

Indiana University Kokomo Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, November 14th, 2016 at 2:30pm in KC130B

Attended by: Aamidor, Alshuwayer, Bever, Bradley, Brown, Casey, Chauret, C., Clark, Connolly, Coppola, Cox, Darr, Davis P., Davis, R., Deerly, Dodd, Downey, Finkler, Fisher, Gottemoller, Hancock, Heath, Heckman, Holcomb, Hughey, Jones Scott, Jones Sylvia, Kaiser, Keener, Knudson-Stanley, Leffler, Lindsey, Madsen, Mason, Masuda, Medley-Rath, Morgan, Parkison, Poe-Greskamp, Preece, Rassel, Rifai, Roden, Rosales, Sebastian, Sehr, Snoddy, Steel, Steinke, Sullivan, Swartzendruber, Thorpe, Tormoehlen, Townsend, Tupa, VanAlstine, Wallace, White, Whitmore, Zhong, Zody. Note: *Quorum was met*

1-Topic: Approval of November 2016 minutes (Steel)

Discussion: none

Action: approved

2-Topic: Campus Campaign (Halperin)

Discussion: Jan Halperin asked faculty and staff members to contribute to funds important to them and that two new funds were started (cougar experience and KEY). Goal is 70% (current participation at 50%).

Action: none

3- EPC new degree approval (Cox)

Discussion: Page 2 (2nd sentence of 3rd paragraph): suggesting was made to change the “required” part

Action: approved with amendment

4- Vote on campus mission statement changes

Action: approved (one ‘nay’)

5- IU Bicentennial course development grant (White)

Discussion: Grants for course development. Eva White encouraged faculty to apply and consider the guidelines as well as that it is interdisciplinary. IU will give a course release (see website for more detail → <https://200.iu.edu/participate/course/index.html>). Sarah Heath is the coordinator for the bicentennial group. For any advice please contact Eva White or Sarah Heath.

Action: none

6- Representative faculty senate (Steel, Sullivan)

Proposal: T.J. Sullivan presented an outline (from faculty affairs committee) for how the representative senate could work. Committee suggested that non-apportioned members (such as adjunct faculty, student body, Purdue faculty, Emeritus faculty) who have limited voting privileges can vote but not be officers. Ex-officio members (proposed) for chancellor and VCAA. Apportioned members would be all full time instructional, research, or administrative appointees. Proposed number per unit would be: # of faculty/N (where N for now is 5, which could change for the Fall if necessary) → rounded to the nearest whole number (with a minimum of 1). Senators of the faculty senate would be faculty without administrative appointments (as defined in the by-laws) and units decide their own methods for selecting

senators. Senators can be recalled or replaced ($2/3^{\text{rd}}$ majority for recall) by their own unit. Officers would be selected by the representatives themselves. The senate committees would still be open to everyone with at least one senator per committee. Senators would be elected in the spring for a 2-year term. Officers also elected in the spring, with a 1 year term.

Discussion/Suggestions:

- quorum should be higher than the current one (currently it is at 50% +1), at $2/3^{\text{rd}}$.
- Leaving decision of tenured or non-tenured faculty up to the units.
- Rules for impeachment
- Other campuses: units define who is part of the senators
- What would the voting process be like (e-vote?)
- Meeting would still be open to all faculty
- Some units would only be left with one representative, so maybe a minimum of 2 should be required
- Large departments would outvote smaller ones → related comment pointed out that this is already the case now (more votes from departments with more people)

Action: Faculty affairs committee allowed to move forward with the proposal → approved (a few “nays”)

7- IPFW no confidence vote discussion on endorsement (Steel)

Discussion: It was pointed out that we do not have all of the information to back up or endorse the vote of no confidence and should be further investigated. Some comments were made on evidence that IPFW campus had been mismanaged. Another comment was made that the IPFW was not looking for a support in details, just in general that they should be included in decision making. A more general statement of support should be drafted by the faculty senate president and the officers and share that with the faculty to further decide on how to move forward with this.

Action: move to draft a paper was approved