

Approved: 8-0-0  
#10  
12/1/09

EC

UNIVERSITY FACUTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 10, 2009, 3:15 p.m.  
HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, B. Evans, C. Lunce, C. Hoffman, C. MacDonald, J. Fine,  
R. Guell,  
V. Sheet  
Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

- I. Administrative report (President Bradley)
  - a. Met with governor regarding state budget. If there are detrimental cuts to higher education the state may be forced to give back stimulus monies. If the State budget goes below 2007-2008 levels, federal stimulus funds may have to be returned.
  - b. Budget issues are always on the table, including the proposed 3% pay increase, until things are finalized at the State level. Hope to hear something in December. Whatever impacts this year's budget will have an impact on future budgets.
- II. Chair report (S. Lamb)
  - a. Advised President Bradley of concerns related to \$10 million reallocation monies. There is much anxiety among units concerning the impact of coming up with these monies.
  - b. President Bradley stated that D. McKee and her staff came up with a draft version of a new retirement incentive plan. Hope to meet with S. Lamb and provost next week regarding this. President's goal is to have it finalized by December Trustees' meeting. Faculty and staff who have already indicated upcoming retirement plans will be able to keep same benefits or elect the proposed plan.
  - c. Promotion increments are being investigated. Promotions approved this year will be entitled to new increments which should go into effect on July 1 independent of pay raises.
  - d. The administration is proposing a three tier plan for faculty salary compensation. Almost all faculty (around 90%) will be in the standard category. A small percentage will be classified as exceptional, and a small number will be classified as being problematic and will not receive an adjustment.  
An Initial plan, which will depend greatly upon existing departmental procedures, for the implantation of this three tier approach will be drafted by S. Lamb, V. Sheets, and A. Anderson working with Kevin Bolinger and FEBC. Faculty will only be allowed to submit a maximum of three pages of material for consideration to their departmental personnel committee. Concern was expressed that there is insufficient time to implement this approach this year.
  - e. Hope was expressed that colleges will meet the challenge of dealing with cases of individuals who will not meet the minimum standards for performance adjustments. The president stated that faculty who do not qualify for

performance pay may need to submit an improvement plan for second year. He believes that reviews are fair and provide a reasonable approach for all faculty.

III. 15 Minute Open Discussion

- a. Concern expressed about University Testing taking a two-day retreat in week prior to grades being due, thus delaying Scantron scoring.
- b. Faculty grade distributions are available online to students, but not to faculty. President will inquire about adding a link to the Portal Faculty tab so that

this will be

rectified.

- c. Petition by students for staff pay hike to \$19.57 per hour ("living wage for family of four"). If benefits were included, this would total approximately \$38,000 per year. The president stated that this could account for a 17% increase in tuition or the elimination of approximately 250 jobs. The federal poverty level for a family of three is about \$18,000. President stated that he would be happy to meet with the student group and explain budget implications. S. Lamb stated that some institutions have implemented living wage procedures for support staff. No family unit can raise themselves out of endless hardship earning \$18,000 a year.
- d. Discussion of new ISU recruitment billboards Suggested having some qualitative analysis done.

