

To be approved

EC #25

FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

April 21, 2009

HMSU 421, 3:15 p.m.

Present: V. Sheets, S.A.M. Anderson, A. Halpern, C. Hoffman, S. Lamb, S. Pontius, D. Worley

Absent: J. Fine, T. Sawyer

Ex officio: President Bradley and R. English

I. Administrative Report

President Bradley:

- a. Strategic Planning – working on getting a committee of cohorts, a quantitative pool, together for each of the six areas. So far, things are going well and we are moving forward.
- b. Working with Facility's Management on repairs and space issues.
- c. J. Beacon will put together a committee to develop a "one stop shop." This would be a group of front line people who can perform multi-task functions to help people get answers to their questions on such issues as admissions, financial aide, housing, etc. I am anticipating that this group to be functioning by the end of summer. I have also asked E. Kinley to look into ways to make ISU's website (networking) more robust making it easier for people to get answers to their questions and resolve issues quickly.
- d. Planning to create a VP position of Community Engagement and Experiential Learning and to have this person work across colleges (parallel) towards student success. The person will work with our current structure. This will be an internal search. I will have more information on this at a later date. (Strategic Planning will provide particulars.) Sheets asked if this will involve some rearrangement. The president stated that it will.
- e. In terms of the budget – the Senate and House met today about the budget. B. Hassler feels we will be getting something in the middle (budget wise). When we know how much stimulus money we will be getting, we will start identifying certain things we will be doing with it. In reference to continuation of capital projects /release money, will be getting some kind of an agreement from the governor on how money is to be spent on capital projects like Science and Federal buildings.
- f. Asked T. Exline to put together a spread sheet to identify criteria for current presidential awards. Looking to merge future awards/criteria. Some kind of staff award, using peer-driven criteria, will also be created. The staff asked me about the creation of some kind of staff award. This award will be a peer driven process.

- g. In the process of putting together the new Recreational Center budget. Use of the Recreational Center will be an employee based right since it will promote their well-being and health as well as offering an opportunity for employees to engage with students.
- h. D. McKee is working on final versions of sick leave transfer policy, health benefits, committee, and spouse tuition waivers, etc. Sheets mentioned he sent out memos re Senate/Executive recommendations to the administration.
- i. Board of Trustees meets Friday and Saturday before commencement. Will discuss tuition targets.

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 14, 2008 as corrected. (S. Pontius/C. Hoffman) 6-0-1

III. 15 Minute Open.

- a. Question asked about status of Lilly initiatives. President responded that the Lilly Grant process is under consideration. Lilly wants to continue the grant at a higher level than in the past. We have not yet made a new proposal to them. He noted that his main concern is making the base of the program wide enough and would not consider the grant unless it is ISU/Terre Haute based. Will know if we are on track within the next two or three weeks.
- b. S. Lamb stated he was pleased to learn that the awards banquet included all senators. He noted the awards/ceremony have long been an ISU tradition.
- c. The president stated that Bob Baesler was nominated to serve on the Board of Trustees. Two more trustees' terms will end soon (LaPlante and Alley.)
- d. Salaries issues: President noted that ISU salaries are much lower than other institutions of its rank mainly due to the large numbers of people ISU employs. A huge amount of ISU's budget goes towards employees salaries. To get better pay raises, we need to be careful about the number of people we hire. S. Lamb noted that committees have been charged to deal with counts and that the provost has endorsed prioritization. The president stated that he has asked D. McKee to gather some bench marks figures to determine the number of teaching positions we have at ISU. Any numbers gathered will be adjusted for inflation.
- e. A comment was made about attrition and faculty...e.g. at the faculty level there was a 31% decrease in faculty over the pass 14 years with non-replacements. Enrollment is also down but not as much - approximately 17%. The president mentioned that at one point ISU had 12,000 students.
- f. A question was asked if one time money (stimulus money) would be incorporated into addressing staffing needs. The president stated that he will take his lead from the provost and the deans. If enrollment goes up in the fall, we may have to hire more adjuncts. Also, he noted that things can be very different between colleges (e.g. Arts & Sciences vs. Business.) The president also noted that the provost is concerned that some faculty may not be teaching at the level they should, and his goal would be to get them back to the classroom. Will have to see what affect this would have on the number of adjuncts who will be retained. The president stated that a 12 hour teaching load is expected for all full time faculty, unless, there is some concrete explanation for why a faculty member is teaching less than 12 hours.
- g. The president mentioned that benchmarks are also needed at the departmental level, given the present budget situation. Numbers need to be examined to determine adequate staffing measures. The president stated that his objective is not to eliminate departments, but in some areas staff may need to be

downsized. He noted that there is a fundamental staffing difference between faculty positions and administrative departments.

