

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
2012-2013  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
October 9, 2012  
3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, J. Conant, B. Kilp, T. Sawyer  
Absent: E. Lorenzen, C. Olsen  
Ex Officio: President Bradley; Provost Maynard

I. Administrative reports

President Bradley:

- a. The Provost Search Committee met today for the first time; closing date for interviews will be December 28. Airport interviews will be held in mid-January. Campus interviews will start the first week in February. The Committee will see all applicants, and the Search consultants will make recommendations to the Search Committee. The consultants will screen out candidates that do not meet the minimum requirements. Ten-twelve candidates will be selected for airport interviews and three to five for on-campus interviews.
- b. Talisma, a software product used in the Admissions office for years for contacting recruits, will be used to alert the campus regarding all student concerns. It is a very good retention tool.
- c. Bids for north dormitory facilities opened today. Facility energy consultants are being consulted about how ISU can reduce the energy costs for the campus. We now spend around \$10,000,000 annually.
- d. We received a check from Lilly for Networks today for \$3 million.

Provost Maynard:

- a. Search for a new Dean for Bayh College of Education will start one month behind the Provost search. Dean Williams will serve as the chair of this search committee.
- b. The president mentioned \$3 million grant for Networks...I was over at the Endowment (Lilly) and they announced a new Focus Indiana grant program. ISU has the potential to received 3.1 million. The grants will be used to help build bridges for our graduates in Indiana in order to make them more marketable.

II. Chair report. V. Sheets:

Board of Trustees met to approve for comment Policy on Policies last Friday. All faculty should be encouraged to direct their comments to the General Counsel/Secretary of the University, Melony Sacopulos via website.

III. **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Executive Committee minutes of September 25, 2012 (A. Anderson/T. Hawkins; vote 7-0-0).

IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:

- a. T. Sawyer: In regard to Faculty Senate minutes and the approval of them – in an effort to try to move the meetings to flow more smoothly, I am sending comments to

members for approval before entering into the minutes. In the future, I will indicate a discussion was held related to a particular item.

President: Only action items should be recorded and items of discussion - not quoting anyone in the minutes. If you weren't there you can't get into the jest of the discussion any way.

- b. A. Anderson: Problem with students paying regular parking along with residence parking fees. Students cannot afford that amount of money just to park on campus.  
President: I will check into this situation.

- c. T. Hawkins comment to V. Sheets: Is your intention to hold off on discussions related to Policies on Policy?

Virgil's comments: I'm not saying you can't ask a question – but we do have an agenda to get to, so I'm asking that we not go too far into it right now.

T. Hawkins: My reading of the policy is that it undercuts faculty participation. Why should faculty spend time and effort sitting on committees if in the end decisions are made in spite of faculty participation?

President: If there is a negative to faculty participation, it is that Trustee can and will say they need to deal with a particular situation within a reasonable time frame. However, this is not to indicate that the Trustees do not value faculty input.

T. Hawkins: The way we (the faculty) operated is that the Trustees already have the final decision and this, to me, seems like a redundant process.

President: The only thing I see is that if the Trustees ask for faculty input on a subject that they would want some level of participation by all members of faculty. Faculty need to understand that there are reasonable timelines that need to be accomplished (met) such as in developing proposals. Faculty are all better off having a policy like this. Faculty do have a direct line to Trustees, but the process is not yet formulated.

K. Bolinger: It is not all that clear to some faculty what the normal route is right now.

President: Show me what the normal route (process) is. It is not the Board's policy to dictate process. The kind of things I could see starting at the Board level is a lot more conceptual. It is important all employees have a role in shared governance. I think there is stuff in the University HandBook that should not be there (e.g. the Constitution does not need to be part of the policy of the Board). This process will help us to also clean up the Handbook. This could be a multi-year task. I would guess that you are not going to see a fully formed policy coming out of the Trustees with regard to things that are basically the primarily responsibility of the faculty. You are going to see morethings like general ideas. Our Handbook needs to have a structure to it. I would like to see some very clear statement by Trustees by what they mean as "primary authority" (What does primary authority mean when Trustees have ultimate authority?) Trustees basically are saying they would never create policy in that area without consultation.

V. Sheets: If faculty proposed something directly to our area of responsibility– it would not carry any more weight than say the students would have.

President: I don't know how to measure weight. Administration, students, faculty and staff can propose changes, but what kind can they propose? Maybe we could restrict which types of policy changes each group can proposed.

K. Bolinger: The general pathway for shared governance has always been sequential. If we can get ahead of the curve on this; if they are looking for expediency; if we could provide a pathway where we have simultaneous reviews...

President: I don't like word "expediency" much but if we could move at a significant pace to get things done. The chance of coming up with a perfect policy first time around is practically nil. Related to your comment Kevin is that faculty currently believe that if the Senate passes something the Trustees have to comply.

V. Sheets: That is not true. I think we are aware that the Board of Trustees (BOT) does not have to follow our recommendations. Over the years, there have been multiple times we've passed things that the administration and/or BOT did not agree to.

President: If it takes a year to come out of Senate there is no real way to take that with a group that would be partially acceptable to everyone. That may be part of the ongoing discussion (e.g. Provost search is only working because people chose for that to work. If people do not cooperate with one another...nothing happens. Policies are not perfect on the first try; you have to be willing to try it and go back and make changes.

