

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
January 21, 2010  
3:15 p.m. HMSU Dede III

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bauserman, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, W. Campbell, H. Chait, B. Corcoran, C. Crowder, R. Dunbar, J. Fine, S. Frey, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, R. Johnson, C. Klarner, J. Latimer, M. Lewandowski, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald, H. Minniear, W. Mitchell, C. Montanez, D. Richards, M. Sample, T. Sawyer, V. Sheets, P. Shon, S. Shure, L. Tinnerman, Q. Weng, D. Worley, R. Goldbort  
Part Time Faculty Advocates: S. Hoffman and new Part Time Advocate Amanda Solesky

Absent: L. Cutter, P. Dutta, W. Redmond, M. Schafer, P. Shon

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard

Guests: Deans: A. Comer, T. Sauer, D. Sims, R. Williams  
R. Torrence (SSC), M. Scott (SGA)  
J. Conant, E. Kinley, M. Leinenbach, R. Perrin, R. Peters, P. Wheeler

I. Memoriam for Evelyn Starr Cutler read by D. R. Perrin, Chair, English Department.  
**Approved by Acclamation 34-0-0.**

II. **Approval of Charles Hoffman to replace Blanche Evans, (who recently retired) as parliamentarian for the Senate.**  
**Approved by Acclamation 34-0-0.**

III. Administrative Report by Provost J. Maynard  
a. Enrollments are up.  
b. President Bradley presently in Florida with Foundation people attending meetings.

IV. Chair report  
Colleagues;

I assume that all have seen the newspaper report that there exists a four % increase in enrollment for the spring and that there is anticipated to be a significant increase in the fall. The administration has been prevailing upon the faculty to increase their enrollment efforts and that has been accomplished. I encourage you to collectively and individually continue with your efforts. They have been most productive.

On another topic, I would like to comment on one aspect of the process used to bring salaries up to an 80% of the median of peer institution that I find problematic. The associates' and fulls' target salaries were determined by first adjusting the median of the relevant peer group by multiplying by .90. This process was not used for the assistants.

Again, for emphases, an individual's initial target salary was determined by multiplying the relevant peer median salary by .80. But before this was done for the associates and fulls, their peer median salary was adjusted downward by multiplying by .9. The end result of this is that the only associates or fulls that would get an adjustment would be those whose salary was less than 72% of their peer median, versus 80% for the assistants. This process seems to build in greater compression at this institution than that which exists elsewhere. I have asked that this process not continue in the future.

Now for a most positive note; The President has insisted that faculty governance, support staff governance, and SGA be full partners in this most onerous process of determining how to resolve the present budgetary crises. It is at his insistence that the officers of faculty government, the chair of the support staff council, and the SGA President are at the table when budgetary cuts are proposed to him by the various vice Presidents.

As you know, the state has very recently informed the institution that they are going to be reducing the funds that they are supplying to our operating budget by about 10 million dollars within the next two years. The President must inform the Board at its next meeting as to how that is going to be achieved.

Fortunately we have an ongoing reallocation process. This foresight has allowed the institution some headway in identifying potential domains for the source of these domains. The case has been well made that a very high percentage of our yearly expenses is tied to salaries. It is also the case that in previous years the institution has had to reduce its non-personnel budget to the bone.

On the morning of January 5<sup>th</sup>, the Vice President of Business and Finance, Diann McKee; the Vice President of Student Affairs, Tom Ramey; and the Vice President of Enrollment, Marketing and Communication, John Beacon presented to the President, the Provost and the three faculty senate officers, and the chair of support Staff, the domains and the positions that felt could be sacrificed without cutting to the core of their missions. Comparisons of the value of potential sacrifices within units were made as well as comparisons of values of the potential sacrifices between Vice Presidential Units. The criterion that was used as the measuring stick was always the criticality of the position or domain to the mission of the institution.

The officers were allowed unlimited input, as were all Vice Presidents. It was an open and fair process. Faculty officers brought specific domains to the table themselves that received a most through discussion. No domain was sacrosanct.

On the mornings of January 7<sup>th</sup> and January 15<sup>th</sup>, the Provost presented to the same group an overview of the specifics that Academic Affairs was considering. Again the group went through the same process. Understand that the instructional budget is not on the table, but regardless, almost half of the individuals who are classified as other than faculty, do work for Academic Affairs. While there are bound to be reallocation of instructional resources, this domain will not experience cuts in the long run. It is hoped

that the retirement incentive package will allow Academic Affairs to achieve the necessary reallocation that is needed in a viable institution.

On the afternoon of January 7<sup>th</sup>, the Provost and the President met informally with the entire Executive Committee in Executive Session to discuss the process, the specifics, and to receive input from this group. The chair of FEBC, Kevin Bolinger, was also present and served in the same capacity.

