

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 18, 2010, 3:30 p.m.

Myers COT, 105

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bauserman, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, W. Campbell, H. Chait, B. Corcoran, C. Crowder L. Cutter, R. Dunbar, P. Dutta, J. Fine, D. Hantzis, P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, C. Klarnar, J. Latimer, M. Lewandowski, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald, W. Redmond, D. Richards, M. Sample, T. Sawyer, M. Schafer, V. Sheets, S. Shure, L. Tinnerman, Q. Weng, D. Worley

Part Time Faculty Advocate: A. Solesky

Absent: S. Frey, R. Guell, R. Johnson, H. Minniear, W. Mitchell, C. Montanez, P. Shon

Guests: Deans: A. Comer, J. Gatrell, T. Sauer, D. Sims, C. Tillery

M. Bennett (OLLI) R. Torrence (SSC), E. Kinley, (IT), R. Peters (CAAC)  
N. Cobb Lippens, H. D. Sapp, J. Tenerelli

I. Memorial Resolution for Diane Buethe, Professor Emeritus of Special Education and Assoc. Prof. of Communication Disorders - read by A. Solesky.  
Accepted (31-0-0).

II. Administrative report. No report —president and provost attending Board of Trustees meeting

III. Chair report by S. Lamb:

Colleagues:

Last month was very trying for the campus. Many of our staff were informed that their positions had been terminated. Some were told that they no longer had a job at ISU. Almost all facets of the University were affected.

The President and the University attempted to proceed in a humane fashion. He was extremely receptive to any idea that would make the entire process less painful. He initiated many ideas himself. Regardless, our concern must be with staff who are most negatively affected. Anything that we can do to help with their hardship would be appreciated.

It is the hope that the retirement incentive plan approved by the Board today will attract many individuals. Some of those positions that are vacated will have to be filled. If so, some of the individuals who had little seniority and who have had their positions eliminated will be able to be reabsorbed into the vacated lines.

The original retirement incentive plan was altered by the administration after input from governance bodies.

- 1) The three-tier approach was adopted,
- 2) Accessibility to the plan was increased beyond anything that we proposed: the plan was opened to those who are at least 55 and have at least 9 years of service (Recall in the Faculty Senate Plan, the rule of 72 had as minimums 55 years of age and 10 years of service, plus the additional restriction that age plus service had to sum to 72; that restriction is gone), and
- 3) Accommodations were made to provide access to a health benefits "bridge" for individuals who take advantage of the retirement incentive plan at age 62 with at least 15 years of service who would not be eligible for the ISU health benefits plan.

However, there does not exist in the final plan the additional protection requested for those in the 50 plus category, and the amount of the severance payment will be only 40% for those who presently have less than 15 years once they reach retirement age with 20 years of service. The original administrative plan had this severance payment at 50%.

The Governance process improved the package. I do want to thank Kevin Bolinger, and all members of the FEBC, including Bob Guell, for the tremendous efforts on behalf of the University Community. Kevin worked within very tight time deadlines. He has worked wonders. The administration also did everything possible to expedite the flow of materials through the governance process.

The institution has been forced to go through some downsizing. Some of this downsizing is an artifact of not paying attention to messages that have been received from the state for a very long time. We must pay attention to these messages. An end result of downsizing may be that it becomes more probable to establish competitive salaries. That must be a goal. That is a necessary criterion to keep the institution viable.

Some domains of our academic community are growing (the College of Nursing and Health and Human Services, for example). The monies devoted to the instructional domain of academic affairs are (at best) remaining constant, and the strategic plan needs to have resources. These factors will force some most uncomfortable realities. We will be asked to spread our existing resources into new domains; those resources will be spread thinner.

- 1) Many faculty who retire from a specific department will not be replaced in that department;
- 2) While there will be some units that will have a heavier reliance on temporary faculty, many units will have a reduction in adjunct and special-purpose faculty monies;
- 3) The result will be that the remaining faculty within units will be asked to increase their student load in one manner or another.

I am confident that the Provost and the President will allow their deans and the chairs, working with the faculty, to find the most efficient means within their units to ensure that student demand is satisfied. In the long run, the solution is increased student demand. While increased demand will initially create hardships, in the long run it will mean increased revenue, which should translate into increases in resources. Let us all work for increased enrollment through viable programs.

IV. Support Staff Report by R. Torrence:

The Council has elected to postpone the 2010 Representative Elections as well as the Officer Elections until June and July. We have our bi-annual rep sessions scheduled for March 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. Once again these will be open to all staff, including administrative staff.

V. SGA report. No report

VI. Special Purpose Advocate. No report

VII. Approval of the Faculty Senate Minutes of January 21, 2010.

APPROVED: H. Chait/C. Lunce 31-0-0.

