

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
September 19, 2005
(Approved)

Attendance

Present: President Al Bowman, Marian Hampton, Nathalie op de Beeck, Josh Garrison, Brett Schnepfer, Ross Richards, Lynsey Wright, Farzaneh Fazel, Lane Crothers, Provost John Presley, Dan Holland, Eileen Fowles.

Absent: None

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of September 6, 2005

Motion XXXVII-6: By Senator Hampton, seconded by Senator Holland, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of September 6, 2005. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Oral Communication:

09.15.05.01 From Barb Todd: Parking and Transportation Committee - Request for Faculty Representatives

Senator Crothers: I have asked if any faculty members want to join the Parking and Transportation Committee. I have also asked Barb Todd if she can identify anyone who might be interested in serving on the committee. We will ask again for volunteers at the Faculty Caucus meeting on September 28, 2005.

Distributed Communications:

09.12.05.01 From Steve Adams: Enrollment Report Fall 2005

Communication Item on Senate Agenda of September 28, 2005.

09.13.05.02 From John Presley: Salary, Promotion and Tenure Review FY06

The Provost will present a summary of the recommendations for salary increments for FY06 to the Faculty Caucus, per the ASPT Policies, on October 12, 2005.

09.13.05.03 From Kathy Taylor, COB: College of Business Bylaws-Revised

Revisions to the College of Business Bylaws will be forwarded to the Rules Committee for review.

09.13.05.04 From Jan Shane, Associate Provost: Assessment Advisory Council - Request for Senate Faculty Representative

The selection of a faculty member to serve on the Assessment Advisory Council was placed on the Faculty Caucus Agenda of September 28, 2005. Senator Crothers added that Jan Shane is more than welcome to identify a faculty member who might be willing to serve.

09.14.05.01 From Vickie Carrell: University Commemorative Day - Policy on Review Cycle

The University Commemorative Day Policy will be forwarded to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee for review.

09.16.05.01 From Priscilla Matthews, University Review Committee: ASPT Document Regarding Matters of Confidentiality and Minority Reports

The University Review Committee submitted recommendations for changes to the ASPT Policies concerning matters of confidentiality and minority reports. The item was placed on the Faculty Caucus Agenda of September 28, 2005 for discussion and approval.

09.16.05.02 From Priscilla Matthews, University Review Committee: ASPT Calendar Revisions - Approved by Senate on 4/27/05

The ASPT Calendar from the University Review Committee reflects the revisions to the calendar approved by the Senate on 4/27/05 and shows the effects of those revisions on the 2005-06 evaluation period. As the changes were previously approved, no further action concerning this document is required.

09.07.05.01 Administrator Selection Policy - September 2005 Draft 2

Senator Crothers: The Administrator Selection Policy is not on your agenda, but are you prepared to discuss some of the comments regarding the policy made at the last Senate meeting on September 14? I would like to move it forward as an Action Item at the next Senate meeting. The point was made regarding 1.C., Internal Searches, which we need to change to Internal and Targeted Searches. I am recommending the insertion of a new D between C and the current D. We would say something to the effect of it is the responsibility of the organizing shared governance group to guarantee that the panel is as diverse and representative as possible: "As outlined in section 2, responsibility for creating lists of potential members of search committees lies primarily with campus shared governance groups. It shall be the responsibility of the groups to ensure that the pool has the broadest possible representation of the unit's skills, disciplines and talents, as well as meeting Affirmative Action criteria."

Senator Fazel: How about the numbers? How many people will be in the pools?

Senator Crothers: I did not change any of that.

Senator Fazel: I thought that the idea was that these people would be elected at the college level.

Senator Crothers: I heard you desiring elections and Dan desiring elections, but I didn't hear that from many other people.

Senator Fowles: The organizing body could elect or select.

Senator Crothers: This language makes elections impossible. Elections can't guarantee the appropriate diversity.

Senator Fowles: We only have eight tenure-track faculty and whether we elect or select, we are all on there.

