

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, September 28, 2005, 7:00 p.m.
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Fowles called the roll and declared a quorum.

Attendance and Motions***Approval of Minutes of September 14, 2005***

Motion XXXVII-7: By Senator Meister, seconded by Senator Garrison, to approve the Senate Minutes of September 14, 2005. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Crothers: We welcome two new senators from the College of Arts and Sciences, Brian Wilkinson from Biological Sciences and Nerida Ellerton from Mathematics.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Garrison: As of last Wednesday, the Student Government Association has passed a new set of bylaws governing our Assembly, which is are senators. These new documents allow more specific power for individual senators to take on actions outside of the Association. Next Wednesday, we will be bringing forth the executive branch changes for our bylaws. In conjunction with that, we will be doing a constitutional referendum for the study body to update the constitution to coordinate with the bylaws that we have passed and will hopefully pass next week. As of this week, our senators have received their constituency list serves and have begun e-mailing students about the actions that student government is carrying out.

Administrators' Remarks***President Al Bowman***

President Bowman: Sandra Burke will be installed as the BroMenn Endowed Professor of Nursing on October 4, 2005 at 2:00 p.m. For those of you who have never seen an installation ceremony for an endowed professor, it is a very interested and dignified ceremony. If you have that hour free, I encourage you to join us. BroMenn Healthcare has provided funding for this professorship. The advantage for the institution is that it allows us to add a tenure-track faculty member in nursing, which then allows us to add additional majors in an area that is under some stress with high student demand. Dr. Burke received her doctorate from the University of Illinois and is very talented; we are excited to have her on our campus.

I was in Washington, D.C. last week. We are getting a lot of support from various members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation for some of the initiatives that we have asked them to fund. You know the success rate in the past. For example, we had an issue with a student from Nigeria who had trouble getting a visa and Representative Tim Johnson, our campus is in his district, and Senator Durbin worked behind the scenes to help make that happen.

Today, we had a group of community college academic advisors here in a workshop that was organized by our admission's staff. They report that interest in Illinois State among high school seniors remains high as well as with transfer students. I want to commend our admissions staff for engaging in this kind of activity. They have done a good job of holding focus groups and staying in contact with high school guidance counselors, as well as people in the community colleges. I think that is probably part of the reason that our application numbers continue to grow from year to year.

We announced today that ADM has funded some scholarships in agriculture. It is Decatur-based company. They are interested in targeting students from under-represented groups. They made a gift during the campaign of \$2 million and it has taken awhile to organize exactly what they wanted to do with it. When I talked to the CEO about the gift a year ago, his two main concerns were diversifying the workforce and retaining employees. If you are familiar with Decatur, Illinois, that can be a challenge in a community which is essentially an aging, rust-belt community.

I would like to thank faculty who are teaching 100 level courses for the extra work that will go into producing midterm grade reports. We had lots of conversation about the need for that several years ago. I think it is a good policy; it allows us to identify students who are in difficulty early and I think that is part of the reason that our retention rates are at an all-time high.

Lastly, I would like to compliment Josh Garrison and SGA for working with the property owners in dealing with getting them to roll back the deadline for signing up for apartments for the upcoming year. I am glad to see that you have gotten cooperation from most of them.

