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

**Absent:** D. Worley **(**excused absence)

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

**Guests:** J. Gatrell, L. Maule

**I. Administrative Reports**

 **President D. Bradley:**

 a. Survey for *Chronicle of Higher Education* – ISU is ready to participate. Sheets asked if

the results of the survey will be made public. Yes, it will be.

 b. University budget from the Indiana Senate is looking better. Based budget 1% less

than this year’s. The governor’s forecast is set for Friday. Where we are is probably

where we need to be. Discussion is needed on how stimulus monies should be spent.

 c. The Board of Trustees will have a tuition hearing on May 8. On April 28 we will put

 together a proposal for tuition increases and draft a budget. Most likely we are

 looking at a 5% increase in tuition. Each base budget is different than governor’s

budget and the University may decrease tuition to something less than the 5% base due to the current economic conditions.

 d. Strategic Planning is in the process of trying to set quantitative goals.

Sustainability: Earlier this week, I met with the co-chairs of the various sustainability working groups. I was impressed with the enthusiasm and ideas that filled the room. I have asked each working group to meet in the coming weeks. I will be having a follow up meeting with the co-chairs in May. This is an important issue and one that must be addressed in a meaningful way.

**Provost J. Maynard:** no report.

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

a. Update on voting on constitutional voting process. Near quorum level. The Handbook states how voting process should be completed, *one week from date ballots are sent* *out.* Will send a memo to faculty re this.

b. Met with Support Staff Council re previous discussions we had at our meetings related to sick leave (proposed) policy. I shared draft with them. They approved. They also wanted to know about the plan for phase retirement, and if it could also be applied to support staff. The president noted that the plan should be available to everyone, but it needs to be an institutional decision. Information on this will be provided soon. Sheets further stated that the Support Staff Council is also very interested in this plan. The president stated that he is not looking at this as a retirement incentive but something that is set down as a long-term commitment (forever). Sheets also discussed shared Benefit Committee plans with the Council as well as the student parking proposal. He stated that he plans on attending the parking committee meeting tomorrow. The student parking proposal was not well received by faculty and staff. The president stated that hopefully, within the next couple of weeks, he and D. McKee will have something put together that will make parking less problematic. They are working on identifying additional parking spaces around campus.

**III. Approval of the Minutes of April 7, 2009 as corrected. (T. Sawyer/C. Hoffman) 7-0-1.**

**IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

 a. Hoffman asked president for clarification re survey for *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

The president stated that the results of the survey will be viewed by the University (made public.) There will also be an aggregate from everyone else as a baseline.

b. The president commented on the Mullen House (guest house for campus visitors) and stated that if anyone wanted to use this house for visitors to campus, they need to contact D. McKee. He noted that there is no charge related to housing guests there. Halpern wanted to know to what extent the house/property might be a liability to the University. The president noted that a fair amount of funds have already been spent on this house and that basically, it would be the cost of utilities. He further stated that the costs of keeping this house for the next several years are very small and the best thing we can do with it is use it.

**V. New Business**

 a. SOG name change: *School of Graduate Studies & Professional Programs* (pending GC approval). J. Gatrell was invited to the table.

 Discussion of F2 document:

* Proposal highlights what ISU does in terms of graduate education; its visibility, and professional programming. It embraces what ISU does well, giving it a unique status. It also provides a rationale for the program.

· Hoffman – commented on the fact that we don’t have a good definition of a college or school. Gatrell stated we have what a school is. Hoffman –

what does it mean in reference to a college for instance – do we create other departments in it? Gatrell – I can see a school of psychology, etc. – it would be in College of A&S. Program allows flexibility. How does the document relate to the mission of the university? The president noted that he has not heard that graduate studies was not part of the mission of the University. Only change – insertion of the word “research.” ISU has been a graduate institution for at least 80 years.

· Hoffman stated that a college of graduate and professional studies sounded like a vocational education. Gatrell stated that it is not about enrollment in the program but a type of profession that we are trying to convey.

· Graduate /professional studies - is it a linking of two types of programs? There appears to be a reference to an artificial deferential - does it refer to a college or graduate and professional studies…what is the distinction? Gatrell – graduate and professional studies vs. graduate and yes there is a distinction there. What is the distinction one may wonder? Would there be any disadvantage?