Senator Crothers: The same problem is going to be true for any small college. The Provost made a very important concession on Wednesday and I would ask the President if he is comfortable with making a similar concession for his searches. The language regarding the dean search states that the search committee to screen candidates for college dean positions will be formed when the Provost makes the appointments. The Provost would be willing to insert the language, 'in consultation with the relevant shared governance group.' So, when selecting faculty, he would discuss it with the college councils; when selecting the AP person and civil service person, he would discuss the appointments with those governance groups.

Senator Holland: Rather than the Provost selecting from the pools, why not place the onus on the colleges themselves, allowing the CFSC to make the selections? That way, it is still the faculty making the selections.

Senator Crothers: I am not sure that that handles the concern that is being expressed of a manipulative administrator because it is the dean then muscling the CFSC.

Senator Holland: It is still a faculty-elected body actually making the selection of the faculty representatives. I would say that the proposed procedure is equivalent to the State of Illinois electing five potential senators and then the President gets to choose the two he wants.

Senator Crothers: The difference is that we have checks and balances formally structured by government and we don't at ISU. All decisions are ultimately made by the President of the University.

Provost Presley: A good analogy might be that George Bush actually does pick people to do specific things. He doesn't pick the people to represent the State of Illinois, but he does pick people to do specific things and that is what these committees are.

Senator Hampton: Like to head FEMA.

Senator Fowles: I thought that the at-large-individuals were going to be the ones used to make the gender and diversity balance.

Provost Presley: That has always been impossible. I can't balance a committee with two appointments.

President Bowman: Lane made the comment last week whereby he would feel comfortable giving the administrators flexibility and then holding them accountable if they don't do what they are supposed to do.

Senator Fowles: Can the administrator negate the selection list of the people who are willing to have their names on it?

Senator Crothers: There is always a chance of perversity. The question is whether you wish to structurally plan for it and imagine every alternative. Secondly, any senior administrator at any moment, having initiated a search, can cancel it. That power exists in the rules now. We are talking about hiring people to a managerial hierarchy. It doesn't bother me that we let managers select those people after we select the general pool, because it is their responsibility.

Senator Hampton: It still has a kind of top-down feel to me and we always want in a democracy to have some kind of grassroots connection, some kind of place where people feel that they have direct role in placing someone on the committee. Would it be possible to include one person elected at large? The reason that I think that we should consider that is because we talked after the meeting about the possibility of cronyism.

Senator Crothers: That is contingent upon us not letting them have a pool of such candidates.

Provost Presley: You are reacting to this as if the appointing officer can look at every faculty member in that unit and say who he or she wants on the committee. That is not the case. If you don't want cronyism, don't elect cronies to the pool.

Senator Holland: There is no guarantee of an election of any kind. The dean can essentially come in and say I want these ten people.

Senator Crothers: No, it would not be the dean; it would rest with the college council.

Senator Holland: Most of the people that I have shown this to have regarded it almost purely as a power grab by the Provost.

Provost Presley: In one sense, that is going on. I will have to admit that, because, right now, the process has created search committees that are cronyism and of people with agendas. The people who try to get elected have agendas.

Senator Holland: Sometimes they are elected because they have an agenda.

Senator Crothers: So, what are elections solving that non-elections risk?

Senator Holland: A lot of very unhappy people.

Senator Crothers: I am hearing some, but not "a lot" and if that stimulates someone to get on the Senate, great!

Senator Hampton: I outlined what was in this policy with my colleagues. John Urice's comment was that it sounded like it is pretty much in line with what other universities are doing.

Provost Presley: I see this as more shared governance than the current system. I see this as having more accountability built into it. I also see it as getting rid of a lot of problems that the current system has almost

guaranteed. It does not say that you cannot have an election; if you want to have an election, have one. If you want to elect the pool, by all means do so, but no appointing officer is going to reach down into the unit and say 'I want these six people'. I really don't understand this because, by whatever means you wish, faculty members will be creating a pool that the appointing officer is obligated to select from.

Senator Fazel: You mentioned that faculty could prevent people who have an agenda or who they don't approve of from becoming a part of this pool. I really don't see this as an option for us. In the College of Business, as I mentioned, if we ask for ten names, my guess is that five or six would volunteer. How can we then select for the final pool?

