Approved 34-0-0 FS #5
1-21-10

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

December 17, 2009

3:15 p.m. HMSU Dede III

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bauserman, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, W. Campbell, H. Chait, J. Conant, C. Crowder, L. Cutter, R. Dunbar, P. Dutta, B. Evans, J. Fine, S. Frey, R. Guell, P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, R. Johnson, C. Klarner, J. Latimer, M. Lewandowski, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald, H. Minniear, W. Mitchell, W. Redmond, D. Richards, M. Sample, T. Sawyer, M. Schafer, V. Sheets, D. Worley
Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard
Deans: A. Comer, T. Sauer, B. Sims, R. Williams
Absent: B. Corcoran, D. Hantzis, C. Montanez, P. Shon, S. Shure, L. Tinnerman, Q. Weng
Guests: B. Warfel, E. Kinley, H. Chi, M. Miller, J. Ryan, C. Olsen, R. Peters, M. Brennan, R. Dolle, R. Perrin, S. Moncada, K. Wilkinson, A. Finch, K. Heath, D. Malooley, D. Barnhart, M. Douglas, D. Mckee, B. Venable, W. Davis, C. Davis, J. Jakaitis, B. Yousif, R. Lotspeich

I. Memoriam for Andre Hammonds presented by V. Sheets
APPROVED by acclamation 30-0-0.

II. Administrative Report
President D. Bradley:

a. President attended budget committee meeting in Indianapolis. The president and D. McKee met with ICHE. The commission is not sympathetic with higher education in general. If the governor says cut the budget, they will cut the budget. They do not act as a filter. Some institutions like Ivy Tech may make better arguments for more funding. ICHE is looking for consensus among the seven institutions. Our portion of the cut appears to be at $9 million mark or $4.5 million per year. S. Lamb to the president – you mentioned that the amount of money that is coming from the state presently to the operating budget is $72 million. Is that right? Probably $67 million will be coming from the legislature. The president responded that $4 million must be reallocated for next year's budget. D. McKee is trying to nail down the details associated with that $4 million. The $72 million is the portion of $85 million of the operational budget that is unrestricted.
b. Board of Trustees will meet tomorrow, Friday, December 18.
c. The transfer of south and east Learning Centers to Ivy Tech will include all employees and resources. ISU will offer the same degree completion courses.
d. Commencement is this Saturday. Commencement speaker will be Congressman Ellsworth.
e. Retirement incentive plan – hope we have something quickly from the Senate that we can react to and take to the Board of Trustees by February. We are on a short timeline. Fine details of this plan should be accomplished by the administration by April 1. We still have 18 months to go in the biennium. Unfortunately the governor

still could make more cuts. Full revenue forecast is not that good. There are huge variations in revenue from month to month, and the governor is very determined that he does not leave a surplus. Our budget plan to be developed must be in response to budget cuts. Plan should include considerations to minimize layoffs; reduce positions; allow reinvestment in other places; improve salary situation; and allow budget flexibility for new programs and student success. All considerations/plans should be made by April 1, keeping in mind that we don't go over budget into next fiscal year.

S. Lamb stated he was pleased that the president, provost, and D. McKee sent the retirement incentive plan on to FEBC. The input accepted from the Senate Officers to the retirement incentive plan by the President was very encouraging. He also appreciated the successful work that K. Bolinger and FEBC have done working on behalf of all ISU faculty and staff. He further stated that he continues to ask the president if he could consider this or that modification to the retirement incentive package. So far, the president has not said "no" to any of the Senate officers' request. He further stated that he realizes that the president has to be responsible, and he must continue to work within guidelines. However, the shared governance process is continuing extremely well. The president stressed his need to have the budget plan done quickly.

Lamb further stated: I know that the President is operating under a lot of constraints and needs to prepare proposals to go to the Board of Trustees. It is important that we take every opportunity to give the president our input.

Provost J. Maynard:

Regarding the closing of the east and south central learning centers (funded by line-item legislation): Ivy Tech will be responsible for these centers by January 4. ISU will continue to offer courses to students but will serve only 2% to 3% of these students.

III. Chair Report

Colleagues:

Much has occurred since our last Senate meeting. The state has asked ISU to reduce its operational budget by approximately $9 million, for beginners. Plans for equity raises, or any other kind or raises, have been tabled. The President has put forward a retirement incentive proposal with communalities for faculty, support staff, and EAP. A second draft of this plan is now in the hands of FEBC, chaired by Kevin Bolinger, who has been kept apprised of all phases of this plan.

