

Faculty Caucus Minutes
April 27, 2005
(Approved)

Call to Order

Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes of April 13, 2005

Motion: By Senator Schlenker, seconded by Senator Wylie, to approve the Faculty Caucus Minutes of April 13, 2005. The minutes were unanimously approved.

04.15.05.01 ISU Foundation Board Report

Professor Joe Armstrong's Foundation Board Report reads as follows:

MEMO TO: Faculty Caucus

FROM: J. E. (Joe) Armstrong, Faculty representative to ISU Foundation Board

RE: Report on activities

DATE: 31 March 2005

1. Term - By the end of this semester, I will have been the faculty representative to the board for 15 months, the full '04-'05 academic year and the last 3 months of the '03-'04 academic year (remainder of a prior term). I serve on two Foundation committees, the Investment committee and the newly formed Planning Committee. I am just now up to speed on several issues, and have finally become a known entity, so I support the idea of having the faculty representative serve a three year term. I serve at the pleasure of the Caucus, and will be happy to continue for a full term (2 more years). As you may judge better after reading the rest of this report, continuity improves your ability to participate and represent the faculty. This is my first annual report to the Caucus and I recommend that this become an obligation of your representative to the ISU Foundation Board.

2. Function - My main role has been to represent the faculty position on various issues, which at times means adding a perspective that is otherwise lacking. You may be assured that V.P. Kern and President Bowman represent the whole university very well. As most of the board members are ISU alumni, but none are academics, so they do not understand our jobs as faculty. Since two members of the ISU Foundation Board are also ISU Trustees, this is an important venue for expressing faculty views and perspectives. I try to represent broad faculty concerns, although it is appreciated when you can provide concrete examples from your own experiences. This means it is important that your representative have scholarly credentials and be actively involved with students, and the enhancement of ISU. When one board member bemoaned faculty wasting time on esoteric research, I had to "correct that misconception" by pointing out that my own esoteric research (rain forest tree reproduction) served its primary purpose of allowing students to engage in the process of learning, and that active scholarship thus was integral to our roles as educators. President Bowman then reiterated my point and expressed his hope that Board members would help carry this message to alumni and legislators.

3. Important Issues

a. Endowment growth - The endowment is now worth nearly 50 million dollars. Twenty years ago the endowment was only 1 million dollars, and it was only 7 million when Boschini kicked off the recently completed fund-raising drive. The next phase is being planned and the goal is to double the endowment. Presently 100 million is the "magic" number that separates well-endowed public institutions from the rest. This will have a big impact on perceptions of ISU as an upwardly mobile institution.

b. Investment policies - The endowment is now big enough to allow the ISU Foundation to engage in more diverse and aggressive investments. It takes at least 25 million to buy into the Common Fund, an investment consortium for non-profit organizations. Most of the investment committee meetings, and over half of the regular board meetings have been devoted to pursuing various options and evaluating different plans. In my opinion the ISU Foundation is getting sound fiscal advice from some very dedicated board members. An LLC (limited-liability corporation) was formed that will allow ISU to move quickly and efficiently to acquire properties and other assets.

c. Long range planning - Curiously the ISU Foundation does not have a mission statement or any planning documents. Because of my prior experiences, both drafting the ISU mission statement and involvement in Educating Illinois, I was appointed to this newly formed planning committee. This is an excellent venue for faculty input. To help jump start this effort, an outside consultant was obtained, someone recommended by an organization of foundation boards, for a 2-day workshop. I have yet to experience a truly good "retreat", but this was the single most painfully awful retreat experience of my career. Bowman and Kern would concur. Thus we reached the decision that we could do as well on our own. As a result a 1-day planning meeting is schedule for 22 April.

d. Search for a new V-P. - Susan Kern's retirement in July 2005 will undoubtedly result in a search for a new V-President, and it will be important to replace her with the right type of person, a combination of personality and charisma, efficiency and confidence, a solid standing in the institution, and some evidence of commitment to the institution and its goals. I expect the search to be an important issue for the coming year. Someone will likely be appointed as acting V-P for the coming year.

e. Voting membership on the board - Technically the faculty representative is an ex officio member with no voting privileges. The other ex officio members are Kern, Bowman, an SGA representative, and a civil service representative. There are 25 voting members. I have broached the subject of making the three appointed positions voting members because as representatives to three constituencies increasingly important in fund-raising we have a vested interest in the Foundation and its decisions. We represent many small donors that cumulatively have a big impact. This is a constitutional issue and will take time, but I think the general attitude of the Board is changing.

