

Faculty Caucus Minutes
Wednesday, April 23, 2008
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes of March 17 and April 9, 2008

Motion: By Senator McLoda, seconded by Senator Alferink, to approve the Faculty Caucus Minutes of March 17 and April 9, 2008.

Action Items:

Election of Panel of Ten Members

By ballot, the Faculty Caucus elected the following members to the Panel of Ten:

John Baur, CHEM

Amy Hurd, KNR

Mark Temple, HSC

Ken Smiciklas, AG

George Rutherford, PHY

Caroline Mallory, MCN

Ron Meier, TECH

David Malone, GEO

Sharon Naylor, Milner

Radheshyam Jayaswal, BSC

Election of Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee Members

There were two nominations for the seven vacancies on the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee, Sandra Roe, Milner Library, and Susan Kossman, Mennonite College of Nursing. Senator Holland nominated David Marx of Physics. There were no additional nominations.

Motion: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Schambach, to elect the nominees as a slate. The motion was unanimously approved. Four vacancies remain on the Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee.

Election of Senate Faculty Representative for the Campus Communication Committee (Term: 2008-10)

There were no volunteers to serve on the Campus Communications Committee. The election will be brought before the Faculty Caucus again at the May 7, 2008 meeting.

Election of Senate Faculty Representative for the Council for Teacher Education (Term: 2008-09)

There were no volunteers to serve on the Council for Teacher Education. The election will be brought before the Faculty Caucus again at the May 7, 2008 meeting.

Discussion:

Academic Impact Fund Study Report (Jan Murphy, Acting Provost) (See Senate Packets of 4/9/08 for this Report)

04.18.08.02 Academic Impact Fund Study Report: Questions Submitted by Faculty Caucus

04.23.08.01 Issues Concerning AIF (Larry Alferink, Academic Senate Member)

Senator Holland: Acting Provost Murphy is going to go over a list of questions we submitted after our last meeting. Keep in mind that this report is not meant to answer all questions. It is a progress report as to what is going on with the fund and, more importantly, what we like to see done with the Academic Impact Fund in the future.

Provost Murphy: As our chairperson said, our purpose in this review was to look at the Academic Impact Fund from a university-wide perspective. In regard to this ten-year review, please note that university budgeting systems are not set up for longitudinal studies of transactions. We hired a half-time data analysis for four months to gather this information. I can't answer some of the questions you submitted. I have tried to group the questions together, so I am not going to go through each of the 15, but I will talk about each group and then I will try to clarify or follow up if there are additional questions.

Kay Moss, Assistant Provost, who originally presented the report to the caucus, is unable to be here this evening; she at an NCATE conference. The purpose of the study was to compare ten years of AIF transactions against data from Planning and Institutional Research, data about the FTE of faculty, of tenure-track, tenure and non-tenure track faculty and students. These are two systems that don't always talk to each other very well.

Planning and Institutional Research holds our IPEDS data, which is what we officially report to the Department of Education and to the IBHE about our FTE. If you ever look at the Fact Book, much of that is IPEDS data. They matched that up with the AIF processes.

Some of the questions I received dealt with ‘what was the AIF set up to do?’ ‘Was it just set up to cover sick leave?’ There are several benefits to the AIF based on what it was originally set up to do. One of the things we know is that 12 to 15 ago, we had a real problem with starting salaries of our faculty. At that time, when a faculty member resigned or left their tenure or tenure-track position, that money was left in that line. All a chair could do was to try to hire somebody for what was left in that line and we know that the starting salaries of our assistant professors were very far below our comparators.

One of the purposes of the AIF was to develop a way to pool money so that we could make better hires at the assistant professor level. That has worked well and currently we are hiring in at about 105% of our comparators, based on CUPA data. We sometimes worry about whether CUPA is the best comparator, but, nationally, that is what we tend to use. So I think that has gone well.

In other words, when a faculty member, who is in a tenure line, resigns or retires, that line stays in the department. The funds all come back centrally and then we put \$29,000 back into that line. We call that Instructional Capacity. When a search occurs, we are able to put money back into the line for the hire at whatever level we need to use to recruit.

It has helped with unused sick leave and that’s huge. For those of you who have ever dealt with unused sick leave, you know that for a department chair, that is significant. Our faculty are sometimes retiring with anywhere from \$20,000 to \$40,000 in unused sick leave and vacation. Sometimes that is as much as an entire operating budget of a department, so that is a significant benefit.

