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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 11, 2011, 3:30 p.m.

HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, J. Conant, R. Dunbar, R. Guell, C. Hoffman, J. Kuhlman, V. Sheets

Absent: K. Bolinger

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard

Guests: M. Affan Badar (Chair, AETM Dept.), K. Brauchle (Dean Extended Learning), R. Peters (CAAC Chair), D. Carole Yaw (AAC)

I. Administrative reports:

 Provost Maynard:

a. President sends his apologies that he is not able to attend today’s meeting due to the Foundation/Donor event in Florida.

b. The president has scheduled Budget discussions to occur on January 21 and January 28. Each of the division VP’s will be expected to share with the group how to respond to the budget reallocation. Academic Affairs is expected to reallocate between $550,000-$850,000 ($550,000 for sure, could be more.) I am currently working with the deans – had a four hour meeting last Thursday to go through round one of what people are considering for budget targets. We have another session scheduled next week. Hopefully, it will bring some closure to sets of recommendations. As you know, this set of reallocations must come from the non-instructional budget. Our options are limited in terms of what we can do. It is safe to say that three fourth of anything proposed will be personnel cuts. I know that S. Lamb, A. Anderson, V. Sheets have been asked to participate in these budget hearings. Tomorrow we will be sharing our budget request with the Ways and Means Committee.

c. Enrollments continue to be positive. Numbers are equally ahead as they were for the fall term with 10% more students this spring term than we had last spring. Unfortunately, transfer students are down (6-7%). I don’t know why. International student enrollment is up over 500.

II. Chair report – response to the provost’s administrative report

 S. Lamb:

a. I know units on campus are down to the bare bones, as is the College of Business, in terms of staffing - administrative assistant positions and S & E budgets. I don’t see how you are going to get $550,000 out from that source without hurting this institution. I do not want to propose that monies be sought from programs that are not as viable as others, but I don’t know where the source of this money can come from at this point without that consideration. I also am bothered by the influx of students when considering our needs. When the president talks about *continuing to have to pare back* *year after year in order to fund new priorities*, I believe there is going to have to be an examination of that statement as well.

 Provost: What purchases should we cut? Various cuts that we propose have had very little impact; I realize that we are all affected in some way.

 S. Lamb: There also have been stars at this institution. Most of us recognize that Ed Kinley’s domain has had such a positive influence on the entire University, and indeed is why we have had such an increase in enrollment. It also bothers me that we are considering cutting Enrollment Services (J. Beacon’s area). We should not be considering cuts to this area. I believe we have already cut to the bone, which, if allowed to continue, could jeopardize the future of this Institution.

I. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a. R. Guell:  Frustration expressed  in entering student final grades.  I entered the

 same grades of 75 students four times because three times they were wiped

 out of the system for three different but equally frustrating reasons.  I realize

that A. Hay is working on this problem and I have great confidence in her ability

 but I hope that I never have to repeat this experience again.

 Provost:  I will be meeting with her soon. This condition is not acceptable.

 b. C. Hoffman: What happened with the retention statistics?

Provost: The dismissal rate for first-semester freshmen last fall was t 11.3%. This year we had a slight increase. I am unable to tell you the exact numbers right now.

 C. Hoffman: Is there a common factor?

 Provost: I can’t tell you exactly. Some colleges were up; others were down.

C. Hoffman: Can the provost confirm or deny land purchased around the University?

Provost: Purchases were made of IKON and the Pillsbury building. But the Foundation purchased these, not the University. Conversations continue about University expansion west of Third Street. All of this is part of the Strategic Plan.

C. Hoffman: Have three- year appointments been approved? Is this going to be the policy for at ISU, and at what academic rank will these appointments be made? Provost: We have agreed to 28 tenure track positions and 12 for Special Purpose faculty (multi-year appointments.) This was the deans' decision. These do not need to be instructors. The president has challenged the deans and me to work together for a targeted staffing plan. Perhaps 70% of our faculty would be tenure track, 10% might be special purpose, multi-year, high quality people who would be performing unique roles. Deans and I would come back with a suggested framework by college.

C. Hoffman: Are these special faculty not expected to do research?

Provost: It has yet to be determined what their roles will be.

R. Guell: A committee has been formed to look at special purpose faculty. (S. Lamb has the names of these people. Provost stated that names would be made public next week.)

