

**Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes**  
**March 29, 2010**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

***Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of March 15, 2010***

**Motion XXXXI-83:** By Senator Fazel, seconded by Senator Kalter, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of March 15, 2010. The minutes were unanimously approved.

***Distributed Communications:***

**03.05.10.01** *From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Surveillance Equipment Policy (Previously Dist. 3/15/10; Information Item 3/24/10)*

**Senator Kalter:** We decided after the last meeting to put this back on this agenda, partly because Dr. Bowman was not here when we had it on the agenda the first time. I know more about what goes on than I ever have and I think we should talk more about it. You wrote up something after the meeting.

**President Bowman:** Yes, as I listened to the discussion, it seems like we need a policy that covers both official police kind of investigation and sort of the usual safety surveillance cameras that we have in the residence halls because I think it is the later that this policy is really aimed at to prevent people from putting up surveillance cameras anywhere without some oversight. For the police version, if we said something like this policy applies to non-investigative operations. It applies to that second kind of surveillance.

**Senator Fazel:** Like ongoing security.

**President Bowman:** Right, for safety and security. It is voluntary surveillance that the university has decided to implement.

**Senator Holland:** We might say that all other surveillance is subject to state law. What kind of oversight is there for police surveillance?

**President Bowman:** It varies. In some cases, they would not inform us and they shouldn't because of the sensitive nature. Maybe Administrative Affairs and Budget should re-look at it with Lisa Huson.

**Senator Kalter:** She came in the first time. I would like to have the minutes from the Senate meeting in the meeting with us when we talk to her about it again. After Wednesday's meeting, it suddenly became clearer to me the kinds of things that could be going on and why it is not wise for the President to tell other people about it. I am wondering if there are three different things here. One is a case where law enforcement agencies aren't informing anybody. Another is the case where they are and it is sort of what the first part of this current policy is doing, which is saying, when they inform us, we are expecting them to take the stuff down when everything is over. The third one is about the routine, ongoing surveillance. So, what we don't have here is the admission that we don't have control over everything. We have taken it off the Senate's agenda and put it back on the Administrative Affairs' agenda for next year.

**Senator Fazel:** I made a comment in the Senate and I wanted to clarify that. It was about the university notifying the campus community of its location. We want to have that flexibility. The reason I brought it up is to make sure that the university doesn't feel like everywhere we have a camera we have to have a sign. So when you are doing the new language, you should clarify that.

**Senator Kalter:** I think that it is very clear right now. We were saying that one way to notify was to put it on a website and not even have it where the cameras are. The sentence says 'shall notify the campus community of location and purpose through appropriate delivery systems determined by the President'. So that leaves the President a lot of

leeway as to whether we want to have big, bold signs on every camera or if we just want to have it on a website saying where it is. I think it's already covering what you are asking.

**Senator Fazel:** That it is already flexible?

**Senator Kalter:** Yes, I think it's very, very flexible.

**03.25.10.01** *From Academic Affairs Committee: Equitable Treatment of Students Policy-Revised (Information Item 4/7/10)*

**03.25.10.02** *From Academic Affairs Committee: Volunteer Emergency Worker Policy (Information Item 4/7/10)*

**Senator Stewart:** We had to take out references to students who are volunteer emergency workers, because they were not really participating in university sponsored events. We needed to strike through everything that refers to emergency volunteer workers and give them their own, separate policy to make it more logical and to make it easier to spot so that governing agencies can see that we do have a policy that covers this state statute.

**Senator Kalter:** In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be addressed to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Ordinarily, something like this would go to Community Rights and Responsibilities. I am wondering who determines and why we determine that certain things are going to the Provost's Office.

**Senator Stewart:** Jonathan put this together with legal getting involved. I am pretty sure that the reason for this is that it is a state statute that we are complying with.

**Senator Kalter:** The second one. What about the first one? That's us deciding that so I am wondering if we want to keep it that way.

**Senator Hochhauser:** I think it's because it is university sponsored events. I think when it's a general absence that a student is trying to be provided for, then they can go to CR&R.

**Senator Kalter:** So it's not to put the burden on a student to bring it for an appeal?

**Senator Hochhauser:** It's not appealing the actual absence because they have a letter that they are excused, but it's the way that they are able to make up work.

**Senator Kalter:** In many ways, it's good to have that in here because it appears more heavy handed than Community Rights and Responsibilities. The implication is that a student will be supported if they appeal.