The first draft of this plan was presented to the officers of the Faculty Senate on Monday, November 30, by Vice President McKee and Provost Maynard. As you may recall, I had said at previous Senate meetings that I did not want a retirement incentive plan to contain a punitive component.

Virgil, SAMy, and I found little to be disturbed about in regards to the incentive portion of the plan, but we were greatly disturbed by another portion of the plan. If a faculty member were eligible for the incentive plan, but failed to take advantage of it, that faculty member would no longer receive the 70 to 80 % of salary severance pay that has been built into our expectations since 1997. Rather, he/she would be entitled only to a 25% severance check.

Not only that, but the 70 to 80% severance pay would be rescinded for all faculty and EAP and replaced by a 25% severance package. Those people who have served a fair number of years, and have incorporated the 70 to 80% expectation into their retirement plans, are especially hurt. Colleagues, Virgil, SAMy, and I saw this initial incentive plan more as an economic coercion plan than an incentive plan. Virtually all older faculty were being given little rational choice, and younger faculty were being penalized.

We asked, at the November 30 meeting, that the punitive portion be eliminated. Keep the incentive, eliminate the punitive. On Thursday, Dec. 3, we heard that our approach had not been accepted. Virgil, SAMy, and I drafted a letter to the President that same night, delineating our concerns. The President set up a meeting with us to be held with Jack and Diann, on Monday, December 7.

At that meeting, the President did work aggressively with the officers of the Faculty Senate and did accommodated input from us. I think that we were able to convince him that a large percentage of the faculty and EAP would be alarmed by the proposal. He was receptive to our concerns. Do remember, faculty, that we have only advisory authority in this matter. The administration does have primary authority concerning this issue. But, given that limitation, the officers did everything they could to modify the proposal.

The end product is the following retirement incentive draft, to be sent to FEBC for its due diligence. It is our hope that FEBC will have advice that is accepted by the administration, which will further increase the positive and reduce the punitive.

Now for the Present Draft:

The end result of the officer's negotiation is the following draft:

Case A, if one has reached age 60 or more, and has put in 20 or more years at ISU: one will receive a severance check of 115% of base salary if one quickly chooses retirement, which would have to take place by December 30, 2012.

Case B, if one has reached age 62 or more, and has put in 10 or more years at ISU: one will receive a severance check of 115% of base salary if one quickly chooses retirement.

Also, under either case A or B, one may take the severance check of 115% and may request the phased retirement option as well. An individual may be able to obtain both. The president was responsible for making the retirement option more positive.

On the other hand, if an individual does meet the above conditions but does not take the plan, one does not settle for 25%. All who presently have at least 15 years of service would be able to receive 60% of their last salary after 20 years of service and being 62 or older. The President made the incentive package more rewarding and agreed to remove a significant portion, but not all, of the punitive. An individual who presently has less than 15 years of service would receive 50% of base pay after reaching age of 62 and achieving 20 years of service.

Hires that occur after this plan has been accepted will receive 25% of their base pay after the age of 62, and 20 years of service.

Did SAMy, Virgil, and I achieve everything we wanted? No. But we were pleased with the extent of movement that the President made.

The officers have always understood, however, that we were only doing preparatory work for the Faculty Economic Benefits Committee to build upon or alter as they see fit. I involved Kevin Bolinger (chair of FEBC) at all phases of the negotiation and insisted that he be present at the Executive Committee to hear all concerns expressed.

It was the officers' thoughts that Kevin's governance body would again use its influence to make modifications to this proposal.

This draft of the incentive plan has already gone to the FEBC for its input. It will be brought back to the Executive committee and to the Faculty Senate for more input. This modified draft, and that is all we have accomplished, is now in FEBC hands. They need to determine justifications, offer criticisms, and make modifications to this draft. Bob Guell is the liaison. There certainly exists an avenue for all perspectives— FEBC and Senate are responsible for the advisory input. Your input today is critical.

I am pleased that we have a number of visitors here today. We need to hear the concerns of those affected.

It is the practice that guests may offer prepared comments at the beginning of the fifteen minute open discussion. These comments will appear in the minutes.

I do want to express one more concern. What if the plan is largely successful? I fear the reduction in all ranks that may occur. I am quite fearful that many a department will be nonfunctional, and that students and ISU may suffer as a result. I know that the administration will have to show adeptness at dealing with this issue. Thank you.