The AIF also helps us when we have faculty who receive firm counter offers and they are faculty that we desperately want to keep at Illinois State University. It does not always work, because faculty don’t always leave for salary reasons, but when we can, we try to keep them. Another very appropriate use of the fund is the funding of new Distinguished Professors.

The review indicated that we probably need to start to have some flexibility in the guidelines as we start to look at the number of tenure track faculty. We talked a bit two weeks ago about the ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure track. I think my bigger concern is just increasing the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty. We can look at ratios in departments or in colleges, but, as a whole, I would like to say that our goal is to increase the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty on our campus.

There were a couple of questions about whether we have reallocated or have we not

reallocated. Again, think about what happens. A faculty member resigns or retires from a position. That position is held in the department. Let's say that faculty member made \$78,000 a year. That \$78,000 comes back into the Academic Impact Fund and we, as a university, then put \$29,000 back into that vacated line. What we don't do well is ever phase out those lines, so a line could stay open for seven or eight years and we are still putting \$29,000 into every one of those lines.

Have we created new faculty positions? Yes, we have created 78 new tenure/tenure-track faculty positions throughout the campus over this last ten years. You can kind of think of it as reallocation, somewhat. We have just never phased out the \$29,000 that keeps going to those lines. Some of those lines remain open for two or three years and we desperately want to fill them. That is why I say that we need more tenure/tenure-track hires. Some of those lines have been open for seven or eight years because disciplines have changed or it is not a priority. One of the things I would like to say, though, is that using AIF for those \$29,000 gets intermingled with issues we have with operating funds.

I don't think we can separate out the concerns we have about our operating funds in our departments from what we are using AIF funds for. That's one of the confounding factors. I think another confounding factor is General Education: trying to understand the true cost of General Education and fully funding it. That impacts what we are doing with tenure/tenure-track hires. We are using the money from the AIF in those vacant lines to hire non-tenure track faculty.

I would recommend to Dr. Everts that we take a really hard look at operating budgets as we go into the next fiscal year and that we get a much better handle on the cost of and the funding for General Education. For me, we need to get a handle on those things and worry less now about trying to delve into the last ten years to find out what we have done in each and every department in terms of hiring tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. So that's just an editorial comment.

Is the AIF broken? I don't think that we can say that it's broken. We have increased graduation rates. We have increased retention rates. We have increased the quality of our programs and of our students incredibly over the last decade. There are lots of measures that tell us that things are going well. I would say that it is important that we take the information from this study and the questions, concerns and suggestions from groups such as the Faculty Caucus, the University Chairpersons Council, the Deans Council, and think about how we will spend personnel dollars in the future.

There are AIF guidelines and they really help us ensure that we are using consistent guidelines to make personnel and funding decisions. There is really no AIF policy, but we are trying to better track how those funds are used. One of the nicest things that will come out of this study is that, in the past, we have given an annual accounting to the Administrative

Affairs and Budget Committee that is a one-year picture. This study will now allow us to give an ongoing, rolling ten-year view of the AIF, which I think will make for a better discussion with that committee.

Some of the questions dealt with AIF balances year by year. There was the one-page *Data Dashboard* (in Senate packets of 4/9/08). If you look down at the numbers where it says, "Use of Funds", that tells you what we are spending AIF money on year by year. There is no one-single snapshot date. The number that we don't know until June 30th of a fiscal year is the amount of sick leave payout, because we don't require notice for retirements.

If you look at the second column from the end, that should say, "FY07", not "Fall of 07" That tells you that in FY07, we spent \$1.6 million replacing tenure/tenure-track faculty. We spent \$340,000 on new tenure/tenure-track faculty lines. We spent nothing on new non-tenure track lines. We spent \$483,000 on the payout of unused sick leave. That number is going to go up to almost one million dollars this fiscal year. We spent \$16,000 on counter offers. We spent \$38,000 for supplements to department-funded tenure-track hires. That means that if a person who leaves is a non-reappointed or a non-tenure track faculty member, we just leave the whole salary there and then add more if we need to increase the amount in the line to make a good rehire.

It's an odd way of saying it, but we say "department-funded", which just means that there was a non-reappointment or a non-tenure track replacement. 'Chair hires' are kind of an odd group, but that number represents supplements to chair lines for hires. We spent \$3.2 million in \$29,000 increments for vacant tenure/tenure-track lines. So that's the snapshot if you want to know each year how AIF funds were spent.