**President Bowman:** You probably have got a timing issue, too, because you need an immediate answer.

**Senator Kalter:** Definitely for the second one. I don't have much of an objection to the second one. The question is more about the university sponsored activity one.

**Senator Stewart:** You don't want the semester to run out and the student still hasn't taken a make-up test. They are both time sensitive. It has to be covered before the end of the semester and a few professors have a situation where we are going to drop your lowest grade. Students who go away for a band or sporting events and professors say, 'We had a quiz. You missed it; that will be the one you drop.' That might be the one they were going to ace, so it's not really fair.

**03.25.10.03** *From Planning and Finance Committee: Institutional Goals and Priorities Report (Information Item 4/7/10)*

**Senator Fazel:** We have six priorities. Some of them are the same as last year; some of them are different. The number one priority we still believe is faculty-staff salaries. A lot of the suggestions that we have here were also in the document last year, but since we did not have a midyear raise, still they apply because we would really like to see this

happening. We are definitely focusing on working on salary inversion and compression and under-rewarded merit, rather than another vehicle for rewarding meritorious performance at the end of the year. This goes a step further beyond that. We are also looking at full professors versus associate professors. They are both in the category of receiving this midyear raise, but full professors are further behind and also they don't have a chance of getting a bump after they are promoted from an associate to full, so this is the only chance, basically, to get salary compression and inversion addressed. So we are asking for full professors to be treated a little differently than associate professors.

Then in terms of transparency of the process, in the few years that we have done this, people have asked, 'Do you know how they decided or do you know how they came up with this?' So we ask the deans or department chairs to officially announce what the process has been. Not to talk about who got what, but this is the criteria for giving the raises. With the openness that we have at ISU, I think that this is also an important part that should be communicated in terms of why the decisions were made and how.

Then the other part is using median salaries rather than averages because when you have really high salaries and really low salaries, averages usually cancel those extremes. The overall picture might look better than what it actually is. The next thing in this category is graduate students. We understand that starting last year, we are paying a penalty for the health insurance premiums, but still we really need more graduate assistants and we need to pay them more so that we can recruit good graduate assistants to come to ISU.

The next item is enhancing library resources. This has been elevated since last year to the number two priority for us. Faculty and students have had issues with the library in terms of facilities, collections and staff. We had Dean Elzy come and talk to the committee and people were convinced that this is really, really important and we need to pay attention to this. They also showed us how we compared to our comparative institutions, especially in terms of collections and staff. This affects our students, our teaching and our research, so we thought it really has an impact on us overall.

Then enhancing a student's educational experience—we have a number of items here. This was on our list last time, but now number one under enhancing a student's educational experience is having a wireless campus. It is just the basic minimum that they expect from us.

**President Bowman:** We were ready to move forward with that this year and then the cash flow crisis hit us.

**Senator Fazel:** Then we always have those problems with classroom furniture and technology. We would like to have a wireless campus and at the same time have access to technology in our classrooms. Next we have continue to enhance student advising. We know that the university is making a lot of improvements in that area. Based on the conversations that we had with the students, maybe we don't have enough advisors so advisors are pressured to process students quickly. Students related that they felt rushed and were not given the time to sit down and spend good quality time with their advisors.

**President Bowman:** Was the complaint about department advisors, university advisors or both?

**Senator Fazel:** I think it was mostly at the departmental or college level. Another thing is small class sizes. That is why they come here and that's why they stay here. Then we have resources for increasing our capacity, which of course includes faculty and then continuing efforts in creating learning environments including community service opportunities. Number seven is the same as last year's: diversifying the student body and the faculty.

Number four is increasing the operating budget. It has been on our list every year. We really need to do something about it in terms of support for travel and technology.

**President Bowman:** We were planning on increasing operating this year, but then we had the cash flow problem. That won't be there forever.

**Senator Fazel:** Then explore expanded programming. This was on our list last year. We developed a proposal for offering courses during winter break and we were talking about additional courses in the summer. The part about

offering online courses or distance courses, this has been worked on and we have had a report on that, but that's still in progress. The other part about offering additional courses in winter and summer, because of budget situations, that's on hold. Because that's hold, we thought we still needed to keep this on our list of priorities until we had a chance to do something.

Finally, improving facilities. We wanted to commend the university leadership for starting the process of revising the master plan. We also support having Fine Arts and the library project as the top two priorities for capital projects. We think that we really need to put money aside for more buildings, which is both a safety issue and a functional issue.

