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Chairperson Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Discussion:***

***02.23.96.1 - Academic Impact Fund***

***03.21.17.01 - Copy of Historical TT-NTT Faculty and Student Headcount***

Senator Kalter: So, you guys have two handouts for this meeting, or things you received in your electronic packets. I’m going to ask our secretary to hand out one more that shows trends in the counts of faculty over five years in each of our colleges and each of our departments so that you can kind of see those trends. So we’re just having a brief meeting. It may be brief. It goes, however, as long as we want it to go. And the two items on the agenda are really not two different items. We have the Academic Impact Fund 1996 report, and then the Historical Faculty and Student Headcounts as fine-grained as we were able to get them. We’re getting a little bit more information from PRPA in the next week or so. Alan Lacy is here to help us talk about this.

So the reason we’re wanting to talk about the Academic Impact Fund. First of all, as some people observed when we were talking about this in the Executive Committee meeting, we often do our oversight of this fund, but we don’t really necessarily have philosophical discussions about the concept of the fund, how it’s changed over the years and how we want it to work for us. This is about the 20-year mark of the Academic Impact Fund, as you can see by the report, the old report. And so there were a couple of things, as I was talking to Dr. Lacy during the time when Academic Affairs Committee was doing their work on this this year, where it was interesting how things were defined 20 years ago. I thought it would be helpful for us to see that and also to see some of the worries that the Senate had when this fund, you know, first came in. So, one of the things that you see in the background of the 1996 piece is that there was obviously, that was during that time of the vote of no confidence against one of our Provosts. And yet the Academic Impact Fund has certainly, you know, endured, has stood the test of time, and I would argue that it’s been one of the reasons why we’ve been able to be stable in the way that we’re hiring.

That report reminds us about how specifically Instructional Capacity was thought of and defined 20 years ago when the AIF was created, and what it meant, right? That we were essentially redirecting department base-budgeted monies to the Provost’s office; in other words, centralizing those monies in order to create a certain kind of flexibility, but that they were also concerned with having departments and colleges have less flexibility as a result of that potentially. So there are a couple of defined questions that we probably should talk about 20 years on, and then other things. We're actually, you know, some people were sort of beginning to bring this up during the Senate meeting, like Senator Day and Senator Glascock, in terms of the Tenure Track Authorization policy and just the number of authorizations. So let me just put up a list or put down a list of some of the questions that come up when we read this report, which essentially defines, that report 20 years ago defines the parameters of how we use these monies and we’ve been pretty sacred about that for the last 20 years. But there are a couple of interesting things in the report that are either ill-defined or where things did not exist 20 years ago that impact the way we think about the AIF.

So in terms of that latter thing, there’s something called Strategic Budget Carryover that had never existed 20 years ago. It used to be that we were not able to take our money from one year and be able to push it over to the next year or the year after to spend. Do we need as a Caucus to define the parameters of how we use SBC money as opposed to the other kinds of permanent monies that we use out of AIF? So, for example, right now SBC is currently being used to back up the Instructional Capacity monies under a condition where we basically expect a huge plunge in our budget because the state is not coming through with our funds. So it’s protecting our non-tenure track faculty from essentially having, you know, not being able to come back on contract in case the bottom were to drop out in terms of state funding. What Dr. Lacy calls backfilling, right, being able to backfill some positions if we have to make cuts to base budgets. One question to ask is whether the SBC in the Academic Impact Fund as a concept should be restricted to personnel use only; in other words, to faculty hiring only. That’s generally been how the AIF has been thought of is that all of the money goes exclusively to personnel, or could the SBC, given that it is something that they did not think about back 20 years ago, could that be used for other purchases? So, for example, because it is one-time money, you can only use the SBC once. Could it be used, for example, to purchase large ticket instructional equipment like we have in some of the sciences where some of our equipment is aging and needs to be recapped, but it’s a huge budget item to pay for? or could it be used to help programs with startup funding for their incoming faculty? Or one of the other things I wrote down, although I don’t think this is really an obvious possibility, but just I was trying to go around the various disciplines, one possibility is in what way might our library materials budget need some shoring up and could SBC be used for that given that that’s instructional? So the SBC question is one question.