IV. New Business

- a. Results of Constitutional voting:
 - 1) Reviewed results of Constitutional voting on constitutional matters. Something should be sent to the whole faculty. President asked that approved changes be copied to M. Sacopoulos – reduce size of senate. University research from 9-7 – did not get support.
 - 2) Hoffman stated that something should be sent to the whole faculty regarding this...wording of the constitution, etc. Sheets stated that his intention is to send an electronic memo to all faculty. The president asked Sheets to copy him and M. Sacopoulos on it. Hoffman stated that he already informed the dean(s) today when he went to Arts & Sciences.
- b. Revisit tenure track delay policy (tabled at Senate); discuss options.
 - 1) Sheets – last week Senate discussed extension of tenure – change in language -addition of three circumstances. Word “request” changed back to “elect.” rather than “request.” But it must address “open-ended” circumstances. How can we permit “elect” for any “extraordinary” circumstance; allow everyone to add two years for any (self) defined reason. Provost will not take it to the board unless addressed; also has concerns about extension for people on. It will go back to the senate on April 30 for a vote and address concerns the provost has re-appointments to extend tenure conditional reappointments.
 - 2) President stated that what we are discussing is that “it cannot be a right” – it is not what it is intended. Decisions need to meet authorization standards. Process needs to include fluent discussions in what is the best interest of a faculty member and ISU/Department. Deans, provost, president provide collective wisdom for decision e.g. unusual or extraordinary circumstances and other issues that justify extension that tenure be awarded.
 - 3) Lamb stated that there are many situations where requests are made for a
a second year.
 - 4) It is difficult (complex re to circumstances/issues of judgment for tenure extensions) and tricky to ask faculty to relinquish what they presume is a “right.”
 - 5) Deans, provost, president provide collective wisdom for decision e.g. unusual or extraordinary circumstances and other issues that justify extension that tenure be awarded.
 - 6) Lamb – suggested bringing in new language. Modify option No. 2 to “may request” or “may elect”. Accept new language before it goes to the senate.
 - 7) Sheets liked idea of “request”. Lamb suggested language “candidate may make one extension” period or “candidate will be expected to request a year extension”.
 - 8) The president noted that a request will be initiated at department level. Deans, provost or president can review. I think we have a collective responsibility to maintain what is going to make faculty stronger. Dean, provost, president can review. The president also noted that this is truly

about the entirety of the process, not just the individual. It is an elective faculty decision – not just a faculty right.

- 9). EC seems to favor “request” to allow for open-ended circumstances. Sheets stated that he will make the EC’s necessary proposed changes before it goes to the senate.

MOVE TO ACCEPT with revisions: (S. Lamb/S.A.M. Anderson) 5-1-0.

c. Revised Faculty Evaluation Policy – Discussion

- 1) S. Lamb and V. Sheets revised to try to account for FAC’s concerns– re pass performance evaluations – always had an opportunity to weigh our strengths – don’t we see faculty holding us up on that?
- 2) Sheets, I don’t understand why we need a new policy. What is wrong with the old policy? Just because we haven’t been doing it doesn’t mean policies/ procedures aren’t there.
- 3) A. Halpern – what was wrong with the old policy? This network of responsibility complicates matters. Departments are supposed to have evaluation procedures...backup...digital measures. What more do you want? Only issue is that administration desires annual review and faculty favor only when merit pay monies are available. President indicated that all pay increases should have a merit component – answer will always be “yes” given concept of pay increase. Most of us in a group would be called “average” need to identify high performers and find people who are not performing. If there is extra money for extraordinary service – it doesn’t need to go to top 10%.
- 4) R. English – the fact that we have not been doing it for awhile. Not all departments had criteria. We have also changed our mission. For us, it was a time to go back and make public (greater alignment). Lamb – if we don’t carry this forward now then how are we going to get conversations going before evaluations must occur? Is the President’s office going to determine requirements/objectives? Needs to be carried forward to the Senate – input is needed. What would be lost taking it to the Senate? We can work on editing later.
- 5) Sheets – the document you gave us had nothing different in it. English – at the very least it meets a need to align it with Community Engagement and experiential learning. Idea of allowing faculty to play to strengths is good and should be protected. Evaluation must be done by peers. Recommendations were made by various chairs/deans together. Personal conversations had input.
- 6) A. Halpern - chance of success would be better if it was decentralized. Other issue is doing it. Staff has to differentiate between paid for performance. Is this not a paid for performance year? If so, ok. President – Numbers of people not performing per expectations likely is small. Should reward faculty engaged in high-level performance, but procedures should not be onerous. Most faculty held to a certain standard will perform.
- 7) Sheets – I don’t see chair or faculty being upset - next year will be a pay for performance year – need to make sure this is aligned with mission statement.
- 8) D. Worley – we want a policy in which we get some kind of pay increase for merit, which we don’t have now. In the pass eight years, we have not

had a consistent policy linked to pay increases or merit with any pay increases.

- 9) A. Halpern – the Handbook is very blunt about some one who does not comply re performance. Administration realizes the needs of faculty.
- 10) President – appeals can't change a "bad apple" to a "good apple". Our people perform to a level capable of doing. One can't lie down - won't be considered a member of team.
- 11) S. Lamb – you will answer to your peers. I think faculty become proud of their accomplishments – much more will value performance process.
- 12) A. Halpern – what will be the motivation. President – to improve. Halpern – especially if linked to salary.
- 13) President – we will ultimately need to look at North Central's criteria re people performing at expected level. Do we need to have two processes? We are using this process for a number of things to help improve and make decisions related to salaries. When there is no pay raise do we want to evaluate? Lamb – could have pay raises in future. We will recommend a score. President – I am willing to examine process – e.g. tenure maybe only do every other year or so. It is my personal feeling that everyone should do a self evaluation every year. Need to see what progress one is making towards goals, which all of my administration will do. I believe 85% or 90% of us should be somewhere in the middle (re evaluations).
- 14) English – nothing in policy that we have to do this. A. Halpern – just need something in Handbook.
- 15) Requiring accountability and scoring "qualitative" activities is what we do for students. Why can't we do it for ourselves? D. Worley – faculty are accountable like students are. It is what we do to students. President – this is not much different than adding a sentence or two to the Handbook. No, it is better.
- 16) What would be loss trying work this through the Faculty Senate? Sheets – I can put it on agenda for faculty senate. Worley – can't we just talk about it for now and have a larger conversation at Senate? Let's not edit it before it is discussed.

MOTION: Send to senate for approval. S. Lamb/D. Worley 3-2-1.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.