C. Hoffman: What is being done to remove the crow (bird) population on campus?

Provost: I will speak to K. Runion to get an update on this problem. However, it will take more than one year to move the bird population from campus to nesting areas down by the Wabash River. It is an effort between the city of Terre Haute and ISU.

 c. R. Guell: Referring to course approval – Can you allow courses

 that are now in the “academic red zone” to go to completion?

Provost: We will be discussing this at Faculty Senate, - how many new courses

have been added to inventory and faculty course overloads.

d. R. Guell on enrollment – how is spring to spring – what are the indicators for fall?

Provost: We are right on target. The numbers are holding pretty constant right now.

e. R. Guell: With three quarters of the monies (the $550k-$850k) distributed by

 Academic Affairs being in personnel will that mean involuntary separations?

Provost: There will be some involuntary separations, but non-instructional. We need to come up with a separation plan. We have not agreed what this will look like yet. No decisions made yet.

S. Lamb: Do you have a sense where the monies are going?

 Provost: Some of it will be going toward hiring new faculty. We are treating this as one time dollars until you start feeling that the base is normal. Until you start reallocating – it’s temporary money that will be used for a variety of things on campus.

f. C. Hoffman: My department (English) met yesterday regarding the Performance Evaluation document (will be placed on the Senate website once cleaned up a little). What is going to happen for a replacement of Digital Measures?

Provost: I need to review demos before taking the next step. I am presently evaluating three-four different products and am meeting with a group led by Kelly Wilkinson.

R. Guell to the provost: Need to see how people are trying to input their work. I hope you incorporate the Artists and Performing Arts (Humanities) in your process.

Provost: I know we have discussed this and recognizing the people in the arts. Everything has been done that can be done – putting what was in Digital Measures into the historical files. We’re trying to schedule a vendor in here and take care of this situation as soon as possible. There will be considerable flexibility afforded to departments.

IV. **Approval of the Minutes** of December 14, 2010 with corrections J. Kuhlman/C. Hoffman 6-0-2.

V. SAT scores

 Review and discussion.

a. R. Guell: History related to this item - President Benjamin made a concerted effort to define the campus in terms of student engagement and experiential learning to have a more qualified freshmen class. Admissions adopted tighter practices at that time. (Freshmen class in 2004 was the smallest class ISU has had in 25 years. Result of this was that, allowing only the better students in, ISU would suffer financially. Cost of more bodies coming in is that it has consistently lower SATs.

b. S. Lamb: Sending this forward for consideration identifies us as an “access institution.” This is my own opinion. (I have enjoyed working with students, not only those at the top of the academic ladder but all those with a desire to learn.)

R. Guell: I agree. But I would never judge a university based on the students it does not teach. Student Affairs looks at the balance between fiscal health and academic standards.

**MOVE TO ACCEPT** as an information item only. R. Guell/C. Hoffman 8-0-0.

This item will be moved forward to Student Affairs, and we will remind them of their primary authority over admission standards.

VI. AAC - Reaction to Proposed Technology Centers - review/discussion – Informational item only

Proposed Center for Homeland Security and Crisis Management:

The AAC approves the creation of this interdisciplinary center and agrees that it could be a beneficial addition to ISU. However, based on the provided business plan, some areas of concern remain, particularly regarding staffing and funding.

* First, since the business plan includes a high level of reliance on specialists outside the ISU community for teaching and research, more elaboration is needed on the availability of the required specialists and appropriate compensation for them in order to ensure the long-term viability and sustainability of the center's certificate and master's degree programs.
* Secondly, while the plan stipulates basic funding needs of the program through 2015, it provides no information on the sources of funding. Where are the start-up funds for the Director's salary and the hiring of faculty coming from? Additionally, no funding is stipulated for the adjunct specialists needed for the proposed curriculum. How will those involved parties be compensated and where will any necessary funding for that come from?
* Moreover, the current plan makes no mention of seeking external funding, such as federal and state grants available for projects related to homeland security. Given the likely availability of significant funding for such projects, the AAC strongly encourages those involved in creating this center to seek available federal and state funding for its program.
* Finally, the AAC would advise that those creating the center keep the ISU faculty and this committee informed as the process evolves, especially pertaining to hiring.

a. A. Anderson – why is Technology initiating this?

