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**Present:** V. Sheets, S.A.M. Anderson, J. Fine, A. Halpern, C. Hoffman, S. Lamb, T. Sawyer, D. Worley

**Ex officio:** Provost J. Maynard

**Guests:** J. Jasco, D. McKee, H. Waldbieser, P. Shon, R. L. Lotspeich

**I. Administrative Report (Provost J. Maynard)**

a. The president is in Indianapolis meeting with legislators. Continue to have concerns

related to the budget before final resolution.

b. Retirement Tea event needs to be revisited. Poor faculty attendance.

c. Invitations for the faculty awards banquet will be sent out within the next few days.

**II. Chair report (V. Sheets)**

a. Voting for Executive Committee (EC) members is underway – process on-going.

**III. Approval of Minutes of March 24, 2009 - approved as amended. (C. Hoffman/T. Sawyer) 8-0-0.**

**IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

a. April undergrad admission report: C. Hoffman asked whether the figures are as encouraging as they appear. The provost stated that it is accurate from this point but nothing is definite until students actually pay tuition. Hoffman also wanted to know if there was any thought re changes in the cost of tuition concerning out of state students. No, not at present time.

b. A. Halpern asked if there were any plans in place for the Mullen House on 7th Street (where the president resided before he moved into Condit House.) There is a caretaker there, but no definite plans at the present time other than keeping it as a place for short-term guests to the University.

c. S. Lamb discussed Strategic leadership function. He stated that most of the time was devoted to Health Benefits issues and how the University could become more proactive. He also noted a concern related to the freshman retention program and trying to identify the person responsible for student success; Administrative Affairs has provided input to working with others, including VPs, Student Affairs, and Business Affairs.

d. Sheets stated that he wanted to address the following issues:

1) The University Speaker Series program and getting better faculty participation. The provost stated that he has been working with Mark Edwards (Marketing/Communications) on this issue. The provost acknowledged a need to find a new group/audience to serve, looking for a more balanced group.

2) Discussion with Sharon Gick re the university providing a better example of what it means to put students first. Sheets discussed an instance where a student registered for a spring class that was put online incorrectly. The student had to go through the registration process all over again when it was clearly the fault of the administration, which should simply have corrected the error without further student effort. The provost agreed that this was not a good situation.

3) A&S Chair Council: people are being told that there will be no support for first generation lap-tops being switched for new models/vendors. The provost noted that clearly this was an indication of miscommunication and that he will ask E. Kinley for clarification.

4) Correctional Education Program (CEP) – faculty concern related to safety and protection of faculty. The provost stated that he will get more specific information and purse the concern.

**V. Discussion item: Travel Procedures: D. McKee, J. Jasco and Hope Waldbieser**

D. McKee and J. Jason were invited to the table (C. Hoffman/T. Sawyer) by acclamation.

a. D. McKee asked members for feedback related to the University’s travel program.

b. D. Worley had concerns related to the use of other providers (other than I.T. or Orbitz) to find cheaper tickets and the time lag associated with getting permission to purchase

them, which frequently resulted in an increase in ticket price. She stated that there needs to be some way to take advantage of lower fares without requiring time-consuming bureaucratic permissions.

c. McKee stated that the 2000 fiscal year travel policy originally required that one had to

use a specific provider (IT Travel) in order to keep rates in check and deal with

approval issues. J. Jasco noted that if faculty found lower fares all they had to do was email his office, and his department should be able to respond quickly.

d. Sheets questioned the costs saved on travel vs. administrative costs and asked if

the University is really saving money. McKee stated that she sees two issues with

travel: 1) maximizing travel dollars for conferences, and 2) a need for discussion to see if the administration can make things more flexible for people while at the same time satisfying the needs of a department. The present policy was instituted because people needed to get prior approval for travel and to protect the university from liability. Also, people who do not turn in their Travel Authorization forms (TA’s) on time prior to trips continues to be an on-going problem. D. Worley stated that she understood this but to couple authorization with fiscal responsibility is difficult when one wants to find the cheapest fare available.

e. McKee stated that she and the administration would take another look at travel policy to see if they can find better ways to accommodate people and improve this

situation.

f. S.A.M. Anderson stated that she (and others) have also experienced difficulty filling out online travel forms, especially when away from the university. The forms require

following several links for required information (Federal rates, etc), which is neither

easy nor efficient.

g. S. Lamb also questioned the $500 amount restriction for out-of- town travel expenses -it is not nearly enough, especially if people are trying to attend events that might aid in advancing this institution. Some kind of supplemental travel money is needed.