· Gatrell – students understand that today we have professional programs.

· A. Halpern noted that not all programs are linked to a licensure.

· Gatrell – clarifying element – school vs. college (language).

· J. Fine – I don’t see it as two different groups grads vs. professional studies - programs are in both.

· Gatrell – concern: other trend is a tendency for some programs to self market – tend to have different venues. This allows us to share identities.

**MOTION: Motion to approve proposal to change title of the School of Graduate Studies for**

***College of Graduate and Professional Stu*dies. All in favor:**

**6-0-2. Will forward this to Faculty Senate meeting on April 30.**

 b. Tenure clock – delay proposal

 Discussion:

 1. Hoffman – grammar corrections “caregiver” add an “s” making it caregivers, and other editorial changes.

 2. Sheets asked the provost if he had a change to run a certification piece. The provost stated that he had not had time to do so.

3. Discussion of tenure clock and people having extenuating circumstances (flood); extension of tenure probationary period. Abused of program: Contracts may not be renewed also can be reviewed under annual review process. The provost stated each circumstance is difference (can be a gray area). He further stated that maybe some additional language should be added stating that it is not a right for all but the time of event and that one is making good progress toward tenure. Otherwise, it becomes a decision, not a right (FMLA, disability). Should have a right to review request.

4. President – change it to a “request” rather than “elect”. Document may need revisions.

5. Provost stated that the proposal is very much “pro-family”.

6. Friendly amendment requested.

**MOTION for friendly amendment be added. Sawyer/Pontius 8-0-0. Sheets will revise it and send to Senate April 16.**

 c. Foundational Studies Proposal (L. Maule) CH/SAM - passed out handouts. Review of documents.

 1. L. Maule stated that voices have been heard. There were many

different views by people expressing what a foundational program should look like. K. Bolinger would like to see a larger and more robust program. Different input (bodies) have made the program more coherent, but not robust.

 2. Important for program to represent needs of 21st century students. The provost stated that he believes the language of this proposal speaks to that.

3. C. Hoffman - how does this program differ from the last program? L. Maule stated that the consensus among faculty was that the old program was less coherent. It lacks rigor. Students also would tell you that it is less rigorous and less challenging.

4. No change to quantitative literature and math. Same as current requirement. It is in keeping with what universities in Indiana do.

5. Discussion on lab course…one course/one lab. Concern lab courses being challenged on campus.

6. Student Outcomes and Assessments

· Don’t teach students to think scientifically (non-majors). What works

and what does not (skill sets). e.g. in science there has to be a foundation laid in chemistry and philosophy.

Students need to be exposed to ways of knowledge as it relates to the world and be able to respond to problems. There are labs classes across disciplines that allow one to “think”. The program is not about sub-structuring, but the redistribution of programs (re- assessing). Want to make sure that students are meeting necessary outcomes.

· In previous (current) program there was little or no assessment. Current model is difficult for transfer students, very complex and hard to understand.

· L. Maule stated that people can turn to SIR and other programs for evaluations. Faculty development stated in proposal also enhances quality of the program. T. Sawyer stated that he does not believe that SIR is the best method of evaluation. Students can make objectives.

· There are multiple ways to do tests/measurements and cross search analysis that can point to Outcome and why students need to take certain courses. We are testing programs, not individual students.

· Students/Deans can petition for substitute courses. This is a big change in student requirements.

· Program proposal will be revisited (revised) every three years.

**MOTON TO ACCEPT: S. Pontius/S.A.M. Anderson. 7-1-0. Will be forwarded to the Senate on April 30 upon revision.**

**MOTION to move into Executive Session: Tenure Evaluation. (C. Hoffman/S.A.M. Anderson)**

**8-0-0. (5:07 p.m.)**

**MOTION TO ACCEPT: contingent on documentation. (S. Pontius/S.A.M. Anderson) 6-1-1.**

**VI. Old Business**

a. FEBC - recommendation to become part of the Budget & Compensation committee – advisory input.

b. Sheets discussion with K. Bolinger re need to have budget committee prepare a resolution to extend spousal benefits to adjuncts that have been employed by the University for at least three years. Discussion on spousal benefit issue has already been discussed with D. McKee and a resolution on this has already been made.

 **Adjourned 5:27pm**