V. Sheets: I agree with you that nothing is perfect on a first try and appreciate your willingness to go back and make changes. But that doesn't mean that shared governance is unimportant. It is very important to get everyone on the same page, to agree on the goal, before something is enacted, even if you anticipate changes will be required.

- V. New Business:
  - a. Budget Committee discussion

**MOTION TO APPROVE** faculty representatives (Chairperson V. Sheets, Vice Chairperson J. Conant, and FEBC Chairperson (Don) Richards) for the University Budget Committee (K.Bolinger/T. Hawkins; vote: 7-0-0).

Discussion/comments:

President: The chair of Faculty Senate, and two other faculty members – it doesn't need to name people. From time to time the expertise you want presented on that committee could change. Right person to serve may not be a numbers person.

J. Conant: I would be comfortable having it open. Having the Committee on Committees draw from a broader base.

T. Sawyer: It makes sense that the Committee on Committees makes the decision. It need not be the chair of Senate.

President: No. The chair needs to serve and two others – I wouldn't have a problem with we that.

K.Bolinger: We can select now and then create a policy later.

b. Diversity Council appointment

**MOTION TO APPROVE** faculty nominees (1 to be chosen) for the Diversity Council: Yong Yoon Park, from Elementary, Early, & Special Education and Namita Goswami from Philosophy (A. Anderson/T. Hawkins; vote: 7-0-0)

c. Special Purpose Faculty Advocate. We previously appointed Michelle (Micki) Morahn from History. Sheets: I have spoken with her and she is agreeable to the appointment.

d. Representation of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.

Chairperson Sheets: I have to admit my hesitancy at returning to this issue. When the Senate has spoken, a matter is usually resolved, and the executive committee is in a delicate position, a position of trust given to us by the Senate, and one we must not breach that by pushing our own views forward.

However, it is not clear that the will of the faculty—or even the will of the Senate—was accomplished. A majority of the Senate voted in favor of this change, and the vocal opposition was not to this concept, it was to this instantiation. In fact, at least two of those voting “nay” have clearly expressed their support for the matter to be revisited; two others and the measure would have obtained the 2/3 necessary to send it forward to an all-faculty vote. We must not assume that this represents all of the opposition. I am certain it does not, but we should not believe that the Senate has fully spoken.

K. Bolinger: Chief sticking point (re vote not passing re voting rights) is that faculty wanted full suffrage. I think if we can make a better case as why some areas are restricting their vote and why it protects those faculty (from chairs abuse) – the vote will pass.

B. Kilp: If a faculty member votes against the chair - it could get overturned any way. Anyone with a contract could vote. Faculty wanted full voting rights. But there is no way faculty could know that because of the way question at the Senate was stated.

President: I think the Trustees will act if faculty do not. People need to understand that there has been a lot of work done in this area (voting rights). Things have changed over the years, and the governance structure has to also change.

T. Hawkins: I think it needs to go back to the Committee. D. Hantzis is working on this issue, and she will “carry the ball” if given encouragement.

K. Bolinger: A lot of people didn't realize what we were trying to do and thought we were voting against not giving full faculty rights...we were actually opening the door...they could vote it up and down, but by voting it down they would have less of a vote.

Provost Maynard: Regarding multi- year faculty – I thought the administration made sure that their review is done by departmental faculty. If faculty are abrogating their responsibility and allowing the chair to do it, that's a problem.

J. Conant: Yes, we don't want a chair having complete control over whether people are hired or not. I agree with the provost that requires a personnel committee to sign off on rehired positions so chair can't be a sole determining factor.

Provost: There is a different process for one year and multi-year contracts.

K. Bolinger: If faculty realize they are part of department process and if this was practiced...

President: I think a requirement that when a multi-year contract is not renewed that the recommendation be accompanied by faculty personnel statement/signature. One reason we have multi-year contracts is sometimes for reasons that have nothing to do with merit (e.g. not enough work, etc.).

Provost: There is a review process by departments, but we try not to regulate everything.

T. Sawyer: The reason the vote failed at the last Senate meeting (Sept. 27) is that the faculty were not schooled. I would have stated ramifications of votes...the faculty did not know. I think FAC needs to develop a protection plan for the instructors and chairpersons. Protection has to be in place for the instructor/chair and then bring a constitutional amendment for full-suffrage...then I think vote will pass. This may not be completed in December, maybe not until first of the year. If it does not pass, then shame on us (all tenure-track and tenured faculty).

J. Conant: I agree.

V. Sheets: It sounds like if we ask for protection provisions from FAC and suffrage – everyone thinks the vote will go through. I apologize for my role in not being clear about how this came about and what it was for. I thought this had been taken care of last year and I didn't want to be perceived as "pushing" faculty to vote in a particular way. But I still think there will be some who will still not vote for it. We should not assume that all of the "nos" represented people who wanted "full" rather than "partial" suffrage. Some have shared with me reasons for this and those need to be recognized.

V. Sheets identified various options for revisiting this issue. It was observed that FAC may be taking up this matter.

**MOTION TO ADJORN 5:00 p.m. (B. Kilp/A. Anderson; vote: 7-0-0).**