost Murphy: Those should be conversations they have with the deans, though. I mean that's the dean's... I mean we get priority lists from the dean, so they ought to be having that conversation with their deans, and I'm assuming deans meet with each chair and walk through… As a dean, I did. I met with each of my chairs one on one to talk through their budgets and their requests and their priority lists.

Senator Laudner: Yeah, because it could be their dean that's putting it at the bottom of the college's list.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Yeah, I mean… One other thing before I go to Larry…

Senator Haugo: Which could be an issue with the policy.

Senator Kalter: I have seen phenomena where enrollment starts to drop because faculty is dropping, and then faculty dropped more because enrollment is dropping, and then enrollment drops and faculty... So Econ is a good example of that, where it appeared in the program review as though that was the phenomenon that was occurring. Now whether that's actually the case, but that was what it appeared, and that's why it seems to need some study. Another option would be that whoever they had in there… You know, they're one of those departments where they have found majors instead of people who come in who want to do Econ right from, you know, high school, so part of that can be the intake. Like, do you have the right faculty in the 100-level course to pull those students and get them excited about Econ, right? But there are instances where you're looking at the pattern over time and you think wow, there's a spiral here. Right? The fewer faculty they have, the fewer students they have, the fewer faculty they have, or is it just that the numbers are going down for the enrollment, in which case that's what the AIF is really for is to reallocate that.

President Dietz: Just a couple of general comments. To me, it's whether we're talking about AIF or SBC or general operating ledger or anything else. To the extent that we can keep this nimble is huge. The flexibility to move some money around is always important, very important when you don't have a budget. That's the only way in the world we've been able to not lay off people and have furloughs and all that kind of thing. To put it into perspective, this last year for FY16, a bunch of us kept thinking that they were going to revisit, they being the legislature, they're going to revisit FY16. That's not going to happen. The Speaker said that and the Governor said that. If those two people agree on that, it probably isn't going to happen. In FY16, we lost 45 million dollars. A lot of money. We can't lose 45 million dollars every year without doing something much more stringent than what we've been doing. So the idea that we can have some flexibility and be nimble with that, and we can't, you know, eventually continue to lay off, or not fill, we haven't laid off anybody, but not fill, you know, 120 staff positions every year. There's an end to that at some point. Otherwise, you're not going to have academic advisors. You're not going to have folks in critical positions around here. So to the extent that we can keep flexibility is a big deal. And also to the extent, and points are well taken about was it the chicken or the egg in terms of the student demand being there, vis a vis the faculty to meet the student demand, and the ideal is that, you know, you have a place where those things meet up in pretty good shape, but doing a data analysis around all that, I know Jan and her team are working hard at that, but enrollment has been the king for a long time and is going to continue to be. And so the idea that we need to be moving some dollars different places to respond to student demand is a reality. The institutions that have not done that are everyplace other than Illinois State and University of Illinois.

Senator Haugo: Can I ask you a question too? When you're talking about being nimble and flexible, do you mean only within the salary dollars, or do you think that the language in the AIF now that allows reallocation for equipment could be useful down the road for us given the kind of shortages that we have.

President Dietz: It could be.

Senator Haugo: And maybe that's something that should stay in the language, because this is a…

President Dietz: Yeah. I think we have a policy and then we have a practice, and the practice has been pretty pure, but having the latitude that if you need to do that, let's say that you're adding a new program, and an example of that is the cybersecurity thing. We're getting a lot of private support and I'm having discussions with some other private companies that might want to do a similar kind of thing. Well if they can bring some dollars to the table. We're still not in the business of training for a particular outside company. They want a well-rounded, educated person, but in this case, you know, the folks that are coming in in cybersecurity, they're going to be taking the same core curriculum everybody else is going to take, so the idea, and I get it where some faculty might say, well gee, you know, are they going to take my courses? Well, if you're part of the core curriculum, yes. And so all the boats are going to rise there to a degree. What we can't let happen is that no boat rise at all, or worse that some boats sink because of that. So that latitude would help us.

***02.23.17.01 – from Martha Horst: Policy 9.1 Current Copy (Dist. Executive Committee)***

Senator Kalter: It seems we're a little bit, I think, past 5, so what I'm going to propose is that we move this item to the Faculty Caucus discussion and let's move Martha's 9.1 Policy to when she can be here. Because of her child care, she needs to be here from 4 to basically 10 to 5, so let's move that to the next meeting. So, motion to adjourn.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Grzanich, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.