Second, that same question about startup packages and major equipment recapitalization could be asked about the Instructional Capacity money, because you might notice that the report is pretty equivocal about whether or not equipment would ever be purchased out of the AIF. Then another really interesting and I think a pretty controversial question is would AIF ever be a place where we might be able to address salary inversion and compression or equity issues given that it’s salary money and that it is sometimes used, for example, when a faculty member has a counter offer. In other words, we make a counter offer if somebody is saying, “hey, I got an offer at another institution, and you might want to keep me here,” so in order to keep that person at ISU, we use the AIF to make a counteroffer and add money to their base-budgeted funding.

And then I think one of the things, the last thing I have on my list, is just the big question I think we always ask about the Academic Impact Fund which Senator Day essentially asked. He said, are we making progress, right? Are we making progress towards refilling our tenure track positions where we need them and want them? So, you know, does the use of Instructional Capacity money for funding non-tenure track positions ever prevent us from hiring the tenure tracks where we feel that they are urgently needed? And how is that working, how is it going, so to speak, in people’s departments in terms of getting the faculty that we need? So with that before I open it up, I’m going to ask Dr. Lacy if he has anything that he wants to add to any of those questions, and then we’ll open it up.

Associate Vice President Lacy: The AIF is a fund that has taken me about two years, the two years that I’ve been in this position, to really fully get my arms around it. It is a pretty complex phenomenon. And one of the things that I have learned about it is that it is very healthy. It’s well funded right now, and as a result of it being well funded, we are able to authorize the searches that we did this year and we’re about to go into our process of determining how many to authorize next year, and I’m guessing, though we haven’t made any final decisions, I’m guessing that we will authorize a significant number again for searches next year. So the fund is very healthy, and even with that, after we take care of authorizing those searches and we send out significant dollars for Instructional Capactiy that supports non-tenure-track instruction, at the end of all that we’re still ending up with a surplus in the fund that we then SBC. And so if every year you have money in this fund and you take care of everything that you want to do and at the end of it you have a million dollars left that you’re not going to spend in this year’s budget, then you SBC that, and so you’ve got…and then your AIF replenishes. It’s permanent money, so it replenishes the next year and then if the same thing happens the next year and you have another million dollars left, now you have two million and so that’s been going on ever since SBC started and so we have about five million dollars of SBC money. Now realize, as Susan said, when you spend money that is SBC'd, you can only spend it once. The analogy I might use is you have your paycheck, it comes in every month, and if you have anything left, you put it over in your savings account, but once you spend that money in the savings account, after you spend that on your new healthcare premiums (laughter), after you spend that money, it’s gone, but you keep getting your paycheck every month, and so that’s a really important distinction about what is permanent money. When we send money out of AIF to a unit to do a search and that becomes a salary for a new faculty member, that’s permanently every year until that faculty member resigns or retires when the money comes back into AIF. So we have, prior…as I mentioned, I’ve been doing this nearly two years. Prior to that we were pretty conservative on the searches we did because we kept hearing we’re going to have this big budget reduction down the road and nobody knew how that was going to play out and I’m not…and I think in hindsight you could say, "Whoa, we should have hired more people back then," but at the time I think the best decisions were made with the information that was known. And so, that’s how we’ve built up this surplus and we haven’t spent any of that SBC money because we still don’t know what the state is going to do and that is kind of our insurance policy even though it’s one-time money, five million dollars will buy a lot of non-tenure track instruction and then remember that you can still get SBC coming out each year to replenish that if you have to tap into it. But it’s getting so big now I think some of the things that Susan has brought up to think how should we use that money to support instruction, be it startup cost, recapitalizing our lab, computer labs, things like that, that departments and colleges may not have the money for may be something that the Senate wants to consider. But at this point, you know, we are trying to stick with the guidelines that are in place about how we would spend that money. As Susan said, SBC was non-existent when the original guidelines were written.

Senator Kalter: So we can just open it up for discussion. Senator McHale, why don't you go ahead?

Senator McHale: I guess my question is directed to you as well as to Senator Murphy. Is this broken? Does it need fixing? Would there be other things that we can’t spend the money on now that we should or do we feel that this five million protects us in a time when we’re barely holding…we are not holding on to what we currently get as recompense?

Associate Vice President Lacy: I think AIF has served us well. I think now that we’ve had AIF in place for 20 years and we are where we are budgetarily and with the SBC, I think it would be an opportune time to look at AIF and tweak it some so that we could use it in the most effective way that we could to ensure that we can continue to offer the instruction that we need and have the facilities to teach and that sort of thing.

Senator McHale: I guess that becomes a question for Senator Murphy kind of like…You know, you have a unique perspective. As the money is currently being spent, is that helping us, or do you feel the need that we need to expand spending this money in new ways?