IV. **Approval of the minutes of October 27, 2009** as corrected. (A. Anderson/C. Lunce 9-0-0).

**Approval of the minutes of November 3, 2009** as corrected. (B. Evans/J. Fine 9-0-0)

V. New Business

- a. Compensation issues (handouts related to past documentations were provided for review.)
  1. S. Lamb and V. Sheets shared concerns discussed with provost concerning faculty evaluation. S. Lamb stated that his primary objective was to keep the compensation process simple.
  2. Ideal is to identify only those individuals clearly exceptional and those clearly substandard. Appraisal should begin at program level and move through chairs to deans. Faculty would submit a personal rationale (3 page maximum). Fairness, flexibility, and balance need to be stressed. The president stated that, in his view, 90% of the faculty should be in the middle category, with a small percentage ranked at "exceptional." S. Lamb stated that exceptional performance should be determined by one's peers. Most faculty do perform adequately. He described a flow process whereby if the personnel committee and the chair agreed upon an evaluation, that process would generally stand. Deans would weigh in when there was disagreement. There would also weigh in, if either the personal committee or the chair or both classified an individual as below standard, and in such a case the individual would have the opportunity to prepare additional materials.
  3. Appeal process must be included in any system. Appeals should be based on procedural issues vs. a judgmental issue. Flexibility should be built into the system. Individuals who have a 12 hour teaching load, should not have the same research expectations as those having 9 or less hours. Lamb recognized that departmental units have dealt with these issues since President Moore first established compensations procedures relying on faculty input. Flexibility is a key factor. Faculty should be allowed to play to their strengths such that the University may

rely on their skills, rather than emphasize their weaknesses. Most departments have incorporated flexible weighting into their processes. The range of flexibility for the three domains is associated with the relative weights that the University has assigned to the three different domains.

- that
4. Guell wanted to have greater attention paid to the workload assignments faculty have. Felt that should be incorporated into any evaluation. How could an evaluation process be just that did not recognize different assignments? The handbook seems to specify a total of 15 credits, 12 assigned to teaching (although a productive research agenda or extraordinary service could reduce that expectation), plus another 3 credits or units assigned to service expected of all faculty. There was discussion concerning the different work load expectations in the colleges.
  5. Lamb, however, wanted continued emphasis placed on flexible weighting at the instructor's discretion with departmental guidelines. When an individual's workload was outside of that which was typical for a department, a different range of weights would be necessary. He wanted faculty to be able to play to their strengths. Faculty needed to buy in to this process. He felt that departments had been wrestling with these issues (different workloads, flexible weighting) for some time independently and successfully, and he felt one system imposed from above would not fit all situations.
  6. C. Lunce felt that some units were poorly prepared for faculty evaluations and needed greater time to prepare. Others felt that evaluation processes had been occurring since the Moore presidency and that departments had responsibilities.
  7. It was felt that the process used this time to accomplish the three tier evaluation might be altered in the long run. We had been given a very short time frame.
- b. Adjuncts, the state of their salary and benefits – discussion (handout materials provided).
1. S. Lamb stated that he asked V. Sheets to go through the materials. Sheets gave brief report - prior documents had stated goals but many have not been accomplished. Five years after Trustees approved the goal, many adjuncts are still not paid \$1,000 per credit hour
  2. Adjuncts are not retained at ISU because of a fair rate of pay but are here because of personal ties and dedication to their individual work. Regardless, adjuncts need to be paid more and be compensated for their talents. We need to retain the best adjuncts we can.
  3. If we don't expand funding for adjuncts many may be cut when budget cuts arise.
  4. Guell-we continue to go through a cycle. First, the suggestion is made that we have too many tenured faculty compared to adjuncts. So, we do not replace retiring faculty, rather we hire more adjuncts. Then when we have tough times, we let our adjuncts go. Then the suggestion is made that we have too many tenured faculty compared to adjuncts.

5. Possibility that adjuncts may be considered for additional benefits including health care free parking pass, use of the Rec. Center, or (for those teaching off campus) copying of materials on campus. S. Lamb asked R. Guell to take this charge (Charge 10) to the next FEBC meeting and have FEBC consult with the administration about added benefits for adjuncts. The executive committee felt that there were numerous benefits that would have little marginal cost to the University and significant marginal benefit to the adjunct faculty member. He would like him to report back at next EC meeting.

MOVED INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION (C.Hoffman/B.Guell) 5:05 p.m.

MOVED OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION (C. Hoffman/C. Lunce) 5:54 p.m.

Motion (C. Hoffman/C. MacDonald) approved 8.0.0

Motion should be sent to FAC: That the event is determined to be a grievable matter, as defined by the Handbook, and that appropriate processes should be followed.

Meeting adjourned: 5:55 p.m.