The requested administration action, based on the Memorandum of Understanding, is that we are asking the President to forward this to the VPs and we are asking the VPs to let us know if they agree with recommendations and, if they do, what they are doing in support of these, or, if they do not agree with these, why they don't agree. We are asking for the responses by November 10, 2010.

**Senator Kalter:** We were talking about two, three and four before the meeting and how difficult it is to prioritize those because they are all extremely important. Is there a way to do a 2a, 2b, 2c, because to me I would sort of equalize exploring programming and improving facilities? I think the operating budget problem is getting bigger and bigger. As costs go up for everybody, it becomes increasingly difficult for people to go to conferences. There is also more than just travel. So I am wondering is there a way to equalize those three priorities or do we have to make the choice to put the library first, student educational experience first or operating budget first.

**Senator Stewart:** I actually see two, four, five and six as subheadings of three, because enhancing the student educational experience is related to all of those.

**Senator Holland:** Although, enhancing the library is not just the student experience. Also, number five can have a significant influence on number four.

**Senator Wedwick:** What is the process for increasing operating budgets for departments and when is the last time departments have gotten an increase?

**Provost Everts:** Last year, we had a 3%. The issue was that it was a drop in the bucket and I think that hardly anyone noticed it. Prior to that, it has been a decade or more.

**Senator Fazel:** I should mention that although we have improving facilities as number six, it doesn't mean it's the lowest priority. It's just the most expensive. In practice, even though you say there is nothing attached to those numbers, when you read a list, the items at the top of the list seem more important.

**Senator Wedwick:** Which is what would happen with a, b and c, also.

**Senator Kalter:** I would make more of an argument for this as an associate professor. Associate professors are much more likely to change institutions, so I think it's a big mistake to attach more attention to full professor salary adjustments than associate professors. I don't necessarily think that associate professors should have more attention, but I don't like this line that says, since there is no opportunity for promotion, etc., the higher priority should be given to full professors. I really think that this should be an across the board thing, because we are much more likely to lose somebody to another institution as they are in the midst of their career. There are not promotion-related pay increases, but people can become Distinguished Professors and University Professors. There are other ways for full professors to enhance their salaries that may not be available to associate professors. Consulting fees, for example, are an opportunity that often attaches to a greater seniority and greater experience in one's field. We know that there's a bigger deficit, but I wonder about having a disproportionate attention to full professors.

**Senator Stewart:** In our school, we look at the disparity in salaries. If a full professor is 16% below the norm and an associate is 5% or 7%, then we try to close the gap a little bit more for full professors. We try to do a proportionate adjustment. We look at it across the board.

**Senator Kalter:** I think that it should be a departmental decision, not us telling people to do it one way or another. Why not allow people, as we always do with the ASPT process, to make their decisions based on the conditions locally.

**President Bowman:** That is the way the process is supposed to work. The DSFCs weigh all of this because it is unique from department to department.

**Senator Wedwick:** I would like to weigh in for assistant professors, because if we fix the problem at that end, we might not have such a big problem at the tail end.

**Senator Fazel:** The other case would be to look at each individual rather than looking at categories because we have some assistant professors who are underpaid, we have some full and some associates. But the directive still comes from the Provost or the President. For example, they say this should only go to full professors and associate professors. How they divide it up is up to the DFSCs and CFSCs. What we are saying is because this is based on how far people are behind the market salary and other peer institutions, if the full professors are further behind, then they should get... we are not saying what portion of the fund should go them, but we should pay attention to the fact that we have a group of people who more underpaid. Let's look at every individual and compare that to people in their rank and for their performance. Then we will make a decision how much they are underpaid. If we want to fix that, I would be all for that.

**Senator Stewart:** I would recommend phrasing it that way instead of paying more attention to full professors. Pay more attention to the group that would be more out of line.

**Senator Fazel:** Right now, full professors are more out of line.

**Senator Stewart:** Instead of naming rank, you give priority to the group that is more out of line.

**President Bowman:** That's the way we have done it.

**Senator Kalter:** I would recommend striking the sentence altogether, but if you are going to say something, I would agree with that. You would say grant higher priority to the greater disparity, because that is only fair.

**Senator Fazel:** But isn't that full professors?

**Senator Kalter:** Not necessarily.

**Senator Fazel:** You are looking at it as categories now, not individuals and this is the way it has been done. 'Within categories of employees who are below peer group medians'. We are looking at our faculty and staff in categories.