Provost Murphy: Good question. Is AIF broken? I don’t think it is. I think AIF protects our faculty ranks. I mean truly I think…and I always think of AIF as this is…AIF is money for faculty salaries that can’t be touched for other things, and I think that’s a really important thing about AIF. So is it broken? I don’t believe it’s broken. I think SBC just has put a little wrinkle into this because you really can’t…you know, even with SBC, we really can’t just keep saving money and saving money and accumulating money in this account because it starts to look…I mean it becomes quite noticeable when we have five million or six million sitting over in kind of a savings account, it starts to raise a red flag. So…but I think that if we do, if we, meaning as our shared governance process, as our Senate, if we think about using that for other reasons, I think we want to be really careful about opening a door. Because I think what we don’t want to do is lose control over a fund that is a salary fund. And I’m…you know, Alan and I have talked a lot about this and so again I think SBC adds a wrinkle there, but I think we want to be really careful about what we use that for. It really needs to relate back, I think, to…well, I would go back to instructional, although that’s not my place to put…to make that decision. I think that’s something that we all would want…I would want a lot of conversation on. So, does that answer? I mean, no, I don’t believe it’s broken at all, but I think SBC just adds a wrinkle that because we tried to save money to protect Academic Affairs at a time when we thought we were going to have given a bunch back, but we haven’t had to give that back, so there it is sitting there, kind of with this little red flag saying, we’ve got a lot of money sitting here.

Senator McHale: So I just really appreciate your perspective as well, both of these perspectives. Thank you.

Senator Cox: I’m just wondering about the procedure or the process that's involved if the concept of the instructional fund is expanded. Is that a discretion that belongs to the Provost’s office, or is it something that requires discussion and, I don't know, policy or some Senate resolution? What would be required?

Provost Murphy: That's a great question.

Senator Day: Perhaps would it go to the colleges and the deans who would then accept proposals and rank those and then submit them to the Provost? Would that be a process?

Provost Murphy: I mean we could certainly make it part of our budget planning process. I mean I absolutely think we want input. You know, I don’t see us sitting up in my office saying, well, you know, here’s a million dollars for…I think we need a lot of good advice on that. I don’t know that it needs a policy change because I think the policy provides for that. Would you say that’s true, Senator Kalter, or not? I thought we talked a little about that.

Senator Kalter: Well, I would say a couple of things. So in terms of process, I think for changes there would have to be both going through either the Caucus or Senate as a whole. And making sure that there's consultation with the Chairs and Deans Council before any kind of agreement, because as you see 20 years ago that was something of the process, right? How is this going to impact the departments, and we can’t answer that, you know, here. We need to consult with the chairs, deans, and directors. So that’s, you know, in terms of…but there are a couple of things that I think are not clarified. We have a pretty clear policy, and the administration has gone with that agreement, you know, for the last 20 years that was made in 1996. But we don’t have a well-defined SBC policy, you know, part of the policy, and there is one little piece of this IC, you know the Instructional Capacity, that is equivocal in the final agreement. So what the administration has done with that equivocation is to go on the safe side and to say we are going to use Instructional Capacity money only to pay salaries. We are not going to use that for, you know, equipment purchases. We’re not going to use it for, what have you. But I think that it would be helpful to clarify on that one. Do we agree with that, right? Is that the way we want it to continue? And there is a very, very strong argument to say yes, we want it to continue that way. And then… but the SBC is totally out there as kind of undefined thing, and we may decide, for example, that once you hit a certain million dollar level in an SBC, that that part should be use for personnel only, but anything above it could be used for certain well-defined other one-time expenditures, right? Or we may decide, yes, we in fact want that all to be always about personnel, but somehow figure out a way not to have it continue to grow and grow and grow without ever… For most SBC in most departments and colleges, you have to spend that within two years. You have to have a plan for spending it. You have to know what you are going to do with it and all of that kind of thing. So, it’s probably in our interest to define SBC for the AIF so that going forward we have a very clear agreement among the administration, the chairs/directors and the Senate about what we’re doing with that.