· **Provost John Presley**

Provost Presley: I wanted to announce that we have successfully been able to empanel two campus-wide committees that will be working on some of the initiatives that I have shared with this body in the past. In the Enrollment and Academic Services Office, we have empaneled a Program Enrollment Management Committee. It is going to be chaired by Steve Adams. The other members of that committee are Molly Arnold, Amelia Noel-Elkins from University College, Julie Huber from Enrollment Management, Jim Moon from the College of Business, Sally Parry from Arts and Sciences, Jon Rosenthal, the University Registrar, and Jeff Wood from CAST. Some of the things that they will be doing over the next year includes analyzing data to try to discern trends in students' actions in selecting and changing majors. They are also going to develop a process to determine academic program capacities, specifying ranges. They are going to try to determine the University's capacity to accommodate in the General Student category. They are going to looking at the possible ramifications of changing the freshman-transfer mix for new students in order to control the General Student issue from that direction as well. They are going to explore processes for recruiting students into specific majors keeping the over-subscribed and under-subscribed programs in mind while looking at this issue. They will develop a formal process for the development and the approval of major program entrance and continuation requirements. They are going to talk about the role of advisors both in UC and in the departments in assisting students in selecting majors. They are going to try to assess the department advisor's responsibility for at-risk-majors who may not meet continuation requirements. The last thing that that group is going to do is receive recommendations from the Academic Advisement Steering Committee. This committee is charged with looking at the report of the task force on advising—looking at those recommendations that were particular labeled as essential and trying to prioritize them. Then they will send their recommendations for initiating these changes to the program Enrollment Management Committee. The Academic Advisement Steering Committee will be putting into place the recommendations of the earlier task force and they will be reporting to the first committee that I mentioned. I particularly want to thank the people who have agreed to serve on the Advisement Steering Committee. Katie Killian from Enrollment Management and Danielle Lindsey from my office will be serving as co-chairs. David Barone, Chair of Psychology, Rod Custer, Chair of Technology, Maureen Smith who is an Advisor in C&I, Lon Carlson, Advisor in Economics, Sharon Walsh, Advisor in University College, and Julie Paska, who is an Advisor in University College as well. I am very grateful for their willingness to serve and I am looking forward to their working on that report from the Advisement Task Force last year. I think we are making very good progress to getting some of these long-term issues front and center and we have very good people looking at them.

· **Vice President of Student Affairs Helen Mamarchev**

Vice President Mamarchev: At our last Senate meeting, I indicated that we were planning and orientation for the students who had come to us as a result of hurricane Katrina and we had that orientation for them on Saturday, September 24. In addition to having the usual representatives, we also had representatives from the Red Cross. During lunch, we had a very fun Illinois State Fun Facts slide show that featured a lot of our famous alumni and special building on campus. I think that the program was very well received and it was interesting to hear these students talk about having to flee from their college or university and make their way up here. I think they have some group activities that they are participating in and they have expressed a lot of appreciation to faculty and students and staff who have gone out of their way to help them. Another thing that we did with Hurricane Rita approaching, with the Registrar's assistance, we ran the home address list for all the students who have a home address in Texas. We e-mailed each of the students who could potentially be in harms way to offer assistance. We have heard back from most of them and most of them did not have too much damage. There are a few people that we are following up on that we have not heard from. Last, but not least, Burger King is now open.

· **Vice President of Finance and Planning Steve Bragg**

Vice President Bragg: Vice President Mamarchev mentioned the hurricanes. One of the outcomes of both Katrina and Rita has been a renewed interest in disaster preparedness and planning for recovery. Illinois State University has a disaster preparedness plan. We refer to it as the Incident Management Plan. These plans are only as good as people are aware of them and able to carry them out. We last went through a rigorous and comprehensive review of that plan after 9/11. We have taken the plan and going through a process of review. We will be updating that plan and over the next couple of months going to through a promulgation and communication process to make sure that those folks that are involved in carrying out that plan are aware of their roles. We are also extracting significant pieces of that plan and designing a new web page.

The other impact that you can't avoid with the hurricane is the impact on utilities, especially on natural gas. We are monitoring this very carefully. Unfortunately, it is moving in the wrong direction. It is moving upwards. About two years ago, we purchased natural gas at about 38 cents a therm. This year, we will be using gas at somewhere between 68 and 70 cents a therm. Today, as we looked to purchase gas for FY07, the spot market is about \$1.30 to \$1.40 per therm. That will come down. We work with consultants on this who understand the market and its movement very well, so we will delay purchasing. But there is no way that it is going to come down to levels that we have been able to purchase this year. We will see some significant increases in utilities in the coming years and as we have a better idea of what that is, we will share that with you as well.

