

University Faculty Senate

Executive Committee

February 9, 2010, 3:30 p.m.
HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, C. Lunce, C. Hoffman, C. MacDonald, R. Guell, D. Richards,
V. Sheets
Absent: J. Fine
Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard
Guest: H. R. Gummadi

- I. Administrative report (President D. Bradley)
- a. Continuing to work on the University budget.
No new information; trying to pull it all together.
 - b. S. Lamb – would it be possible for D. McKee to expand health benefits "bridge" for younger retirees? President: Final edited version of the retirement plan document will be released today. To expand the bridge is very costly.
 - c. S. Lamb – met with members of Faculty Recognition Banquet Committee, who are willing to expand invitation to all members of standing committees, even though there is an attempt to pare down other costs. The Banquet Committee wants to celebrate the work of Faculty Governance.

Provost J. Maynard – no report.

- II. Chair report – no formal report.

III. 15 Minute Open Discussion

- a. Discussion of R. Guell's seven questions previously asked at Feb. 2 EC meeting.
- b. President – questions on retirement incentives will be presented to Board of Trustees (December payouts vs. January payouts) . D. McKee is putting together a document which will address these questions. We are doing what the IRS requires and making sure we follow IRS regulations. Some employees want pay accelerated (paid in December); others want it delayed (paid in next year for tax purposes). We are required to be consistent. An IRS requirement is that we treat

everyone the same way. D. McKee will do what she can to accommodate people.

- c. Special purpose faculty and retirement: President -- These are contract people, and contract will be honored.

IV. **Approval of the Minutes** of February 2, 2010 (as corrected) (C. Lunce/C. Hoffman 8-0-0).

V. Discussion of Input to State Legislators Concerning Definition of Marriage Act. (Senate Joint Resolution 13).

- a. The state proposal is definitely conservative and would apply to state institutions.
- b. Would the Definition of Marriage Act eliminate health benefits for same-sex domestic partnerships? This definition has eliminated health benefits in other states. Many individuals would find the attitude within the state hostile and intolerant, and not be willing to seek employment here. Other state institutions have responded. The consensus was that ISU needs to be on record, even though there is very little chance that the motion will pass through the Indiana House of Representatives.

Motion to Create a Memo to the Legislators (A. Anderson/C. MacDonald 8-0-0):

That the Executive Committee, formally expresses its opposition to Joint Resolution

13. (Definition of Marriage Act).

- a. Several edits of phrasing were suggested. Members felt that the letter should address the need for the State to seek a moral ground not dependent upon bigotry and intolerance.
- b. Input will be provided by members and Ex. Comm. could approve the designed statement by mail.

VI. CAAC Item: Replacement member needed.

- V. Sheets recommended Rebecca Hinshaw as a one-semester replacement for Troy Allen. The recommendation was accepted. Sheets will contact R. Hinshaw.

VII Moved into Executive Session at 4:00 p.m.

Moved out of Executive Session and adjourned at 4:19 p.m.