Are there other ways we use AIF? No, AIF money is personnel dollars. The one exception was for the huge rescission that we experienced in FY03 in which we used AIF funds to return \$500,000 to the State of Illinois.

Some of the questions asked, 'Can we know college by college and department by department, the allocations and the transactions that occurred in and out of the AIF for any single department?' Could we do that? Yes, but it would take a long time. Again, thinking of how much time it took us to look at the AIF as a whole, trying to delve department by department or college by college would take a significant amount of time because the budget systems do not follow longitudinally. Most departments have shadow systems that they use for their budgets because of the way in which they manage their transactions. I will give these recommendations to Dr. Everts and we will weigh that against some of the other kinds of things we need to also do, which is, again, looking at General Education and operating budgets, but I will make sure that she is aware of the suggestions for that detailed data.

There were questions about the tenure-track to non-tenure track ratio. It is an important

concern raised by a number of individuals in the questions submitted. For me, the bigger issue is that there was a decline in the number tenure-track lines during that ten-year period and it is lower than the mean. That is the concern that I have.

During that decline, we hired more non-tenure track out of the Instructional Capacity. In other words, we were not replacing vacant tenure/tenure-track lines at the level they were retiring or resigning. We were using that \$29,000 to hire our non-tenure track colleagues to teach and for all of the things that we know our non-tenure track colleagues do.

It is not an isolated issue at Illinois State University. AAUP data shows us that that is a national trend. Does that make it right or wrong? It makes us pretty consistent, though our percentage of full-time faculty who are tenure/tenure-track is a couple of percentage points below the national average. Seventy-two percent of our full-time faculty are tenure/tenure-track; the national average for universities like ours is 74%.

One of the things we talked about was, ‘why do the study?’, ‘what was the purpose of spending the money on this study?’ and ‘what is it going to tell us?’ What I believe it tells us is that we need to make more data-driven decisions about the allocation of personnel dollars into tenure/tenure-track lines. We need to do it based on things like student need, student demand, quality of programs, new programs and innovative ideas or innovative discipline areas that need to grow. I think that this is showing us that we have an issue concerning tenure/tenure track faculty numbers. I would like to see us be able to replace some of those vacant tenure/tenure-track lines in a way that more appropriately helps us to do the things that we need to do as a university.

The questions about the number of tenure-track lines relates back to the previous question. The AIF funds a portion of the non-tenure faculty hired on this campus—a portion of it. We have non-tenure track faculty who are hired into non-tenure track faculty lines. We have non-tenure track faculty paid for by tenure/tenure-track lines or AP lines that have money left over, which is what we call variance dollars. Also, we have many research grants and contracts that provide salaries to buy reassignment for our tenured faculty and we use that to hire non-tenure track faculty. So there are a number of ways in which we hire and pay for non-tenure track faculty. This AIF Instruction Capacity, those \$29,000 allocations into the vacant lines, is only a portion of it.

The Instructional Capacity, that \$29,000 into each vacant tenure/tenure-track line, accounts for 42% of the non-tenure track funds on this campus. That’s why I don’t want to be quite so concerned about the ratio of tenure/tenure-track to non-tenure track on campus as a whole, because grants and contracts are a good thing and we want to increase the numbers of grants and contracts that our faculty are able to receive. That will cause us to allow them to buyout some of their time and hire non-tenure track faculty. Again, I think we need to focus on the number of tenure-tracks and be able to make quicker decisions about replacing those

tenure/tenure-track faculty who resign.

There were a couple of questions about the rescission of lines. In FY03, the AIF was used to cover a \$500,000 rescission that the State of Illinois requested from us. We used the AIF for that because the departments and colleges could not afford the amount of the rescission. We allowed colleges, over a three-year period, to decide how best to pay into that \$500,000 rescission that the Division of Academic Affairs paid.

Some colleges very quickly gave up some lines. Those were the rescissionary cuts to the tenure/tenure-track lines that occurred. Other colleges had much healthy balances in other kinds of things. They had operating dollars, non-tenure track pools of funds or summer school dollars that they used to pay for the rescission.