IV. Support Staff Report – R. Torrence:

The Support Staff Council has approved our bylaw revisions to include representation of administrative and professional staff. The revisions are on the December Board of Trustees meeting agenda as an action item.

The Support Staff Council met in a special session this morning to discuss the retirement incentive proposal. We are very pleased that Support Staff have been included equally in this proposal; I think it speaks highly of our administration. During our meeting this morning, a motion was made to propose a tiered retirement incentive that would give a higher % for those choosing to retire before 12/31/2010.

The ISU Holiday Choir has been singing all over campus and Terre Haute in the past few weeks. I hope you have had a chance to hear them.

On behalf of the Support Staff Council, I would like to wish everyone a Happy Holiday!

V. SGA Report – no report.

VI. Special Purpose Advocate Statement to the Senate, Susan Hoffman:

This has been a good semester. Steve Gruenert, the new director of CEP, has initiated regular e-newsletters to the teaching staff. This new line of communication keeps the faculty informed and updated about issues such as scheduling. This openness is appreciated.

On December 1, Kelly Wilkinson of CIRT, David Wright of Student Affairs, and a committee convened by them held a workshop for adjuncts and teaching assistants on classroom civility issues. Although attendance was low (only a few adjuncts and no TAs), the effort at communication was laudable. Several e-mail announcements, including one the day before and one the day of the meeting, encouraged people to attend. For a group known nationally as "the invisible faculty" the effort in reaching out to us may be the most noteworthy element of the workshop. The committee was surprised to find that the attendees were seasoned teachers. The least experienced has taught for seven years at ISU. The expectation had been that novice teachers were the ones struggling with student behavior in the classroom. Instead, the issue is across the board, but with this faculty often it is an issue with new students in entry-level classes.

VII. **Approval of the Minutes** of November 19, 2009. (C. Hoffman/P. Hightower 30-0-0)

VIII. 15 Open Discussion. – Retirement/Incentive Plan

Prepared comments by guests:

R. Lotspeich statement:

I wish to comment on President Bradley's proposal for changing ISU compensation policy with respect to retirement pay, a change that would unilaterally breach a contractual agreement in place for decades. I find myself in complete agreement with my colleague Professor Guell. I strongly urge the Senate to vote against this proposal.

The proposal is badly conceived and insufficiently motivated. Not only is it unethical, it is divisive and demoralizing—and possibly illegal. There are other ways of coping with the financial stresses facing ISU; this particular approach is neither necessary nor sufficient for that.

The Faculty Senate should vote against this.

Jeff Harper's statement:

Colleagues:

It has been several years since I sat amongst this group as a Faculty Senator, Executive Committee Member, or Senate Officer. In general, I remember those times quite fondly, although there were certainly some dark days.

Shared governance is at the very heart of a successful institution of higher education in the best of times and especially during troubling economic times such as these. Our leaders certainly benefit from your advisory authority as they consider the difficult and weighty decisions that must be made in response to the fiscal challenges upon us. Shared governance takes the time, effort and dedication of engaged scholars, such as you, to work effectively. Your efforts are important to our institution's success and I salute you for your willingness to serve in this role.

With that said, I have been asked to share an idea with you today. Let's call it the "Rule of 72."

As I am sure you know, plans are now being completed to offer a unique retirement option to the employees of Indiana State University. As I understand the current proposal, an employee must have reached the age of 60 and have 20 years' service to the institution to be able to take advantage of this option. Employees that opt in to the offering will retire within the next few years and will receive 115% of their salary as an incentive to do so. However, there are many employees here that might avail themselves of this incentive who do not have the combination of 60 years of age <u>and</u> 20 years of service.

The idea behind the Rule of 72 is to expand the eligibility requirements for the retirement option to a larger group that might wish to take advantage of this offering. Simply put, the Rule of 72 would require a combination of age and service that equals at least 72. For example, a 62 year-old employee with 10 years of service would not be eligible for the retirement incentive under the present requirements of 60 years of age with 20 years of service. However, if the Rule of 72 were adopted, that employee would be eligible to choose the retirement incentive since her age of 62 and 10 years of service combined would equal 72, thus meeting the minimum combination of 72. Another example would be an individual aged 56 with 26 years' service to the institution. 56 plus 26 is 82, which would meet the eligibility requirement. In both cases, the Rule of 72 would allow employees who would not have been eligible otherwise to be included in the retirement incentive plan.