In actual practice we are allowed to vote without any objections, even when my no vote caused a measure to fail. I told the chair I would not mind be called out of order for voting, which would allow him to declare the measure passed, but the vote was allowed to stand. So I think what is now practice will become official with time. I will make a motion that the board consider this issue when next the governing document is a topic of discussion.”

Professor Armstrong, Foundation Board Faculty Representative: I would be happy to answer any questions about the activities of the Foundation Board during this past year. I did not assemble a data pack for you, which I could do now, because I actually obtained some very good background data on a lot of different things over the past weekend. We had quite a planning retreat on Saturday.

Senator Crothers: In the last few years, when the earnings on the endowment have been so low, has there been much discussion about when it’s appropriate to erode principle?

Prof. Armstrong: It all depends on how the Foundation account is set up. If the principle is inviolate, then you can only spend earnings. If you set up an endowment account to provide a steady stream of income, then it has to be something where you agree to take a certain percentage, which is averaged over 12 quarters. When earnings go down, you do erode your principle. That is usually only accomplished if you have a real gifting program to add to the principle to bring it back. As a general rule, whatever amount you have as principle, you could spend 4% of the interest on that and the account would still grow to keep up with inflation. If you go higher, when the market goes negative, you dip into your principle. Many accounts won’t allow that because they are set up such that you can’t touch the principle.

When ISU’s endowment moved into a range of about \$30 million, we entered into the “small endowment” category. Smallest is under \$10 million; small is \$10 to \$50 million; mid-size is \$51 to \$100 million. When we broke above the \$25 to \$30 million mark, it put us in a category where we could join with a lot of other non-profit institutions in what’s called the Common Fund. That is a much better investment vehicle for Illinois State. The safety in these things is diversification and this is very diversified.

I want to note that I am not required to make this report to the caucus, but you may want to revise your rules to require this report on an annual basis to keep you informed.

NOTE: The following update was provided to the Faculty Caucus on April 29, 2005:

Date: Fri, 29 Apr 2005 15:14:30 -0500
From: "Joseph E. Armstrong" <jearmstr@ilstu.edu>
Subject: endowment question
 X-Sender: jearmstr@mail.ilstu.edu
 To: alcroth@ilstu.edu
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
 Original-recipient: rfc822;alcroth@ilstu.edu

It turns out I did have some of the information, and am able to answer one or two of the questions asked at the last faculty caucus. Please forward this for me.

Size of ISU's endowment in comparison to Illinois schools (dollars in millions):

Private: ITT - \$226, IWU - \$153, IL College - \$117

State: UI - \$1,058, SIU - \$58, ISU - \$48, EIU - \$28, WIU - \$20, SIU-E - \$9

National Median: \$71.5

Among our benchmark schools, ISU is dead last both in terms of absolute amount (and per FTE \$ in thousands):

U. South Carolina - \$330 (\$15), Clemson U. - \$265 (\$17), Miami U. - \$251 (\$12), Ohio U. - \$176 (\$6.5), Ball State - \$125 (\$6), UNC-Greensboro - \$119 (\$9), Bowling Green - \$104 (\$6), East Carolina U. - \$66 (\$3.6), SIU - \$58 (\$3), ISU - \$48 (\$2.6)

Among these benchmark schools ISU has the 5th largest number of living alumni (gift potential) (in thousands):

USC - 191, SIU - 183, OU - 150, MU - 148, ISU - 145, BSU 140, BGSU - 138, ECU - 112, CU - 92, UNC-G - 81

9.1% of ISU alumni have provided gifts to the Foundation. Clemson tops the list with 17.9% along with Miami at 14.1% (16% is the 75th percentile among tier 3 institutions; 13% is the 25th percentile of tier 2 institutions). SIU just tops us at 9.6%.

All of this information was compiled for planning purposes.

J. E. (Joe) Armstrong

Action Items:

04.15.05.05 Selection of IBHE-FAC Representative – Term 2005 – 2009

Professor Curt White was elected by acclamation to continue as ISU's IBHE-FAC Representative; his term of service is 2005 to 2009. Senator Ken Jerich was elected as the alternate.

04.21.05.03 University Review Committee Recommendations for Revisions to ASPT Five-Year/Post-Tenure Review (Faculty Affairs Committee/URC)

***Faculty Caucus Information Item 4/13/05**

Senator Crothers: Priscilla Matthews, URC, is here to talk about the changes that URC made in light of the Faculty Caucus conversation of two weeks ago regarding the post-tenure review and the clarification now of the difference between an annual post-tenure review and a cumulative post-tenure review. This is now an action item for our consideration.

