

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 10-22-1997

Senate Meeting, October 22, 1997

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, October 22, 1997" (1997). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 623.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/623>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
TIME: 7 P.M., Wednesday, October 22, 1997
PLACE: Circus Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of October 8, 1997

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Provost: Summative Report on Academic Impact Fund for Fiscal Year 1997

Special Topic: Foundation Funding
Guest: Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Judy Riggs

Action Items:

1. Appointments to Committees
2. 11.20.96.03 CFA Council By-laws - (Rules)
3. 10.15.97.03 Academic Planning Committee Membership - (Rules)
4. Election of Faculty Representative to IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee - (Rules)
5. 09.08.97.02 Disestablishment of BA Degree Designations in COE Programs - (Academic Affairs)
6. 04.11.97.03 Approval of Minor in Tourism - (Academic Affairs & Budget)

Information Items:

1. 09.24.97.02 Presentation of Minor in Art History (Academic Affairs)
2. Ad hoc Committee on Shared Governance
3. Revisions to the Illinois State University Constitution - (Rules)

Communications

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meeting participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(approved)

October 22, 1997

Volume XXIX, No. 4

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairperson, Paul Borg.

Jean-Marie Berard Taylor was seated and welcomed to her first Senate meeting.

Roll Call

Secretary Joel Brooks called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

XXIX-32 Motion by Senator Varner (seconded by VanVooren) to approve minutes of October 8, 1997. The motion was carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Paul Borg reminded everyone to let the Secretary know if they leave before adjournment of the Senate.

There is a mistake in the agenda tonight. The comments that the Provost is making should be under Administrator's Remarks.

Vice President Judy Riggs from Institutional Advancement is a guest speaker tonight. She will respond to questions that address matters in her presentation.

The Board of Trustees is meeting on Friday, October 24. Between 8:00 - 9:00 a.m. There will be an opportunity to speak with the Board members. First will be a presentation about the Foundations of Inquiry Course, followed by informal discussion. The second draft of changes to the Constitution is on the agenda for their formal meeting. Campus Communication Committee met last Friday. They received information on a number of items.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson, Joe Jannazzo had no report.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Jason Barickman said we are ahead of schedule with the Student Fee Process. Our quest for a Student Trustee vote in Illinois is continuing, but has had some road blocks along the way. There have been some in the last 24 hours.

With respect to the Accuracy and Crime Report Act mentioned at the last Senate meeting, we met with Rick Olshak, Director of Student Judicial Office. We are looking at bringing a teleconference to ISU to look into the effects of this legislation. The conference will be held Nov. 14.

The Student Government Meeting last night had a proposed constitutional amendment to eliminate the student leader salaries from the activity fee.

Questions:

Senator Clark asked what sort of salaries they earn? *Reply* - Senator Barickman said anywhere from full-tuition fees and reimbursed to half-tuition and fees reimbursed, to certain students.

President Strand asked for a timeline at which this might move to give opinions. *Reply* - Senator Barickman said it will be an action item at the November 4 meeting. I do not see any recommendations being made at the next meeting.

Senator Bender asked which salaries must be eliminated. *Reply* - Senator Barickman said formally the President and Vice President of Black Student Union, President, and Vice President of Graduate Student Advisory Group, and President of the Association Latin American Students. Informally because of constitutional problems, the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and President and Vice President of Pride (Gay and Lesbian Association).

Administrator's Remarks

President Strand shared observations on several topics:

- University of Illinois at Springfield is making serious overtures to add a lower division program to offerings. They are talking about a Capital Scholars Program that would have 550 students at its peak in lower division work. This would make the University of Illinois Springfield a comprehensive university, much like other comprehensive universities in Illinois.

I wrote to the Board of Higher Education last December expressing concern about this proposal and also spoke about and expressed similar concerns at the October meeting of Board of Higher Education held earlier this month. The nature of my concerns related to three primary topics:

1. At a time when Priorities, Quality, Productivity Exercise (PQP) is still observed across the universities in Illinois. To what extent does this initiative fit in with the goals of PQP?
2. Capacity of Higher Education in Illinois. There are some institutions unlike ISU, which have had a tremendous decline in undergraduate enrollment. To what extent is this proposal consistent with the capacity of higher education in the public university sector?
3. Funding priorities of the State. In addition to reallocation of funds within the University of Illinois, there is also a request for \$250,000 in new State Funds for this initiative.

I concluded remarks before the Board of Higher Education in October by observing that this is a reverse PQP exercise, where the campuses are watching the Board of Higher Education as it wrestles with the type of question we have dealt with on our campuses since 1991.

Lieutenant Governor, Bob Kustra, who chairs the IBHE has expressed support for this proposal. He will bring this matter to a vote at the November meeting of Board of Higher Education. Other member of IBHE have requested and had a motion passed asking that this matter be studied further, and a recommendation and come back as an outgrowth of that study at the January meeting of IBHE.

- I repeat the invitation made earlier to attend the Board of Trustees Meeting to be held on Friday, October 24, 1997. From 8:00 - 9:00 a.m. the Board members will be available in the Founder's Suite. The public meeting will be from 9:00 - 10:30 a.m. From 12:30 - 3:00 p.m. the Board members will have Campus Experiences, hosted by the five Colleges and Milner Library. The Board members are trying to make themselves more available and more visible within the University community.

With regard to the Board of Trustees (BOT) Constituent Survey, this is a new process that has never done by the Board of Regents (predecessor to the Board of Trustees). The BOT will use the results as part of their self appraisal. There were 3 questions relating to the Constituent Survey that were asked by Senator Reid:

1. How many copies of the survey were sent out? 54 were sent out
2. How many were sent to each group listed on the survey? Faculty -10, Staff, A/P - 8, Civil Service - 8, Students - 8, Administrators - 7, Off campus - 13.
3. What criteria were used to decide who within each group would participate in the survey? The survey was sent to a small sample of various types of groups that have worked with or had contact with the Board.