There are some problems with this idea, however. As I understand it (and I'm no expert on this), ISU insurance requires 20 years' continuous service in order to be continued into retirement. PERF, the retirement plan for some of our employee groups, requires the age of 60 before benefits kick in. Thus, while an individual might be eligible for the buy-out under the Rule of 72, they might be in a situation where they do not have health coverage or retirement income for a period of time if they choose to opt in and, so, would probably decline the option. Still, there are other situations where these shortcomings to the plan might be mitigated and the employee would still choose to retire.

Consider, for instance, the case of an employee in facilities maintenance with whom I have recently talked. He is currently 63 years old and has 14 years' service to ISU. Under the present proposal, he would not have the necessary 20 years' service to be eligible for the retirement incentive. However, he would qualify under the Rule of 72 as 63 and 14 is 77. He would announce his impending retirement by the April 1st deadline and actually retire on his sixty-fifth birthday, say June of 2011, when he will be covered by Medicare. So, although he would not have ISU health insurance, he would choose to retire with the 115% one-time pay incentive. Without the Rule of 72, this option would not be available to him. There are many other examples that I could give you where the Rule of 72 would provide a viable retirement option to individuals that would not otherwise be qualify for the current retirement incentive proposal.

Minimums should also be established in order to qualify through the Rule of 72. A minimum age, I suggest 50, and number of years' service (perhaps 8) will ensure a reasonable combination of the age and service factors.

In summary, the idea associated with the Rule of 72 is to be more inclusive in the retirement incentive offering by expanding eligibility for the program beyond the current requirements of 60 years of age with 20 years of service. It will allow more ISU employees to consider whether the retirement incentive is the right option for them.

Thank you for your time and attention.

R. Guell statement:

Every faculty member gathered here today got the same speech from their department chair that I got when I was offered this job in 1991. Jim Kyle explained that though the salary was lower than he wished it would be, the administration had a plan for bringing those salaries into line and besides, we have a great retirement plan. Those of us who accepted the bargain did so in good faith and we expected the administration to abide by their side of the bargain in good faith. Today the current President is breaking that good faith agreement. With no money in the foreseeable future for raises of substance, any promise he made in October or makes today or in the future on the subject of salaries will ring as hollow as the promises of Landini, Moore, and Benjamin. The details of the plan before you will cost most faculty here between $10,000 and $20,000 in present value terms. That is because the 115% incentive is no incentive at all for faculty who will turn 60 by 2012.

A further sign of bad faith can be found in the details. Administrators and a few chairpersons who were hired from the outside were promised nothing when they arrived at age 50 to 55 because they were unlikely to stay until they were 70 or 75. Under this plan they can now receive 60% of their final, already high, salary as a retirement payment. Specifically, under present rules no one who has been here less than 20 years gets anything, but under the proposed one, those who are here for as little as 10 years get a payment. While this helps a few faculty, it significantly impacts former President Benjamin, Provost Maynard, and Vice President Ramey who are nearing the 10 year anniversary at ISU. In this proposed plan (but not under that which exists today) they would take with them $120,000, $160,000, and $75,000, respectively while four of my economics colleagues who are all 54 to 55 will get approximately $15,000 less than they were promised 18 to 26 years ago. While I owe much to the two aforementioned Vice

Presidents, they along with former President Benjamin should not get this benefit and accepting it would be immoral and unethical.

Besides being immoral and unethical, it is curiously ill-considered if the desire is to encourage the senior faculty to retire earlier than they would otherwise retire. The table you have on the reverse side illustrates three prototypical cases of faculty considering retirement and one case where a faculty member could have retired already but has not done so. In it I have assumed a start date and a starting salary using information I have acquired from conversations with my colleagues and the Indy Star web site that lists all of our current salaries. I have rounded numbers a bit to make it generic. I have used published Social Security and TIAA-CREF formulas and S&P500 data to estimate post-retirement income from Social Security and an annuitized CREF balance. For those who do not know, retirement planners advise their clients to aim for post-retirement income that is 75%-80% of pre-retirement income. Most of us can get there if we work to 65 or 66. What I find is that unless you assume that CREF shares will rise to their 2007 highs by Dec 2012, no one currently 58 to 60 can generate post-retirement income from their Social Security checks and CREF annuities alone that will get them there and that faculty who have been here for 25 years or less have no hope of doing so if they are to retire prior to Dec 2012. In short, there is no “incentive” in this incentive plan. For all practical purposes the 58 to 60 year old faculty are simply being sold out. Only people who have significant outside opportunities, were going to retire anyway, or who are already in their mid-sixties or older can be expected to retire before Dec 2012. For the latter group, those hearty souls such as our Senate Chairperson, the extra 35% to which the proposal entitles them makes nearly no difference in their economic circumstance. They, like many in the academic community, stay for their own non-economic reasons and a relatively small $30,000 to $35,000 inducement, on top of their three-quarters of a million dollar CREF accounts and full-benefit Social Security payments, won’t matter much. In short, there is no way to describe this plan as having any realistic chance of meeting its stated objectives of getting 50% of eligible faculty to retire. If I could do this analysis and write this statement in the three hours between 6:30 am and 9:30am this morning, I cannot understand why it wasn’t done by the administration prior to this.

