

**Minutes of Faculty Senate 2/20/17 Meeting  
123 Hathaway Hall**

**Senators**

## 1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm. Fourteen senators were present.

## 2. Agenda

Parliamentarian Dantrea Hampton noted the agenda was missing time limits. A motion was passed, with all in favor, for the meeting to last 75 minutes overall. The objective of the meeting was to determine if the question of a vote of confidence in the Board of Regents overall, or for specific Board members, should be put forward to the whole faculty.

## 3. Discuss vote of confidence on the Board of Regents, or certain members of the Board of Regents.

Faculty Senate President Sipes noted that while Senate always welcomes guests, today we would follow the protocol of senators speaking first, observing three minute time limits. Speakers were asked to identify themselves. Senate voted in favor of letting guests speak after senators had a chance to express their views.

Chair Rye praised the recent student forum and the way students expressed their concerns in a civil manner. Then she noted that her primary concern is with the low percentage spent on instruction at the university: KSU is at 14% actual and 18% functional versus our sister institutions, which are closer to the mid-30s. The good news is that faculty are on the finance committee and so will have more input going forward.

Chair Andries noted that those he represents have questions about the current presidential search, but with little information available about how the search was undertaken, it is hard to come to conclusions.

Parliamentarian Hampton reported that people in her area met and discussed the issue. They felt there was not enough information to move forward with a vote of the whole faculty. They wanted to wait to

remain, such as how the search was executed; why some Board members did not vote on the finalists. We should arrive at answers to these questions before moving forward.

A senator argued that he was against a vote of confidence because we have no guidelines to follow; Robert's Rules doesn't indicate how this should be done.

Chair Moffett explained that people in his area have expressed a desire to have their voice be heard through a faculty-wide vote.

Past Senate President Smith said that he had difficulty having confidence in the Board, but had been divided about how to proceed, especially since the Board's intention with the upcoming special meeting were not clear. He registered concern about the search firm having the campus complete a survey about the search and then not

A student expressed frustration with the tone of the meeting and indicated the student meeting had not proceeded in that way. Students need answers; they have been seeking information about how the search was conducted.

President Sipes responded that faculty are as interested as students to find answers. Senate has submitted an open records request. She reiterated that the purpose of the meeting today was not to discuss the search process but to discuss a vote of confidence.

An alum argued that this really is all about the search. He said that Dr. Thompson has had six months on the job and the Board has decided he was not the right fit. He dismissed the allegation of mishandling of funds by one presidential candidate by noting something similar had happened when George Reid was President.

A guest said he was a new faculty member and had left a long career in industry in order to teach. Since he was new, he had not heard specifics about past grievances against the Board. He asked what we hope to accomplish by going forward and felt he had not heard that yet.

A student responded to the alum's point about misuse of funds saying we can't afford to lose any more money.

A member of the alumni group from the Indianapolis reported that his group was against a confidence vote. He said that if there is a vote of confidence, it should be against the faculty.

VPAA Jackson argued that there are going to be parts of the search process we may not like. Teaching students is the most important thing we do. Everything is meaningless if students don't graduate. There is a problem when students complain that faculty won't email them back. She argued that she has tried to stay away from Faculty Senate processes for the sake of shared governance but until she can go to the Board with a decent graduation rate faculty are living in a glass house.

President Sipes noted her 17 years' service to the university and questioned the notion that the graduation rate is all the faculty's fault. That is like saying it's all the Board's fault. Faculty want to work with the Board to solve these problems.

Student Regent Williams added that the students had a more collegial meeting than this one and that faculty need to set an example for students.

A student expressed his feeling that there is a lack of responsibility being taken. He also noted the Student Regent should come to the students, not the other way around. Inclusiveness should be the top priority.

President Sipes suggested Regents McFayden and Williams seek to further the dialogue with their constituents.

Staff Regent Gilmore argued that we don't have to mar the process because don't like the outcome. He recommended everyone read the appropriate constitutions and bylaws that govern

A vote was taken by secret ballot. The vote results were 16 yes; 3 no; 2 abstain. The motion carried.

4. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn carried at 4:56pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Joe Moffett, Faculty Senate Secretary

[Approved at the 3/20/2017 Senate meeting]