The officers of the Faculty Senate will be meeting with the President and Vice President in the same capacity for at least three more extensive meetings.

It is the case that the President will present to the entire University his plan to deal with the budgetary challenge in early February. It is also the case that he wants to have three –one hour sessions on campus to receive additional input after his initial plan has had some exposure. These dates are Thursday February 4 from 11:00-12:00, Wednesday February 10 2:00-3:00 and Tuesday February 16 1:00-2:00. These meetings will be held in Dede II.

I have informed the various chairs of the standing committees of these meetings. I am strongly encouraging the chairs and the members of the standing committees to be present at these meetings. And I would like to encourage all senators to be present as well. While so much of that which is occurring is truly outside our standing committee domains, it is certainly the case that these cuts will affect each and every one of us. I am very pleased that the President has done all that is possible, and is continuing to seek avenues to achieve greater faculty input into this process.

- V. Support Staff report–Roxanne Torrence
  - a. The Staff Council bylaw revisions were approved by the Board of Trustees in December and we will hold our annual election in March to include current administrative staff.
  - b. The Council is working on a *Relay for Life* fundraiser, and we hope to have information about that within the next few weeks.
  - c. I am pleased that the Council as well as Faculty Senate is included in the meetings to discuss budget cuts. It seems to be a fair and respectful process.
  
- VI. SGA report–Michael Scott
  - a. SGA is pleased to be involved in the budget discussions and thanks the administration for indulging us in the process. We understand this is a tough process and all will be affected. We look forward to the president's announcement and campus involvement going forward.
  - b. SGA Elections are March 1-3, making this among my last times representing SGA
  - c. We are in the process of changing our constitutional make-up, with the Student Senate discussing at length last night the proposed changes. We are continuing the discussion and hope to have this before the board on February 18th.
  
- VII. Special Purpose report–S.Hoffman
  - a. Introduced new representative, Amanda Solesky

- b. Susan expressed gratitude to the 300 special purpose faculty, for the opportunity to represent them at Senate.

VIII. **Approval of the Minutes** of December 17, 2009 as corrected. (K. Bolinger/C. Lunce 34-0-0)

IX. 15 Minute Open Discussion

- a. Suggestion to provost regarding consideration of the non critical cuts in reference to the present budget. K. Bolinger – take into consideration salary compression pressures, (e.g. assistants vs. associates) and whether or not present model should be altered or abandoned? J. Maynard – the president mentioned that he would look into it. Advice will be received and will be discussed. Will need to look at specific comparisons.
- b. Regarding retirement incentive package pressures- tenure lines in certain areas need to maintain as well as the use of special purpose faculty since many of these positions are critical.
- c. Value of looking at four day academic week. Maybe saving money on costs of utilities as well as making scheduling meetings easier. Other universities have tried this.  
The provost felt that the savings would be miniscule. Also would have to deal with the public perception as well if we went to a four day work week. Some offices would have to remain in open and in operation. Also, concerns regarding students in keeping their relationship ongoing to campus. The provost stated that he would look into the suggestions that were made.
- d. Regarding list of potential cuts – what was not discussed is the degree which we have six or seven buildings that are not being utilized. Maybe we need to close some of these buildings sooner, particularly, the towers where the College of Business is still presently located and the College of Education section which has not as yet moved over to University Hall. Closes them sooner than later would save us money.
- e. The possibility of the University hosting more outside conferences in order to collect additional money for the University for this service. Other universities are doing this.
- f. Possibility of the University cutting more in Athletics. Provost stated that Athletics is still on the table (under consideration) as well as other areas at the University.
- g. D. Hantzis statement: Regarding cost saving and revenue generating suggestions through programs similar to our Good Ideas program. There are lots of ideas out on the WEB and here are four
  - 1) Several universities report closing their Central Stores operation and selling surplus items on eBay and generating strong revenue as a result.
  - 2) Consider moving developmental courses (e.g. Math 010, 011, and English 101) to the Continuing Ed operation, which allows greater flexibility in delivery and fee schedule.
  - 3) Initiate a fee to repeat a class for grade improvement (several universities are doing this; it may be good both because it generates money, and it serves as an incentive to improve class performance
  - 4) Move Counseling Services to auxiliary funding structure; Student Affairs professionals report that the need for counseling services cannot be met regardless of funding by the university so any attempt to fund the

service fails; face the reality and shift Counseling to a fee-based service, retaining emergency response as a part of operations.

- h. President has had limited contact with presidents of other universities regarding their financial structure (budgets). Unfortunately, shared information among presidents within this state is limited.
- i. S. Lamb requested of the deans their perception as to how process is going in their areas. Dean Sauer stated that he had to focus on functionalities. The process has been an open process, as has been stated. It is the best attempt at the lesser of two evils. I made my budget reduction contribution, and it was an excruciating experience. I believe in the meetings with other deans that we are all doing the best we can.

