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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AUGUST 23, 2011

3:30 p.m. HMSU 227

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

Ex officio: President D. Bradley, AVP S. Powers

1. Administrative report
   1. President Bradley:

I met with Governor Daniels, Commissioner Lubbers, State Superintendent Bennett and seven (7) Indiana public university presidents. The following items were discussed:

1. The state is under some obligation by the U.S. Department of Education to rank and rate Schools of Education. The state determined that Louisiana has a very good model and will follow it. My guess is that it will take several years to accomplish this because the plan is to follow and evaluate every new teacher with regard to student performance compared to experienced teachers’.
2. Accountability for performance-based funding: Basically, my colleagues and I complained again that most of the accountability monies went towards enrollment growth rather than accountability. Campus’were rewarded for increasing total number of degrees and total hours completed. The Legislature gave the Commission a mandate to review their accountability model and will report back to the Legislature by, I think, November.
3. When asked if he was against the legislature imposing tuition caps, the Governor responded that he was. R. Minas, D. Bradley and D. McKee will meet with state legislative (budget) committee on the September 8th to justify tuition rates increases at ISU.
   1. AVP Powers: No report
4. Chair, S. Lamb’s report:
   1. Colleagues:

I must first report that I am disturbed about the presentation of the Taskforce Report chaired by Dr. Schriver to the Board of Trustees at the most recent Board meeting. This report made several recommendations to the Board, that certainly appear to infringing on the primary authority of the Faculty. Perhaps this was just a preliminary report, but the fact that the opinions of the Schriver task force were not vetted before relevant faculty standing committees is disturbing. The report deals with potential barriers to graduation and contains such suggestions as the determination of common start and stop times for classes, to the possible reduction of the number of hours required to graduate from 124 to 120 , and it

appears that some of these suggestions are already being implemented. I would like my fellow officers to comment on this further during the fifteen minute discussion period. I do know that the Board has been sensitive about receiving the input from the Senate, and honoring governance protocol. To have this protocol undermined is not appreciated.

I continue to be concerned that Trustees have not acted on emeriti appointments for recently-retired faculty. In years past, all retiring faculty were entitled to emeriti status. President Bradley asked for a more definitive set of conditions for such appointments.

Under the recent Senate-approved change, only some of our new retirees are entitled automatically to that status, others are eligible to apply but are not granted it automatically, and some are not eligible. "Emeritus" and "Emerita" are academic ranks/titles, which only the Board can confer. Without Board action, none of this is a matter of record. I have no knowledge that retired faculty have been made aware of their emeriti status, whether they have it, or whether they may apply for it. This issue should be addressed.

1. Powers noted that there are Emeriti appointments on the 8/30/11 Board of Trustees’ agenda.
2. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
   1. C. MacDonald:
      1. It is the day before classes start and our new faculty don’t have computers yet. If we are serious about strategic Goal #6 – Recruiting and Retaining Great Faculty, this needs to be improved –how can faculty do their jobs if we don’t provide them the equipment they need to do so? It is bad enough that we can’t provide them with new machines, as we do our new students.   
         D. Bradley: I agreed that this is a problem that should not have occurred. (It was later determined by S. Powers that loaner machines are available to new faculty.)
      2. The timing of the blackboard update was really terrible – the week before classes start Blackboard is down. Again, we are getting in the way of faculty who are trying to do a good job. Can we move the next upgrade to May or the Winter break, when it will affect fewer courses and fewer faculty?

S. Powers: ITAC (which has faculty representation) was asked by former CIO Kinley whether August or May was the better upgrade window and suggested that August was better than May.

C. MacDonald: I still believe that August is a poor choice relative to May.

* + 1. In the spring, at a Senate meeting, I raised the issue of looking into the number of Elluminate classrooms on campus as well as the number of seats in those classes. Ed Kinley said someone from his office would contact me or my chair. This has yet to happen, so I would like to ensure that this issue does not get lost in the transition to his successor, Lisa Spence.
  1. Tim Hawkins:
     1. The University bookstore’s web page is offering potentially confusing information to students on materials. Specifically, thought those materials that are required and recommended are noted, advertising (some of it potentially misleading) is included on other materials (such as jump drives) in an apparent attempt to increase sales of materials that the faculty member neither required nor recommended.