D. Yaw: Because the Department of Aviation is working with other departments on campus. It is just not the College of Technology department center; it involves other areas.

b. V. Sheets: Does it encompass both teaching and research? And, should it not go through the curriculum process (CAAC)?

 D. Yaw: Some of it is teaching/research but it involves getting a certificate once the Center is up and running. It is professional development, nor curriculum.

 Provost: I need to first view the final plans. It could lead to curricular implications, minors to a master’s degree in aviation. I suggested that we bring this forward for further discussion.

 S. Lamb: I am considering this to be a preliminary discussion and hope that if a center should be created and supported by Academic Affairs, especially if it has curricular responsibilities, it would also go through the CAAC process.

c. R. Guell: I am concerned that there is really no Handbook process for centers. I believe this brings up more structural problems.

 D. Yaw: Yes. We need to develop a protocol on how to develop centers at ISU (driven by college deans.)

d. S. Lamb: It is my practice when AAC asks for comments on proposals, that AAC share their comments with us. However, this is not an action item.

 Provost: More information needs to be gathered for consideration of a charge that would be directed to the Executive Committee concerning Centers at a later date.

Discussion of Centers for Gypsum Product Research and Construction Risk Management

From AAC:

Both of these centers would be contained within the College of Technology, and the AAC agrees that these are good concepts that could make valuable contributions to the construction industry and to ISU programs in the College of Technology. However, the AAC recommends that these general proposals be fully developed into more detailed business plans (with staffing and budgetary particulars) for faculty consideration. Most importantly, the AAC is concerned that members of the faculty within the Built Environment Department and the COT had no knowledge of the proposals for these centers. The AAC strongly recommends that these proposals go through the appropriate COT governance structures before they proceed to any university-wide committees.

VII. Distance Education Survey – presented by Dean Brauchle

Review/discussion – request for more guidelines related to student expectations. A task force will be developed consisting of faculty, administrators, representatives from CAAC, etc.) – appointments will be made soon.

* S. Lamb: What is the main source behind student frustrations?

K. Brauchle: The main source of student frustrations is with communication or lack of it between faculty and students (e.g. little or no feedback regarding student assignments, grading or late grading)

S. Lamb: This problem seems to be more prevalent among distant education students.

R. Guell: Maybe a mechanism can be put in place to indicate timeliness of responses (e.g. within Blackboard)?

Provost: We could also use a communication mechanism (process) in place for the entire campus.

K. Brauchle: This is not just a communication problem, but we need to understand where the issues lie.

VIII. Distance Educational Student – Definition presented by Dean Brauchle.

Review and discussion:

* K. Brauchle: What is a distance education student? ISU needs to come up with a common agreement/definition, primarily for administrative purposes. We also need to understand the source/s of our growth. Students do need to go through Registrar’s so they can determine priority registrations.

S. Lamb: Our intention is to try for a specific number of distance education students, but our main objective is filling courses.

Dean Brauchle: What I am proposing is that if we come up with an automatic system, based on a common definition, departments would still have the option to over-ride the classification in specific cases.

IX. Emeritus/designation requirements (revisited -tabled at Faculty Senate on December 16, 2010.)

 Discussion.

S. Lamb: Charged V. Sheets with the creation of emeritus language and will have another discussion regarding this at our next EC meeting on January 18 (before we bring it goes back to Senate).

X. Course bloat - discussion of Charge for CAAC

R. Guell: Discussion of possible re-implementation of 5-Year or a formalized rule (complete analysis from late 1990’s/2000). Also, need to look at courses really taught only by arrangement; some courses act only as upper division electives. There ought to be some even ratio; upper division electives need to be judged by some standard.

S. Lamb: We had some discussion about this in the past. Would it be better to look at the sum of enrollments in reference to electives (only offering them as one sees fit)?

R. Guell: I am operating on the assumption that very few faculty teach these courses. We need to understand what upper division electives will be offered and that there has to be a level of judgment, absolutely. On portfolio – there is a need to regularize a program prioritization process - the inventory of why courses are offered.

XI. CAAC item, Civil Engineering Technology, Randy Peters and M. A. Badar presented rationale for the proposal.

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** Civil Engineering proposal. J. Conant/A. Anderson 6-0-2.

Meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.