To go back to what Senator McHale said, I would say the State is broken, right? It’s not the fund that's broken. I think the State is broken, right? And because the State is broken, we are thinking about… I think all of us are in some way in the back of our mind, or the front of our mind, thinking about, well, how are we going to provide for all of the needs and wants that we have. What are the most primary? And where are we going to get money to fund those things? And as I said in Exec, to his very, very great credit, Dr. Dietz has put people first. And I think the AIF puts people first. So in that way, I think the answer is also, no. For me the answer is no. The AIF isn’t broken. The problem is that we’ve got these external pressures and it’s 20 years on. It's time to talk about it. But one of the reasons why we sent around this sheet that goes back to 1987 is that some people sometimes say, well, we have fewer faculty, fewer tenure track faculty on our campus than we used to have. That’s actually not true. You know, it goes up and down a little bit, but it’s not true. The reason for that is mainly due to the AIF because it allows that flexibility. So this is kind of a record of merit with respect to that.

Senator McHale: I guess, could I?

Senator Kalter: Yes, Senator McHale.

Senator McHale: Well, I first of all just want to offer an observation. We’ve been talking about how we might need to get more chairs, deans, administrators involved with the decision about how to disperse these funds. I’m kind of missing the discussion of faculty, like maybe faculty could have some kind of…I mean especially if we’re going to add administrators, if that’s what we’re talking about, our decisions to disperse the funds, then…

Senator Day: I think the faculty would express the need, okay we need to recap our lab, for instance. We make the request, right?

Senator McHale: Right. Well, do, the faculty don’t know that we need the lab?

Senator Day: But that would go up through the dean or whatever up to the Provost, who could say, all right, here's how we…

Senator McHale: So faculty don’t know that we need the lab? Only the chair does?

Senator Day: No, we would.

Senator McHale: Oh, okay.

Senator Day: Our lab's creaky and cranky. You've got ten-year-old computers. Yeah, you know you've got to recap those, right?

Senator McHale: Well, I mean the teachers would know that, right?

Senator Kalter: One of the reasons, Senator McHale, why this came up at this time is because during program review on Academic Planning Committee, Geology/Geography, I think it was Chemistry and Physics all have equipment, major equipment that needs to be replaced and none of them know…they’re all telling the Academic Planning Committee we do not know where we are going to get the money to do this, right, so it brings up that question. But I don’t know how we’re not including faculty. We are faculty, so having…

Senator McHale: Oh, okay. I was responding…

Senator Kalter: We represent our faculty here, that’s what a representative group does.

Senator McHale: I thought that Cox was saying do we need to get more deans, chairs involved in the decision to how to disperse this money. And when she said that list and then the list was reified by you, I didn’t hear faculty. I heard deans, chairs, administrators, but I didn’t hear faculty.

Senator Cox: Just a correction…

Senator Kalter: Faculty. So I'll add faculty and I would say that we here represent the faculty. That’s our job here is to bring that faculty voice to that discussion.

Senator McHale: Okay, well the particular point was should we have more deans, chairs help decide, as we are talking about the review how this A…I… how this money is being dispersed, and I just wondered if we thought maybe the faculty should be part of that process, too, or is that just, you know.

Provost Murphy: Can I add to that, though? It’s my…it would be my understanding and my hope that as we get budget plans and budget requests and budget documents from our chairs and directors that go up to their dean’s office that those are representative of the needs of the faculty in the departments, and so I think…I first heard us thinking about just taking kind of the decision on whether or not we would use SBC for something other than salary. I assumed that part of what, Senator Kalter, you were saying was we need to have discussions about even changing the policy or changing the processes with all of these different interest groups. But it’s always my hope, Senator McHale, that when we’re looking at budget documents prepared at the department level that they are representative of the faculty in a department. Does that make sense? And so through those budget processes, I hope that what we’re seeing are the needs of our faculty come up through their chairs to their deans.

Senator McHale: Can we ever imagine a situation where a chair would have different priorities than the faculty in their department?

Senator Murphy: If that’s the case, I hope we see indication of that in annual evaluations of chairs.

Senator Hoelscher: I have a very, a most decided personal opinion here, and I’d just like to set it forward and be very respectful of whatever the group suggests, but as a fundraiser, in my role as a center director I spend a lot of my time raising money. I can raise money far easier for things than I can for salaries, and if we have a pile of money to protect us and to help us with our Instructional Capactiy, with all of the bad things that can go wrong in terms of salary, then I would be in favor of protecting that money and finding other ways to buy chairs and equipment and buildings and all those other kinds of things, because those are…I know it’s all a hard sell, but they’re much easier sells in terms of a fundraising effort than it is for salaries, and I just think that that money protects us from things like furlough days, from things like not getting the Instructional Capactiy in our departments, from summer school offerings, for all those kind of things that we think are very, very important, so this is a different conversation than what we just had in terms of who needs to be helping to make those decisions, but it scares me to death to take money that’s traditionally been considered to be for salaries and people and to even consider using it for other things.