D. Bradley: Students are likely more sophisticated. Is there a bookstore committee to whom such issues could be directed? S. Lamb: No

T. Hawkins: It is allowed that they advertise non-required materials.

B. Kilp: Is it in their contract?

President: This website is pretty standard. I’ll talk to D. McKee about this issue and make her aware that some people are concerned about these advertisements.

* + 1. I am concerned that Academic Affairs is trying to push some kind of mandate on scheduling which is understood to be the chair’s responsibility. I am concerned that departments will be forced to schedule times outside the appropriate times already set by departments and the faculty teaching classes.

D. Bradley: I believe that the provost will be happy to discuss this when he is available to do so. The report by J. Schriver should be interpreted as the committee’s view of items that should be explored and should not be interpreted as recommendations for Board of Trustee action. The whole issue of barriers to degrees is going to be a big one. That is one of the items that came up in our discussions with the Governor yesterday. We are only going to be rewarded for one thing down the line and that is getting students through completion. We are going to have discussions on campus before recommendations are made for Board action. There is going to be faculty input on it though there may not be faculty agreement on it.   
  
T. Hawkins: We need to recognize that chairs know their departments and issues better than does the administration.

D. Bradley: We should continue the discussion of this report but it would be more productive with the provost. It should be noted that if departments create schedules at odd times they create scheduling problems for other students. Not having that does affect the efficiency of the operation.

J. Conant: I would like to talk about the process as well as the specifics:

First of all, they have not been preliminary reports; they were mandates. The mandates came down not only in terms of start and stop times but in terms of a minimal 30% of courses outside the 10-2 window. Econ has a senior capstone which, because I agree with the Experiential Learning mission, I have to schedule in a non-standard, once a week, 3 hour time slot. It is in our seminar room so I do not take up any classroom. It is only for our majors; they know about it. The fact that I have to rationalize that to someone every semester is burdensome…it becomes part of an attitude that says “let’s save administrator time, even if it costs three times as much to faculty and chairs.” The other thing is that we are being judged with SCH, and we talk in this group all the time about student/faculty ratios. This semester, Economics has 15% of our classes outside the 10-2 windows. They are the only classes that have open seats. If I am forced to put 30% of my classes into those times, my student/faculty ratios are going to go down. There seems to be little recognition that our policies are inter-related which brings me to the process…as a chair I have been doing this for 15 years – I know my faculty – I know my curriculum and my students. No chair was consulted prior to the report going out. I cannot begin to tell you what that says when an agency puts forth even a recommendation to its Board of Trustees about something that is a chair responsibility without ever discussing it with the chairs.

President Bradley: I don’t believe it was a recommendation.

J. Conant: The point is that mandates were made to chairs about something they are responsible for and have knowledge of, but they were not consulted about the issue before they were given the mandates.

S. Lamb: I believe there has already been some modification of this policy. I think it has been suggested that if the deans are comfortable with the exceptions made by the chair that it will not be carried any further. I think that the primary point is that input was not sought from chairs who have so many forces placed on them already. They balance the needs of students, the desires of faculty desires, as well as their deans' wishes. We are doing a balancing act and we are doing the best that we can in our minds to further the goals of the unit we are within. Not to have discussion with those who have devoted their careers to walking this very narrow line is troubling.

President: I had no knowledge that we did not have standard start and stops time because other institutions do. That is the only way to avoid problems where someone decides that they are going to teach a class across times, making it difficult for students.

R. Guell: This mandate is trying to fix something that was really not broken to begin with. It has not been demonstrated to anyone or by anyone. I have asked multiple times to see the data behind the report. I asked the Director of Institutional Research what data was provided by her office in support of this report and she indicated there had been no such request.

J. Conant: Who benefits from reallocating a class from a time when students want to take it to a time when students don't want to take it? – the answer to that is “no one.” We are trying to break something that is not broken with these mandates.