**VI. New Business**

a. AAC Staffing Report/Faculty-Administrative Count (R. Lotspeich)

1) S. Lamb noted the soundness of the report compared to what we have seen in the past; the research is excellent and the data are understandable.

2) R. Lotspeich summarized the data report (overview of tables, re-classification of employees from professional to administrative highlighted consistent trends in EAP, changes in staffing of non-instructional personnel, faculty roles, etc.)

3) Other items discussed in reviewing the report.

· program prioritization

· decline in tenure- track over 14 year period resulted in harm to some programs.

· faculty salaries being below other peer institutions

· costs involved in helping students who are under prepared

· change in leadership – trying to improve administrative processes

· role related to the mission of the University

· EAP and support staff changes in classification - makes a difference in

comparing data.

· data interesting to the Senate; frustrating to the administration in terms of assessments and enforcing/policing policies and decisions

· faculty need details about the efficiency of some programs.

4) Sheets thanked R. Lotspeich for his report and stated that he will put it on the agenda for the next Senate meeting (April 16).

**MOVE TO ACCEPT (with appreciation**). (C. Hoffman/T. Sawyer) 8-0-0. Will be

forwarded to Senate.

b. Sick Leave Transfer Policy (FEBC approved)

Address concerns: about black market and leave time losses to unit. (Sheets noted that K. Bolinger was unable to attend today’s meeting.)

a. Sheets noted that FEBC had raised issues of concerns/modifications

1) Making sure no black-market is established. Establish policies within

departments/units (shorthanded departments have to continue their work.)

2) Limitation of time donation from one person to another. Two weeks or

a certain percentage of time donated…e.g. 10% in one fiscal year (or whichever is greater.)

3) D. Worley noted that more information from staff members is needed since we don’t know all issues surrounding staff/sick leave policy nor do we know all the groups that are impacted by this policy.

4) Sheets reminded members that EC is mainly offering input to the policy drafted and submitted by D. McKee.

5) The provost stated that this proposed draft is a reasonable approach to the sick leave policy but that he is opposed to donating sick time on a percentage basis.

6) Discussion of short term/long disability benefits and FMLA benefits.

**MOVE TO ACCEPT**: (S. Lamb/S.A.M. Anderson) 8-0-0. Will be forwarded to the Senate.

c. University Benefits Committee (FEBC reviewed) - Modification of document

Concerns:

1) Three faulty not enough: does not represent diverse categories/groups.

2) Appointment by representative bodies.

3) S. Lamb reiterated his view that role of FEBC not be diminished in any way and its traditional role is retained.

4) S.A.M. Anderson asked if there shouldn’t be one more retiree on committee (2) (one for faculty and one for staff.) Introduced as a friendly amendment. Each group shall have representation.

**MOVED TO ACCEPT** AS modified (include section on retirees): S.A.M. Anderson/J. Fine 8-0-0.

d. Spousal fee Waivers Proposal

1) Applies to undergraduate courses only.

2) Approval 80% tuition waiver for ISU employee’s spouse. Suggestions made to extend the benefit to other groups, but consensus emerged that this is the best

which is possible at this time.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT**: **(D. Worley/SAM Anderson) 8-0-0.** This will be forwarded to the Senate for approval.

e. Motion on Administrative Prioritization (EC response to FEBC)

**MOTION: Read as follows:**

**“**The Faculty of Indiana State University request that the President, in partnership with the Faculty Senate and Support Staff, charge a group of administrators, faculty, and support staff to conduct an open and transparent review and prioritization of all administrative areas/functions performed on campus**.” (S. Lamb/D. Worley) 8-0-0.**

f. Cancellation of spring Standing Committee reporting meeting April 21.

The Senate will meet in special session (an additional meeting) on April 30, 2009 to consider remaining action items.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT: (D. Worley/C. Hoffman) 8-0-0.**

**VII. Old Business**

a. Student parking proposal discussed – request for adjustment in parking lot fees and usage designations.

**MOTION:**

**“The Executive Committee does not endorse this proposal.”**

**(S.A.M. Anderson/C. Hoffman) 7-0-0.**

**VIII. Committee reports. None.**

**Meeting adjourned: 5:24 p.m.**