X. SAC Action Item – Alteration of Eligibility Criteria for Hines Medal Recipients - J. Buffington presented.

The SAC motion: *"A student must have completed 94 residency credit hours at ISU in order to be included for consideration of the Hines award" and (part 2) "that the individual colleges call attention to the Hines winners at the their individual awards banquet"*

- a. Traditionally 124 credit hours was required for award to all students with a 4.0, all hours earned at this institution. Some students, however, earn some of their credits at other institutions. Should rule be relaxed?
- b. 62 credit hours was discussed, but not much support for it. Committee settled on 94 credit hours earned at ISU making students who have a 4.0 eligible for *Hines Award*.
- c. It was noted that this award has been previously underfunded. Would this put a strain on endowments? No, all 4.0 students would be eligible.
- d. Would Hines recipients receive more distinction at graduation? No, we feel that the university does at good job at distinguishing them as well as deans at individual ceremonies
- e. New grading plus/minus scale might make it harder for some students to get 4.0.

**MOTION TO APPROVE/ACCEPT the SAC motion** (T. Sawyer/C. Lunce 34-0-0).

XI. FEBC Action Item - Retirement Incentive Plan – K. Bolinger, Chair FEBC presented. He clarified that the items are recommended alterations of the original draft (2). Each of the 5 items were voted on separately.

**Item One:** Rule of 72

Purpose- to provide more flexibility and maybe entice more people to retire.

**1. Open the early retirement option to two groups:**

**1) anyone with a minimum of 10 years of service who will reach the age of 55 by the date of their retirement providing their age plus years of service is equal to or greater than 72 on December 31, 2012 or:**

**2) years of service (min 20) plus age equals or exceeds 72 by Dec 2012. Note Retirement must be effective by June 30, 2011. Note: the addition of this second group was the result of a friendly amendment.**

Discussion of Number 1.

- a. S. Lamb – we are expanding the possibility of early retirement
- b. Would amendment be a wise decision on part of the University? Would there be any risks? K. Bolinger – This expansion may be appealing to people with marketable skills, and people who have other intentions. We will lose some good people. S. Lamb reminded members that this is not just for faculty but all EAP and support staff. What we are doing is expanding the availability of the retirement option to a larger set.
- c. Has there been any assessments of skill levels by departments? S. Lamb – I know at the College of Business this had been done, and I know the provost knows the number of people who would be eligible. There will be hardships for some departments and relief to others. But, we are in hard times. We have to finance our strategic objectives and come up with \$10 million. We cannot assume that everyone that is working here is only interested in monetary gain. Regarding early retirement, it has problems because it is difficult to control who takes advantage of it and who doesn't.
- d. K. Bolinger – the date of retirement in the former draft was December 31, 2012. The President moved that drop off date to June 2011 but leaves the criteria window at 2012. Still those who take advantage of the plan must leave by June 2011.

**MOTION APPROVED AS AMENDED** (K. Bolinger/J. Buffington) 30-3-2

#### **Item Two – Tiers**

Purpose– Incentives created for more immediate departures

#### **2. Provide a progressive severance tier to incentivize early retirements such that qualifying individuals who:**

- a. Declare retirement by April 1, 2010 and whose date of retirement occurs on or before June 30, 2010 receive 150% of base pay as severance**
- b. Declare retirement by April 1, 2010 and whose date of retirement occurs on or before Dec 31, 2010 receive 125% of base pay as severance**
- c. Declare retirement by April 1, 2010 and whose date of retirement occurs on or before June 30, 2011 receive 100% of base pay as severance**

Discussion of Number 2

- a. Based on the numbers, I don't think 150% will be a sufficient incentive. I think 200% will.
- b. Needs to be a penalty given to those who do not take early retirement. J. Maynard – Again, not all decisions are made on a monetary basis.

**MOTION APPROVED** – (K.Bolinsky/J. Buffington) 32-3-0

#### **Item Three -part a. – Remove penalty**

Purpose –remove undue hardship on a specific group as defined below who were expecting 70 to 80 %.

**3a. Faculty who have 20 years of service prior to the December 31, 2012 program deadline and who are at least 50 and not yet 61 on the deadline date will remain on the current 70% minimum severance package (70% to a maximum of 80%) provided they do not take the retirement incentive offered during this program.**

Discussion of Number 3a.

a. Friendly amendment – (R. Guell) Move number 60 to 61. Have the statement read 50 and not yet 61. *Note, this friendly amendment does appear in the motion above.*

b. If changed to 61 does it not penalize people? No – protects people who do not otherwise have options. The point of this is to help the faculty who have been here a long time and have reduced options. It is measure to protect a certain group.