President: I don’t want to be apologetic for the Committee or the provost but I would say there are things that will need to be done structurally and some of them are not going to be popular. I don’t know what they are specifically, but I am sure that the provost would be willing to discuss this matter. The provost and I understand that there is nothing that is perfect and modifications will undoubtedly be forthcoming. Whatever was done this summer to change the fall schedule, I would be surprised if he would not be willing to look at modifications to whatever the edict was that came out over the summer.

J. Conant: This is not the first time that this has happened. And doing something to fix something that did not work…why not just bring in the people who are responsible and knowledgeable before policies are made…

President: Communications has to be an ongoing process. We need not be in such a hurry as to skip over steps.

S. Lamb to the President: I hope you understand that our responsibility is when we feel that the communications process was not properly followed… that faculty governance was not properly followed….

President: Yes, but I urge you to use care in the level of reaction.

Hawkins: This seems to be a matter of scheduling and scheduling is part of curriculum and the responsibility of faculty of the university. It is that need that seems to be central to many of the problems that we have – a failure of communication between the administration and faculty that seems to be a serious breakdown…that is a management problem from my perspective.

D. Bradley: The provost felt he needed no input or Board approval to impose either of these rules on scheduling.

S. Lamb: In our charges, we are recommending that the Schriver report be sent to both the CAAC body and the Graduate Council.

President: What I would suggest, Steve, as an alternative, is that J. Schriver be invited to meet with those people and you all can talk to her about putting additional people….this task force is not finished. I have no problem with whatever task force recommendations come out that they be vetted.

S. Lamb: Good.

President: What I would suggest is that the recommendations be annotated with whether the Faculty Senate agrees or does not agree. However, I do think there will be disagreements.

S. Lamb: We have had many task forces…but when their work has been completed and often while it is being completed, it has gone through standing committees…

President: Clearly there will be times that the provost or I may recommend things that you may not agree with.

S. Lamb: We have no problem with that, but we do have the responsibility of giving out input through our existing structure.

R. Guell: The Handbook gives scheduling to the chairs. This is a violation of the Handbook.

President to R. Guell: I do not agree that it violated the Handbook.

S. Lamb: Let us conclude with this statement: There will be task forces, and they will investigate issues within our primary authority. At the conclusion of those reports, they will be sent to the governing body of this institution for their input. There are issues where the president will not agree with our recommendations, and he has that right, but we must have the opportunity to give our input or advice to those positions.

* 1. R. Guell to S. Powers: Could you explain the change in the readmission policy. A student with multiple dismissals was placed in a department without the consent of that department. Admission policy and retention policy are the primary authority of the faculty, the Student Affairs Committee in particular. The policy as it existed required students to return to their original college. The new policy appears to allow students to change colleges even when they are not in good academic standing.
     1. S. Powers: There is a difference among the associate deans as to the definition of the phrase “college of the intended major.” Does the “intention” mean the current intention or the previous intention?
     2. R. Guell: This was always a bad policy that had been dealt with between associate deans. This policy should be changed but that should be by the Student Affairs Committee.

1. Motion to Approve the minutes of August 16, 2011 (T. Sawyer, C. MacDonald Vote: unanimous)
2. Motion to Accept the Standing Committee Charges in full (one was added on). (T. Sawyer, J. Kuhlmann)
   1. D. Bradley: Neither the provost nor I are supportive of the creation of a budget committee of faculty. We believe that budget is a university responsibility and not a purview of a faculty committee. We need a lot more discussion. I am pleased to and want to be consulted on budget issues.
   2. S. Lamb: At this point, all we are doing is to move responsibility from Administrative Affairs Committee (AAC) of the Faculty Senate to FEBC; Period. What we have before the Senate on Thursday merely transfers that responsibility to the FEBC. The charges are for the FEBC body to consider. I am certain that the administration will have a response to the FEBC’s definition of its role..
   3. J. Kuhlman
      1. Please add the following to the charges for the University Research Committee.
         1. Determine the advisability of requiring presentations to provide information regarding the preparation of the grant proposal.
   4. K. Bolinger
      * 1. Last year FEBC considered the matters within 3.4 (look for in FEBC role) in their minutes

Vote: Unanimous

1. Meeting adjourned at 4:23 PM.