Senator Kalter: Senator Hoelscher, just to make sure we all understand. You're talking both about the permanent funds—IC and the tenure track authorizations—and about the SBC?

Senator Hoelscher: That is correct. In fact, the first thing I would say with the SBC if we weren’t in these trying times, I think right now we need to think about the trying times and protect ourselves and our Instructional Capactiy, but beyond that, we have the salary compression/inversion thing, but I don’t know how appropriate it would be to use one-time money for that, because that’s a repeating expense.

Senator Kalter: To clarify that one. You can’t use the SBC for that. It would have to be the permanent funds that could be used for that.

Senator Hoelscher: Yeah, yeah. And that makes a lot of sense to me. But I would guess you can use it for shortfalls like…I forget which university that…I don’t know if we said it in here or if I heard it earlier, that’s already experiencing furloughs one day a week or those kinds of things, because those would be one-time expenses. And those things can have serious impact on us, and we’re not out of this yet. I mean, we are strong and stable and I’m so very proud to be a part of the ISU family, but times are not going to be easy over the next nine months, and I don’t want to keep any more than we have to, than we need to keep because we have the red flag flying, but I want to remember that we need to protect our people.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Horst: Yeah, I have a comment and then a question. The comment is that I am sympathetic to the people, the programs that have large ticket items. In the past, the School of Music has required instruments that cost, you know, $20,000, $50,000 and so we've turned to the Provost’s office. It’s very hard for us to turn to a corporation to get that kind of support, so I’m sympathetic to that. My question is the process. The Academic Impact Fund. We have the report for that. Are we conceiving of writing a report or how are we conceiving of addressing this issue? Do we have a game plan? For how to create a position and what to do with SBC funds?

Senator Kalter: How to create a position paper, so to speak?

Senator Horst: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: That’s something that we would have to form as a Caucus, so we don’t have a…you know, we haven’t gotten to that stage where we say, yes, as a Caucus we would like to have an ad hoc committee to do that. But it's is a possibility that we could do it that way.

Senator Wortham: Yes, I’m a little bit behind in connecting the conversation. We’re talking about dispersal of funds. I'd like to have an explanation of exactly what is the red flag which usually signals jeopardy and to whom is this red flag meaningful. I don’t quite understand why the concern. If the fund is not broken but there is a red flag, to whom is this a red flag?

Provost Murphy: I think I used that analogy. I was referring to the SBC itself, and there is a limit to how long you can carry over SBC. You know, we really say two years, although we can sometimes with the exception make three years. So my sort of saying that kind of sends a little red flag was not about the AIF fund or about any issues with the AIF fund. I was saying with that SBC that’s grown so large, it sort of sits out there and it’s a big amount of money and does that amount of money sitting there in kind of a savings account. Will that catch somebody’s interest, because we’re not supposed to use SBC as…

Senator Wortham: Who’s the somebody?

Associate Vice President Lacy: I can put it in a broader context. I’ve heard Greg Alt talk about the amount of money the university has in SBC. And he’s concerned if we have too much money getting carried over that the State looks at us and says, oh, you’re not in any trouble. Look at all that money. And I can’t remember the exact numbers. I want to say, when I heard this conversation, maybe 12 to 18 months ago that the university had overall about 30 million, and half of that was coming out of Academic Affairs. Not all of that is in the Academic Impact Fund. There is money out of the colleges and the departments and then some that the Provost’s office has as well. So in Academic Affairs, since I’ve been in this position I have been encouraging people to use SBC as *strategic* budget carryover, and we got away from that as we were saving money waiting for a budget reduction. And so now we’re saying we need to go back to that. If you carry it over, you need to have a plan to spend it. It’s not a savings account. And so when we have that much SBC and then we say to the rest of the university, oh, we need some money for this or that, that becomes…it makes it hard for us to make a very good case even though it is all just one-time money, and permanent money is really sometimes what we need more than one-time money, but…so that plays into it as well.

