

Draft Minutes of the Faculty Senate

May 18, 2011

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: P Koehn (P&A), R Woods (AAS), J Carbone (SHS), T Moreno (HPHP), K Saules (PSYCH), S McCracken (CMTA), J Nims (LIB), M Reedy (ART), T Brewer (GC), B Jones (G&G), Elaine Martin (PLSC), Lidia Lee (SPED), L Kolopajlo (CHEM), P Francis (L&C), D Barton (MKT/LAW), P Smith (TED), S Gray (WGST), D Crary (ECON), M Rahman (ACCT), W Zirk (MAD), R Olwell (H&P), M Evett (COSC), J Eisenbach (BIO), D Chou (CIS), M Bombyk (SWRK), P Majeske (STS), S Nelson (NURS), S Norton (ENGL)

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Call for executive session (approved)
 - a. Summary of interactions with S Martin
 - b. Ad has been placed with several services
 - c. Most recent option: Do search now, candidate visits in September
 - i. Moeller refused
 - ii. Martin is eager to get this rolling.
 - iii. 12 member committee, two faculty (and two students)
 - iv. We used to be paid for additional service in the Sp/Su, but no longer.
 - v. Pool of available faculty is small, too small to provide reasonable input.
 - vi. We are facing a certain amount of creep.
 - vii. Why is Jack Kay leaving in June rather than in September?
 - viii. End of Executive Session (3:26) Moeller arrived.
 - ix. Prior MOU was *only* to finish up the search.
 - x. It seems that MOUs are precedent-setting.
 - xi. Expedited ULP is underway. S Martin is going ahead without us.
 - xii. Still no idea why she needs a provost *now*.
3. (3:30) Approval of minutes of April 6, 2011 (see attached) (DEFERRED)
4. (3:35) Committee Appointments:
 - a. Library replacement for the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning Comm. [Rita Bullard; LIB] (Approved)
5. (3:38) Academic Affairs budget issues [Jack Kay]
 - a. Assuming a zero percent increase in tuition and appropriate enrollment figures, we are looking at a \$24M decrease. AA would take \$9.5M. \$5.5M from administration, balance from instruction.
 - b. Only real leeway is in Faculty overloads. We're not going to lay off faculty.
 - c. We've seen steady growth in UG, and good growth of Grad admissions. Faculty played a large part in that!

- d. Faculty growth is consistent with the increase in credit hours.
 - e. On the instructional side, it's impossible to come up with \$4M in savings in the first year.
 - i. Probably areas to improve instructional efficiency. Reducing grading stipends, reducing overloads might account for \$1M.
 - ii. Other reductions really hurt – reducing advising, etc.
 - iii. Do we do away with a grad dean? Moving the decisions totally to the colleges? Eliminating a dean of extended programs, replacing them with a director. Cutting SS&M more?
 - iv. So far, there is no mention of faculty cuts.
 - v. D Barton: Can't support a huge reduction in AA without a reduction in Athletics.
 - vi. D Crary: The \$24M plan was a surprise to the budget council. The BoR want to consider the spectrum from 0-7% tuition increase.
 - vii. JK: At this point, boards across the state are dealing with this. There is a lot of pressure to keep tuition as low as possible. 0% doesn't seem likely.
 - viii. P Francis: Will the partner benefits clause make it through, and if it makes it through, where will *we* go? We hope it won't go through. There will be a conference committee to discuss it (at the state level). The 80/20 premiums language just went through. There's a lot of stuff going on at the state level.
6. (4:00) Pres. Martin
- a. SM and her VP are confident that they will hit the \$50M goal in fundraising.
 - b. SM has a history of asking for input beyond the requirements for faculty input. In the 2009 provost search, faculty input was everywhere.
 - c. In the 2011 search, she is hoping to have a committee together in five weeks. There will be 12 members. A dean, VP of student govt, people from the provost office, emeritus faculty members, a department head.
 - d. Wants to hold a meeting of the committee to deal with the associate provost and other open positions in the provost office.
 - e. Wants to establish and refine a timeline for the search, so that someone starts in the middle of the year.
 - f. Goal is to complete the search by end of 2011, so that the search for the associate provost.
 - g. P Francis: Will you consider that if we come to the first meeting, postponing the search. Ans: If we wait, we may not get candidates in by the end of the year. Search firms haven't been all that useful. We tend to get candidates that we already knew about. Given the number of positions open in the provost office, we need a permanent provost to advocate for the faculty.

