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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AUGUST 16, 2011

3:30 p.m. HMSU 227

Present: S. Lamb, J. Conant, R. Guell, T. Sawyer, J. Kuhlman, C. MacDonald, K. Bolinger, T. Hawkins

Absent: B. Kilp

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard, President D. Bradley

Guests: C. Yaw, R. Lotspeich

1. Administrative report
   1. President Bradley:
      1. Trustees
         1. D. Campbell has been named by the Governor to be the Alumni Representative to the Board of Trustees. He is a 20 year member of the Foundation Board. He replaces R. Carpenter.
         2. A. Tucker, a Communication Major from Indianapolis is the new student representative to the Board of Trustees.
         3. The August Trustees meeting has been moved to 8/30/11.
      2. Enrollment
         1. Enrollment will be up slightly overall
            1. CEP enrollment will be down 200
            2. Graduate enrollment will be down

CoE

Full-time graduate enrollment looks healthy

Part-time enrollment is down significantly

* + - * 1. Freshman enrollment will be down a little (from 2500 to 2450 in non-CEP Freshmen)
    1. Indianapolis
       - 1. The legislature’s Budget Committee is worried about state university tuition increases. ISU has to testify at their 9/8/11 meeting. The president stated that our plan is to be straight forward. ISU had a 15% budget cut, but, regardless, we are committed to only increase tuition based on the rate of inflation in the long run but we cannot accomplish that minimum increase in tuition every year. When we suffer decreases in revenue from the state, we must adapt. We will see how this develops.
         2. ICHE

They are reviewing state performance funding models on campuses

They meet next week with Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and Tennessee campuses staff to look at performance funding. With hope the state will also seek campus input.

The Performance Model used to fund states looks to be aggregating enrollment, retention and graduation metrics, as well as research metrics.

S. Lamb request to J. Maynard: May I be added to the enrollment report distribution list?

* 1. Provost Maynard:
     1. ISU’s participation in the CEP is being phased out
        1. Those BA students with less than 1 year to finish or AA students with less than one semester to finish will be allowed to do so. This will entail about 300 students and will be zone based so that ISU students may be served by other schools, and we may serve others’ students. There will be no new students registering.

R. Guell: Are we getting money to phase these students out?

Provost: Yes, we are receiving money to do so. I will be signing a contract to this effect, but basically, ISU will be breaking even, we’ll neither make nor lose money.

* + 1. Lisa Spence has been named the new AVP and CIO. She began employment on August 1.

The provost encouraged members to meet with her when the opportunity presents itself.

* + 1. The Commission on Higher Education approved the Master’s of Social Work. The three programs created by the COT last year will be reviewed next. There is some staff concern about the PhD in Health Sciences. We will need to frame new program in terms of ICHE’s strategic vision of ISU.

1. Chair report (S. Lamb):

Colleagues;

I have just a few prepared remarks. I would like to welcome the members of the Executive Committee and thank you in advance for your service.

First the work that Rich Lotspeich did on the AAC Continuing Staff Analysis is superb. It is far superior to the work that Charles Hoffman and I did on the first Staff Count in 1992. Rich has several suggestions which I am hoping are made into charges and passed down to committees. His analysis is rich with insight.

I want to thank the Provost and the President for receiving input from the PTOC and considering their input seriously. You have treated faculty governance with respect. I also have heard, although I do not have the details, that you have extended benefits (retirement, I think) to those special purpose faculty who have multiple year contracts. Perhaps you would respond to this and add some clarity.

J. Maynard: Yes. We put together a task force last spring to look at that package of benefits. What they have recommended is that they extend this package to those individuals who have been offered multi-year contracts. Those on one year contracts or on course-by-course contracts will be compensated as per previous policy. Special purpose faculty will receive benefits in a fashion that parallels what tenure-tenure track faculty are receiving. If the Board of Trustees approves it, it will go into effect this fall.

S. Lamb: Thank you, Jack. Finally, I appreciate the fact that Dean Murray and the Provost went the additional step, and consulted with the Communications department, and sought additional input from the faculty of the Communication department, and altered their initial decision as to whom should serve as the interim chair of communications. Faculty, in general, are apprehensive when an interim chair is appointed from outside of the department without broad support from the department.

I think that a quality decision was made, and I am sure l that the department will do all that it can to conduct a worthwhile search for the permanent chair. I congratulate all who were part of this revised decision making process.