Now we have rules to the departments on the SBC. They are supposed to spend it within two years, but in AIF, we haven’t followed that rule because I don’t have any guidelines on how to use SBC in AIF because we didn’t have it when the policy was written. I guess if I wanted to make a…really get you all riled up, I’d sit here and say you know, we’re using AIF exactly how the policy says, and this money is SBC, so it’s no longer in AIF. I can use it any way I want to. Now I’m absolutely not advocating for that at all. That money has been set…is just sitting there just to make sure that we have enough funding to backfill. For instance, certain departments in the budget reduction that we had to do, gave up non-tenure track positions, gave money that was in the non-tenure track bucket; they didn’t give up any positions, it was money that was in the non-tenure track bucket, and then we’re coming in with Instructional Capactiy money to fill that bucket back up so those faculty continue to teach the classes we need taught. If we ever ran short on that, then we’ve got this SBC sitting over here, but thus far we haven’t come close to running short, and in fact, every year we’re coming out of AIF with a million, a million point 5, adding to…I mean, we don’t know exactly what we’re going to have…we don’t know how many resignations, retirements and all that kind of thing that will come back in. You know, most of those come in between now and the start of the fiscal year. But, you know, we could be getting close to 7 million dollars in there when I come make my report to the Senate next year. So my thinking is, you know, we have a very good system in place, in my opinion, of a check and a balance. When I make a report to AABC, it comes to the Senate, reports to the Senate, I come and talk about it, try to answer questions, and if we were to have any guidelines about how this money perhaps could be used, it would be guidelines that would come from the Senate and then if we did use any of the money for that, we’d have to build it into the annual report that we do every year so that we continue to have that check and a balance. You know, if we spend some money in an inappropriate way, then we’ll have to deal with the Senate, and we don’t want to do that.

Senator Wortham: I've got it.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Haugo: I have a question first and then a comment. So my question is for Senator Murphy about the budget process. Just my own ignorance. Do you see the budget proposals that the directors and chairs write, or do you only see the budget proposals that come to you from the dean? I’m wondering how deep the…

Provost Murphy: We see pieces of it, so we don’t necessarily see the accomplishments from the year before, but we see all the personnel requests. We would see Provost Enhancement Requests, so we see pieces of those.

Senator Haugo: Okay, so you would see all the personnel requests at the department and school level regardless of how that comes out in the dean’s personnel request?

Provost Murphy: Yes.

Senator Haugo: Okay.

Provost Murphy: And I’m hedging a little bit, but yes. There are so many of them, so depending on the college, and when we really start to look at them is if we see something at the college level and think, well I wonder, you know, I wonder how and I’ll make this up, truly make this up. I'm looking, so I’ll say School of Communication, well that’s funny, that’s not what I would have expected to see as their, you know their number one position at a School of Comm, and we can go back and look at those and say oh, okay, well maybe that makes sense. So we have access to pieces of them.

Senator Haugo: Okay.

Associate Vice President Lacy: I think it varies from college to college. In Arts and Science, I have no idea how many position requests Greg Simpson gets.

Senator Haugo: Right.

Associate Vice President Lacy: I know that he meets with all of the chairs. The chairs make presentations to their other chairs and the dean staff, but Greg doesn’t put…you know, if he gets 67 tenure track position requests, he knows he’s not going to put all of those in his budget. He may in consultations with his chair and his staff, he may select 20 and put them in his budget. So we don’t necessarily see them all. Other colleges may put them all in. All we see is what they send us.

Senator Haugo: From the dean’s office?

Associate Vice President Lacy: From the dean’s office in consultation with their staff in their departments and those…and they prioritize those and send them to us.

Senator Haugo: The dean’s office prioritizes what the chairs and directors…

Provost Murphy: I’m a little…now this is my first run on it, and we do it a little differently in CAST where all of those departments, all of those budget documents are on the college website, and so they’re available. So I guess I’m all…maybe I’m saying this wrong because I would have assumed all of the colleges did that, so I must not be.

Associate Vice President Lacy: Well, I’m not 100% certain, but I would certainly guess that …if I remember right, the College of Arts and Sciences was about 20 deep. I would certainly guess that they have far more requests than that, but he has to make some decisions and put them in priority.

Senator Haugo: And I’m less interested in whether the documents are posted publicly, I guess, than whether the Provost’s office has the ability to see whether there may be a disparity between what a director or a chair is requesting and what comes to you from a dean, not that there’s necessarily a current issue, but when we’re looking at positions that have been requested and not filled at the department or school level for a number of years, where does that kind of stop?