Senator Crothers: Is there a marked difference of the utility use out of Schroeder now that it has been renovated.

Senator Bragg: Just the double-paned thermal windows alone, we estimate have had at least a 10% improvement in consumption.

Senator Crothers: Does the new College of Business building operate less expensively than Williams.

Senator Bragg: Absolutely, we can control some of this. The biggest factor after weather is conservation and reducing consumption. Probably the single most important thing we can do on this campus to save energy is to re-lamp the entire campus—change out all of the inefficient fluorescent fixtures to more efficient lighting. That is a significant capital outlay that cannot be done all at once.

Committee Reports

· *Academic Affairs Committee: No report.*

· *Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee*

Senator Smith: We did complete the assessment of the Solicitation Policy and the Administrator Evaluation Policy; we will be forwarding those to the Executive Committee. We had a discussion about the annual commentary on the President and the means by which we gather information that contributes toward that commentary. Last year, we gathered information from the University community by means of an e-mail requesting comments on the President's performance. We discussed whether that was the best way forward to continue with that method alone. If anyone feels strongly about that method being inadequate or could be significantly improved upon, my e-mail address is pjsmit2@ilstu.edu.

· *Faculty Affairs Committee:*

Senator DeSantis: We discussed two major issues. First, we began the process of evaluating the efficacy of the new ombudsperson position with an projected recommendation in the spring about whether to make this a permanent position. One of the issues that came up was that the College of Arts and Sciences also just instituted an ombudsperson position, so the committee will discuss is whether other colleges are doing this and if so, do we really need a University ombudsperson. Second, we moved forward with our work on the issue of faculty retention at ISU. We will administer a survey this semester to get a sense of what is of greatest importance to faculty in terms of keeping them here and keeping them happy. We will also begin preliminary work on initiatives that the University might put into place to retain faculty.

· *Planning and Finance Committee:*

Senator Burk: We began our discussion on background material for our various charges that we have this year. Steve Bragg and Deb Smitley came to talk with us and gave us very information about the 'color of money', faculty and staff salaries comparison by peer groups and institutions and a short discussion about the process by which pay raises are determined at Illinois State.

· *Rules Committee:*

Senator Holland: The Rules Committee has several topics on the agenda this evening. We are plowing through our work just as fast as we can. We have looked at the College of Business revised bylaws and the revised College of Arts and Sciences bylaws and are completely mystified right now by the Milner Library Policy. We are going to get clarification as to exactly what it is.

Information Items:

09.21.05.04 *Administrator Selection and Search Policies – September 2005 Draft 3 (Senate Executive Committee)*

NOTE: September 2005 Draft 2 was distributed in the Senate Packets of 9/14/05.

Senator Crothers: You see before you draft 3 of the Administrator Selection and Search Policy. The decision was made to bring this back as an information item given that there were a number of significant questions raised at the last Senate meeting and people believed that there would be more significant questions raised at this meeting. It is certainly my intention that this policy be before you in two weeks for a vote. As it is being brought forward on behalf of the Executive Committee, I want to describe the changes that, based the Senate conversations of two weeks ago, the Executive Committee made to the document in cooperation with the President and the Provost.

First, you will note a new Section A in Section I, a sunset provision that this policy return for assessment to the Senate within three years. The typical review cycle is five year. This was an idea of the President and I appreciate the President's suggestion that in case there are concerns about the way this language is written or moved forward that we can act them on quickly, rather than needing to wait an excessive amount of time. There is also a new Section E. There were concerns that diversity in its broadest sense was the intent document, but was not explicitly within it. I believe that this makes it clear that it is the responsibility of both the shared governance groups and appointing officers to guarantee appropriate diversity in representation, both skills, talents and other types of diversity. Also, I still need change the title of Section D to "Internal and Targeted Searches". There are a few structural changes in Section II. Hopefully, these will accommodate many of the concerns raised two weeks ago. First, in II A, B, C, D, E, and G, everything but F, in the first paragraph it will read, when the President, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance body or, in the case of E and G, it reads, the Provost, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance body. This means that assuming this issue of panels continues to go forward, the choice can be made only in discussion with the shared governance body that created the list. Therefore, it is not quite as random or independent as some concerns were expressed at the last meeting. I appreciate very much the President's and Provost's accommodation of that concern. Note also in A, B, C, D and E that in case, we have increased the panels' numbers of students, which was at the students' request given that sometimes students