There will be a report to the Board of Trustees on Sabbaticals as part of the October meeting agenda on Oct. 24. The policy in place at the University is the same one that was utilized by the Board of Regents. I am very supportive of the concept and the practice of having sabbatical programs, but there are some elected officials who do not share this perspective on sabbaticals. As part of the appropriation process last Spring the language which I will share with you was also stated during the appropriation hearing. Senator Borg heard these types of comments. First a quotation from Senator Stephen Raushenberger, who chairs the Appropriations Committee that deals with budgets for Higher Education. I quote Senator Raushenberger, "*The current sabbatical practices at our universities and colleges need to come to an end. It is costing taxpayers millions of dollars a year. It is one thing to take a sabbatical for valid research work, but universities need to practice discretion.*" A quote from State Representative, Ron Stephens, "*I will tell you there are a lot of people who would be willing to work at a University and do nothing. There are plenty of people to fill those positions that are highly qualified, will work without sabbaticals.*" I share this as an example of points of view of people in powerful positions, who influence the budget or other aspects of our university operation. We continually try to discuss the difference of views.

- My final comment is to the revision of the University Constitution. I express appreciation to Senators Borg, Cook, and Jannazzo for working as a sub-committee with Dr. Kern and me and a number of revisions shared with you and are reflected in a copy of the Constitution, which is part of the Board packet for the Friday meeting. This will be an

information item at the Friday, October 14 BOT Meeting. It will be an action item at the February meeting. Dr. Susan Kern and Trustee Nancy Froelich will be available to the Rules Committee to discuss the Constitution.

Provost Urice said:

Tonight I am using prepared text because my remarks will be atypically lengthy. There are a number of topics about which the Academic Senate should be updated or informed.

1. Meetings with IBHE Staff. Last Friday, Alan Dillingham and I met with key academic staff at the Board of Higher Education for one of our periodic meetings. You may recall from previous reports to this body that every six months or so we request these sessions to ensure that Illinois State remains in a leadership position with regard to statewide undergraduate education and other matters. A few weeks ago, Dr. Chapman, Dean Pancrazio, and I had a similar meeting with the same people on the statewide plan for education that Illinois State University submitted. These regular meetings and other opportunities for mutual understanding provide an excellent forum for the University's academic agenda to move forward and likely have had a favorable influence on recent budget decisions.
2. Faculty Searches. Last week, the University's full-page display advertisement for 80 faculty positions appeared in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Many faculty have commented that they believe this advertising sends a strong, positive message nationally about the academic vitality and excellence of Illinois State University. It is my understanding from anecdotal information that responses to this ad, postings on the Internet, and other notifications have begun to yield strong pools of candidates. It is an extremely exciting year for faculty recruitment, but we all recognize there is a great deal of work required to recruit the very best candidates.
3. Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies. The search committee, chaired by a Panel of Ten member, is working diligently on this important search. The applications and nominations continue to arrive regularly, and by the time the formal review begins on October 27, we trust we will have a talented and diverse pool of applicants. The committee fully understands the need for broad campus involvement in this recruitment and screening process, and they hope to have on-campus interviews before the end of the semester. The Academic Senate and the campus will be notified well in advance of any interviews or of any changes in the search schedule.
4. Major Presentations. As announced at the last Senate meeting and in a recent issue of the *ISU Report*, Dr. Ana Guzman, who chaired President Clinton's Commission on Hispanic Education, will be on campus as my guest next Tuesday and will make a presentation in the Circus Room at 7:00 PM next Tuesday night.

Also, I wish to remind the Academic Senate that on Thursday, November 6, at 7:00 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center, Dr. Lucia Getsi will deliver her Distinguished Professor Lecture, "Chasing the Still Unravished Bride Why We Need Art." I again encourage your attendance at both of these events.

5. Scholarship Awards Ceremony. I hope you can attend the 1997-98 Scholarship Awards Ceremony at 2:00 p.m. this Sunday, October 26, in the Ballroom of the Bone Student Center. This year's ceremony will recognize more than 100 students for their exemplary academic achievements. The honorees were selected on a University-wide basis for a variety of Illinois State University scholarships.
6. Foundations of Inquiry Course. I am pleased to announce that over a hundred faculty—including several deans and a provost—have volunteered to teach Foundations of Inquiry as we bring the new General Education program on line for the freshmen who will become part of our community next year. Each faculty member who volunteered but has not yet taught the course will receive training and assistance in preparation for what some veterans have described as one of the most fulfilling teaching opportunities of their careers.
7. I now would like to read a statement into the record:

Illinois State University is a great university, with a long tradition of faculty involvement in shared responsibilities for governance, curriculum innovation and development, faculty and student recruitment, and a full array of other activities critical to academic excellence. One crowning success recently is the development and overwhelming endorsement of the new General Education Curriculum, a curriculum that ensures the University will continue to be an educational leader well into the new millennium. Advancements like this require collaboration and communication in addition to risk-taking and change. These can create periods of discomfort for those involved in the process. The University now is at another crossroad of change, as we realign older, often dated, campus processes and policies with the realities of a new board's expectations, changing campus demographics, and a public that has increased expectations for accountability. Reform of the ASPT system, parallel reform of administrative evaluation processes, and innovative and more aggressive mechanisms to recruit the best and brightest personnel for the University are three distinct challenges which the University must address. In each of these areas, the administration has made proposals, and the appropriate internal or external committee of the Academic Senate is considering each. That the administration has proposed change is not only appropriate, it is indeed implicitly required by our own *Code of Ethics*. Allow me to quote a sentence from this document:

The University faculty has the right to expect a competent, frank, scholarly administration that is able to give dynamic and purposeful direction to the institution.

As noted, the campus is now considering a wide range of matters, many of which are sensitive, and some of which are controversial as we have seen first-hand in recent deliberations regarding revisions to the *Constitution*. In the midst of these significant discussions, and in the context of many changes, misunderstandings can easily occur, and I wish to share an example.

