Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
October 26, 2009
(Approved)

Call to Order
Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of October 12, 2009
Motion XXXXI-29: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of October 12, 2009. NPERs was corrected to NEPRs and the minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

10.12.09.01 From Dan Liechty/Faculty Affairs Committee: University Professor Policy (Information Item November 4, 2009)
Senator Holland: We have suggested revisions for the University Professor designation. They have gone through and really beefed up the procedures. You will notice there is actually no Senate involvement.

Senator Wedwick: I think that they decided that if this independent review committee were created, that would suffice for a vote that would be fair. It would be a faculty committee and wouldn't need to come to the Senate.

Senator Holland: If it is going to be a recruitment tool, having expediency with Senate approval could be a problem.

Senator Kalter: If this is going to be a recruitment tool, how would you get people to nominate someone who is not yet at the university?

Senator Wedwick: The Provost's Office would need to bring those forward, but then the review committee would look at that person's credentials and then give the approval of it.

Senator Fazel: In item 11, you say the nomination process would be waived. That would be for everybody who is coming from outside, not just those who have Distinguished Professor rank?

Senator Wedwick: No, I think only those who already hold Distinguished Professor rank at another institution. The whole thing is waived and the President grants approval. If a person holds the rank of Distinguished Professor, then they have already been through that process of people scrutinizing their credentials, so we wouldn't need to do that again.

Senator Fazel: I think for number 11, we need to say the nomination and review process shall be waived.

Senator Kalter: The only concern I would have about that is if we were recruiting from a school that does not have the reputation of ISU, but I would imagine that that's not going to happen.

President Bowman: I wouldn't approve it if their credentials didn't meet our criteria.

Senator Fazel: Before this document is approved, should the monetary value be included?

President Bowman: I asked Sheri to refresh our memory on what we did for Distinguished Professors. We would do something that is close to that.

Senator Wedwick: One of the things that came up in our committee is what happens if a person gets this designation and gets whatever the amount is. Then, a few years later, gets the Distinguished Professor, are they going to get an additional $5,000 on top of that? According to this, they have to give up their University Professor designation to get the Distinguished Professor. We think maybe that increment should not go up an additional $5,000, but that was just our thinking. We were not sure if it would be a one-time amount or something added to the base salary.

Senator Kalter: Where is the DP right now?

Senator Holland: I have a vague recollection that it is the same as the bump going from associate to full professor, which is $5,000 to the base salary.

Provost Everts: We can pull that language and send it to everyone on the Executive Committee.

Senator Holland: I guess we want to figure out if it is a one-time award.

President Bowman: Was it the sense of the committee that you wanted something added to the base?

Senator Wedwick: I think that's what people want because in the long run, that's what makes the big difference, but I do think our committee thought that either one was ok.

President Bowman: If they get this and then the DP later, that's the reward for doing a good job.

Senator Holland: Is there some sense of what people would like, a base salary increase significantly less than a DP, plus a one-time award?

President Bowman: We could do a base and a one-time amount.

Ms. James: Are we changing this document before it goes to the Senate.

Senator Holland: We can make a friendly amendment on the floor.

10.15.09.01 From Susan Kalter: Code of Student Conduct Summary of Revisions
10.19.09.01 From Susan Kalter: Code of Student Conduct – Revised (Information Item November 4, 2009)
Senator Stewart: On pages 28 and 29, I didn't see any corrections in your dark highlight.

Senator Kalter: There weren't any. I just thought that language needed to be put back in because we have it almost everywhere else. If you are on a DFSC, you can't promote your spouse.

Senator Fazel: I had a large number of points and they can probably be discussed after the meeting just to clean up the document. There were a few things I thought we needed to discuss in the committee. One is a suggestion of having a flowchart or some kind of guide to this document because you have to read the whole document to know what is really relevant to your situation.

Senator Kalter: I think that that is an excellent idea and I think that we should have them do that separately for this document.