**Senator Wedwick:** Assistants aren't mentioned in here anywhere.

**President Bowman:** The midyear doesn't go to them because they are at peer group average.

**Senator Fazel:** But we have associates who are below peer groups less than full professors. That's why we are saying, if assistants aren't included and we have associates and fulls and if it is based on how far the category is below peer groups, then full professors need it.

**Senator Holland:** If there is a department where associates are further behind than fulls, then you would definitely want it to go to the associates.

**Senator Stewart:** That's why I wanted the wording to be a little more general so that it gives each department the flexibility to deal with the problems that they have.

**President Bowman:** Departments have the flexibility to do what Susan is suggesting. There may be some departments

that might decide to give a bump to a professor who is retiring in two years.

**Senator Kalter:** I am saying both, because I'm an associate and I don't want that kind of discrepancy. Also, I think it's a local decision and the individual DFSCs and SFSCs have to be looking at specifics and can't be beholden to this, especially because this is unfair to associates and likely not to retain good faculty. Mostly this is for equity and retention and it's not going to perform its function if you are not allowing DFSCs and SFSCs to make decisions according to their individual circumstances.

**President Bowman:** Maybe if you struck that last sentence because every department is so different; I don't know that you could describe a scenario that works for everyone.

**Senator Kalter:** I would like to have that sentence removed and leave it as it has always been.

**President Bowman:** We have envisioned this process as being department driven. It has to be approved up the chain, but we never adjust those recommendations from departments.

**Senator Fazel:** At the same time, if this is for equity and salary inversion and compression and then it goes to a department and a department argues the same way that Susan does, that this is a younger faculty and chances are higher that this person is going to leave, so let's give a bigger bump to this person even though this person is only 2% below the market. The other person is only four or five years away from retirement and even though the person is 15% below the market, we don't have to worry about them. To me, that is what we do. If this is based on equity, shouldn't someone who is further behind be treated differently?

**Senator Kalter:** Why are you assuming that that is a full professor in every case?

**Senator Fazel:** I am not assuming that.

**Senator Kalter:** Yes, this sentence assumes that full professors should get higher priority.

**Senator Fazel:** That doesn't mean that you give them more if they don't deserve it, but you pay attention to the fact that this is a full professor and they are further behind. Let's look at these people and then look at the associate professors and see which one should be getting more.

**Senator Kalter:** I very much doubt that anyone reading this would know that that's what you meant.

**Senator Stewart:** If you strike that last sentence, the sentence before really says that: 'in combination with annual merit-based raises, this plan should continue to offer targeted midyear pay raises to address salary inversion and compression and under-rewarded merit within categories of employees who are below peer group medians.' I think that says what you want it to say. It is open enough to address those inversions, which are the most critical.

**Senator Fazel:** I will discuss it with the committee, but because of the comment that Susan made, I am actually concerned now that this could be interpreted that associate professors are more important because they are going to be here for a long time or leave, so let's give them a bigger raise.

**Senator Kalter:** I am not saying that associate professors are more important.

**Senator Fazel:** But that could be interpreted that way and that's my concern now.

**Senator Kalter:** Well I'm concerned that this looks like full professors are more important and I don't think that they are.

**Senator Fazel:** They are not more important, they are more underpaid.

**Senator Kalter:** In general. But we also know from what you have said in the past that there are people in some

departments who are actually higher than their peer group median who are getting money out of this fund. So that's not fair. We know that there are people who are high performers who are already getting top salaries who are getting midyear raises because DFSCs are making these decisions to give salaries to their top performers who already above their peer group median. That could be a full professor. So that person would get money before an associate who is below and has under-rewarded merit. This is not directing the money to the people who are below the median; it's directing the money to full professors.

**Senator Fazel:** I will run this by the committee and maybe we would have another sentence or something that would clarify that.

**Senator Kalter:** I think you have three people who are disagreeing with that and our objection needs to be taken into serious consideration.