Question to Provost and President: What are your perceptions of some of the major challenges to the University in the coming year?

* + 1. President
       1. Continuous reconfiguration of resources in response to
          1. State budget cuts
          2. Small (and constrained) tuition increases
          3. Also our health insurance program and employee ratios will be impacted.
       2. $1-1.3 million in further reallocations will be necessary for compensation increases to take place.
       3. Overall enrollment will have to continue to grow at 2% for any of the planning assumptions to work. We can live with these assumptions – they are not unrealistic.
       4. We will have to focus on our own performance based funding given the state designed program.
          1. Even if overall HE funding is flat, if our performance does not improve, we will face further budget cuts.
          2. We need to:

institutionalize student success initiatives

increase graduation numbers and rates

* + 1. Provost
       - 1. Continue to work on the development of new, innovative programs
         2. Review currently existing programs
         3. Re-engage Program Prioritization with an eye to eliminating some programs

S. Lamb: reminder of charge (formed at the last Faculty Senate meeting in April) going to GC and CAAC.

* + 1. Strategic Planning integration
       - 1. Commit to student success programs because at present we are not distinctive. If we are serious about this commitment, I believe we need to take it up to another level, and we are not there yet.

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. R. Guell: To Provost: Will GC and CAAC get new program enrollments to compare their results with their promises? All the programs that were created over the last couple of years relative to those promises that were made when those programs were approved?
   2. Provost: Yes. I believe we should go public with that as to avoid any problems.
   3. President: All programs, not just new ones, will be judged by their enrollments.
2. Approval of the Slate of Faculty Standing Committees Assignments,
   1. **Move to Accept:** K. Bolinger, T. Sawyer vote: unanimous
3. Approval of the Slate for the Faculty Dismissal Committee
   1. **Move to Accept**: T. Sawyer, C. MacDonald vote: unanimous
4. Election of Parliamentarian
   1. **Move to Accept:** R. Guell nominated T. Sawyer. Elected by acclamation
5. Approval of the Slate of Administrative/ All-University Committees,
   1. **Move to Accept:** T. Sawyer, C. MacDonald vote: unanimous
6. Academic Calendars for 2012-2013, and 2013-2014,
   1. D. Yaw addressed EC regarding changes to calendar and asked if anyone had questions.
      1. S. Lamb: Were the desires of the Senate to create a break on an entire week incorporated in both of these calendars? Provost: Yes
      2. R. Guell question to J. Maynard: Was J. Beacon’s staff consulted? Provost: Yes

**Move to Accept:** T.Sawyer, J. Conant vote: unanimous

1. Informational Item; Distance Educational Task Force Report, S. Lamb: being sent down to the appropriate committees.
   1. S. Lamb: I have come to understand that some faculty are not sufficiently flexible when responding to problems students have with the technology even when the technology issue is not in dispute. This is troubling
   2. C. MacDonald: I was on the committee. Its members have been aware for some time that there do exist such inflexible faculty.
2. Informational Item; ISU Staffing Study
   1. R. Lotspeich:
      1. Previous trends with regard to faculty/administrative ratios have stopped.
      2. Previous trends with regard to administrative/staff ratios have continued.
      3. The staff (in facilities management in particular) have been cut disproportionately leaving significant unmet maintenance needs
      4. There is a significant shift to non-tenure track instruction

S. Lamb: During the course of meetings with the president and the provost these reductions have been considered. I think this is not new information, but it is extremely well organized and should stimulate thought. These decisions were not taken lightly but nevertheless it is most fair game to have them in the public eye to see results of the calls for budget reduction and reallocation. I am very pleased that there has not been a reduction in the total dollars spent on faculty as you point out but on the other hand we have relied more heavily on the Special Purpose faculty. There are all kinds of economic reasons and expediency reason for that - that’s for sure. The italicized comments should be translated into charges. This report is accepted by consensus by the Executive Committee members and will be presented to the Faculty Senate at one of its next two meetings.