One of the questions was, 'Will you give back those 21 lines that were rescissionarily cut in FY03?' No, what I would rather say is that, as new allocations of funds come to Academic Affairs, we will use the normal budget planning process to decide where we can rehire tenure/tenure-track faculty. Some of those lines were given up because we just didn't need them anymore in those discipline areas. So instead of just adding back a line, we need to make thoughtful decisions about that.

We had a glitch in the web link, so if you were looking for the AIF report online, the address was off. We fixed that so that the web link works. The guidelines have not significantly changed over the last ten years because we really had not done a thorough, long-term study of those guidelines.

A couple of the things that were in the very early guidelines was, one, there was a three-semester time limit on Instructional Capacity dollars into vacant lines. As far as we can tell, that three-semester rule was never followed. We have just kept putting the \$29,000 into those vacant lines. That caused some of the problems that we have now. On the other hand, if you happen to be a chair, we know that you are planning your budget based on those funds.

One of the things that we have promised chairs we would not do is suddenly decide that we are going to use that three-semester limit. Chairs really do plan two to four years ahead in terms of budgets, so we can't just say, 'you have five vacant lines, so two years from now, you are going to get \$150,000 less in personnel dollars because you should not have been getting those funds.' We can't do that to departments.

The other thing in the original guidelines is that we allowed departments to opt for equipment start-up funding instead of Instruction Capacity dollars. We can't find evidence that we ever switched those personnel dollars into equipment, but that doesn't mean that it didn't happen once it got to the department. Once dollars and budgets go out to departments, chairs do have some flexibility in trading monies, such as trading personnel for equipment when it is needed,

trading equipment for travel, etc. So it could be that we sent that out and they did that in the department, but we don't have a record of it.

Some of the questions dealt with the Instruction Capacity dollars and the relationship to seats for majors. I think that that is kind of the vision of where we want to go. We want to start to think about linking allocations of AIF funding for new or replacement positions, and even Instructional Capacity, to more data, to more evidence about the quality of degree programs. Program review is incredible evidence of the quality of programs. It tells us a lot about programs and where they are going.

Our goal is to link the allocation of AIF funding, including for non-tenure track faculty, to evidence about the quality of programs, credit-hour growth, cost of production, need for new programs, student demands, and the costs of service for General Education courses. It is always going to be a judgment call, but we are going to have to make those calls based on better evidence and better data from colleges, departments and disciplines.

Another of the questions was why don't we allow immediate replacements. Why is there a one-year waiting period? Kay and I are trying to be more flexible about that this year. For example, we have an incredible search going. We get five candidates. We bring them on campus. The top two candidates are amazing and they would add, for example, to the diversity of a department. We know that the department has a second search sited for the next year, so we allow two hires out of that same pool, instead of one hire this year and running another whole search next year.

We have tried to be more flexible, but I am going to suggest to you that a faculty resignation or retirement should require a department, and I mean the faculty in the department, to do a healthy review of their curriculum, of their degree programs, of their strategic plan, because we don't always need to hire that same person right back in and you don't always know that right away.

There are going to be instances where we have an unexpected resignation in a healthy program that we know needs that person immediately. That is a different situation and we need to be more responsive to that than we have in the past, but I am always going to encourage a department to take a year to take look at the position.

I have been in the Provost's Office eight years. When we have a resignation or retirement, we reorganize everybody's job. You have different expertise. The needs of the campus have changed, so we need to hire someone in with a different mix. You don't just hire in exactly the same person you lost. I am going to suggest that that is a good thing for a department to do in terms of their curriculum and in terms of the faculty, but, again, I think we do have to be more flexible with that.

Senator Alferink: I am going to respectfully disagree with that because before AIF was in

place, we would conduct a search because we knew a retirement was coming up. There were a number of cases in which we changed the job description, but there is nothing special about waiting a year to do that. The real issue is doing the planning and deciding the nature of the need that you have. Having a year to do it doesn't make that any more or less likely for that to happen.

Provost Murphy: I don't think that we are disagreeing. I think that that is a healthy thing to do, so I am going to agree with you on that. That is why I say that I think that we have to be a little more flexible with that.

Senator Alferink: In a year, we will probably have a number of resignations and retirements for which there are no sick leave payouts. Since the sick leave was such a huge driving part of this, wouldn't it be reasonable to revisit this policy to address the issue of the phase out of the sick leave payouts. Maybe there are other reasons to have AIF, but that reason is going to disappear. That may suggest the possibility for flexibility in some other areas.