have to drop out of committees and they wanted to have a sufficiently large pool from which choose alternate representation. Also note that in A, B and C, we have essentially borrowed the language from D regarding the Civil Service Council and the AP Council providing lists of people to the appointing officer. That was both to clarify and make to the language consistent responding to concerns raised by the AP Council and the Civil Service Council. In D, E and G, there was discussion and the President and the Provost agreed that a reduction in the range of choices from these panels was appropriate. So, it is no longer 1 of 4, but its 1 of 3, or its no longer 4 of 10, its 4 of 8. Those kinds of changes were made to try to constrain the ultimate choice. In discussions with the administration and also with Human Resources, it was agreed that the question of NTT participation in search committees is in fact appropriately a Senate matter and not a unit bargaining matter. So, as a consequence, that issue, if people wish to raise it, is appropriately in the Senate again. The question of NTT representation on search committees is a fair topic for this Senate to address.

Senator Borg: What is the appropriate shared governance body for each of these? I assume for the vice presidential level, it's the Senate, for the college dean, it would be the college council. My concern here is with the Vice President and Provost. When you get from the various colleges 3 candidates from which one is selected, would the appropriate body be the individual college councils or would it revert to the Senate.

Senator Crothers: My interpretation is that it would be the college councils. In the other three, where it refers to the Faculty Caucus creating a list, then the Faculty Caucus is the appropriate place to go to.

Senator Borg: Would it be clearer if that were stated as such.

Senator Crothers: It would be clearer, but I am not sure how to write it.

President Bowman: For each of the vice president searches, the language about a civil service employee working with Academic Affairs seems to imply that, for example for the University Advancement position, that the AP and Civil Service representatives would be from Academic Affairs.

Senator Crothers: I apologize. I literally copied it and did not change that. In each area, it should be Academic Affairs for Academic Affairs and University Advancement for University Advancement, etc. That is my typographical error. I will fix that one.

Senator Fazel: Since in the College of Business, our college council is called the College Coordinating Team, could we in all the sections add "/Coordinating Team" where it refers to college councils?

Senator Crothers: That would be relatively easily accommodated.

Senator Holland: I did go out and actually poll my constituency this time and as I predicted, it came back unanimous against. How can I address the question from them of "We have already tried this approach with the President search where they sent two names forward and we had to choose one and there were many concerns when we did not chose the one that they wanted?" Another question that arose was, "How can a single person better protect the interest of the constituencies by reducing the role of the constituencies in selecting their own representatives?"

Senator Crothers: I think that this better addresses, and people may weight it differently, issues of true diversity because elections cannot actually address the question of diversity effectively.

Senator Holland: No one had any problem with trying to establish diversity, but they regard the current document as providing for that effectively.

Senator Crothers: But it doesn't because we ended up with seven white males on the search committee.

Senator Holland: It was pointed out last time that one of the big problems that the Provost would have a hard time finding any diverse members of the committee because they were significantly overworked. How is this going to change that? If there is nobody there to begin with, how is this going to change that?

Senator Crothers: Those Provost appointments, by rule, are obliged to not be in the college or the unit in which the search is going on. If the college may have more diversity within its ranks can bring its own diversity forward, that simplifies that problem.

Senator Holland: The other concern that people have is that this appears to be somewhat of a pattern of loss of faculty rights over the last couple of years. A number of people brought up the loss of the possibility of appeal for any promotion and tenure.

Senator Crothers: It is a very serious concern, but I don't quite see it the same way. The argument that I would make to them is that this expands faculty and shared governance rights in other areas, with internal and targeted searches, which right now go on without any involvement whatsoever. This expands involvement in those areas.

