



Southern  
Illinois University  
Carbondale

5-12-2011

To: William Recktenwald

President, Faculty Senate

From: Sherri Lukes

Commencement Committee member

I have served on the Commencement Committee for the past two years. I have a letter in my files dated 2009 from Philip Howze, who was the president of the faculty senate at that point, stating my nomination to the committee was ratified by the faculty senate. We have never met as a committee. I can't even tell you who the current chair is. I received a phone message from him at one point, just acknowledging that he was the chair and I was now on that committee, but have had no correspondence since. I contacted a fellow CASA faculty (who was also on the committee) at one point and asked if there was something I needed to be doing, and he said not that he knew of. I completed my two year term, and feel my "service" on this committee is not something I would like to continue. I prefer to serve on a committee with more actual service involved.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sherri M. Lukes".

Sherri M. Lukes, RDH, MS  
Associate Professor, Dental Hygiene  
SAH-CASA, MC 6615  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901  
Phone (618) 453-7289  
FAX (618) 453-7020  
[smlukes@siu.edu](mailto:smlukes@siu.edu)



Southern  
Illinois University  
Carbondale

July 7, 2011

Professor William Recktenwald  
President, Faculty Senate  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Re: Report on the activities of the Graduation Appeals Committee (2010-2011)

Dear Professor Recktenwald,

The committee met twice during Fall 2010 and three times during Spring 2011. The meetings were held under the chairmanship of Tiffany Spencer. The committee dealt with course equivalency, residency requirement, and course requirement issues. There are no issues or concerns that require input or action from the Faculty Senate at this time.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ahmad Fakhoury".

Ahmad M. Fakhoury, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor

## **Report to the Faculty Senate**

### **RE: Faculty Senate representative on the College of Engineering Dean search**

Submitted July 5, 2011 by Lisa Brooten

The College of Engineering Dean search committee met on a regular basis, starting with our meeting to receive our charge from the Chancellor and Provost on November 9, 2010. At that point, a Blackboard system for distribution of information and applications and a listserv for committee communication were established. Prior to the meeting, Provost Rice had appointed Cynthia Fountaine, Dean of the Law School, as a committee Co-Chair. During our first meeting, the committee took nominations and chose by secret paper ballot the second Co-Chair as Dr. Botros of Electrical Engineering. The group then elected Dr. Paul of Mining Engineering as the committee secretary. Once formally constituted, the first task of the committee was to review a draft of the position description, which the committee decided to make available for College of Engineering faculty and staff for review and feedback as well. The committee also agreed that the search process would involve a vote on the top candidates brought in for interview by engineering faculty and staff. On November 16, the committee met again to finalize the job description for the position and to discuss its own internal process for evaluating applicants.

The committee met again on November 30 to devise a draft review sheet for our own internal use in evaluating candidates, which by December 7<sup>th</sup> had been approved by a unanimous vote via online voting. By December 10<sup>th</sup> we had begun to receive applications, which were made available to committee members via Blackboard. By January 10, 2011 we had received 13 applications, by January 20<sup>th</sup> there were 21 applications, and by February 21<sup>st</sup> there were a total of 34 applications. The committee members reviewed candidates individually, and submitted completed evaluation forms, which were then available to the entire committee (without names of reviewers) via the Blackboard site. We met again on January 27<sup>th</sup> to discuss our screening, evaluation and voting processes and to begin reviewing applications; we continued this work in meetings on February 7<sup>th</sup>, February 17<sup>th</sup>,<sup>1</sup> February 24<sup>th</sup>, and March 1<sup>st</sup>. With this screening process, the committee identified 15 applicants meeting the minimum qualifications for the Dean's position.

On February 24<sup>th</sup>, the committee decided on a list of five top candidates to be given more serious consideration for potential on-campus interviews. On March 1<sup>st</sup>, the committee decided to proceed with reference checks on the five candidates: Pepper, Reddi, Worek, Kazakos, and Warwick. We created sub-committees to be responsible for reference collection for each candidate. I was assigned to the subcommittee checking references for candidate Lakshmi Reddi; this subcommittee met on March 8<sup>th</sup> (9:15-11:30am) and spoke on the phone with four references, and again on March 22<sup>nd</sup> (9:45-10:45am) to speak with the final reference. We compiled notes from these conversations to share with the entire committee.

The committee then met again on March 24<sup>th</sup> and finalized a list of four top candidates that we recommended for on-campus interview (forwarded to the Provost/Chancellor on March 28<sup>th</sup>). At that meeting, the committee also compiled a list of those candidates the committee deemed unqualified, and those who met minimum qualifications but were not top candidates.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Feb 7<sup>th</sup> meeting was held during a class I really needed to teach, and the Feb 17<sup>th</sup> meeting on a day I was out of town at a conference, so I arranged for Dean Cynthia Fountaine to be my proxy for those two meetings and sent her a detailed assessment of my evaluation of each candidate.