- h. D Crary: You did point out that the previous search took four months. If you know you're getting a faculty rep on September 7, you can have the meeting on September 8. Hopefully the folks on the committee can be aggressive.
 - i. D Barton: What is so critical? S Martin: Are faculty searches done in the Spring/Summer? Ans: No.
 - j. D Crary: A number of years ago, we took a pay cut. We were told we did not do spring/summer service.
 - k. M Rahman: Why not persuade Kay to stay a bit longer? If Kay stays a little longer, the interim problem is solved.
 - l. P Francis: There is concern that you have a candidate in mind. Is this true? Ans: She has three in mind. This is a tough place in terms of employment.
 - m. What is with the language change concerning the Vice President? Ans: They want someone to be here when S Martin is off in Lansing, etc. Someone to run the place.
 - n. J Eisenbach: Many of us can *only* do our research during the Sp/Su. Many of us would like the chance to participate, as this is an important position. Ans: there are not a huge number of meetings.
 - o. D Crary: The longer the committees go on, the more candidates you lose. Starting now extends the search time. Ans: We are starting ahead of the market, so we'll have more candidates.
 - p. If we pass the resolution, will you postpone the search? Ans: She wants us to not pass the resolution.
 - q. S Gray: How is the search firm tied to the timing? Ans: If we start now, we'll have a better idea of whether an external search firm is worthwhile.
 - r. M Bombyk: We must have the best possible provost. It has been traditional to have searches during the school year. What kind of person would want a job as an institutional newbie and handle the budget cuts? If we appoint an interim effective July 1, they can handle things until the September search starts. We will get better candidates if we wait until September. If someone shows up, are they running from something? They will be leaving their position at an odd time. Ans: Bob Neely started mid-year, he wasn't running from anything.
 - s. S Norton: Makes no sense to ask people that aren't around to provide input. Makes more sense to wait until September.
 - t. Joe: Bringing in and unknown in the middle of all of these issues will not be effective. An internal interim would be the best choice at this moment.
 - u. L Lee: We'd like SMartin to take a leadership role in this. It will be very good for the new provost to have the support of the faculty. By delaying a little and getting the faculty onboard.
 - v. Barton moves for a ballot vote, Crary seconds it, approved.
7. (4:20) Provost search resolution (see below)

- a. Resolution passes 22Y, 3N, 2A
- 8. (4:35) President's remarks:
 - a. Parking/Transportation Committees—there are two?
 - i. S Moeller – they are not going through with the PH lot.
 - b. Faculty position apportionment
 - i. No movement on that. Pretty much guarantees that no decision will be made until the budget is settled.
 - c. Textbook selection (see below)
 - i. We are out of compliance with federal law, working on a better system.
 - d. Possible June FS meeting, June 15?

Resolution Concerning the Naming of a New Provost
May, 2011

Whereas the Faculty Senate supports the search for a new provost starting as soon as possible with meaningful faculty input and

Whereas the Faculty Senate seeks above all things to preserve the concept of shared governance and input as defined in the Master Agreement between the faculty and the administration and

Whereas the by-laws of the Faculty Senate call for the Senate to “participate in the selection of the academic officers at the level of Dean and above” (paragraph III.A.2) and

Whereas the first day of the Fall semester is Wednesday, August 31, 2011 and the first Faculty Senate meeting of the Fall semester is Wednesday, September 7, 2011 and

Whereas input cannot be provided during the Spring and Summer semesters because faculty are not then under contract

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate calls for a search committee to be formed, with faculty members named to the committee by the Senate at its September 7th meeting, with the first meeting of the search committee to occur as soon as possible after that date and

Be it also resolved that any earlier meeting of a search committee would necessarily deny the faculty of their contractual right to provide input and is therefore unacceptable.