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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2016-2017

May 4, 2017

3:30 p.m., DEDE III

Approved Minutes

Members Present: K. Berlin, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, M. Cohen, J. Conant, D. Cooper-Bolinskey, B. Corcoran, E. Gallatin, N. Goswami, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, M. Howard-Hamilton, M. Hutchins, B. Kilp, J. Kinne, J. Kuhlman, A. Kummerow, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, D. Malooley, S. McCaskey, N. Nichols-Pethick, L. Phillips, A. Solesky, F. Stewart, S. Stofferahn, K. Yousif

Members Absent: S. Buchanan, K. Lee, A. Payne, H. Tapley

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent: none

Guests:

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. President D. Bradley
		1. The General Assembly has adjourned and they gave us more money than they did two years ago. They did this based on our student success initiatives. They cash-funded a remodel of the Fine Arts and Commerce Building. Design efforts will begin in a couple of months with construction to begin in May, 2018. The only downside was the food and beverage tax denial for the Hulman Center project. We are confident it can happen.
		2. Thanks for the changes to 305. They were important and say a lot about the institution and you and the rest of the faculty.
	2. Provost M. Licari
		1. A recap on dean searches. An offer is going out for HHS. The second of three CAS candidates is just here and that search is nearing its completion. The BCOE search committee reviewed additional applicants and we will be having three additional candidates interview next week. Thank you for your attendance at open sessions. The feedback has been very valuable.
2. Support Staff Report
	1. No report.
3. SGA Report: A. Velazquez
	1. Thanks for a great year. I graduate on May 13 and will be working in Nashville, Tennessee.
4. Temporary Faculty Advocate: M. Muyumba
	1. No report.
5. Chair Report: T. Hawkins
	1. This is our tenth and final Senate meeting of 2016-17. I want to take a moment to thank all of my Senate colleagues for your hard work and support over the year. This was a Senate that took its role in shared governance incredibly seriously. As a result, we accomplished quite a lot. I am honored to have served as your chairperson. And, I am a little relieved to be stepping aside in 27 days.

Speaking of which, on behalf of the Faculty Senate I would like to express to D. Bradley our appreciation for his willingness to participate actively in shared governance over the past nine years. The process works much better when he is in the room to provide us with his point of view—something he has never hesitated to do. Thank you.

We still have a little more to do today. Files #2, 6, and 8 are reports that were either accepted or endorsed by Exec on Tuesday. We can do the same and discuss them as needed. Most or all of the principals are here to answer any questions you might have. File #5 has been set aside for this year. It will be reviewed again at the standing committee level in the fall. The remaining items will require approval from Senate. We will take them in the order they appear on the Agenda.

1. Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of April 20, 2017
	1. Motion to approve (S. Lamb, B. Kilp). Vote: 28-0-1.
2. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
	1. S. Lamb: Thank you President Bradley. Now we have an identity and it has grown. It gives us all a sense of pride. That’s a tremendous achievement. Thank you.
	2. Over the course of the past few months, several retired faculty members have expressed frustration over the quality of the benefits provided by the University’s Retiree Medical Program. They have expressed that our program is not as comprehensive as that which retirees from other companies have. One current faculty member was prepared to retire this spring. In preparation she completed an analysis of our Retiree Medical Program. She stated that she cannot afford to retire simply because the Retiree Medical Program will not meet her and her spouse’s health care needs. This concerns me and also makes no sense to me. A few years ago when the administration decided to fund retirees health plan with the VEA Trust fund, we were assured that the funds were adequate to provide a high quality health plan for all eligible faculty and staff. In 2015, the value of the Trust was approximately $85 million and the liability was estimated to be around $60 million. If the VEBA Funds are now insufficient to provide high-quality health care; what has changed? Are the funds inadequate or are we using those funds for other purposes?
		1. D. Bradley: D. McKee has no intention of going to the Federal Penitentiary. The fund has sufficient money, has a surplus. The plan is offered to retirees who are at least 62, have 25 years, and were hired before January 1, 2005. It is maybe not a Cadillac plan, but it is at least a Buick. It is a Medicare Supplement plan. There are limits as to what you can do with that.
	3. A. Kummerow: Is there any way to get a rough estimate of what the discontinued VP search cost? Can we recoup that?
		1. D. Bradley: It was my error. It is not canceled, it’s in suspension. The consultant will be looking to bring new people into the pool. I apologize for not being forward-thinking enough to close it earlier.
	4. B. Corcoran: This may be an issue for next year. The question of scholarships and the question of the value of scholarship funding. It raises the issue of transparency in terms of the Foundation. For example, in the English Department where there are issues with applicants, the raw value of our premier scholarship has dropped from $20,000 in 2012 and now $9400 in 2017. In talking to other folks, this isn’t unique to the English Department and I think we deserve an explanation of what is going on. Our TIAA-CREF funds have not gone in that direction over this period of time.
		1. D. Bradley: Historically, our Foundation and many around the country were far too generous in terms of payouts and many endowments have not recovered in the recession of 08-09. They needed to reduce the percent distribution. It has to happen so the dollars can be available for the long term. If you have 1 million in 2007, the market went south and we continued to pay out and give awards. It will take time for them to fully recover. I have agreed that the university will award scholarships in the names of those who made gifts. We can’t continue to pay out at the same level. If anyone wants particular information, R. Carpenter will inform them.
		2. B. Corcoran: Would any department be able to get information on the original bequest?
		3. D. Bradley: Yes.
	5. M. Howard-Hamilton: On the presidential search committee will there be more than one student on the committee?
		1. T. Hawkins: That is beyond our control. The only thing we control is the faculty representatives.
		2. D. Bradley: They set up the search committee in parallel to what was done nine or ten years ago. If you add one more student, you have to add one more faculty because of Handbook language.
		3. M. Howard-Hamilton: I think there should be a grad student on the committee.
	6. B. Bunnett: Senate elections. I think we have an excellent group of incoming Officers. But it wasn’t really a vote. I think we should consider commissioning a nominating committee to get at least two candidates for each of the Officer positions.
		1. T. Hawkins: L. Brown can consider that as a charge for the appropriate committee.
3. Promoting a Positive Faculty Culture
	1. Motion to endorse (A. Kummerow, E. Gallatin). Vote: 28-1-0.
4. AAC Items
	1. Proposed changes to Section 360
		1. Motion to approve (D. Hantzis, J. Kuhlman). Vote: 29-0-0.
	2. Presidential Search Committee
		1. T. Hawkins: AAC completed their action. I want to thank them for doing so under a tight deadline. They forwarded their slates to the Executive Committee on Tuesday. EC considered both of them. Neither of them received sufficient support, so EC created their own slate. There was an attempt to combine members from the first two slates. The EC slate does not have any members from SCOB or any Instructors because of the nature of the committee, we cannot satisfy all expectations. I intend to put a member of SCOB and an Instructor on the Transition Committee. These are the slates that we will consider. They cannot be changed. We will pass ballots. Put 1, 2, or 3. If one slate gets a majority, that will be the approved slate. If not, then we will take the top two and have a runoff for the final determination.
		2. M. Howard-Hamilton: Do the individuals on the slates know they have been nominated?
		3. F. Stewart: Should there be an alternate?
		4. T. Hawkins: Fortunately, presidential searches don’t happen very often. Certainly we might want to make adjustments in the process.
		5. D. Hantzis: It might be that there is no maneuverability. They did what they could.
		6. S. Lamb: I think it’s a good idea to identify the concerns so they are forwarded to the proper body. This is one area where we want to give a lot of input.
		7. J. Gustafson: I am on AAC. In the Handbook, it said that the general pool should be representative. There was a great deal of care taken so that the slates would offer diversity. Each one had five different colleges, and someone from the rank of Instructor or Senior Instructor. We thought that was important. We were confused when we heard that EC rejected both slates. The EC slate dropped an Instructor and two members of EC were placed on the committee. There was a feeling that AAC was not permitted to vet the nominees. There was also a deadline and we couldn’t add to the nominees. The general feeling among AAC was that we put together a representative and diverse group of candidates. I would encourage you to keep that in mind as you vote on the slate.
		8. T. Hawkins: In terms of two being members of EC, neither of those two individuals will be on EC after this month. You suggested that a spectrum was a concern. One aspect is going to inevitably be set aside. As far as the instructor question is concerned, without a doubt, the priority of EC was experience.
		9. K. Yousif: I cannot support a slate that doesn’t have an Instructor. It is disingenuous to who we are. The constant preference towards experience leaves that out.