Professor Matthews: Basically, the vast majority of the changes were to qualify the words "post-tenure" and "cumulative" when appropriate. Section X indicates that if the academic departments decide to require as a feature of their internal guidelines a cumulative review, the recommended cycle is three to five years. We debated whether to state five, but we wanted to leave the option for three. There were also three wording changes on page 2, paragraphs one, two and three, to more clearly express the URC's feelings about this section. Other than that, it is pretty much as was submitted two weeks ago.

Senator Riegle: The major change is making this process voluntary at the departmental level.

Professor Matthews: Voluntary, in most circumstances. A cumulative review is required regardless of the departmental requirements if insufficient merit is received two out of three years.

Senator Riegle: I would prefer that this process be, except for the case that you just mentioned, voluntary from the faculty perspective. That is, it is not the department's right to require this, but the faculty member's right to elect to undergo this. In that spirit, I would offer the following amendment, that in Section X, the sentence starting "Third, individual departments..." be struck. The affect of this amendment would be to make the process of cumulative post-tenure review, except for the case you mentioned, voluntary from the faculty's perspective.

Motion: By Senator Riegle, seconded by Senator Mohammadi, to approve the proposed amendment to strike the sentence in Section X, paragraph one, "Third, individual academic departments may require, as a feature of their internal ASPT guidelines, a cumulative review of all tenured faculty on a recommended three to five year cycle."

Senator Wang: Could you explain the advantage of striking that sentence?

Senator Riegle: If we keep that sentence, Department A could require it and Department B could not require it. Therefore, post-tenure faculty members will be treated differently depending on their department. I just don't like that. I prefer to place the power in the hands of individual faculty members if this policy is to do what it is supposed to do, which is to develop faculty.

Senator Reid: I am sympathetic, but what bothers me is that we have taken "insufficient merit" out of all of our CFSC documents. So, that doesn't exist anymore in our evaluations in the College of Arts and Sciences. So, what does insufficient merit mean?

Professor Matthews: People who are not raise eligible because they have not met the standards.

Senator Reid: Is that stated in the ASPT document?

Professor Matthews: Yes, if you are not raise eligible, it is stated. Section XII, A.2.a., 'Faculty members with unsatisfactory performance receiving an insufficient performance evaluation shall receive no incremental raise.'

Senator Reid: So, it's not called insufficient merit; it's called insufficient performance evaluation?

Professor Matthews: Is it a friendly amendment if we change the wording to make it equivalent to “not raise eligible”.

Senator Crothers: Yes, whatever the appropriate language is. My only concern is that it may vary by college. It might be better to say the “performance review equivalent of insufficient merit”.

Senator Reid: Why not use the ASPT wording?

Senator Crothers: We are now talking about another amendment and we need that to wait. I am opposed to Senator Riegler’s recommendation because I am opposed to the change. I think that all departments should require cumulative post-tenure review; I think it is valuable. I don’t think that we would do it unless we are forced to.

Senator Wang: I also believe that departments should have the right to require it. By striking that, you only give that power to post-tenure faculty members.

Senator Parette: I agree with Senator Riegler because of the amount of time and effort that we are asking faculty to commit to the process. We have dossiers that are five inches thick for annual reviews. If our department opted for this, not only would our department have those lengthy annual reviews, but they would have another document on top of that. That makes no sense to me.

Senator Reid: I would add one thing that Barbara communicated to me as chair, and the other members of the DFSC, was that this was an enormous waste of time. They had people coming up with substantial teaching records, substantial research records, and there was no question that they were doing an excellent job. Departments would have liked to limit it to those people who really have problems and needed help.

Senator Crothers: There would have been no reason for my department to compel a five-year review of me, but I had dissatisfactions and concerns with my department that would never have come up in the absence of my being forced.

Provost Presley: I think that Senator Parette makes a good point, but if you read carefully the material that begins at the bottom of page 3 and continues to the next page, this policy attempts to minimize the paperwork demands caused by a cumulative review. It in essence asks for simply the reviews of merit done in the preceding years and then a short memo that would summarize those. The reason for the sentence on page 1, Section X, that begins “Third” is that during the investigation of post-tenure review that I was asked to do by the caucus a year ago, there are departments and individuals who are happy with the policies of their departments now.

Senator Hampton: There needs to be some time element for notification built into the proposal if there is a three to five year review.

Senator Holland: I have no real objection for letting various departments set their own standards, but it seems to me if ASPT guidelines are followed, there is supposed to be a substantial review of your cumulative work. It’s not supposed to be a single-year review. When I did a five-year review, it was almost a complete waste of my time.