On Sunday, October 12, a colleague sent me a copy of a message apparently sent by Curt White, a fellow Senator, to an unknown number of addressees. The person who forwarded the message to me used the subject line "Shared Governance?" with a question

mark. The message dealt in part with proposals that were forwarded by President Strand on September 22 to the Academic Senate regarding changes in the selection and evaluation of administrators, and other issues related to discussions now on-going in the ASPT review. In my opinion, much of the content was mis-statements of fact or lacked the context that would have profoundly changed their meaning. In saying this, I ascribe no motives. The issues are complex and require discussion among the parties and informed deliberation by those concerned about the topics.

In reacting to that document, as part of a larger response I inappropriately suggested, based on the message containing items which I considered to be inaccurate representations of the administration's position, that the Senator consider removing himself from the Administrative Affairs Committee. I want to state publicly my apology to Professor White; it was inappropriate for me to make this suggestion.

I strongly believe in the processes of shared governance and the need for broad faculty participation in this process. On a related matter, let me quote from the Academic Senate's own Blue Book, specifically the statement on "Shared University Governance" on page 3:

The Academic Senate is a deliberative body which acts in an advisory role to the President of the University in dealing with a wide scope of issues...."

It was within this context that the Academic Senate, and by extension its committees, as a deliberative body received the document entitled, "Request for Academic Senate Review and Advice Regarding Proposed Changes in the Illinois State University *Policies and Procedures Manual*." While the transmittal came from the President, the Office of the Provost has staff responsibilities for the topics under consideration. The intent of this transmittal was to seek advice and recommendations for changes. Indeed change in the proposals has already occurred, and I wish to share two examples.

In September, I received a letter from Professor Rosenbaum as Chair of the College of Arts and Sciences College Council stating that the council believed the *current policies* for the evaluation of deans provided insufficient opportunities for chairpersons to participate. This governance body urged that the new policies, which they knew were being prepared for Academic Senate review, remedy this situation. In reviewing what had been submitted to the Senate, I concurred that the proposals did not sufficiently address this valid concern. I wrote the following to Professor Rosenbaum and sent copies to all Senators from the College of Arts and Sciences, to the Chairperson of the Academic Senate, and to the Administrative Affairs Committee:

This office played an active role in preparing the proposals, based on a range of models used elsewhere. In reviewing the proposal sent to the Academic Senate, I believe there may not be sufficient opportunity for the chairpersons to play an appropriate role in the evaluation of deans. Based upon the recommendations of the College of Arts and Sciences Council, I hope that when the Administrative Affairs Committee responds they also will include, along with other suggested refinements

and improvements, an expanded role for chairpersons. This would be an improvement over the current draft.

Similarly, another document that administratively defined the role of chairpersons and other dimensions of their responsibilities was sent to the Administrative Affairs Committee and to all departments. Soon thereafter, it became clear that language which had been reviewed and endorsed by a wide range of people was unclear as to the faculty roles of academic chairpersons. It was obvious that, despite the best editorial efforts and multiple levels of review, the document was causing confusion and consternation among some faculty. Chuck McGuire, as chair of the Chairpersons Council and I met, and proposed clarifying revisions to the chairpersons and deans. Following this consultation, we recommended that the President send revised language to the Administrative Affairs Committee and the Academic Senate. In his letter the President wrote, "In recent days, the Provost and Professor McGuire have become aware of some confusion regarding language in the document.... They have suggested editorial clarifications...."

I cite these examples to allay any concerns from members of this governance body who might believe that their opinions and advice do not count, or that time spent in providing advice is not time well used. In the years I have been a part of the administration, I have seen no situation where good, well-reasoned advice is not considered and usually accepted. Neither have I seen a situation where confusion and misunderstanding cannot be resolved, or at least minimized, by conversation among the parties.

It is my hope that during this time of many changes—and much progress—all committees of the Academic Senate and others who have concerns will continue to help the administration better understand their concerns through open communication. Further, I hope that through such dialog we in the administration will be provided the opportunities, in the context of a civil and academic community, to provide factual information that might assuage concerns. I hope that as we continue to consider important issues, we will deal with each other directly, we will not ascribe motives, and that we will recognize that each of us is trying to maintain the academic momentum of the University.

A few minutes ago I cited a reference from the *Code of Ethics* which made reference to administrators being frank, and providing dynamic and purposeful leadership. I have subscribed to these values throughout my career, but I also have ensured that I listen with respect and attentiveness to the informed perspectives of others.

Thank you for your indulgence in the reading of this statement. I look forward to continuing to work with the Academic Senate and all its Senators in the future.

8. I am now pleased to present the report to the Academic Senate on the first year's implementation of the Academic Impact Fund. I am pleased to introduce to you Dr. Sharon Stanford who, as Associate Vice President for Academic Administrative Services, has staff responsibility for implementing and managing the process known as the Academic Impact Fund. By way of background, I remind you that at the March 20, 1996, meeting the Academic Senate, following an extensive review and report from an ad hoc committee chaired

by Senator Weber, overwhelmingly approved a motion that recommended the implementation of the fund for a three-year trial period. In its report, the committee noted, "After careful review and much deliberation, the committee concluded that the AIF is needed to address two important University concerns." They identified these as "the development of a strategic approach for effectively allocating or reallocating resources among colleges and programs," and "to broaden the base available to fund payout."

During the committee's deliberations, as noted in the report, I volunteered to report annually to the Academic Senate, and am pleased to do so tonight. I shall limit my comments and data to the first year of the program, Fiscal Year 1997 that ended this June 30.

Provost Urice then presented data about the Academic Impact Fund for FY97 and showed a model of how the system works.

Vice President Boschini had no report.

Vice President Taylor said in the last two sessions of the General Assembly there has been activity to make possible an optional retirement program for faculty and staff at the University. There would be an option instead of using the *current* State University Retirement System, they could opt it off into a Self-Managed Investment Plan. It appears we will be available to offer this option to our faculty and staff beginning April 1st of this year. Three companies have been selected and a fourth may be selected by the State University Retirement Board of Trustees. This will be available for the current staff. They will have one year to make a decision, and new staff will have 60 days to make the choice.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs: Senator Lockwood said Academic Affairs met and will forward the Senate as an information item the proposal to dis-establish the major/minor of Administrative Systems and Office Technology.