Senator Holland: I have problem purely with the selection process.

Senator Crothers: But the package matters. Moreover, there is an appeal for promotions, its just not after the Provost level. It is a question of where the appeal comes; the appeal is still there. I can understand the concern about the erosion of rights. This expands rights in one area. It does change the process of selection in a different one and part of the question is whether you think the possibility of promoting diversity is worth the risk. If you make the list and I have to choose from that list and I have to talk to you about who I am choosing, I don't sense how that is an erosion in shared governance. It is a change in shared governance, but I am not sure how that is an erosion. It seems to me that it is more shared because we are communicating rather than just directly, mechanically doing something.

Senator Holland: Their point is that the Provost has his people to select and the faculty have their people to select. Everybody is very keen on the idea of diversity, but they weight the loss of self-determination much more heavily. Finally, this policy seems to almost being guaranteeing conflict in the future because it is completely ripe for abuse from both sides. How would you address this?

Senator Crothers: I don't think that the abuse is possible from the administrator's side. I have been going around and asking people. You make the list; I have to choose from your list; and the question is whether or not we are going to fight about 1, 2, 3 and 4 versus 5, 6, 7 and 8 if your list is strong. I don't see the problem.

Senator Holland: From the faculty point of view, we could select four very good candidates that you want and four very weak candidates.

Senator Crothers: And you are just insane. There is no policy on earth to prevent someone from being stupid.

Senator Holland: I think that the last presidential election showed that. On the other hand, the Provost, or whomever, could abuse this if they wanted to by specifically targeting people they want on the committee and asking them to run and then no matter where they came in in the election, if they happen to make the top eight are automatically selected.

Senator Crothers: That does assume that a college council is just going to be a creature of the Provost and I find that very difficult to believe. It means that every faculty on this Senate would fall prey to something like that from a Provost and I find that remarkably unlikely.

Senator Holland: It is being allowed in the current document.

Senator Crothers: It is being allowed now. Why can't a Provost encourage people to run and then organize elections for them now.

Senator Holland: They could.

Senator Alferink: The comments were made last week and then repeated tonight that if you have a panel selected of very highly-qualified people, what difference does it make which of those people are selected. I would like to explore that issue a little and ask the following question. If the Faculty Caucus were to select a panel of 8 or 10 faculty members and if the President were to pick four of them to serve on the Executive Committee, would that be acceptable? Alternatively, if the Faculty Caucus were to select two candidates to chair the Academic Senate, would it be acceptable for the President to select one of those people?

Senator Crothers: You are comparing apples and oranges in the first question, because we are talking about administrator selection policies in which administrators, who are ultimately responsible for hiring administrators, have a say on who helps influence the selection of administrators. That is very different than a governance system in which faculty are choosing faculty leadership for faculty purposes. The administrator selection committee is faculty participating in the selection of administrators who work for other administrators. This is a different situation.

Senator Alferink: I refer to Item E, Section I, entitled, "Responsibilities of All Shared Governance Groups and Appointing Officials". That is a very nice addition, but how has it been operationalized in the rest of the document? What procedures have changed to reflect this statement in terms of the practices that this document addresses?

Senator Crothers: I think that the current selection mechanism that is offered in this document helps to resolve that very question, because it might be that a college council undertakes a nomination process. It might be that a college council undertakes and election process. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences' college council asked for a nominee from every department. The College Council and then look at those questions and balance those considerations. I trust my college council to do that intelligently. If you go to straight elections, I would strike Section E because there is no operational way to do it. It says, moreover, that when administrators make their selections, they have an obligation to consider diversity as well. It is operationalized by

allowing the flexibility. You are right if were in a situation in which a college presents only white males. In my opinion, that language means that it's the appointing officer responsibility to go back to that college council and say this is not a satisfactory list.

Senator Alferink: I am not certain that it puts the responsibility sufficiently on the other body. Is there sufficient responsibility provided or is the responsibility ultimately still on the appointing officer?