Vote on Amendment: A roll-call vote was conducted for the proposed amendment to strike the following sentence in Section X, paragraph one of the ASPT revisions: “Third, individual academic departments may require, as a feature of their internal ASPT guidelines, a cumulative review of all tenured faculty on a recommended three to five year cycle.”

The motion failed; the vote was 15 no, 8 yes and 1 abstention.

Friendly Amendment: By Senator Reid to change “insufficient merit” within the ASPT document to “unsatisfactory performance (receiving an insufficient performance evaluation)”.

Senator Smith: The words “receiving an insufficient performance evaluation” seem to imply that the performance evaluation itself is insufficient, rather than the result of the evaluation.

Senator Crothers: How about “unsatisfactory performance rating, as defined in the ASPT guidelines”?

The caucus accepted the revision as a friendly amendment.

Vote on ASPT Post-Tenure Review Recommendations: The caucus unanimously approved the URC recommendations for revisions to the post-tenure review process, as amended by the caucus, with the addition of minor editorial corrections.

External Committee Faculty Elections Slate (Rules Committee)

The following faculty members were elected to the External Committees of the Senate by the Faculty Caucus:

Committee/Nominee	Tenure/Tenure-Track	College
Academic Standards		
Oforiwaa Aduonum	TT	
Jeff Kahn	T	
Paul Walker	T	
Darrell Kruger	T	
Jihad Qaddour	TT	
Athletic Council		
S.J Chang	T	
Craig McLauchlan	TT	
Honors Council		
Tim Fredstrom	TT	
Jean Memken	T	
Library Committee		
Naidu Gurramkonda	T	
Gary Weilbacher	TT	
Reinstatement Committee		
Margaret Nauta	T	
Randy Winter	T	
SCERB		
Michelle Vought	T	
SCERB Grievance		
Jack Gascock	TT	

SCERB Hearing

Deb Alley	TT
Heather Gavlas	TT
Steve Goodwin	T
Jack Howard	T
Sandra Klitzing	TT
Michael Lorber	T
Richard Nagorski	T
Todd Stewart	TT
Bruce Stoffel	TT
Byron Wiegand	TT
Andy Taylor	NTT

UCC

Chad Buckley	T
Greg Ferrence	TT
Chad Kahl	TT
Marilyn Moore	T
Ken Stier	T

AFEGC Committee Elections by Ballot

The following faculty members were elected by ballot by the Faculty Caucus to the Academic Freedom Ethics and Grievance Committee. Their terms of service are 2005-2008.

Note: Professor Rankin, a nominee from the School of Art, was ineligible to serve, as he is a member of a CFSC.

Mark Temple, Health Sciences
 Richard Nagorski, Chemistry
 Khondar Karim, Physics
 Nancy Tolson, English
 Angela Bonnell, Milner
 Laurie Merriman, Theatre

Administrative Search Committee Election (Panel of Ten)

The following faculty members were elected by the acclamation of the Faculty Caucus to the Panel of Ten; their terms of service are 2005-2006.

Gerald Savage, English
 Shang-Fen Ren, Physics
 Jack McLaughlin-Gray, Theatre
 Nancy Lind, Political Science

Rick Whitacre, Agriculture
Sandy Roe, Milner
Gellert Modos, Music

Information Item:

04.08.05.02 *URC Recommendations for ASPT Calendar Revisions (Faculty Affairs Committee/University Review Committee)*

Document 1: Pages 1-3 of the Proposed URC Recommendations for Revisions to the ASPT Calendar

Senator Crothers: This ASPT document is related to the timeline changes we made last year. We are not yet dealing with page 4, but only with Document 1, pages 1-3, which simply formalizes what we agreed to last year and makes sure that the dates line up appropriately.

Professor Priscilla Matthews: Basically, when we looked at the calendar changes, we felt that there were some additional changes needed. For example, the first three changes on page 1 under the heading, "Forwarding Documentation for Promotion and Tenure Cases", arose out of a number of questions received by both the Provost's Office and myself, as Chair of URC. We felt that this clarification was needed. The last change on page 1 came out of a question concerning college standards. I realize that the philosophy is that we look at performance evaluation in a holistic sense, but equity comes out of a different pot of money, and, therefore, we felt that that change was needed.

On pages 2 and 3 are part of the changes for appeals of promotion and tenure cases. Our primary concern is that this will come out in plenty of time for those entering into entering a promotion and tenure process next November; they will know unambiguously what the process is. There were some questions about "review" versus "appeal" language. The URC feels that this refers to an appeal since it is under the appeal section. On page 3, there are a few adjustments in the timeline modifying the trial run we did this year.