Administrative Affairs: Senator Clark said Administrative Affairs met October 22. We discussed:

- proposed calendar for 2001-2002 academic year. Will be in the next Senate packet. It will also be sent to all academic departments. Appreciate receiving comments.
- proposed changes to the Policies and Procedure Manual. There is a copy in every department office, with a memo asking for comments. Have a request to put on a Web site.

Budget: Senator Nelsen said the Budget Committee met this evening and discussed the two minors:

- Tourism
- Art History

The Budget Committee will not meet before the next Senate meeting.

Faculty Affairs: Senator Weber said Faculty Affairs met this evening at 6:00 p.m. and continued the discussion of the proposals that are being made regarding the ASPT process with the committee.

Rules: Senator Cook said Rules Committee received recommendations for 2 members of External Committees. The College of Fine Arts has waived their claim on a particular seat on the University Union Programming Board. It can now be opened up to members of other colleges in the University.

These will be brought forward under appointments to committees.

We decided to postpone discussion of the Constitution until we receive further information; but we are going to suggest a motion to “please retain the existing language” to take to the BOT meeting in Friday, if that is what the Academic Senate wants.

Student Affairs: Senator Brook said Student Affairs Committee is currently researching several issues regarding students on campus. We do not have enough information collected to report on the issues.

The next Student Affairs Committee meeting will be Wednesday, Oct. 29 at 1:00 P.M. in room 301, Hovey.

Special Topic: ISU Foundation and Funding Raising with Judith Riggs, Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

Judith Riggs said Institutional Advancement consists basically of 6 areas of the University:

- Alumni Services
- Advancement Support Services
- Illinois State University Foundation
- Development
- University Communications, and
- Media Relations

There are currently 80 employees in the division.

Alumni Services is the “fund raising” arm of the University that keeps alumni involved with the Illinois State. Activities consist of chapter and affinity club events. Homecoming, reunions, and alumni career and legislative networks. Publications such as *Illinois State Today* are sent to all alumni.

The development area consists of annual funds and major gifts. Annual funds consist of gifts of less than \$1,000 and are raised primarily through the telefund. Major gifts are gifts of more than \$10,000 or pledges toward a \$10,000 gift. All major gift work is coordinated through the Office of Development and each college is served by a college liaison.

The Advancement Support area supports our database of more than 190,000 records and processes more than 26,000 gifts a year, in addition to sending numerous pledge reminders to donors.

The Illinois State University Foundation is a separate 501 c3 organization with 2 basic purposes:

- to assist University in all fund raising efforts, and
- to receive, withhold, administer, and invest those private dollars that come to the Foundation

More than 650 accounts are managed within the Foundation.

University Communications offers writing, editing, designing, and printing services to the campus. More than 350 different kinds of publications are produced in this office each year.

Media Relations was added to the area 2 years ago with the responsibility to inform internal and external publics about the University.

I am here tonight to address questions related to the development area. These questions were presented to me by Senator Razaki at the September 20, 1997 Foundation Board meeting and I have also received questions from Senator Nelson (Appendix A). I would like to extend an invitation to any of you who would like to meet with me individually if I don't answer your specific questions tonight.

Questions:

Senator Nelsen asked for an explanation of the amount of unrestricted dollars in the Foundation. In the Board report for August, when the contract for the Foundation was approved, it was reported that there was \$1.2M in unrestricted funds and \$1.9M in restricted funds that were distributed last year. Please explain. *Reply* - Judith Riggs indicated she was unaware of these numbers. *Senator Nelsen* said he will give her a copy of the report. *Reply* - Senator Taylor said that when the audit for the University was done, the auditors looked at funds reported to them by department. In that report, restricted funds designated as scholarship funds are treated as unrestricted funds by the auditors. This is done by the external auditors with the purpose of looking at the return in investments. The definition the auditors use is not the same definition the Foundation uses for restricted and unrestricted funds.

Senator Clark questioned the cost of raising a dollar (\$.27). He asked how this compares with other charitable organizations, specifically other state universities? *Reply* - Judith Riggs indicated that this figure would be high for an established program, but not for an institution like ISU, since we are just beginning a fund raising program. It is always costly when you are attempting to acquire donors. In an established fund raising program, the cost should be closer to \$.20.

Senator Weber asked what the overall budget had been each year so that he would have a better understanding of the growth of the fund raising budget in comparison to the growth of private support. How does this compare to other universities like ISU? *Reply* - Judith Riggs indicated that the budget had grown since 1992. She indicated a willingness to provide past

budget figures if the Senate wanted them. She reported that between \$300,000 - \$350,000 in state appropriate dollars had been added to the budget in the last 5 years and that the Foundation had provided approximately \$800,000 over the same 5 year time period. Our fund raising salaries are average to above average for major gifts staff and the remainder of the salaries in development are in line with other institutions of our size in Illinois.

Senator McCaw asked a question about the restricted endowment and the amount that was put back into fund raising. He referred to Table B of the handout *Reply* - Judith Riggs said the \$806,000 represented 5.5% of the 12-month average balance in the restricted endowment. Using one percent of the 12-month average endowment market value would mean that \$146,697 would be taken from the \$806,000 leaving approximately \$600,000 for distribution to restricted endowment accounts for FY98 usage. *Senator McCaw* asked if this practice was common at other institutions. *Reply* - Judith Riggs indicated that a combination of alternatives are used at most institutions. She referred to an article in the October 1997 issue of Case Currents that focused on how various institutions funded development activities and mentioned other schools that were using a % of the market value of their portfolio for fund raising purposes.

Senator MacDonald a member of the History Department, said they had worked hard in the department, since the resignation of President Wallace, to retain donors by pledging that their restricted endowments would be respected. They already have donors in the department expressing some concerns about the 1% assessment. *Reply* - Judith Riggs offered to talk to History department donors about the 1%. She also indicated that endowment agreements with donors include a statement that the number and amount of scholarship awards will depend on the annual net investment earnings. The main responsibility the Foundation has to the donor is to protect their principal and assure that scholarships can be given. Dr. Riggs indicated that every restricted endowment account and every restricted account in the Foundation had a balance in it at the end of the last 3 fiscal years. She suggested that these balances be used to award scholarships at the amount they had been awarded in the past until the 4.5% distribution would equal the scholarship amount. She felt this should only take a year or two because of the growth in the market value of the portfolio.