Start Year	Start Age	Starting Salary	Ending Salary	Soc Sec	CREF Annuity (estimate)*			Total Retirement Income			R
					@ CREF current value	@ CREF 2007 value	@ CREF 2008 value	@ CREF current value	@ CREF 2007 value	@ CREF 2008 value	@ C cu va
1980	30	$18,000	$75,000	$20,296	$34,066	$45,060	$27,451	$54,362	$65,356	$47,748	72
1985	35	$23,000	$75,000	$19,096	$25,428	$33,551	$20,542	$44,524	$52,647	$39,638	59
1985	35	$19,000	$65,000	$17,896	$21,062	$27,780	$17,021	$27,780	$38,958	$17,021	60
1975	30	$18,000	$91,277	$27,811	$75,995	$100,730	$61,115	$103,806	$128,541	$88,926	11

- Assumes entire CREF account is annuitized at 5% to age 80.

The FEBC and the Senate should reject this proposal completely when recommendations are made and votes are taken. If the President wants to engage the entire campus in an everything's-on-the-table budget cutting exercise, the faculty should expect to feel a proportionate amount of pain. Had he laid out a long series of cuts that affected athletics and the administration before he proposed this it would have gone a long way to creating an atmosphere of shared sacrifice. If the President wants to impose this immoral, unethical, and ill-considered breaking of good faith outside that larger context, that is his prerogative but he should do so without faculty complicity.

J. Conant read **D. Israel's statement**:

While it may seem like a small thing to take away future faculty compensation, I believe that it is bad precedent to reduce the percentage that faculty receive upon retirement relative to what they were promised at the time of hire. Changing the policy for people who have not yet been hired is different, since they will then adjust their savings accordingly. Universities are a place where all faculty should be working together. Taking away benefits from a segment of faculty and giving to another segment of faculty can only create ill will. Offering an extra "carrot" to induce early retirement is one thing, but introducing a "stick" at the same time is inappropriate.

I'm resigned to giving my "equitable" share. I don't know how to operationalize "fair" so I won't use that term.

Using the information Bob has shared with you already, my share has a PV of about $18,000. What he didn't say is the share of someone who will retire 10yrs after me would be about half that and the share for someone retiring 20yrs after we would have a PV of very little.

As an academic institution, a place of enlightenment, we should not discriminate so heavily against an old minority of faculty. It's not the size of the burden, it's the distortion of burden that bothers me. We can and should do better.

Additional comments/statement concerning the retirement incentive package:

a. Most of us here are tenured, but need to keep in mind the possibility of job cuts for others. Need to vote with less consideration for how it will affect our individual wallets and reflect on how it will benefit the institution.
b. Found it most objectionable that arguments presented termed the President's plan as "immoral, unethical and incorporating bad faith". Plan could be problematic and both bad or good. Some people may inadvertently gain from it. Discussions should occur without relying on that type of language.
c. Comment directed to the president: After the dust settles in 2012 people will have accepted or have not accepted your (president's) vision on what ISU will look like. How is this situation going to impact your vision? President: results might come after 2012. We may have the same number of faculty we have now, but they may not be in the same departments. We hope for growth in enrollments. From the instructional side some change will occur with the bulk of the campus looking at a reduction in service; most individuals will be doing more than they do today. Hope more can get done with technology. Instead of 1700 employees, we may have about 1600 employees three years from now.
d. If we do not have a successful retirement package, we may be looking at eliminating whole departments and laying off tenured faculty. This cuts close to the bone. If the

choice is about tenured layoffs or the consideration of a retirement package, I would like the retirement package on the table even through it means some sacrifice.