VIII. 15 Minute Open Discussion

a. H. Chait comment to Faculty Senate concerning the proposed Indiana Defense of Marriage Act (Resolution SJ10013):

“The minutes of the February 9, 2010 meeting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate note that the Committee voted almost unanimously to create a memo to be sent to the Indiana Legislature expressing its opposition to Joint Resolution 13, also known as the Defense of Marriage Act. SJ0013 would amend the Indiana Constitution to state that only a union between one man and one woman would be recognized as a marriage in Indiana.

Let me begin by saying that I am speaking only for myself, and not my constituents in the College of Business.

I find that action by the Executive Committee to be nothing short of outrageous.

As a general principle, issues of the content of Indiana Constitution are neither in the primary nor advisory authority of the Executive Committee or Faculty Senate. I would add that in the absence of a Law School, they are not even within the competence of those bodies.

That the Executive Committee should think that they can speak for the faculty in a matter that is clearly controversial and on which public opinion is divided usurps the civic autonomy of individual faculty members. I do not want to be associated with the Executive Committee’s memo, and an almost unanimous vote could lead an uninformed observer to believe that it reflects my opinion. Faculty members are perfectly free to, and capable of expressing their individual opinions to their legislators.

I am also concerned that nowhere in the minutes does there appear any suggestion that the memo would be taken to the Faculty Senate as a whole.

Why? Could it be that the members of the Executive Committee feared that their social and political view would not be endorsed by this body? Could it be that they did not trust us on this matter?

Finally, and I think most importantly, the memo characterizes the legislators and the legislative committee members who introduced and voted for the SJ0013 as being motivated by 'bigotry and intolerance.' By extension, that would apply to those supporting the resolution. Frankly, that is plain insulting. This body should quickly and decisively reject and denounce that level of disrespect for the opinions of others.

If appropriate, I move that this body instruct the Executive Committee to desist from any effort to influence the Indiana Legislature with respect to SJ0013 or any similar pieces of legislation introduced into the legislature."

After receiving an opinion concerning the appropriateness of the motion from the parliamentarian, the motion received a second from Robert Goldberg.

S. Lamb – The memo that you quote was rewritten. The language referring to bigotry and intolerance was removed. The Executive Committee and the Indiana State AAUP chapter felt that there was an unstated reason that the state legislators were going through this exercise again. After all, this language is already a part of Indiana law. The action of the Executive Committee was viewed as a symbolic act. A request for this action came through our chapter of AAUP. But we can bring our motion that we did send to the State Legislators to the next Senate meeting for discussion/review and if this body does not believe EC actions were appropriate, this can be placed in the record.

This identical action had been taken in previous years by the Executive Committee and reported to the faculty senate without any controversy. Other Indiana state academic institutions have objected to the same legislation in previous years as well as in this year. It is apparently the case that the last time this issue came up in our state, an Indianapolis paper questioned why the academic institutions had not objected to this legislation.

Similar legislation has apparently been used in at least one other state (Michigan) to deny health coverage for same-sex partners; the fear is that our state could do the same.

**MOTION TO TABLE** motion concerning Marriage Act decision made by Executive Committee on February 9, 2010 for further discussion by Senate at its next meeting on March 18, 2010 ( V. Sheets/C. Lunce 24-7-0).

VIII. 15 Minute Open Discussion.

a. D. Hantzis – regarding: displaced workers Information sessions – trying to provide more services. Some workers were not able to attend due to the weather, etc.

b. M. Lewandowski–appreciate the President's acknowledging scholarly achievements of campus, but there was no mention of artistic/creative achievements of campus.

c. K. Bolinger regarding President's budget cuts: Requested that we put on the next

Senate agenda how certain cuts were decided upon (justification/discussion).

- d. R. Goldbort – would like to know how much the University saved due to present budget cuts? What was the logic of not waiting until retirements were declared? Would also like this discussed at next meeting.

IX. Overview of Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI): Presentation by Michelle Bennett.

- a. ISU has experienced remarkable growth and is accomplishing significant outreach.
- b. OLLI was started in 1997 as the Dewey Institute. They have received a third grant since 2007 of \$100,000. OLLI was founded by Bernard Osher in 1997. As of 2009 we will be the only OLLI in the state of Indiana. Membership is for ages 55 and older. Mini courses are held September through August. There are 40 programs per session and four sessions per year.
- b. S. Lamb thanked M. Bennett for her overview of the program as we as for championing the Osher Lifelong Learning program.