Senator Razaki agrees with the practice of trying to increase our endowment. He suggested that we work on methods that would allow scholarships to not receive less money than before. *Reply* - Judith Riggs said that if balances in accounts were used, along with the distribution in a few years, the scholarship amounts would be of the value they have been.

Senator Gore asked if there is a major campaign being planned. *Reply* - Judith Riggs indicated that the first comprehensive campaign for the University is being planned, with the intent to begin the quiet phase of the campaign in FY2000. An internal audit is being conducted now that will look at the internal readiness of the development, advancement support, and alumni offices.

Action Items:

- 1) *Appointments to Committees*

XXIX-33 Motion by Senator Cook (seconded by Newgren) for nomination of Faculty Senator for Honorary Degree Committee - *Senator Marjorie Jones*, and nomination from the Fine Arts Faculty for Council on Teacher Education - *Sue Ann Stutheit - MUS*

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXIX-34 Motion by Senator by Senator Cook (seconded by Garner), approval to *CFA Council By-laws*, (11.20.96.03).

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXIX-35 Motion by Senator Cook (seconded by Ori), approval of *Academic Planning Committee Membership*, (10.15.97.03).

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXIX-36 Motion by Senator Cook (seconded by Razaki), approval of *Procedures of Election of Faculty Representative to IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee*.

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXIX-37 Motion by Senator Lockwood (seconded by Chelluri), approval of *Disestablishment of BA Degree Designations in COE Program* (09.08.97.02).

Dean Sally Pancrazio of College of Education is present to answer any questions.

The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXIX-38 Motion by Senator Lockwood (seconded by Nelsen) for approval of a *Minor in Tourism*. Tabled by Motion XXIX-40 to re-commit the approval of Minor in Tourism to the Academic Affairs Committee.

XXIX-39 Motion by Senator Brooks (seconded by Brook) to amend the proposal (p.3) to read Political Science 145 or Political Science 141.

Debate/Discussion:

Senator Lockwood spoke against this amendment since there had been ample opportunity going through the curricular process for that amendment.

Senator Brooks said this is not an un-friendly or hostile amendment. This is an attempt to enhance the proposal. If inappropriate for Senate to propose amendment, why do we have the right to vote on this proposal?

Senator Lockwood said there are better venues for making such an amendment.

Senator Brooks said the reason for proposing the amendment is to give scheduling choice to students. Students should be able to include a European class.

Senator Schmaltz asked for clarification of the amendment. *Reply* - Senator Brooks said it simply says that students have to take Political Science 141 or Political Science 145. Senator Schmaltz asked to have one of the guests explain why the course is not available. *Reply* - Professor Sublett said this has gone through 5 curriculum committees, and this issue was never brought up or considered. We have carefully crafted over the last 2 years.

Motion XXIX-39 to amend proposal turned down by roll call vote of 12 aye, 25 nay, 4 abstentions.

Debate/Discussion:

Senator Jones asked if Budget Committee would give recommendation for this proposal.

Reply - Senator Nelsen said Budget Committee feels the current department resources can meet the amount needed.

Senator Craddock said as a student he is scared of this minor. This is supposed to appeal to a wide variety of majors in Geography/History/Political Science/Communication, but in the requirement for this minor, in HPR 300 level courses, 374, 375, and 377, there are required pre-requisites. This is 6 hours of pre-requisites. (Page 81) explanation of pre-requisites for course 374 (advanced recreation programming) requires HPR 271 or instructors consent.

Senator Walters said the requirements are not intended to apply to Tourism minor. An appropriate change, might be in the language concerning the pre-requisites to make the pre-requisites clear.

Senator Craddock said the proposal states that you need the class for basic Recreation Programming. There is no advanced class for Recreation Programming.

Senator Brooks said for some students to take the pre-requisites and other students not take pre-requisites, makes it extremely difficult for the faculty member to teach the course, and impossible for the students. There is also the absence of any language requirement. As an aspect to travel, knowledge of a foreign language seems to be essential.

XXIX-40 Motion by Senator Brooks (seconded by Varner) to re-commit the *Minor in Tourism* proposal to Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Lockwood spoke against the motion. The proposal has considered the pre-requisites and was addressed before the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Walters said he is against the motion to send back to Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Kurtz said should send back to Academic Affairs

Senator VanVooren said with all the many requirements, it would be hard for students to meet the requirements. Needs to be sent back to Academic Affairs.

Senator Schmaltz said either a course is a pre-requisite or it is not a pre-requisite. How is a student supposed to know which pre-requisites apply? *Reply* - Senator Lockwood said any course may have the consent of the instructor in addition to the pre-requisites. The pre-requisites for students coming through Tourism Program, would probably be met by other experiences within their majors, within the courses in the minor, so they would not be totally dis-advantaged going into the course.

Senator Newgren said the foreign language is not necessary, but by clarifications of the pre-requisites will make Tourism more attractive to students.

Senator Brooks said to waive pre-requisites puts the student at a clear dis-advantage in the course.

XXIX-41 Motion by Senator Barickman (seconded by Jannazzo) to cut off the debate and move immediately to a vote of Motion XXIX-40.

Motion passed with a roll call vote of 39 aye, 1 nay, 1 abstention.

XXIX-40 Motion by Senator Brooks (seconded by Varner) to re-commit the *Approval of Minor in Tourism* proposal to Academic Affairs Committee.

Motion passed with a roll call vote of 28 aye, 11 nay, 2 abstentions.

Information Items:

1) 09.24.97.02 *Presentation of Minor in Art History* - (Academic Affairs) Chair of the Art Department, Dr. Ronald Mottram is a guest present to answer questions. Senator Lockwood said this is a 24 hour minor, 12 of the hours are required. This will become a sequence within the Art minor. There are 2 other sequences:

General Art Sequence

Teacher Ed Sequence

This will add a 3rd sequence in Art History. The addition to this sequence is the addition of 12 hours of 300 level courses in art history. This sequence is constructed in such a way to focus on Art History as opposed to the actual production of art.