Senator Crothers: That's a fair question.

Senator Wilkinson: Will this new policy allow an administrator who they don't want to chose that would have to have had under the old system.

Senator Crothers: The possibility exists that that could happen.

Senator Wilkinson: I served on the selection committee; I actually chaired it for Dr. Mamarchev's predecessor and one of the members on it was Senator Razaki and I rather doubt that he would have been the first choice of an administrator. He served with great distinction.

Senator Crothers: I think that that is a legitimate concern. That is among the reasons that I think a three-year review is important.

Senator Ellerton: What is there in the document that "jointly" is interpreted in the same way by all parties? In Section E, it reads, "the responsibility to form search committees is held jointly by shared governance and the University officials, but there is no reference anywhere that intimates how one might interpret or negotiate what it means to be joint and the two parties concerned could have very different ideas of what joint is.

Senator Crothers: I did not consider that because my understanding is that is exactly what the rest of this policy does by assigning who is responsible for what role in creating memberships. The policy obligates both sides to do. I don't sense that there any wiggle room, because that is what the policy outlines who has to do what and when.

Senator Ellerton: I would refer to the phrase that is used throughout, "in consultation with appropriate shared governance body". That consultation can take various levels. What does in consultation mean and where might one find out a definition of what that might mean or somewhere that that would be negotiated.

Senator Crothers: Under the "Memorandum of Understanding" that Senator Borg negotiated between the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees, it defines the responsibilities of shared governance for both the administration and the Senate. Though all the things that we do are subject to presidential approval, it does require that should a president refuse to accept the Senate's actions, they owe us a conversation and explanation. You are right that there is no governing language precisely defining how serious or sincere that needs to be, but so far, it has happened. So far, no president has rejected an Academic Senate action in the now seven years since that document was passed. So, I am not sure how one would write in that level of precision. If you have any ideas, I would be curious to see them. You can send me an e-mail.

Senator Ellerton: In Section I, letter I, page 4, changes in procedure, why has it stated that any modifications or interpretations of these procedures should this document be approved would need to be approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee rather than the decision made by the Academic Senate?

Senator Crothers: I think that this carry over language that may need a mild amount of clarification. All policies at ISU are in a five-year review cycle. Many of those policies come through the Academic Senate as part of that cycle. That language is not intended in any way to indicate that this policy would not come through under the five-year review cycle to the entire Senate. Indeed, Section A requires that it come through the entire Senate in just a three-year cycle. The clear intent of that section is if, for example, there were modifications requested due to special circumstances regarding a specific search, that request would go through the Executive Committee. I will certainly add language clarifying that.

Senator Mackey: Under Section I.F.3.e, it refers to setting a reasonable deadline. What is reasonable?

Senator Crothers: There is no way to answer that question. The practice has been historically about one week. About a week after the last candidate leaves, the search committee typically has met to discuss the candidates. It depends on the search is happening. I am not aware of any circumstance in which a timeline has been set that disenfranchises people who wish to be heard.

Senator Smith: There was an issue brought up last time about the non-tenure track faculty being excluded from this document and you mentioned earlier that they could be included?

Senator Crothers: That is correct. It is within the purview of this Senate to decide if they believe non-tenure track faculty membership is appropriate. I had a meeting today with Senator Rahn, the NTT rep. I feel confident that when this comes as an

action item, there will be an amendment offered from the floor adding non-tenure track representation.

Senator Fazel: On page 3, item H.2. about final appointment for department chairs and directors. When you read this statement, it seems like the deans do not really play an active role in the selection of a department chair anymore. The search committee would recommend the names and provide the report to the dean and the dean would just forward that report to the Provost.

Senator Crothers: I believe that this is carry over language from the existing policy.

Senator Fazel: The existing policy I believe says that the dean makes the choice and then forwards that to the Provost and to the President.