**Senator Fazel:** We will and maybe we will consider something else.

**Senator Holland:** I think the primary goal is to address salary conversion and compression.

**03.25.10.04** *From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Blue Book Revisions – AABC Functions: Academic Impact Fund (Information Item 4/7/10)*

**Senator Kalter:** We are adding a couple of things to the Blue Book committee functions just to clarify what future committees should do. The first one is just for the AIF, recommending that the committee meet in October. I had it written up a couple of different ones so that we would receive that cash flow report in the spring. Then I thought why not do it all at once in October. So what we are recommending is that we meet with the Provost's Office, receive reports that we usually receive in the fall on searches authorized, the data used to determine that, but also at that time get that cash flow report that just came through now. I couldn't figure out a good way to word that without saying the two previous calendar and fiscal years. It just seemed best to have two calendar years and two fiscal years and receive the report that way and then they would draft their recommendations. The other thing is just to remind whoever is chair that when we meet with you folks to talk about the operating budget in the fall, it should take place before the October Board meeting so that we are actually doing what we are supposed to do, which is to approve the proposed operating budget as it goes forward to the Board.

**03.25.10.05** *From Charles McGuire, Asst. Provost: Academic Calendar for 2014-2015 (Advisory Item 4/7/10)*

**Senator Holland:** We also have the 2014-15 Academic Calendar.

**Senator Kalter:** It's Chuck that's bringing this, right?

**Provost Everts:** Yes.

**Senator Kalter:** Could we ask him for two things. One of them is already covered because I think Cynthia has the thing that Jonathan wrote up.

**Ms. James:** Yes.

**Senator Kalter:** We usually get this piece and one that is more detailed. It's kind of like a chart and also a third page that has the credit hours that the state requires. It is also a chart. That will close down unnecessary questions. It will let people know that we have to have this many hours on Mondays or what have you.

**Provost Everts:** I know the document that you are talking about.

**Senator Holland:** You will notice that it is one of those years that you can leave for ten days and come back and have one week of classes.

**Senator Wedwick:** This year, we actually have two weeks in between, right...when we come back from Thanksgiving?

**Senator Holland:** I honestly don't know.

**Senator Kalter:** The only way I can think to change that is to move spring semester earlier in January and move classes beginning earlier in August, moving everybody's contracts. There is no way you can do that because I think that they need time after they come back from winter shut down to get everything together for students to register and things like that.

**Senator Holland:** It is what it is.

**Provost Everts:** I don't think there's a way, but you think there is?

**Senator Wedwick:** For some reason, I think there is, because classes start so late this fall. It's possible that Thanksgiving falls very late in the semester.

*Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting on April 7, 2010:*

### **Academic Senate Meeting Agenda**

**Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2010**

**Time: 7:00 P.M.**

**Location: Old Main Room, Bone Student Center**

*Call to Order*

*Roll Call*

*Approval of Minutes of March 24, 2010*

*Presentation: Legislative Issues (Phil Adams, Assistant to the President for Government Relations)*

*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 Stewart*

*Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Chairperson Kalter*

*Faculty Affairs Committee: Chairperson Liechty*

*Planning and Finance Committee: Chairperson Fazel*

*Rules Committee: Chairperson Solberg*

*Advisory Items:*

*01.27.10.01 Academic Calendar Procedural Information (Jonathan Rosenthal, EMAS)*

*03.25.10.05 Academic Calendar for 2014-2015 (Jonathan Rosenthal, EMAS)*

*Information Items:*

*03.25.10.01 Equitable Treatment of Students Policy-Revised (Academic Affairs Committee)*



**03.25.10.02** *Volunteer Emergency Worker Policy (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**03.25.10.03** *Institutional Goals and Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee:)*

**03.25.10.04** *Blue Book Revisions – AABC Functions: Academic Impact Fund (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

*Communications*

*Adjournment*

**Senator Kalter:** Should we leave the Institutional Goals and Priorities on or should we take it off?

**Senator Holland:** The problem is if we take it off, that would mean that it would come to the Senate at the very last meeting of the year. It would have to be voted on by a completely new Senate unless we immediately change it to an Action Item that night. Perhaps we could have a meeting about it and bring it to the 21<sup>st</sup>. I would like this Senate to vote one way or the other.

**Senator Fazel:** Cynthia, when would you need this to include it on the 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Ms. James:** By Thursday.

**Senator Fazel:** I will email everybody or call them and see what they say. We will keep it on the agenda and I will let you know by Thursday.

**Senator Holland:** We can approve the agenda with the exception that it may be taken off.

**Senator Kalter:** The only other change is that it should be Chuck McGuire instead of Jonathan Rosenthal doing the calendar.

**Motion XXXXI-84:** By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Kalter, to approve the Senate Agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

*Adjournment*