Dr. Mottram said the 12 hours of courses also deletes 9 hours of studio courses.

Questions:

Senator Schmaltz said 12 hours at 300 level of Art History courses. How many of these courses have pre-requisites. *Reply* - Dr. Mottram said they do not have pre-requisites

Senator Nelsen asked if there is an approximate number of people expected in the minor? *Reply* - Dr. Mottram said he has not way to estimate the number. Senator Nelsen asked if there is sufficient capacity in the Art Department in current existing courses to accommodate the minors? *Reply* - Dr. Mottram said yes.

Senator Jones asked if there are any new courses proposed for this minor, and is there any budgetary consideration? *Reply* - Dr. Mottram said there are no new courses proposed, uses the existing faculty and courses, so no new budgetary. **Senator Jones** asked if the courses will be offered sufficiently frequently so the students can take the courses. *Reply* - Dr. Mottram said yes they are.

2) *Ad hoc Committee on Shared Governance*. Chairperson Borg said the *draft* for the construction of the Ad hoc Committee has attached to it sections of the By-laws and the recommendations made May 7, 1995, by the Committee to Assess the President, and the petition that was signed by 209 faculty members.

Questions:

Senator Varner asked about the membership on the committee. Why would the Deans appoint the members? *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said in Section 2.6 of the By-laws it says, "Membership of each committee created by the Academic Senate shall be selected by means of appointment, election, or a combination of appointment and election, as determined by the Constitution, action of the Academic Senator, or both". The Senate decides the procedure. This is a suggestion.

Senator Schmaltz said on page 1 of the By-laws, Section 2.2 says, "Senators as members. Unless otherwise specified by the Senate, at least one elected Senator shall be a member of each committee, with voting rights". I suggest a Senator should be included on the Ad hoc Committee.

Senator Razaki said the Academic Senate should vote on who the members of the Ad hoc Committee will be. I object to tenured distinguished professors or full professors only to be considered for the 7 faculty positions. There should not be any limitations. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg asked if he objected to the restriction of someone being at the University for at least 10 years. Senator Razaki said there are some who after 2-3 years may be capable. *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said among the suggestions considered in making the draft was that tenured distinguished and full professors be considered, and that they have a long tenure at the University.

Senator Brooks said it says in the By-laws that members of the Ad hoc Committee shall be recommended by the Executive Committee, subject to approval or rejection by vote of the Senate. Also, someone could be here for only 2 years, but have experience at another institution and be very useful.

Senator Kurtz said has a problem with tenure rule. I question the "distinguished professors", because they do not necessarily have experience. What was the committee of 1995 and what happened to this report? *Reply* - Chairperson Borg said the committee to assess the President was assembled under Chairperson Len Schmaltz and given the charge to look at a number of matters. At that time the legislature voted to change the system of governance on the State University systems. The consensus at that point was to see how that worked and then work through changes in shared governance. Senator Schmaltz said they had a general fac-

ulty meeting to access the effective of the President. At that meeting the faculty voted overwhelmingly to establish the Ad hoc Committee.

Senator White said wants you to remember that a couple of years before the committee to assess the President, there was a report of another Ad hoc Committee, the Administrative Efficiency Committee. Many of its recommendations had to do with how the structure of administration at this University would most efficiently work. Also, the language in the By-laws and the Constitution is the most expeditious way get the committee started.

Senator Reid said the faculty should be appointed by the Senate, possibly nominated by the Deans. Perhaps 3 of the Senate faculty should be required to be with the University for at least 10 years, instead of 7. Also, suggest to put the April 30, 1998 date off a little longer.

Senator Nelsen agrees with the previous suggestions about how the faculty should be selected and suggest that the tenured or full professors be changed.

3) *Revisions to the Illinois State University Constitution - (Rules)* Senator Cook said in the last Senate meeting, the census of the faculty speaking was in the sections of Article V that describe the form and function of the Senate. The Senators prefer to retain the existing language in the present Constitution, as opposed to the suggested language. I need a motion from the Senate to propose this to the BOT at the meeting on Friday.

A Sense of the Senate Resolution Motion by Senator Razaki (seconded by Varner). The Senate should charge the speakers from the Senate at the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday, Oct. 24 to make a strong statement in favor of retaining the language concerning the functions of the Senate in Article V of the current Constitution.

Sense of the Senate Resolution

It is the sense of the Academic Senate that the language of Article V, Section 1.E of the ISU Constitution (Functions of the Senate) should be retained.

The Sense of the Senate Resolution Motion passed on a roll call vote of 35 aye, 0 nay, 4 abstentions.

Communications:

Senator White accepted the apologies from Provost Urice.

Chairperson Lockwood asked about the procedure for the Minor in Tourism *Reply* - Senator Schmaltz said to take back to the Executive Committee letting them know what Academic Affairs wants. Then the Executive Committee will decide the procedure.

Adjournment:

XXIX-42 Motion to adjourn at 9:42 p.m. by Senator Craddock (seconded by Schmaltz). The motion carried unanimously on a standing vote with no abstentions.

October 22, 1997

Date: 10/22/97	Vol. XXIX	No. 4											
Name	Attendance	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Sense of	Motion
		#32	#33	#34	#35	#36	#37	#38	#39	#40	#41	Senate	#42
		all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes	all yes	tabled				Resolution	all yes
Barickman	left 9:20 pm	no abst.	no abst	no abst	no abst	no abst	no abst		no	no	yes	***	no abst
Bender	X								no	no	no	yes	
Blum	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Borg	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Boschini	X								abst	abst	yes	abst	
Brook	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Brooks	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Chelluri	left 9:25 pm								yes	yes	yes	***	
Clark	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Cook	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Craddock	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Deakins	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Dodson	left 7:40 pm								***	***	***	***	
Ehlers-Zavala	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Garner	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Gore	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Hohner	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Jannazzo	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Jones	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Joyce	left 9:15 pm								no	yes	yes	yes	
Kurtz	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Lockwood	X								no	no	yes	yes	
MacDonald	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
McCaw	left 8:35 pm								***	***	***	***	
Nelsen	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Neuleib	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Newgren	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Ori	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Razaki	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Reeder	excused								***	***	***	***	
Reid	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Schmaltz	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Schwartz	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Strand	X								abst	abst	abst	abst	
Taylor, C.	X								abst	no	yes	abst	
Taylor, J-M	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Thompson	X								abst	yes	yes	yes	
Timmerman	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Urice	X								no	no	yes	abst	
VanVooren	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Varner	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Walters	X								no	no	yes	yes	
Weber	X								no	yes	yes	yes	
Weldon	absent								***	***	***	***	
White	X								yes	yes	yes	yes	
Young	absent								***	***	***	***	
Zielinski	excused								***	***	***	***	