Senator Crothers: You have raised this concern several times. I think that the new language that we are going to add helps to deal with that problem because it puts the responsibility on the shared governance group of taking a positive set of actions to guarantee that the pool is representative. You and I disagree about dean searches. I think that it is very unlikely that only seven or eight people are going to volunteer for a dean search committee. This policy does put a positive obligation on the shared governance group compiling that pool to come up with diverse representation. If they violate that policy, then it is the responsibility of the appointing administrator to hold them to it or the responsibility of a shared governance institution like the Academic Senate to say that this college has failed. What can we do to fix this problem? There are no answers to every possible negative permutation. Getting back to my previous question, would the President be willing to add similar consultative language regarding the vice presidential searches?

President Bowman: I think that that is reasonable. I also think to deal with the some of the concerns, there might some wisdom in having this sunset in two years and have it revisited at that time. Then if your fears are realized, we can change it in short order.

Senator Crothers: We can ask for an assessment, but because of the turnover rate, we may need to have that review in three years rather than two.

Ms James: I don't understand the need for the pool if you are placing the onus to ensure diversity on the colleges. Why do you also need to have the Provost select from a panel to ensure diversity?

Senator Crothers: This draft takes that responsibility away from the Provost. This draft puts that responsibility in the colleges.

Ms. James: So are you keeping the language about the selection by the Provost from the pools?

Senator Crothers: It is my understanding that at this time we are keeping that, but that may be argued out before we are done. The other part is that I don't think I am going to get the administration to agree with any other language.

President Bowman: It is not just for the Provost; the same remains true for the presidential searches.

Senator Crothers: I want to make sure that I have a sense of the agreements and disagreements. The addition of a section requiring the responsibility of the shared governance group to take responsibility for providing the broadest possible pool has been accepted. The consultative language for both the President and the Provost and any place appropriate, will be inserted in the policy. The language regarding numbers and percentages remains. I did suggest for college deans that we go to four out of eight just for the sake of consistency.

I had two other concerns. As was pointed out at the Senate meeting, for the Vice President and Provost search, the Civil Service Council provides a list of civil servants from Academic Affairs and the AP Council provides a list of AP personnel from Academic Affairs. The other three vice presidential searches have these list generated by the staff of the divisions themselves. Is that appropriate since these other units are small compared to Academic Affairs or do we want to ask the AP Council and CSC to generate the lists for the other three vice presidential areas? I think that we just borrowed those procedures from the existing language. The other concern was that for the third bullet in the Vice President for Student Affairs section, we have 'one civil service employee and one administrative employee from a list of ten permanent members of the Student Affairs staff (provided by the Student Affairs staff)'. That is inconsistent

with the language for the other vice presidential searches in which civil service is choosing ten and AP is choosing ten. That needs to be clarified.

There were no objections to the summary of revisions, including the selection of the AP and civil service pools by the AP and Civil Service Councils for vice presidential searches.

Senator op de Beeck stated that she was more in favor of elections and suggested that if people knew what was at stake with an election, then more people might volunteer. This would result in a larger pool of candidates and an election would be a way to pare down the larger pool. Senator Garrison asked that the policy be revised to increase the size of the panel of students from which to choose in case some students needed to withdraw. Senator Crothers asked if there were any objections to bringing the policy with the proposed revisions before the Senate at its next meeting as an Action Item. Senator Fowles asked that it be brought back for a second information session because of the substantive revisions to the policy. She stated that constituencies would want to see the revised draft before it came before the Senate for a vote. The committee agreed to Senator Garrison's and Senator Fowles' recommendations. The policy, as revised, will come before the Senate for a second information session on September 28, 2005.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of September 28, 2005:

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of September 14, 2005

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Action Item:

Information Item:

Communications:

09.12.05.02 From Steve Adams: Enrollment Report Fall 2005

Adjournment

Motion XXXVII-7: By Senator Fowles, seconded by Senator Garrison, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda for September 28, 2005.

Senator Crothers: We do need to add the Administrator Selection Policy as an Information Item.

Senator Holland: The Rules Committee would like to have the Panel of 10 membership tenure question and the revised Faculty Associates Code of Ethics added as Information Items.

With the above additions, the Executive Committee unanimously approved the agenda.

Adjournment