Provost Murphy: Again, you know, I need to be looking at Kevin, because you know better, too. So I may be having my …you know I may still have just my college perspective on, because this will be a first time for me, but in CAST, we’re really open about those documents, so all the chairs see all the documents and then the chairs see what the dean pulls together and sees that priority order, so it’s a very open process where faculty, chairs and directors have access to all of those documents. So as a faculty member you would know, this is what my chair has put together and now this is how it compares to the priorities that the dean has put together. But for me, I’m working under the assumption that all of the colleges do that, and I may find that is not the case.

Senator Haugo: Right, but that’s…I’m…you’re responding from a different direction than I’m asking the question. I know what goes into our chair’s document.

Provost Murphy: Right.

Senator Haugo: Or directors’ document. I can see it. And I also know…I have the ability to know what the dean requests. What I’m asking is whether the Provost’s office also has the ability to see what the school director and the department chair requests.

Provost Murphy: Right. And that’s why I say I’m…I was trying to answer in that way. I’m saying I assumed we did because I know we could, as a Provost I could see everything in CAST, so I made that assumption and I may have made a misassumption. I just assumed I would have access to all those things.

Associate Vice President Lacy: The budget presentations that we had yesterday and today will be uploaded to the Provost’s website by the end of the week, so you can see those documents on the website that the dean submitted to us.

Senator Kalter: And before I go to Senator Pancrazio, I’m fairly certain that in CAST, CAS, CFA and Mennonite that that process is quite open. So, for example, College of Arts and Sciences and CFA and I think Mennonite also all have, you know, a budget meeting where… You know in the case of Mennonite, they just talk about what their budget is, but in the other ones the chairs and directors are giving presentations, usually with slides, and those all, you know, then after that the dean, when he or she orders the list in terms of AIF, that that is known by the chairs and directors. So I’m pretty sure that it’s open, and the ones that I don’t know about are Education, Business and Milner.

Senator Haugo: I know that part. I was asking about the other direction. Right? I actually gave the budget presentation this year.

Senator Kalter: Whether or not the Provost sees that side.

Provost Murphy: Yeah.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you. If I understand right, we’re talking about these two funds, the AIF and the SBC and that these two funds are currently things that we want to keep and want to make sure that they are good, we want to dedicate these to people. However, if we allow a continuing accumulation of money that could perhaps raise higher levels of scrutiny and could eventually put in jeopardy our ability to protect our people. If that’s the case, and if I’m understanding it correctly, would it be, I think, germane to the long-term health to come up with, to appoint an ad hoc committee to look into how, what’s our crucial tipping point so that we know how much we can come up with and then by what criteria we are going to be able to use those funds? I think it might be a way to come up with a concrete way to ensure the long-term stability of these funds and I mean too much of a good thing can cause more problems in the long run, and this is some fiscal discipline has done very well for us, and I think this is something we should continue to do. Could we ask for ad hoc committees? I can point to some people who know more about money around here than I do, but I think that might be a way in terms of committee process to kind of step forward and come up with something here.

Senator Kalter: The answer to your question is yes, you can ask for ad hoc committees. Senator Horst has been looking at our bylaws lately, and I believe it's the full Caucus or the full Senate that would approve an ad hoc committee of that sort.

Senator McHale: I just want to say that I agree totally with my esteemed colleague from the Business department that we’d be better to be conservative about this. I, also, in recognition of the comment that was just made, I would feel far more secure about like putting limits on what is a reasonable sum if the budget, the state budget situation wasn’t in such flux. And if we did…I guess at the end of the day if we did get a budget and they paid it on time and next year we had 7 million dollars, I’d love to just talk about how we would have to spend that extra 2 mil. So those are my, kind of, you know, just general thoughts. I just really appreciate the conservative nature, and I would hate to start for the Provost to have to decide about construction projects with money that was specifically designed and designated to maintain salaries of teachers.

Senator Haugo: Yeah, the comment that I had wanted to make earlier, too, is that I do agree with Senator Hoelscher. I have some trepidation about money that is instructional money being used for, even if it is instructional equipment, and I come from one of those programs that desperately needs equipment. Our accreditor has told us that, too. They have asked us to create a plan for replacement of equipment. We’re like okay, we will busk, because we’re artists. We'll just guitar case. But that being the case, you know, I think that instructional money is instructional money and at a time when we are struggling to have enough faculty in some programs, I have some trepidation about the possibility of this money being used for other purposes, both pots of money, including the SBC, so....