Provost Murphy: The one thing I will tell you is that I believe that we have just hit the start of the big, sick-leave bubble. So I think that that will continue for five or six years, but, again, I will agree with you about the flexibility. We tried to do that on several occasions this year when there were real opportunities to do that. Sometimes, there are spousal hires that allow us to hire another individual quickly. So, yes, I would agree with you.

Senator Stewart: Is there some way of getting confirmation that you don't have to wait a year. Since there may be two dozen institutions in this country that have Ph.D. programs in our discipline, when we do a search, we get maybe ten candidates. Finding a bridge person to fill the spot for our retirees can be very difficult and we have waiting lists for students to come into our program, so we know that we want a replacement right away.

Provost Murphy: First of all, yes, but also remember that we are competing for a finite number of resources. So I also don't want to pretend that the budget is so healthy that next year we are going to hire for everyone that resigns. So I would say, Senator Stewart, yes, to your question, within the constraints we have, if you are approved to make that search. Again, I guess I like the idea of doing some planning and thinking that through.

Senator Campbell: Is the \$29,000 given to the college?

Provost Murphy: It is given for the line, but it goes through the college.

Senator Campbell: Is the college obliged to use all of that \$29,000 on instruction?

Provost Murphy: No, they are not and there are instances where that is not occurring. I want to be careful about that because, as I said when I was talking to the chairs, 'One of the things I

want to say is that sometimes we are not always using the AIF appropriately.' Now I am not implying that that is an inappropriate use of university resources, because we are having problems with operating budgets. Is it inappropriate to use AIF funds to fund faculty travel? I don't think that that is an inappropriate use because we don't have healthy operating budgets in all of our departments, but what that is driving is some of what you are seeing with the AIF funding and where that \$29,000 is going.

What we have had to do in some departments is build our budget planning based on getting that \$29,000 for every line. So, again, that is the other reason that we can't come in tomorrow and say that we are going to evoke the three-semester rule because that just isn't fair to departments. They have planned budgets based on their \$29,000 in vacant lines and we need to be very careful about making any significant change quickly.

Senator Wang: I agree with you that many departments use AIF funds as variance money and many of those are Instruction-Capacity-related activities. So they may not directly spend it on Instructional Capacity, but they are appropriately used for activities related to that. Does the money for resignations or non-renewals stay in the department?

Provost Murphy: Non-renewal? For a non-reappointment, the money stays in that line in the department. If it costs more to hire a new faculty, we will add money to that line. If it costs less to replace that faculty, we will take that extra back.

Senator Wang: What about a leave of absence?

Provost Murphy: They stay in their line; that is not a vacated line. They keep their faculty position.

Senator Ellerton: I was going to add to the comments that were, effectively, saying that it can be more disruptive not to have a smooth transition. One of the things that should be avoided is the automatic sense of the loss of a position, or the potential loss of a position, and the need to defend to it. It can be healthy to conduct a review of curriculum and of the department's needs, but it can be very destructive to have to fight for that position. That is certainly not happening at the moment, but it could happen and that, to me, would be a concern. I would hate to see it move in that direction.

Provost Murphy: I don't know that I ever see us at a point where we don't have to justify or provide a rationale for requesting a position. Whether it's an immediate replacement or we have that one-year period, I still think that we expect departments to build a solid rationale for replacing a faculty member who has resigned. I do think the rationale is important, but I am going to agree that sometimes some flexibility is necessary.

Senator Kalter: I do believe that that is already happening. In my department, I believe that

we have about seven lines that have been vacated and that have not been filled. Part of that is because of the compression and inversion and some of the other things that have been happening, but it really is difficult on department morale, particularly in a large department, wherein every part of the department feels that it must defend what it is doing when we all actually have very strong needs.

I also wanted to say something about the complexity of the ratios that we are dealing with. Because we run a fairly complex graduate program, doctoral students, master students, a couple of different certificates, we also contribute a lot to the General Education Program. So one of the things I would like to see us thinking about is not just admissions to majors and that kind of ratio, but to look at student demand in a complex way. 'How many tenure-track faculty are needed to run a doctoral program, in what areas and what does that equate to when it comes to the ratios of majors? What do all of these things mean?'

Provost Murphy: I think that I mentioned that we have some programs that are more expensive programs. A Ph.D. is a more expensive program than a bachelor degree program.

Senator Kalter: My main point, though, was that I do think that right now in our department we are feeling a sense of having to defend each and every position in terms of what we do, even though we have increases in the number of majors and other increasing demands on our resources.