**Comments to the Academic Senate
October 22, 1997**

**Judith K. Riggs
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Illinois State University**

1. How many people are employed in the unit? How many of those people raise money?

23 people are employed in development, advancement services, and the Foundation Office:

5 major gift officers (one part-time)

2 annual funds staff, one who spends 1/4 time with major gifts

8 data entry and gift processing staff

In FY 97, almost 26,000 gifts were processed, numerous pledge reminders were sent out, and the data base of more than 190,000 records was kept current

2 accountants and 1 assistant

More than 650 accounts exist in the Foundation, approximately 6,250 checks are written each year, and the investment portfolio of more than \$18,000,000 is monitored

2 clerical staff

1 computer support specialist

1 prospect researcher

1 donor relations coordinator

2. What is your overall budget?

The FY 98 budget for development, advancement services, and the Foundation Office is:

<i>State appropriations, operations</i>	<i>\$ 71,954</i>
<i>State appropriations, personnel</i>	<i>\$ 651,982</i>
<i>Master Contract</i>	<i>\$ 260,000</i>
<i>Foundation, operations</i>	<i>\$ 62,853</i>
<i>Foundation, personnel</i>	<i>\$ 161,861</i>
<i>1%</i>	<i>\$ 146,697</i>
<i>other*</i>	<i>\$ 300,000</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$1,655,347</i>

**estimated cost of fund raising for Insurance Program, Intercollegiate Athletics, WGLT*

For this investment of approximately \$1,655,347, the fund raising dollars totaled \$5,763,470 in FY 97. This represents a 348% return on the investment of dollars, with \$.287 being invested to raise each dollar.

3. Why do you need the tax?

The investment is needed to increase major gifts and overall gifts for the University, to qualify and cultivate major donor prospects before a capital campaign begins, and to have an adequate number of staff in place to conduct the campaign.

4. Who made the decision? Who did you confer with? Were donors consulted? Was the Foundation Board consulted? The Executive Committee or the full board? Was the vote unanimous? Was there any discussion?

All decisions of this nature are made in consultation with the President and Vice Presidents, Deans, and the Investment Committee and the full board of the Foundation. The Investment Committee discussed at length whether the 1% should be taken from the distribution or the growth of the principal. They believe it is their fiduciary responsibility to allow the principal of the endowment to grow as rapidly as possible; thus they overwhelmingly supported taking it from the distribution. No vote was necessary since they were following an already established Spending Limitation Policy. The Board determined it was a University administrative decision to use some of the distribution as an investment to raise additional dollars for the University.

Hugh Thresher, of The Common Fund which manages our portfolio, attended the Investment Committee meeting and indicated that using a percentage of the income from investments was a common practice at many higher education institutions. I have also attended several conferences where discussions have focused on how best to fund a development office and agree with Hugh that it is common practice to use a percentage of the earned income. Senator Khalid Razaki was present at the Investment Committee meeting, as well as at the full board meeting of the Foundation, where discussion also occurred.

After reviewing all of the alternative ways to fund the fund raising efforts of the University, the Deans supported the concept of the 1% investment. However, they have asked for accountability of their investment at the end of the fiscal year related to number of contacts made with donors and donor prospects and the increase in dollars raised.

5. Was internal reallocation considered within the IA unit?

Yes. Additionally, several other options were explored as a way to increase the budget within the development area. Various options and the rationale for not using any of the other alternatives are explained in Table A.

6. Isn't this really a 20% tax? One percent of 5.5 is approximately 20% of the income.

*The Spending Limitation Guidelines from the Foundation are as follows:
"The amount of endowment return available for current spending during a fiscal year will be equal to 5.5% of a trailing 12-month average balance for the current fiscal year. Distribution shall not exceed 6.5% of the average market value for the last 12 quarters unless reviewed by the Investment Committee."*

For FY 97, the investment return on the restricted portfolio was 18.5%, which includes interest earned, dividends, and increased market value. Of that 18.5%, 5.5% was distributed according to the Spending Limitation Guidelines of the Foundation. Of the 5.5%, 1% will be used by the development office as an investment to further growth of gifts to the University, 4.5% will be distributed for current use by colleges and departments, and the remainder will be applied to the principal in each endowment account.

7. How will it be allocated? Specifically? How will the campaign be funded? Will you ask for another tax then? Have you already begun spending this money?

The 1% represents an investment of \$146,697 and will be used for operations in the development area, including additional money for events, publications, and travel related to cultivating and soliciting donors and prospects. Using this money for operations has allowed us to hire an additional major gifts officer and a more experienced annual funds director to replace a staff member who left, and will allow us to hire a future Director of Development.

The campaign will be funded with the current budget that is in place, but may require additional funding, based upon recommendations from external consultants.

The 1% dollars are being spent as expenses occur within the division.

8. How does more money in your unit translate to more private support?

The additional dollars will be used primarily to raise more major gifts for colleges, departments and other areas of the University. Growth in fund raising will come from cultivation and solicitation of major donor prospects.

Progress in fund raising for the University has happened only because additional dollars have been infused into the area by the University and the Foundation. The growth in scholarship dollars from the Foundation, endowment, and gifts is shown in Table B.

9. Does this tax apply to all endowments?

The 1% investment applies to all restricted endowments. Interest income earned on the unrestricted endowment is used as part of the Foundation budget for the following year.