* 1. D. Bradley:
     1. The analysis does not account for two significant issues
        1. the bubble in freshman enrollment (which creates a temporary need for adjunct instructions).
        2. The retirement packages inducing significant faculty retirements where the instruction was replaced with temporary faculty in last year and tenure-track faculty this year.
     2. The intention is to maintain a percentage of instruction by TT faculty in the upper 60 percent range.
  2. S. Lamb:
     1. This report, the Schneirov report concerning special purpose faculty, and the Distance Education report need to be housed on a Faculty Senate web page. Guell is charged with making that happen.
  3. T. Hawkins
     1. Question to D. Bradley:
        1. Is there an intention to continue the trend of having more instruction provided by nonTT faculty?
           1. Answer: No. The target is the upper 60% range. We will need continued enrollment growth to accomplish that. The ultimate intention is to attempt to grow enrollment so that we can sustain a faculty mix that is 70% TT, 15% full time special purpose faculty, and 15% course-at-a-time adjuncts.
           2. J. Maynard

The deans are working on alternative models such as 65-20-15 etc.

* + 1. S. Lamb
       1. Question to D. Bradley and J. Maynard:
          1. Could you describe the pressures to achieve a 20:1 student faculty ratio (a 20:1 student faculty ratio translates into the average number of students that each faculty member has is 100 per semester in 3 hour courses, or 300 SCH’s per semester).

Answer: D. Bradley: The only way to achieve compensation goals is if faculty productivity increases to this level.

Answer: J. Maynard:

The state is looking to graduate 10,000 more students a year

We need to come up with a new model of instruction to achieve greater productivity. (Faculty may need to teach a lot more students.)

We need some way to recover the 15% budget cuts experienced in the last two years.

20:1 is not that difficult and is common among our peers.

S. Lamb: Do you see the movement you desire when talking to the deans? Provost: I see an awareness of the issue – an understanding that these are real issues – not manufactured.

S. Lamb: You must be aware how important it is it is important to keep up communication with the campus as a whole regarding the pressures from the state. This direction will be rejected unless there is a good understanding of the issues.

D. Bradley: My plan, as far as moving us in the desired direction is working with the deans and the deans working with the chairs, and that we develop a set of targets needed - to be generated at the College and Department level that will result in the 20:1 university ratio. The 20:1 ratio is more easily achieved in the fall, but it needs to be achieved over the entire year. The spring numbers are much lower because Chairpersons do not release adjuncts during the spring.

S. Lamb: This is very difficult to accomplish in the short-run, much is fixed.

T. Hawkins: There has to be a department-by-department variation.

D. Bradley: Agreed

K. Bolinger: Targets need to be SCH-based rather than courses-based for faculty because otherwise splitting sections unnecessarily will be the result. Assigning all faculty a four course load is irrational.

S. Lamb: I strongly agree.

J. Conant: It needs to be recognized that policies are interdependent and that the scheduling dictate to chairpersons to schedule courses outside the 9-2 window is in direct conflict with the dictate to maximize SCH production. (Policies are leading us in different directions).

R. Guell: You are being disingenuous with “20:1”. None of our peers are at 20.

If you are using 20:1 and saying that our peers have this, that is IPEDs data and it is NOT what are peers are doing. They are between 17:1 and 19:1 and we are 19:1.

If you use your definition which yields a 17.5:1 rate for us, you have no way of knowing what our peers are doing because they do not report their data using your definition.

Moreover, if you are using an annual 20:1 figure that ratchets up the productivity increase even more, as the IPEDs data are Fall reports not annual reports and every one of our peers has the same Fall-Spring change in enrollment we do.

Pick a definition and judge us by that definition, but by using different definitions and claiming factually inaccurate comparatives you are comparing apples and oranges.

D. Bradley: The only way we can afford compensation increases and the current staffing levels is through increased productivity and increased enrollment. We have to have lots of discussions concerning levels we hope for compensation, staffing, offices, etc. We are not moving to 20 immediately. It is going to take time to get things done. What I am hoping for this year is to do substantially better in the spring. The drop from 17.5 in the fall to 15 in the spring is in part because everyone likes their adjuncts, and if you give (adjuncts) four courses in the fall, you give them four courses in the spring, and we just can’t operate that way.

R. Guell: In my department we understand the predictable nature of the Fall/Spring numbers and use the spring slack to deal with sabbaticals and to offer more major-based courses so we can meet the higher enrollment that is needed in the fall in Foundational Studies and service courses.

1. Standing Committee Charges:
   1. S. Lamb: Read the charges brought forward today, and suggest changes and additional charges at our next meeting.
2. Meeting adjourned at 4:41 (T. Sawyer, R. Guell)