Senator Mills: I believe that this is different language and I would assume that a provost would want to confer with a dean about it, but it does not say that specifically. Where it makes a reference to a dean making a recommendation, it is just saying that the provost or the president could reject those recommendations. That would be an area of concern for me because I would assume that a provost or president would want to know a dean's recommendation.

Senator Crothers: That may be easily solved in revision.

Senator Fazel: I e-mailed this document to all of the faculty in our college and asked for feedback. The overwhelming majority opposed and had concerns about this document basically because of the impact it would have on shared governance. One of the parts that faculty brought up was the idea of targeted searches. I believe that Senator Smith asked last time if they were internal or targeted and we decided that we would make them internal and targeted. However, when you read the paragraphs related to this, there are still mixed together. Are we talking about targeted searches only within the University or could we just decide that our next dean, for example, is going to someone we have already identified from another university without actually going through a search process?

Senator Crothers: They are mixed because it is possible. The language goes on to require that the provost or the appointing officer have a conversation with your college coordinating team about that very question. So, it is not just a random discussion; it does require participation of shared governance.

Senator Fazel: Just having a conversation with a group is different than actually working with them and having their agreement on that. It is something that the Executive Committee has to clarify. This document has come to the Senate floor as a document forwarded by the Executive Committee of the Senate, but I would like to mention that several members on the committee did not support this document. How do we make sure that when the conversation place, the final decision is something that the parties actually agree to?

Senator Crothers: There is no way to guarantee that when all decisions are ultimately the President.

Senator Fazel: On page 2, F.3.f., prior to making its recommendations to the appointing officer, the committee shall "arrange an interview for any candidate designated by the appointing officer. Is this in addition to the final list that the committee has identified?

Senator Crothers: Yes, because it has empirically been the case in a senior administrative search within the last several years, the Affirmative Action Officer ordered the search committee to add a name, as they have the right and power to do.

Senator Fazel: Does it happen at the beginning of the process? In other words, do these people also go through the same screening process?

Senator Crothers: This is carryover language and it depends. The appointing officer has under exiting policy to do this now.

Provost Presley: It was our intention to use the carryover language about the searches for department chairs or school directors. Unfortunately, the one phrase that did not get carried over is that the dean shall indicate his or her preference for a departmental chairperson or school director from among those recommended by the committee. I would have no problem whatsoever with language being inserted that would indicate that the dean's preference has some weight.

Senator Fazel: I am just not sure about the internal and targeted search. Can we then explain this in a language that is clear what we mean by targeted searches? If the targeted search can be external, then that language should be clarified so people know what they are voting for. Does it refer to only those positions in II.G, which the targeted search section refers to? I think that these are really significant factors for our role in shared governance depending on how we define these terms.

Provost Presley: I understand the wish to have those things defined, but I think it would be an error to put those definitions into a three-year or five-year policy because those terms are defined search by search by the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action.

There are legal issues. They may change as legal precedent changes. Targeted searches and internal searches can only be done if they are declared legal by ODAA. What this would do is also add to that the relevant governance body would also have to agree that it was legal and appropriate. I think that it is important that everyone know that there are rules for determining that, but they are very difficult to describe. We would wind up with a policy many, many pages long. The decision about whether it is legal to do it is made instance by instance by ODAA.

Senator Borg: What would be the problem if on page 1, I.D., instead of saying “especially”, we just eliminate that word and it would read, “it is sometimes appropriate for positions covered in section II.G” and limit it to those in II.G. That would seem to address the question that Senator Fazel has about dean searches.

Senator Crothers: I would have to discuss that with the Provost.

Senator Fazel: That only refers to internal searches.

Senator Crothers: No, the second sentence is governed by the first.

Senator Fazel: Until two weeks ago, I was under the impression that these targeted searches apply basically to the same category of positions that internal searches would. Now, they take place, but these are not positions that have direct impact on faculty and students without their involvement. They do have a major impact on the institution, but these are not dean positions, chair positions, vice presidential positions. But last time, it was stated that, yes, the targeted searches could be internal or external and now you saying that it could even be a deal. So then that changes this document for me.