Senator Alferink: As a former chair, I know how useful it is to know that pots of money exist around the university, especially if you can uniquely find them and gain access to them. I also understand the problems that are created when there is this big pot of money out there that people can find uses for, because it can quickly devolve into a situation where those funds are not used in any strategic way, where they are dealing with priorities.

One of the things that struck many of us by surprise at the last meeting was that one of the priorities might not have been filling tenure-track lines. When budget problems arise, it is certainly useful to have those funds, but what is the priority. Covering travel? We certainly need more travel money. Or is it filling tenure-track lines? Has that kind of strategic, priority-setting process occurred when you have a pot of money sitting out there that people can access for a variety of reasons?

Provost Murphy: First of all, I don't think of the AIF as a pot of money. It is personnel dollars that are contracted dollars. You look at that \$5.7 million, but at no point in time is there \$5.7 million sitting anywhere. They are really contracts. It is how you allocate out contracts into those lines. Remember, of that \$5.7 million, \$3.6 million automatically goes back in those rollover budgets out to those departments that have those vacant lines.

Senator Alferink: They don't, necessarily. You have just said that they don't necessarily go

out to the department lines; they go to the colleges.

Provost Murphy: Yes, to the colleges, but they flow throughout. You said that there is this big pot of money and I don't think of it as a big pot of money. The closest we come is we set a bit aside to try to second guess sick leave buyouts; otherwise, most of that money leaves the minute our fiscal year budget is set. It will be out in the units and flowing into the departments. This year, for example, we underestimated the sick leave buyouts. We set aside \$700,000, but it is probably going to be closer to \$1 million. So we will pull \$300,000 out of, perhaps, enhancement grants. Perhaps fewer enhancement grants will go out or we will beg and borrow from the President, who will find \$300,000 for that.

I can't answer the second part of that, though, about how we have followed the priorities. I would say that one of the biggest priorities on this campus has been faculty salaries. That has been a bigger priority than operating budgets. Is that right or wrong? I kind of think it is right. Again, I think the strength of the university is the strength of the faculty we can recruit and retain. Faculty salaries have been a priority and we have heard that pretty clearly from the Senate.

One of the documents that I am most excited about, which we have before us for approval this evening, is the Priorities Report. I think those priorities and holding us accountable to report back in November is a pretty clear message of what the Senate thinks are the priorities for this campus. That is where we try to be accountable. It is helping our incoming provost to understand that, where we have the opportunity, those are the priorities that we need to meet.

I can't answer the question about whether how we spent the money in the last ten years prioritized faculty or not. I think that it is so much more complex than that.

Senator Kalter: I wanted to make one more point about a point you made earlier about the ratio. While I, ideally, agree that it is not as important what the ratio is as is whether we increase tenure-track lines, I think that, practically speaking, financially speaking, we have to look at that ratio. One way of thinking is that it is cheaper to have, for example, a non-tenure track person who can teach a 4:4 load in my department versus a tenure-track person who can teach a 2:3 load. However, there is a lot that is lost when you have a ratio like that.

Of course, given our tight budgets, the money has to come from somewhere, but some of the things that are lost are, for example, the research capacity. Particularly, one of the things that I see being lost is our service capacity. The tenure-track faculty in our department have increasing service demands with fewer bodies to fill those demands. I think we see that sometimes on the Senate even, when people don't volunteer for university service.

I do think that there are other reasons why we need to look at that ratio. It depends on the department, but I can personally say that the faculty in the English Department don't find it

desirable for someone to get a Ph.D. in English and spend their life at about half the salary that I spend my life at.

So, we should not, I think, ethically, as a university, be hiring more and more non-tenure track faculty, at least in the English Department. I won't speak for anyone else because I know that there are very different non-tenure track faculty. It is getting a certain kind of labor for half the price and for a lesser standard of living. I don't see it as healthy to have a department in which you have that kind of split and an increasingly large number of non-tenure-track faculty to tenure-track faculty, in some departments, who feel, for whatever reasons, legitimate or perceptual, as though they are disenfranchised from the actual workings of the university.

Senator Holland: I believe I mentioned before that if the AIF continues along the same lines that it has been, if every single time a person leaves the university, we dump \$29,000 ad infinitum, the end game is that every single dollar in the AIF goes to pay NTTs. So somehow, there has to be a sunset provision somewhere. Obviously, you can't do it overnight. Do you have ideas as to what is going to happen?