10. Why should students pay for this tax through reduced scholarship amounts?

While this first year, and perhaps the next year, the 4.5% distribution means fewer dollars in endowment accounts for current use, all endowment and restricted accounts in the Foundation have balances that could be used to award scholarships in the same amounts as in the past.

11. Isn't this a "breach of contract" with the donors who expected that the income from their endowments would go exclusively to the intended purpose?

Our endowment agreements allow for this type of expense to occur from the earnings. Most all of the agreements read as follows: "The number and amount of scholarship awards will depend on the annual net investment earnings produced by the endowment's principal. A portion of these investment earnings will be used for scholarship awards. The portion of earnings that is not used for scholarships shall remain invested to increase the endowment's principal value."

12. Will we be continuously informed of the use of these funds? Will donors?

Khalid Razaki represents the faculty and Academic Senate on the Foundation Board and also serves on the Finance and Investment Committees of the Foundation. Annual reports go to donors each year that explain income sources and expenditures of the Foundation. Additionally, a statement will appear in this year's annual report about the use of part of the distribution to raise additional dollars for the University.

13. Is the 40% tax from the telefund going to be reduced? If not this year, next year?

The 40% investment from the telefund will not be reduced this year and probably not next year. We are anticipating that FY 98 will be the first year, since the inception of the telefund in February of 1992, that subsidies will not be needed to meet the expenses of the telefund. From FY 92 through FY 97, \$3,411,247 was raised, with more than 30,000 new donors being identified for the University.

Riggs' Comments to Academic Senate
October 22, 1997

Question #13, continued

For FY 97, expenses for the telefund were \$317,562; dollars received were \$680,483; thus the cost to raise a telefund dollar was \$.46. Expenses included:

<i>Personnel (student wages)</i>	<i>\$ 186,578</i>
<i>Telephone charges</i>	<i>\$ 50,553</i>
<i>Printing & postage</i>	<i>\$ 43,318</i>
<i>Computer maintenance</i>	<i>\$ 13,007</i>
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	<i>\$ 24,106</i>

TABLE A

FUNDING OPTIONS CONSIDERED FOR FUND RAISING

- 1. Have the institution cover fund raising costs**
We believe our current level of state support is appropriate when we compare ourselves to other public institutions in Illinois. The use of additional state appropriated funds would mean fewer state dollars for programs and services of the University.
- 2. Use unrestricted gift dollars**
In FY 97, only \$10,388 of unrestricted dollars were raised for the University. The fund raising emphasis for the University is on raising restricted dollars for colleges, departments and other areas of the University. The unrestricted endowment for the University at the end of FY 97 was \$2,971,764. Unrestricted gifts and income earned on the unrestricted endowment are used as part of the income source for the Foundation budget each year.
- 3. Have the University contract with the Foundation**
The University already has a Master Contract with the Foundation for \$260,000. These dollars are used to support Alumni Services, some development operational costs, the Foundation operational costs, Ewing Manor, the Chicago office, and audit fees. Increasing this amount beyond \$260,000 is not a viable option.
- 4. Recover direct costs of every fund raising campaign**
We are currently not in a major campaign; therefore there are no costs to recover. Taking costs directly from donor dollars would be objectionable to donors and discourage giving.
- 5. Levy a tax on every restricted gift dollar based on the cost of recording, processing, and administering the gift**
This process would be very cumbersome to administer and would not generate sufficient support.
- 6. Use short-term interest on all current-use restricted funds**
Short term interest is minimal and would not generate sufficient support.
- 7. Charge more for managing the endowment than it actually costs**
This practice would not generate sufficient support and could have an adverse affect on endowment growth if a large percentage were taken.

TABLE A, continued.

8. **Make a flat percentage charge against all matured bequests regardless of their purpose or current use**
Current bequests, most revocable, total \$14,768,745. They are not a steady or reliable source of income at the present time and this practice would be highly visible and distasteful to donors.
9. **Charge for each transaction**
This would be extremely difficult to administer and would require new policies regarding minimum gift and multiple payments.
10. **Make a prorated charge against all income to cover costs**
Using direct donor gift dollars would be too troublesome to too many donors.
11. **Take development costs out of grant overhead**
Grants with overhead are not connected to fund raising at Illinois State, but are a part of the Graduate/Research office.
12. **Use income from patents or copyrights**
Very little income would be available since we are not a major research institution that develops substantial patents or copyrights.

TABLE B
GROWTH IN FUND RAISING

Foundation Scholarships

<u>Year</u>	<u>Scholarships</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
FY 94	\$ 852,322	
FY 95	\$ 994,228	16.65%
FY 96	\$ 996,741	0.25%
FY 97	\$1,140,481	14.42%
FY 98	\$1,598,928	40.20%

Restricted Endowment Growth

<u>Year</u>	<u>Endowment Market Value</u>	<u>Income Distribution</u>	<u>Investment Fees</u>	<u>Fees as % of Market Value</u>
FY 92	\$ 7,091,337	\$451,102	\$27,750	0.391%
FY 93	\$ 9,424,006	\$480,949	\$38,016	0.403%
FY 94	\$10,827,785	\$512,985	\$43,956	0.406%
FY 95	\$12,604,616	\$591,397	\$58,597	0.465%
FY 96	\$13,909,273	\$606,730	\$60,035	0.432%
FY 97	\$15,938,273	\$806,730*	\$74,807	0.469%

*The distribution is based on an a 12-month average market value. The \$806,730 represents a 5.5% distribution on \$14,669,787. One percent of the 12-month average market value is \$146,697; thus the distribution for FY 97 was \$660,141.

Fundraising Growth

<u>Year</u>	<u>Gift Total</u>	<u>Major Gift Total</u>	<u>Donors</u>	<u>Gifts</u>
FY 93	\$5,364,737	\$3,812,083	12,720	20,738
FY 94	\$4,381,508	\$2,730,081	15,491	25,363
FY 95	\$3,995,311	\$2,483,085	15,243	23,710
FY 96	\$4,788,395	\$3,263,272	15,653	24,618
FY 97	\$5,763,470	\$4,181,619	16,576	25,595