Senator Fazel: On the Hearing Panel, we have a staff member, but on the SAB, Student Appeal Board, and the Student Grievance Committee, you have removed the staff from those two.

Senator Kalter: I have in this document because the Senate at some point either changed that or never had it as staff.

Senator Fazel: So this is from the Blue Book? The Hearing Panel can have a staff? My question is should it be consistent and have them on all three committees.

Senator Kalter: I think that's a question for another day, but it should be consistent with the Blue Book. If I go back and find out that there are no staff in the Blue Book, I will take that out. But if there are, then we should send it to Rules to decide why those are inconsistent.

Senator Fazel: On page 24, concerning academic integrity cases, it says that the faculty member should report all

instances of academic dishonesty to Community Rights and Responsibilities. I know "should" is not a very strong word there, but as a faculty member, I don't feel comfortable reporting every time a student does something dishonest. I was hoping that we could reword this so that it would not be misused. I think that many faculty try to deal with it themselves. If it's a major one, then you would definitely want to take it to the university level or if you have a repeat offense.

Senator Holland: I can understand why it should be, because if it is a repeat offense, you would have no way of knowing that. You could have someone trying to push the envelope in every class.

Senator Kalter: While I understand that rationale, if they want to know if the student is repeat offending in several classes, but I am simply unwilling to report every case that I get.

Senator Holland: We could say 'are encouraged to' or 'at their discretion'.

Senator Fazel: I thought, as a matter of courtesy, that we should send this back to Anne Newman before we bring it before the Senate.

Senator Holland: I can just advise her of the changes and see if she has any objections.

Senator Spialek: I looked at her document a few weeks ago and one of her big hold ups was the right for the aggrieved party to be able to appeal a decision. That was her main issue, but that is not an issue in this version.

Senator Kalter: That was a misunderstanding on my part and I reread it, so I decided to leave that out.

Senator Spialek: Right, on page 34, it says that aggrieved parties can only appeal the sanctions imposed for misconduct, not the finding of violations.

Senator Fazel: I have about 18 or 19 other little changes that we can talk about after the meeting.

Proposed Academic Senate Agenda for November 4, 2009:

Academic Senate Meeting Agenda

Date: Wednesday, November 4, 2009
Time: 7:00 P.M.
Location: Old Main Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of October 21, 2009

Gladly We Give Campaign (Vice President Dianne Ashby)

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ***President Al Bowman***
- ***Provost Sheri Everts***
- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams***
- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Daniel Layzell***

Committee Reports:
Academic Affairs Committee: Chairperson Gudding
Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Chairperson Kalter
Faculty Affairs Committee: Chairperson Liechty
Planning and Finance Committee: Chairperson Fazel
Rules Committee: Chairperson Solberg

Action Items:
10.08.09.01 Blue Book Revision: Academic Planning Committee Membership Confirmation (Rules Committee) (In 10/21/09 Packets)

10.08.09.04 College of Education Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee) (In 10/21/09 Packets)

05.08.09.03 College of Business Bylaws-Revised (Rules Committee) (In 10/21/09 Packets)

Information Items:
10.12.09.01 University Professor Proposal (Faculty Affairs Committee)

10.28.09.01 Code of Student Conduct-Revised (Executive Committee)

Communications:
Executive Session: Honorary Degree Recipient Recommendation (Provost Everts)

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-30: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda of November 4, 2009. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Discussion
Presidential Commentary – Questions Concerning Survey
Senator Kalter: We were talking about the fact that sometimes when people take the survey, they say to us that they don't know what the President did this year. I know that deans and chairs are supposed to put something out, like a one page document, about what they have accomplished. We were hoping that your office could provide that as a link. When we send out the survey by email, we can say here is a place where you can go to see this.

President Bowman: They really are institutional accomplishments. When would you like that?

Senator Kalter: We send out the survey the first day of classes in the spring.

President Bowman: Sure, I can get that to you.

Motion XXXXI-31: By Senator Wedwick, seconded by Senator Stewart, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.