Senator Nichols: Yeah, I guess I take a different view, and a clean separation between them. In Biological Sciences startup funds have been a limiting factor multiple times at the college level. Well, we hear that they could justify multiple positions for us, but they can’t afford startup for multiple positions. It’s not the salary that’s our limiting factor. It's being competitive, and I’m not talking about competing with med schools, just being competitive with peer institutions for startup. And it’s very tough to get what we would consider top-line candidates for ISU to come in. We’re starting to see a falling off of the applicant pool due largely to the inability of the college and our academic unit to come up with startup packages, and so I don’t see that as an inappropriate use. It seems like if we want to secure high quality and the number that we would need to maintain the integrity of our academic unit, to go back to that. It’s a one-time expenditure, and it ties in with getting people. It’s not stuff for the sake of stuff. It’s buying enough stuff to get the candidate that we think is going to best fill our need to educate the students.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah, the only thing that I would add is that I understand and I respect the idea that this is instructional money. At the same time if you blow a good thing by drawing too much attention to it, you can hurt the whole thing in a longer time. So I just say that if you can find…if you can be very precise about how much you want and what your parameters are for what you can have in that fund and not draw the type of scrutiny that would ruin it, then I think that that might be a judicious way of being able to use the money in such a way just to maintain that long term reserve. Because we don’t have the ability like a bank to have endless reserves.

Senator Cox: I’d just like to state that I consider it a real privilege to be made privy to the entire topic. I know that it is within our purview, of course, within a self-governing, or shared governance system, to be party to this discussion, but as we’ve heard, there could easily have been a decision made to look at that “pot of gold” over here and make some decision based strictly on the discretion of a limited few. And so I think that the role that we played here in our conversation has been very much appreciated I hope on all parties' side. But moving from here into the process, I think it’s important that the conversation be continued. I’ve already heard that…of some, you know, some disagreements about how we might like to see that issue addressed, more conservative, on the other hand more of an investment opportunity, and so I'd like the idea very much of our pursuing it in a more systematic way, perhaps through an ad hoc committee, and that might entail a survey of some sort or a focus group - I don’t know, but some way to synthesize our ideas for the benefit of ourselves and the Provost’s office and so on. So if I could make a motion, if that’s appropriate coming from the Caucus, to create… Would it be the Executive Committee that would create an ad hoc committee to further look into this matter?

Senator Kalter: The Executive Committee would not create this committee, but we could go back to Executive Committee to create a charge for the committee for the Caucus to vote on. Right? In other words, the whole Caucus creates the committee, but if you would like for us to work out the parameters and the timeframe for an ad hoc committee, Faculty Caucus Exec could do that and then bring that back for revision and a vote.

Senator Cox: What’s the process then for the Caucus to create an ad hoc committee?

Senator Kalter: That is the process.

Senator Cox: I mean do we vote and say, you know, does the majority want an ad hoc committee and do we decide who’s going to be on the committee?

Senator Kalter: Right.

Senator Cox: Oh, I see.

Senator Hoelscher: I second that.

Senator Kalter: You second what?

Senator Pancrazio: I think it’s a point of order. I think it’s a point of order. We need a motion.

Senator Hoelscher: It’s a basic, general concept that you get to define. It gets us closer to adjournment.

Multiple People: (Laughter)

Senator Kalter: Indeed. Am I hearing a second to asking Exec to create a charge for this ad hoc committee?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes.

Motion: By Senator Cox, seconded by Senator Hoelscher to ask the Faculty Caucus Executive Committee to create a charge for the ad hoc committee.

Senator Kalter: Alright. Is there any debate? Make sure I’m properly following Roberts Rules of Order. You know, you wouldn't want to go away from that. Alright, all in favor of us creating the draft of a charge for an ad hoc committee to look further into this.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Pancrazio: It can be edited, though.

Senator Kalter: Say again.

Senator Pancrazio: It can be edited by…

Senator Kalter: You better believe it should be edited by everybody. Absolutely. Alright, Faculty Caucus Exec will work on that. Let me just ask a little sort of strawish poll, even though I hate straw polls. We want only SBC to be the scope or both Instructional Capacity and SBC to be, or just the study in general of how the academic impact fund is working?

Senator Pancrazio: I would say that one of the principle constraints is that you want to think in terms of how do you maintain these and both in that functioning way that are going to protect us for a longer period of time.

Senator Kalter: So looking at it in a broad scope and…

Senator Pancrazio: Right, and keep in mind how you are going to protect these two, because if they are working, let's keep them working.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Did I have somebody over there? No. Okay. Alright, we have created the potential creation of a committee and we are going to adjourn. Does anybody want to raise their hand to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

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