X. **CAAC Action Item – Definition of School** (R. Peters, Chair of CAAC)

***A school at Indiana State University is an academic unit located within a college that is administratively equivalent to a department in terms of structure, function, and leadership (customarily designated as head, director, etc.) To become and/or maintain the designation of “school” such units should reflect the following characteristics: (1) a significant student enrollment; (2) multiple sources of revenue, including external funding, endowment or other significant financial resources; (3) multiple academic programs (majors, minors, graduate, undergraduate) based in an integrated disciplinary curriculum and (4) provide evidence that the term “school” is a common, recognized designation in the field; and (5) provide evidence of a clear benefit to the University.***

Motion to accept the school definition was made by P. Hightower, with a second from S. Anderson.

R. Peters reviewed definition with Senate.

Questions about the wisdom of using the term ‘disciplinary’ found under number (3 ) given the nature of interdisciplinary studies. A friendly amendment was made by D. Hantzis and accepted by P. Hightower and SAMy Anderson to strike the word disciplinary.

Another motion to amend the motion was made by Virgil Sheets with a second by Julie Fine.

The motion was to substitute the following sentence for the first sentence in the original motion:

**A school at Indiana State University is an academic unit located within a college that **may be** administratively equivalent to a department in terms of structure, function, and leadership (customarily designated as head, director, etc.) **or may contain departments within it.****

Comments/Discussion concerning motion to amend as well as discussion concerning the original motion:

- a. Don't like permanently restricting future possibilities. Do not like the fact that the original form of the motion does not allow departments to be subunits of Schools. Why not give CAAC the ability to make those decisions in a case by case manner.
- b. Original definition not useful. No group of departments wants to lose and become one department. It restricts rather than encourages the creation of a college.
- c. If we open back up the option of schools having departments, that would give a license to the administration to expand, resulting in more administrative expense.
- d. We forget that any change(s) need to come through CAAC and Faculty Senate. Do we want to tell CAAC what their job is?
- e. There is no need to have the option of departments within schools at this time. If it comes down to a future definition (or a need to revise the definition) – it can be addressed later.
- f. We need to think of schools as fund-raising opportunities. Outside funding is one of the benefits of a school. We need to think about what facilitates fund raising.
- g. In NHHP, it would be of immense use to have departments within a school.
- h. School name is significant (e.g. School of Music). What a unit is called makes a difference.
- i. Don't see any actual difference between a college and a school.
- j. Should have kept original motion in place.
- k. Two questions: 1) if a department is part of a school, what is its relation to other departments in the college? 2) Any thought to what name we have for origin of programs not housed in a college? Is "school" defined as an organization within a college?  
R. Peters – did not want a dichotomy – one school within and one school outside a department. Don't see a problem with departments within a college but I do see a problem having departments within a school.
- l. There is a probable proliferation of administrators when adding departments to schools.

**Motion to Approve Amendment (V. Sheets/J. Fine) 19-12-0**

**Motion approved as amended (P. Hightower, SAMy Anderson) 24-6-0.**

The following is the complete amended motion as approved:

A school at Indiana State University is an academic unit located within a college that **may be** administratively equivalent to a department in terms of structure, function, and leadership (customarily designated as head, director, etc.) **or may contain departments within it.** To become and/or maintain the designation of "school" such units should reflect the following characteristics: (1) a significant student enrollments; (2) multiple sources of revenue, including external funding, endowment or other significant financial resources; (3) multiple academic programs (majors, minors, graduate, undergraduate) based in an integrated curriculum; (4) provide evidence that the term "school" is a common, recognized designation in the field; and (5) provide evidence of a clear benefit to the University.

- XI. GC Action Item  
**Types of Graduate Assistantships, Term of GA Appointments**  
Jay Gatrell – passed at GC 7-0-0. **Overview:**

- titles
- a. Will prevent student confusion about role of grad assistant and will establish that students would be familiar with (e.g. what is a T.A.?)
- b. Establishes when an appointment begins and ends – a policy will be in place.
- c. Will establish what is expected of grad assistant – manage expectations - assist with grading period.
- d. What about grad assistants who commute? Will be reviewed by J. Gatrell on a case-by-case basis.
- e. What about established perceptions of generic categories ( e.g. in COB – grad asst. may do a number of different tasks)? J. Gatrell – does not change form – can mix and match.)
- APPROVED (C. Lunce/K. Bolinger 30-0-0)

XI I. Standing Committee Reports:

AAC – 1) Report on Employee Satisfaction Survey and how ISU compared to other institutions.

Data on website under Faculty or Employee tab.

2) concerns about emergency preparedness and how we would respond to certain emergencies. Evacuation plans – community.

AEC - No report.

CAAC – D. Worley met with Foundation about student proposal. Definition of School.

FAC - Special purpose faculty situation being discussed

FEBC - Equity adjustment plan. Merit pay and classifications.

GC - No report.

SAC - J. Buffington – Faculty Senate scholarship (through Foundation) – amount \$850.

URC - Ten proposals totaling over \$80,000 - \$26,000 was dispersed. Not all verified yet.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.