		10. S. Lamb: I am pleased to see an Instructor on the transition committee. It will have as big an impact as the search committee. The EC did not come up with the idea of a transition committee, I think that was the Board of Trustees. I think it will serve us well in this period as well as further ones. In past searches when the President has felt that there was inadequate representation, I know the President has appointed an additional member.
		11. T. Hawkins: It may be splitting hairs, but the two slates weren’t rejected by EC, rather they were not approved.
		12. R. Guell: I believe it was after the selection of the search committee that selected Provost Licari, and D. Bradley and I were concerned about the balance. I am acutely sensitive to the need for balance in all dimensions. I made the motion to endorse the first slate at EC. I am comfortable with the first slate in that if the intention is mostly about providing representation, then that one is appropriate. However, my colleagues and I were persuaded by J. Conant that the experience dimension is something that can’t be missed. One of those members is the faculty representative to the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. I believe it is important for the faculty to have someone who is a powerful voice for shared governance at the highest level. It came to me that there is a balance of needs. I believe the EC slate accomplished that.
		13. D. Hantzis: I find this very awkward because of the nature that we are contesting each other’s judgment. Serving on a presidential search committee is a lot of work. It sounds prestigious. It’s a huge search committee. Those five on the EC slate, many were picked by AAC. I think we should decide who they are representing. Maybe each college needs to choose a representative. We can make it a lot simpler and less procedurally contested. I hope we will revise that.
		14. B. Bunnett: I agree that the policy needs to be looked at carefully. With the slates that come from AAC in that pool, AAC looks at it to ensure it is diverse. Then the EC makes sure again that the slates are diverse. In the situation we are faced with now, that the EC hasn’t approved any of the slates and they’ve produced their own slate. They could choose five full professors from CAS and that could be their slate. There’s no restriction. However, their slate is then voted on by us, that’s true. I see that as a flaw that their slate does not have the same kind of review that the others do. I’ve mentioned this before that J. Conant was on the search committee when the present provost was hired. I think the same people shouldn’t be on if they were on that committee.
		15. J. Conant: I would like to remind you that the purpose is not to represent policy, it is to screen. It requires depth and breadth of experience. Thank you.
		16. Slate 1 received 4 votes, Slate 2 received 8 votes, and Slate 3 received 17 votes.
	3. 2016-17 Staffing Report
		1. Motion to accept (L. Phillips, A. Kummerow). Vote: 27-1-0.
		2. K. Yousif: President Bradley; I respect and admire you, and I am very saddened by your upcoming departure. You have made innumerable improvements in the university, for its long-term health, our students, and its employees. Most importantly, you have created a certain school and professional pride, ultimately changing the culture of ISU. However; I am irate when I read the staffing report before us. I have felt this slow shift in resources over the past few years, and time after time, my fellow senators, notably Senator Lamb, have cautioned, encouraged, cajoled you to consider issues of faculty workload and morale. I remind you once again, that faculty cannot sustain the current “do more with less” expectations. We are teaching more students; we are under more and more service obligations, and we each face professional and personal standards of academic scholarship. I am not alone; ask any faculty member of any rank and in any discipline. I’m fatigued; I’m irascible (but you all know this); and both my work and my students are suffering. I ask the administration to act on the report’s recommendations.
		3. D. Bradley: Thanks. I appreciate your comments, especially the first part. I question the recommendations or findings. This is a report that should not be written in isolation. I think the provost, HR, or my office should be consulted before this is published. I question some of the conclusions.
		4. T. Hawkins: It would be helpful for the administration to formulate a response for the beginning of next year.
		5. D. Bradley: I think the report should be co-authored.
		6. R. Guell: I have to agree with D. Bradley on a couple of technical matters. The first one is the best of these ever produced was by R. Lotspeich and he sat down with D. McKee and agreed on definitions. I believe we need to agree and then go analyze the data. I am confident when you do that, you would agree with K. Yousif that the rebuilding of the administration has come at a faster pace than the rebuilding of the faculty. The second technical point serves to illustrate the problem that if you don’t agree on definitions or weren’t around, you come to an erroneous conclusion. We are counting the apples and criticizing the oranges. We need to have a good, constant set of definitions.
		7. S. Lamb: I noticed that shortcoming. K. Yousif’s point about how raw the institution is is such a valid point. I know we have achieved things that are unbelievable. We have been sandpapered to death. It is time to somehow turn the spigot in those areas where data indicates the spigot should be turned. The institution is desperate for something.
		8. J. Kinne: We should have recommendations at some point. If we are going to go with a higher instructional budget and a lower administrative budget, someone should come up with that.
		9. D. Bradley: I don’t know what definitions folks are using, but in number of students per staff member and number of students per faculty. The idea that the number of faculty has not come up with the number of staff is wrong.
		10. T. Hawkins: I think it would be helpful to give it to AAC at the beginning of the year.
5. SAC Items
	1. Policy 405, FERPA
		1. Motion to endorse (D. Malooley, D. Cooper-Bolinskey). Vote: 28-0-0.
	2. Admission/Scholarship Standards
		1. Motion to accept (A. Kummerow, B. Kilp). Vote: 28-0-0.
6. Committees
	1. Senate Standing Committees
		1. Motion to approve (D. Malooley, J. Gustafson). Vote: 28-0-0.
		2. K Yousif: Could you explain some of the changes?
		3. T. Hawkins: Some people backed out and did not want to serve.
	2. University Committees
		1. Motion to approve (D. Malooley, D. Cooper-Bolinskey). Vote: 28-0-0.
	3. PTOC
		1. Motion to approve (D. Malooley, J. Kuhlman). Vote: 28-0-0.
7. Proposed Revision to 246.6
	1. Motion to approve (J. Kinne, J. Kuhlman). Vote: 27-0-1.
	2. J. Gustafson: How do we determine if it’s minor change?
	3. T. Hawkins: This came as a minor change. We determined that it was discordant language and this straightens that out.
	4. R. Guell: J. Gustafson, I raised that too. The Senate clearly changed the process last year, and at the President’s request, we made the critical officer the Provost rather than the President.
8. Academic Calendar
	1. Motion to approve (L. Phillips, A. Kummerow). Vote: 27-1-0.
9. Adjournment 4:45 p.m.