Senator Crothers: Under these rules, on page 2, "Appeals of Promotion in Tenure Cases", there is no longer an opportunity to appeal after a DFSC/SFSC decision; so it is a post-CFSC appeal only. An FRC appeal would only occur after the CFSC decision and before the Provost.

Motion: By Senator Crothers, seconded by Senator Reid, to move to action Document 1 (pages 1-3) of the URC revisions to the ASPT guidelines.

Senator Holland: Before moving to an action item, I would like to talk this over with my constituents.

Senator Crothers: We either need to get it done at the next meeting, with 17 new faculty, or we need to get it done one meeting into the first semester. This timeline affects people pursuing tenure and promotion in November; we did this already this year.

Senator Holland: I still have people in my department who are concerned about where appeals can be made.

Senator Crothers: That is a reason to move it to action and then argue against it.

Vote on Motion to Move to Action: The motion to move the item to action was approved by the Faculty Caucus; Senator Holland abstained and the remainder of the caucus voted in favor of the motion.

Senator Holland: I know that it has been explained many times before; however, I still must give my a constituents opinion that not being able to have any appeal mechanism after a Provost decision is not sitting well.

Senator Hampton: Hasn't it been discussed that after that point, the appeal would come from a lawyer?

Provost Presley: Yes. I hope that your constituents understand that in some ways I find the situation as froth with difficulty as they do. By not being able to explain a decision, I really can have no affect. It puts me in a strange position that I am not very comfortable with, but it is in response to a legal opinion. That opinion leads to the conclusion that faculty governance is the place for an appeal of faculty opinions and when it gets to a certain point, a person's actual recourse is legal representation. It is the Board's lawyer who has put that opinion forward. I think that we have to be honest with candidates. I think that we are going

to have to say at a certain point, 'if you want to get the records or if you want to talk to the President or Provost, you are going to have to do it in probably an adversarial way with representation.' Some members of the FRC felt the appeals were a waste of time because they were based on speculation.

Senator Holland: The basic concern that they have is that this University, in the past, has had many decisions that were regarded as somewhat capricious and arbitrary, specifically for the reasons that you are said, 'no response was given as to why they were made'. My understanding was that when the ASPT document was revised, it was the understanding that the Provost actually could make a response.

Provost Presley: I don't know precisely why the lawyer delivered that opinion, but it may have been in regard to an appeal court's decision in Illinois that just came down. The decision was, this is in the private sector, that an officer of a corporation describing to others issues like poor performance constitutes slander.

Professor Matthews: Having been a member of the FRC when this ruling first came down and having written the letter to the URC that started this whole process, I can say that it was extremely frustrating to have to speculate as to why something was being appealed.

Vote on Document 1 (Pages 1-3 of the Proposed Recommendations for Revisions to the ASPT Calendar):

The Faculty Caucus approved Document 1 (pages 1-3) of the recommendations for revisions to the ASPT Calendar, as amended by the caucus. Senator Holland abstained; the remainder of the caucus voted in favor of the recommendations.

Document 2: Page 4 of the Proposed URC Recommendations for Revisions to the ASPT Calendar

Senator Crothers: Document 2 is actually page 4 of the proposed ASPT Calendar revisions from URC. It clarifies rules regarding the circumstances under which early tenure might be pursued.

Professor Matthews: This was the result of a concern expressed in the URC that the early tenure process be clarified in order for departments to be competitive when young, active members are being recruited and being promised hire with tenure elsewhere.

Friendly Amendment:

Senator Reid: I would like to amend the syntax of the last sentence. I would suggest that after "circumstances", you put a period. The next sentence should simply read, "When candidates are recommended for tenure before the last year of probation and when the recommendation is not accepted, the candidate may finish the probationary period and may reapply for tenure."

Senator Crothers: I would like to suggest a slight change: "When candidates are recommended for tenure before the last year of the probationary period, the candidate may finish the probationary and may reapply for tenure if the recommendation is not accepted."

The caucus accepted the amendment as a friendly amendment.

Motion: By Senator Crothers, seconded by Senator Schlenker, to move to action Document 2, page 4 of the URC recommendations for revisions to the ASPT Calendar. The caucus unanimously approved the motion to move to action.

Vote on Document 2: The Faculty Caucus approved Document 2, page 4 of the ASPT recommendations submitted by the URC, as revised by the friendly amendment.

Adjournment