Provost Murphy: What we are hoping to present to Dr. Everts is a recommendation that that we begin to follow that provision in the AIF, but to do that in a fairly careful, three to five-year plan, working with departments and department chairs. That is not something that we think we can do in FY09 certainly. That was the first thing I said to chairs. Probably not in FY10, but starting to say in FY11, that we are starting to try to determine where we can pull some of those positions that have been unfunded for many years. Again, the other piece of that is to see if we can make an impact on operating budgets in the meantime. I think that has to come. That is going to be my recommendation to Dr. Everts. We really have to enforce that sunset clause in those vacant positions, but we have to do it fairly carefully.

Senator Holland: As far as further review of the AIF, are you envisioning a committee structure to look at this?

Provost Murphy: We hadn't really thought of that. Our original plan did not call for more study of the AIF. The thing I am struggling with is that so many of the questions that you ask would require further analysis at the department level. We have to weigh that with the sheer cost. The study that you see is about a \$35,000 study. To me, I think of how many sections of a General Education course that would fund. So I think that we want to be fairly careful of that.

Again, that seems like that would be an easier thing than not. There is a lot of data that is available through Planning and Institutional Research. We know what has happened to tenure-track FTE versus non-tenure track during the past ten years. That data is pretty easy to look at and you can look at that pretty easily longitudinally. It is just matching that up with

transactions in and out of departments that would take a significant amount of time.

I am not sure, Senator Holland, that I have an answer for you, mainly because we thought we had done the study. The next thing that we were really hoping to do was work with Planning and Institutional Research and have Kevin, who is the data analyst who helped us with this, start to develop a template of a system for departments that all departments could use that would interact a little better with the main budget system. We have 35 departments and 35 different kind of systems; some use Excel and some use other spread sheets. We want to just to have a way to more consistently help departments manage their budgets. That is where we were going with this, but I will certainly take your comments into consideration.

Senator Holland: I am not so interested in during further studies. I am thinking more along the lines of ‘where to next?’ We have this; it has given us at least a baseline idea of what has happened, but what do we want to do with the AIF? Do we want to keep it as it is? Do we want to shift priorities?

Senator Crowley: It sounds like there is some need for more accountability. People were surprised about how the AIF is used. The other part of it is policy. Perhaps we should have some kind of policy guidelines for prioritizing and about what is held truly as untouchable.

Senator Alferink: It sounds to me like you are kind of envisioning a kind of evolving of the AIF rather than necessarily a reworking and so my question re-arises, because the original AIF was endorsed by the Senate. Are you expecting changes that are great enough that it would be reasonable to come back to the Senate? This follows up on Senator Holland’s question about a working group for where we go next.

Provost Murphy: In the original guidelines, the only thing that I think we looked at that we think maybe, as an institution, we should have done was to enforce the sunset clause, but that is already in that original set of guidelines. For us, that is the biggest piece that has caused probably this shift that we have seen. It is just not moving funds out of those long, vacated positions into more tenure/tenure-track hires. That is in the guidelines, but I would be happy to sit down with a group.

The guidelines were vetted through the Senate the first time. Maybe that is a starting point next fall to just sit down and walk through those guidelines. In terms of priorities, personnel are one set of priorities. We have other priorities at the university. Again, we want to be very careful. I don’t believe that personnel funds on this campus, particularly in Academic Affairs, are being misused.

We have tried to be very careful about the language we have used because you can sit in front of a group of 35 department chairs and 35 of them are trying to do the best job they can with the resources that they have. We are not misusing university funds; we are just not.

Senator Alferink: That is not what I was saying.

Provost Murphy: And Senator Alferink, I didn't think that you were. So if you ask if there is something that I would change, I really would think about how we can start to move out of those vacated lines and hire more tenure/tenure-track. It is not going to be replacing every single faculty member who retires. It is not even going to be saying yes to every request we get.

We are never going to be at a point where we can say yes to every request we get for a tenure/tenure-track line, but it always comes back to that big picture look. The big picture, for me, it is that the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty has gone down. If I could pick one thing out of study that has raised the biggest flag, it would be that. We are 30 FTE tenure/tenure-track below the tenure mean right now.

Adjournment

Motion: By Senator McLoda, seconded by Senator Holland, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.