**MOTION APPROVED** – (K.Bolinsky/J. Buffington) 34-0-1

**Item Three -part b. – Remove penalty from an older group**

Purpose –remove undue hardship on a specific group as defined below who were expecting 70 to 80 %. Motion made by T. Sawyer/S. Lamb

**3b. Faculty who have 20 years of service prior to the December 31, 2012 program deadline and who are at least 61 will remain on the current 70% minimum severance package (70% to a maximum of 80%) provided they do not take the retirement incentive offered during this program.**

**MOTION APPROVED** (32-1-2)

**Item Four - renegotiations.**

Purpose- to provide for the possibility of renegotiation under 3 hardship conditions.

**4. Faculty may rescind their retirement if between the date of their signature and the date**

**of their retirement any one of the following has occurred:**

**1) They have divorced a spouse or have a pending divorce (or parted with a domestic partner) that has or will result in the reduction in their Tiaa-Cref balance by 50%.**

**2) They or their spouse/domestic partner have incurred a catastrophic health crisis that has required a disability or medical leave.**

**3) The S&P500 falls below 67% of its 4/1/10 level and remains below that threshold through the month prior to their retirement.**

**Faculty may appeal to the University Health Benefits Committee to request a rescinding of their retirement if a financially significant and unexpected event occurs between the date of their signature and their stated retirement date.**

Discussion of Number 4.

a. What about the situation where a person who may divorce and reconciles later?

b. Has there been a discussion about the relationship between having a disability leave and renegotiation?

- c. How about an economic crisis that was not foreseen by you or your spouse?
- d. Other conditions may apply, which can be appealed to the University Health Benefits

Committee. That is the purpose of the final paragraph of this motion

**MOTION APPROVED** (34-0-1)

#### **Item Five – Extend Cobra Coverage**

Purpose - Provide faculty and staff with less than 20 years the necessary bridge in medical coverage to get to the Medicare qualifying age of 65.

**5. Allow option for providing retiring faculty and EAP cash payments for those with greater than 15 years of service but less than 20 years of service and who are 62 years old or older such that they could extend their Cobra coverage (at their own expense) from the federally mandated one year to up to 3 years.**

Discussion of Number 5.

- a. Proposed retirement provide option for cash payment. People not age 65 could take advantage of plan. This plan could have a three year window. Applies only to the incentive plan. Someone 61 would not be covered under this plan.
- b. At FEBC offered to group was to allow for extension period of time for faculty who are retiring but not paying health insurance to COBRA mandate one-three year period.
- c. D. McKee and Melony Sacopulos looked into the legal implications. This option can be quite expensive. The motion does not make it clear as to who pays for the COBRA coverage.

**MOTION APPROVED.** (34-0-0)

#### XII. CAAC Action Item

The Elimination of the two-year A.S. Degree in General Aviation Flight Technology from the Aviation Technology Department.

R. Peters review reasons for elimination of program.

**MOTION TO APPROVE** THE ELIMINATION OF TWO-YEAR A.S. DEGREE IN GENERAL AVIATION FLIGHT TECHNOLOGY FROM AVIATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT. (C. Lunce/R. Guell 32-1-0).

#### XIII. Standing Committee reports

**AAC:** Academic Affairs is currently drafting a report on the Great Colleges to Work Survey initiated by the Chronicle of Higher Education. We should have the report ready for Senate Exec within the next few weeks. Later this month, the committee will be reviewing the campus emergency shut-down policy. In February the committee plans to meet with VP McKee to review how budget reductions will affect non-instructional units.

**FAC:** FAC continues to work on standing charges. Currently, the committee is working on the charge concerning the definition of emeriti faculty.

**FEBC:** We have met twice since the last senate meeting and worked both times on crafting a response to the president's proposed retirement incentive plan.

**SAC:** SAC met on January 14, 2010, and will next meet February 11, 2010. We are on schedule with regard to the three remaining charges. SAC completed its work with the treatment of students who have been academically dismissed from ISU, but have been readmitted after achieving success at another academic institution, resolving that a student may request that his academic record be considered for Academic Renewal *if*

*five (5) or more years have passed between my last ISU enrollment and the current term of admission, or I have subsequently earned a two year degree at another accredited college or university and maintained a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher.*

SAC also looked at highlights from the report conducted by the *International Programs and Services* on the "Economic Impact of International Students on Indiana State University for the Period of 2005-2009," noting that international students contributed more than \$25 million to the local economy during that time period, and that international enrollment has increased from 455 to 475 during that period.

XIV. Don Richards – **Motion - proposal to moved Faculty Senate meetings to begin at 3:30 instead of 3:15 pm – APPROVED 34-0-1.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.