Senator Crothers: I believe that Provost Presley indicated that he would not have a problem removing “especially” and I will place a semicolon between the first and second sentences in the targeted search section. Will that solve your concerns?

Senator Fazel: If targeted and internal searches are only limited to Section II.G., I will not have an objection to it.

Senator Crothers: Thank you; that will be easy to do.

Provost Presley: Actually, I would object to that. Sometimes internal searches are appropriate.

Senator Fazel: If targeted searches apply to deans and to chairs and to positions that directly affect faculty, then that was the point of concern. Faculty have expressed a strong concern about that.

Senator Borg: The wording might be, “It is sometimes appropriate to limit searches to internal campus applicants only. It also may be appropriate for positions covered in Section II.G. to conduct targeted as opposed to open searches. In other words, place that restriction in that that second sentence.

Senator Crothers: I am not sure about the Provost’s intent and agreement, but I can see how it might solve the problem.

Senator Alferink: I want to follow up one more time on Section I.E., Responsibilities of all Shared Governance Groups. Was consideration given to specifically making governance bodies within the college responsible for that process? For example, there might be eight individuals nominated that the college council can select from. Has that been discussed?

Senator Crothers: I don’t understand the question. Right now, the college council is nominating all eight for the dean search and the Provost is choosing four.

Senator Alferink: I am trying to put some responsibility on that body and if they don’t actually make the selections, I don’t think that there is accountability there. So I am trying to guide one way in which E might be operationalized.

The Administrator Selection and Search Policy will come before the Senate as an Action Item on October 12, 2005.

09.23.05.05 *Faculty Associates Code of Ethics (Rules Committee)*

Senator Holland: We looked at changes in the Faculty Associates Code of Ethics to reflect the changes in the University ethics document relating to consensual relations. In your document, they have underlined their changes and we looked through it and we were fine with it.

Motion XXXVII-8: By Senator Holland, seconded by Senator Alferink, to move the item to action. The motion was unanimously approved by the Senate.

Motion XXXVII-9: By Senator Holland to approve the revisions to the Faculty Associates Code of Ethics. The motion was unanimously approved by the Senate.

09.23.05.01 Administrative Selection Committee – Panel of 10 – Blue Book Revision (Rules Committee)

Senator Holland: There was some question about who was allowed to serve on the Panel of 10, because on one page, it specifically said tenured faculty only and on the other one, it just said nominations are made from each academic department. We wanted to make sure that this was tenure faculty, so we added that line. There is a change that I forgot to make. If you look at the functions down below, there is a list of various people and it needs to be updated to actually reflect current names. We suggested making number three, which is Provost, should actually be Vice President and Provost and I wanted to make that one number one. Number two would be Vice President of Student Affairs. The “and Dean” has been dropped. Five would go to three; six would go to four. Number five would be college deans and number six would be university administrators other than those listed above.

Senator Borg: There is one other necessary revision, department/school.

Provost Presley: I have a question about the language that is now number one, university administrators other than those listed below. The Administrator Selection Policy that is now in effect says that members of the Panel of 10 would be used for a specific class of administrators. Is this not too broad? Does that mean that the Director of Housing search would be chaired by a member of the Panel of 10?

Senator Holland: That is not our intention. There are one or two other positions that have been specifically brought up where it would be appropriate to have a member of the Panel of 10 on it, but it is not for every single search.

Provost Presley: Could I suggest that the committee consider changing it to “Academic Affairs Administrators”?

Senator Crothers: This can come as an Action Item in two weeks if you want to make those changes and come back to us with them.

Communications:**09.12.05.01 From Steve Adams: Enrollment Report Fall 2005**

Provost Presley: This is the specific document that I promised you last time when I talked about enrollment during my opening remarks.

President Bowman: I would like to make two comments about the report. One, a higher number of students above 30 on the ACT composite are on our campus today than at any other time in our history. Number two, I looked at the closely freshman profile for Indiana University and ours is virtually tied. That’s pretty good company.

Adjournment