Another meeting was held April 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss the interview process and to reconsider, at the request of the Affirmative Action office, three of the minority candidates; the committee discussed these candidates and reaffirmed its position that they were less qualified than others and should not be included in the on-campus interviews.<sup>2</sup> The Chancellor approved the four top candidates forwarded by the committee for campus interview, but we received word that Dr. Reddi, one of the top four, had withdrawn his application as he had accepted a job elsewhere. The Chancellor also added another name to the list of candidates to be interviewed from the list of minority candidates the committee had been asked to re-review. This addition from the Chancellor created concern within the committee, because although this candidate was qualified, her application had been reviewed twice, with the decision both times that she was less qualified than other possible candidates. An emergency meeting of the search committee was called to address this unexpected development. The committee requested to meet with the Chancellor. We were instead invited to meet with Susan Logue on April 22 to discuss this development, and asked her to convey to the Chancellor our request that she change her decision. After this April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting with Logue, the committee decided that in the event the Chancellor went ahead with her decision, we would release a statement to our constituencies stating our concern that the search process had been compromised. This motion passed with a vote of 15 yes votes and 1 abstention. This statement was composed and edited via e-mail between April 25<sup>th</sup> and April 27<sup>th</sup> and is attached as Appendix A.

One of the search committee's members, Randy Auxier (representing the Faculty Association) took it upon himself to write a personal letter to the *Daily Egyptian* about the Chancellor's decision to add another interviewee, which appeared on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. This was followed the next day by a letter sent to the DE by the search committee co-chairs, Cynthia Fountaine and Nazeih Botros, that the previous letter had contained inaccurate information and that the committee had not endorsed the views expressed in the article or the information included. In an e-mail to the search committee explaining their actions, Co-Chair Fountaine stated that "Yesterday's article violated both the confidentiality of Dr. Chevalier's candidacy and the confidentiality of the Committee's deliberations. In addition, the article contained inaccurate information regarding the results of Committee votes as well as our recommendation to the Chancellor."

Four interviews were held on campus in late April and early May. Candidates interviewed were Dr. John J. Warwick, Dr. Dimitrios Kazakos, Dr. Darrell W. Pepper and Dr. Lizette Chevalier. Search committee members participated actively in these on-campus interviews, and after the interviews were completed, oversaw the faculty and staff vote of the College of Engineering that was conducted on Thursday, May 12, 2011 from 8-2:00pm. The committee then met at 2:30pm that day to tabulate the engineering faculty votes, discuss the candidates, and summarize our own observations of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates. Co-Chair Fountaine forwarded this summary, which also included the results of the College of Engineering vote (and the votes of the non-CoE search committee members), to the Chancellor late that afternoon of May 12<sup>th</sup>.

On June 10, 2011, it was announced in an e-mail forwarded to the search committee that Dr John Warwick had been offered and accepted the position as Dean. This officially completed the work of this committee in a manner that seemed to be consistent with the College of Engineering vote and the search committee's observations, and also seemed satisfactory to committee members.

---

<sup>2</sup> I was out of town at a conference so arranged for Cynthia Fountaine to act as my proxy for this meeting.

## **Appendix A**

### **Statement by the College of Engineering Dean search committee Approved April 27, 2011**

A majority of the College of Engineering Dean Search Committee has endorsed this statement:

The College of Engineering Dean Search Committee, a committee with 22 members representing various constituencies within and outside of the College of Engineering, was formed last fall to review applications and make recommendations for interviews on campus with the goal of recruiting a Dean for the College of Engineering by July 1, 2011. The Committee received 34 applications. The Committee met numerous times and spent countless hours reviewing, discussing, and evaluating the candidates based on the criteria published in the job description (which had also been reviewed and agreed upon by the Committee). Following this exhaustive review of the candidates' credentials and experience, the Committee narrowed the pool and contacted references for written letters and verbal comments (over the telephone).

Following our review of reference letters and telephone input we further narrowed the candidates to a finalist of 4 and made a recommendation to the Chancellor that these candidates be invited for interview. The Committee was asked to review 3 candidates again on Affirmative Action grounds. However, the committee found large differences in the credentials of these candidates and those recommended for interview. The upper administration then unilaterally added one of these 3 candidates to the interview pool and ignored concerns expressed by the committee. We therefore feel that the uniformity of the search process has been compromised.

## **Faculty Senate Report - June 2011**

### **SURS Members Advisory Committee**

The SURS Members Advisory Committee generally meets twice a year, in spring and fall, for about a half day at the office in Champaign-Urbana. The morning consists of an update from the SURS officers and staff on all aspects of the organization's performance as well as pending and pressing legislative matters. Many universities as well as annuitants are represented at the meeting. The afternoon consists of open discussions as well as a legislative subcommittee and a benefits subcommittee meeting, of which the results are discussed with the entire group. The chair of SURSMAC is our own Jake Baggott from the Carbondale campus. Mr. Baggott is a good person to be in this role in light of all of the legislative changes to SURS that are being discussed. The new board is in place and becoming informed about their responsibilities and issues. As issues arise that will affect SURS, both the participants and the annuitants need to get involved and talk to their legislators and try to stop some of the misinformation that is being spread by opponents to our retirement system. We have one of the best retirement systems around, and clearly not excessive benefits, and we need to watch after it. We have certainly lost some money in our retirement system as the economy has taken its toll, but SURS is handling the situation well and its allocation has performed admirably. However, our funding liability keeps shrinking, and one of these years the legislature will have to start putting back the "required" SURS payments that have been used for other purposes. The pressing issues for this year are all of the proposals being thrown about to reduce our retirement benefits. A two tiered system is now in place, but more cuts are being considered. This second tier affected new hires with a much less robust retirement plan and thus potentially making it harder to retain and hire new faculty and staff. However, there appear to be some areas where current members and annuitants may have their benefits changed and /or costs increased. We all need to be vigilant and remain involved.

Respectfully submitted

Steven J Verhulst, Ph.D.  
SIU School of Medicine  
June 2011