e. I'd rather have my position and continue working with students. I would be willing to sacrifice the possibility of the 70% to 80% retirement severance package for a smaller amount and be able to keep my job.
f. Response-I am resigned to giving up my share of the present retirement package. But the burden with the present plan is different for each individual. A disproportionate share falls on my generation. The burden should be fair for all.
g. I question the proposal and the results. Cuts related to Athletics in the budget proposal would go a long way to solving the present crisis. I want to see the burden distributed equally.
h. President – On February 1, I will have a draft for the campus and hopefully you will find it equitable. I will provide a list of reductions.
i. I believe there has been much openness by the administration. It does not help when we oppose ideas in the manner that has been done today. I am looking forward to receiving the President's budget report.
j. I urge us all to also consider the staff and not focus completely on faculty terms (e.g. people not yet 50, support staff, custodial, etc.) all who can benefit from it. President – I would ask all to remember that the retirement incentive plan is designed to benefit all those working at this institution and retirees.
k. Unrelated item- Hope we keep recreation center open over break.

S. Lamb – I greatly appreciate today's discussion. In general, it has been most informative and professional.

IX. CAAC Action Item:

Merger of African and African American Studies with History Department.
Chris Olsen and Jennifer Ryan presented an overview of the proposal. The merger will be reviewed after three years.
The following is taken from the proposal:

"While the African and African American Studies (AAAS) program has remained popular with students and serves as an important part of the intellectual life of ISU, the Department has never been large. Depending on faculty members from other disciplines–as befits a multi-disciplinary major and minor–the Department has typically included between one and four tenure-track or tenured faculty members. Currently it has one tenure-track faculty member and one full-time, special purpose faculty member. Experience has proved that a department this small places undue, unfair burdens on tenure-track and tenured faculty.

In order to maintain the major and minor and to preserve as much autonomy as possible for the AAAS program, faculty from AAAS and History suggested that AAAS operate as a separate program within the Department of History. These discussions began about three years ago but were delayed by Program Prioritization, the death of Prof. Francois Muyumba, and the resignation of Prof. Ken Prouty, among other factors. With the new process for administrative reorganization laid out by the Faculty Council, now seems to be the appropriate time to move forward with the restructuring of AAAS. It should be emphasized that these ideas have come, at every stage, from faculty involved in the programs. "

MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSAL (C. Hoffman/V. Sheets 29-1-0)

X. SAC Motion:
Reaction to Waiver of Dismissal Policy for First Year Students.

"The policy at Indiana State University is that first-term students who earn a term grade point average of 1.0 or less will be academically dismissed and should expect to stay out of classes for one academic semester. The Student Affairs Committee strongly affirms its support for this policy, believing that a one-semester period of reflection is truly in the best interest of any freshman who has not attained an acceptable academic record. In general, poorly performing freshmen who are allowed to continue at the University do not show significant academic improvement. Hence, the majority of poorly performing freshmen allowed to continue simply accrues additional debt and a more damaging academic record. As part of its affirmation of the 1.0 policy, the Student Affairs Committee strongly counsels Deans and others in the Administration to abandon attempts at encouraging students to appeal dismissals prompted by this policy."

MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSAL (B. Guell/C. Lunce) 30-0-0

XI. FEBC Motion: Filter on Equity Adjustments

“The President and Provost should impose the following filter on equity adjustments: Any faculty who are under a currently-operable conditional reappointment or were denied an across-the-board increase at any point between 2000 and the present will not automatically receive the equity adjustment. These faculty may receive a portion or all of the equity adjustment if their Dean so recommends to the Provost.”

MOTION TO APPROVE (B. Guell/P. Hightower) 30-0-0

XII. Standing Committee Reports:

AAC No report
AEC No report
CAAC Name change being considered for a department
FAC Establishing guidelines for emeritus status at ISU.
FEBC Retirement Incentive package which was discussed at today’s meeting is on the agenda
GC No report
SAC SAC met on December 3, 2009, and will next meet January 14, 2010. We are on schedule with regard to all our charges. SAC completed its work with the Hines Award charge, resolving that “a student must have completed 94 residency credit hours at ISU in order to be included for consideration of the Hines award,” and “that the individual colleges call attention to the Hines winners at the their individual awards banquet.
URC No report

XIII. Senators applauded B. Evans, who is retiring in recognition of her service to the Executive Committee and Faculty Senate. S. Lamb recognized the courage that she brought to several difficult situations during her many years of service.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.