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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

January 24, 2012

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, K. Bolinger, J. Conant, R. Guell, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, T. Sawyer

Absent: J. Kuhlman, C. MacDonald

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard

I. Administrative report

Provost Maynard:

a. We have the results of the decision to reduce the standard from 1.0 to .85 for freshmen retention. There were 28 students whose grades were between .85 and 1.0. Additionally, there were 276 freshmen below the .85 standard. Of those 113 were allowed to return. Of those 113, 36 had a 0.0 GPA. The numbers by college are not yet official. There was one college that was an outlier in this process but with that exception, I believe that there was a conscientious effort to determine which ones had the best chance of success.

b. In response to a previous concern about salary floors for instructors and full-time lecturers, I had said, that all multi-year contract instructors were being paid no less than $36,000 per year. I had also said that all single-year full-time instructors were being paid no less than $30,000. The latter is the case, but I have been informed that the former is not the case. I will do what I can to raise these faculty salaries to no less than $36,000 as quickly as I can.

S. Lamb: Will you give them back pay?

Provost Maynard: I will try. B. Kilp had asked me in a previous meeting about some temporary faculty getting health benefits removed in January. I responded incorrectly in that I thought that the new 15-hour standard for full-time lecturers was being applied in the fall since the Board passed that in August. I was informed yesterday that because the fall semester had already begun, that those teaching 12 hours in the fall kept their health benefits in the fall, but as a result of the standard increasing to 15 hours those who had been teaching 12 hours and are teaching 12 hours in the spring, are losing those health benefits.

c. R. Guell asked yesterday about the new program that has all new employees having 3% or their salary deducted and put into a new type of CREF account. I said yesterday that this was the first I had heard of it, but in retrospect that is not accurate. This was an issue that was decided by the Board in October of 2008. R. Guell had also asserted that it had not been vetted through governance, and it turns out he is right; it probably should have been.

d. President Bradley met with Senator Kinley regarding frustrations with the constantly changing performance metric process. He noted that given that the metrics are neither clear nor constant, that the weights are not revealed until after the fact, and for other reasons, the University Presidents are growing cynical of the process. We do not object to performance funding but do object to this aspect of it. We still are working through what to use as our institutional metric. It must be consistent with mission and affordability and must have data going back to 2006. We had considered staffing ratios but do not think that would be best given that we have improved about as much as we think we realistically can. We are also considering student success because that is something we need to improve and where we surely can.

II. Chair report, S. Lamb: No report.

III. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

a. J. Conant: I have a concern expressed by a faculty member that ISU is preventing him from withdrawing CREF money for one of the three legally acceptable reasons (Business failure, health, or education of a family member). ISU’s Staff Benefits say that it is CREF which prevents it when in reality it is the optional restrictions that ISU puts on that money in its agreement with CREF.

Provost Maynard: I would suggest you direct that to D. McKee, Vice President, Business Affairs and Finance (it is a contract issue.)

K. Bolinger: It appears to be a decision by our Board to prevent these permissible transfers. (ISU’s Staff Benefits wants to be sure that staff invests in their individual retirement fund. It is simply a restriction by our institution.)

S. Lamb: If the law allows it, then it ought to be, at a minimum investigated, so that the contract can possibly be changed. If the state board does allow this it is worthy of investigation by our FEBC. Requested J. Conant take up this charge with FEBC.

R. Guell: This ties in with the paternalistic and incredibly condescending way in which the new 3% option is presented. ISU is telling its employees that it knows better about our personal finances that we do.

b. S. Lamb: Do we have the retention decisions broken down by college? I asked Dave Wright if we could have those broken down by college as well.

Provost Maynard: Not in a fashion I am comfortable reporting. They seem to change daily. Given me another week and I will get them to you.

B. Kilp: On the 0.0 students - can’t we just clear the semester for these students?

R. Guell: There would be financial aid issues with doing that and we already have academic renewal after several semesters away.

Provost Maynard: In many cases we paid faculty to meet with students over the break to gauge their seriousness and to help those students get a handle on their academic issues. I called Jennifer Schriver, David Wright, and a number of individuals let students back in (not by college) broken down by college.

T. Sawyer: We had a meeting in our department yesterday and were told that we should begin contacting these students to set up meetings to advise them on what classes they should be in. Needless to say, we are three weeks into the semester! I was given the name of a student to contact; asked to have him come in to fill out a form; set up his schedule, etc. etc. - To me, this is ludicrous! Student(s) should be required to make up the F’s they got – why three weeks into the semester?

Provost: I can tell you that this is not the norm of what is going on.

T. Sawyer: I would hope not.

Provost: We have “x“ number of faculty contracted to work with “x” number of students who came in over the holidays. They agreed to meet with students in order to monitor their progress. The number in the CoB (College of Business) and CoT (College of Technology were small enough that the University thought they could handle this with a small number of advisors. Something similar was set up with A&S (Arts & Sciences) as well as NHHS (Nursing Health and Human Services). I am not disputing what T. Sawyer stated.

R. Guell: One thing asserted at SAC was that in the Athletic Training, in particular (because it is a popular major among students) - the students who came in late were required to a set of courses which were already pulled. A faculty member on FAC said that they were told to put those students in a second course (e.g. BIO 241 though 231 is not a prerequisite to 241, almost everyone who succeeded in 241 has been in 231.) It was just a place to “park” a group of students. A large number of students were affected - annihilated by that advising practice! This is a from a faculty member who is on SAC who said this at a meeting (Al Finch, Physical Ed). I do not know whether this is true or hyperbole. We do need to have a serious conversation at the associate dean level about what happens at summer orientation when we run out of seats.

T. Sawyer: In Recreational Sports one student who I asked to fill out a questionnaire had not filled out a contract.

B. Kilp: Is this the first semester in which we are using grades in the previous semester to administratively drop students on prerequisite grounds? (There are a lot of prerequisites that are not really prerequisites (e.g. Hist I & II where a signature is needed because the student is still in the class and hasn’t got a grade yet. I think we were really not prepared for the mass drop - the email to us came on New Year’s Day! )

Provost Maynard: It is. We knew this would create problems, and it has, but we need to make sure students pass the prerequisites. Rather than having departments do it, we thought that the Registrar should do it and put the onus on the students. Let me attempt to get more details on this issue from April Hay (Registrar).

c. K. Bolinger: With regard to the “Civility” charge to FAC, AAC was looking at it and believes that they should consider including:

1. A range of consequences (regarding violation of civility policy)

2. Exemplars of uncivil behavior

3. A chain of arbitration/mediation

S. Lamb: You can pass this on to FAC directly. I do believe that we are opening up a can of worms, and that we are going down a troubling path.

d. B. Kilp: I was told that the Department of Art didn’t have a chair; asked to have one; and told that they would be without a chair.

Provost Maynard: B. Venable was appointed interim chair.

Will the old chair keep her stipend?

J. Maynard: If it is a stipend for being chair, no. We are close to using a new model for all administrators that will follow the Presidents whereby over a period of years, all administrators returning to their departments will earn the CUPA median for their rank or the highest salary in the department, whichever is more, rather than being able to keep their higher salary.

IV. **MOTION TO APPROVE** the Minutes of January 24, 2012 (T. Hawkins/J. Conant; vote: unanimous**)**

V. Into Executive Session 4:25 p.m.

Out of Executive Session and adjourned at 4:29 p.m.