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UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMTTEE

September 6, 2011

3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

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

T. Sawyer

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

Guests: A. Arrington-Bey, R. English, S. Powers, D. Malooley, B. Sims, J. Stegeman

1. Administrative reports

President Bradley:

1. Met with J. Beacon to go over the 5-day enrollment numbers. There are good and bad things to report. On the bad side, IVYTech (Wabash Valley) transfer numbers are actually down from last year by 5-10% so something needs to be done there. Our Illinois freshman student enrollments are down. It may be because of the economy, but it’s hard to say. Illinois enrollments are down by 50. If ISU had those 50, we’d be pretty close to even. On the good side, we are up significantly (25%) with African-American students having a 3.0 HSGP or above. Evansville area students’ enrollment numbers are up as well. It has almost double within the last three-years. ISU has been trying to recover some of our lost territory. Southern Indian used to be a mainstay for ISU, but somehow we have abandoned it in the last decade or so.
2. This Thursday I will be going to the Indianapolis legislature for discussions with the Budget Committee. They want very little from us in the way of material and are only asking us to present a short presentation followed by a 20 minutes of discussion.

Provost Maynard: No report.

1. Chair report (S. Lamb) No report.

IIl. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion

1. J. Kuhlman: Blanche Evans’ (former Executive Committee member) mother passed away unexpectedly yesterday morning.

b. C. MacDonald’s statements

1) Faculty have mentioned to me a problem with grades that they assigned as “Incomplete”(IN) being changed to “In Progress” (IP) without their notification or consent. The grades were assigned this summer, and by August had been changed. This is a real problem, since faculty cannot currently change an “IP” (in process) grade on the computer the way that they can change an Incomplete. It currently requires actual paperwork to be signed by a number of people to change those grades. It is also problematic because with some of our courses, including practica, every student in a course might receive an Incomplete, as a matter of course, thus generating large amounts of paperwork. This is a potential infringement of faculty’s primary authority for assigning grades.

J. Maynard: I will look into this issue.

2) A comment regarding searches. It has been past practice here that if a faculty search was unsuccessful, the department did not automatically get to continue the search in the following year. This led to departments hiring people who were essentially not someone we wanted to hire, who then required extra time attention, and efforts from multiple levels to support these faculty, and who were still sometimes not successful in the Tenure and Promotion process. Hires (including bad hires) were made so that a line would be filled in the fear that otherwise, the position would be swept. Not all universities do it this way, and it ends up creating more work for us. The process needs to be re-evaluated.

R .Guell: There is a parallel problem of not guaranteeing a replacement line to departments that decide not to tenure a member.

D. Bradley: Departments should make the right decisions about personnel matters. It would be easier to commit to carrying over failed searches than to commit to tenure-denial replacements because the number of years that have passed since judgment was made that the department needed a line in the tenure case is just too long. When a department turns someone down for tenure the position should convert back to the department. You are looking at a span of one year vs. six or seven. We’re not going to be looking at staffing levels in departments every year determining whether or not we need to reduce the staff. This is not what we do. We basically carry positions in departments that are probably not needed. On the first point mentioned above, I would encourage you to work with the provost.

Provost: This issue goes back to the deans. Resources/positions have been tight in the last few years. I cannot guarantee anything.

J. Conant: You have to understand that departments may not tenure a “bad” faculty member who is marginally performing (bad tenure) but their expectations may, at the margin, drop if they know that the denial of tenure will not result in a replacement. (It’s not a “bad” colleague vs. an empty chair, but it’s a not up to standards colleague vs. an empty chair.)

3) Jim Buffington would like more information/background on the charge to SAC

regarding readmission policies. R. Guell will follow up with him with an explanation.

c. T. Hawkins: At Faculty Senate, C. Olsen asked about recreating the Chairs council. Will that be done?

Provost Maynard: I have asked J. Powers, the Administrative Fellow in our office, to re-construct a mechanism by which chairs can meet and offer input as a group.

d. J. Conant: With regard to the naming of the Performing Arts Center for President Landini, what are the processes for doing so? If there is a policy, what might that policy be, and are we giving away something we have to sell?

President Bradley: The Foundation didn’t think they could market that building its reasoning is that it is difficult to “sell” existing buildings.

B. Kilp: The Director of the School of Music and Dean claim they were notified (but not asked) about it only 10 minutes after it was made public.

J. Maynard: The Dean knew and his view was sought but neither he nor N. Cobb Lippens

were asked for their approval. Both were asked to help decide the building’s exact name.

IV. **Approval of the Minutes** of August 23, 2011 (T. Sawyer/C. MacDonald Vote: unanimous)

R. Guell: Regarding the contents of the Senate minutes. Is there too much content?

President Bradley: I would like to see more generalized statements - particularly in 15 Minute discussion – maybe just mentioning items discussed.

S. Lamb: I do believe that in an effort to make the minutes as candid as possible, we do need detail. Perhaps we can abbreviate them somewhat, but I do not want the minutes to become just bullet points. I want the general public to be able to follow them easily.

To the president: If items are of a sensitive issue, we can always keep things off the record and proceed…

V. Discussion with Lisa Spence, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and CIO

L. Spence offered insights about her first months. She indicated she is working to garner input from as many corners of campus as possible. She wants to engage with groups of faculty and staff about operational issues, opportunities and concerns, and to engage both when judging resource allocation issues.

She responded to several questions:

1. Is ITAC operational? Yes, she and Y. Phillips will meet with Steering tomorrow to lay agenda for ITAC.
2. Where is the data retention policy recommendation?

R. Guell: Your predecessor (E. Kinley) at one point asked me to put together a committee re data security. I worked with all the OIT people from the controller’s office, payroll, admissions and all the rest – drafted a policy on data retention – what could be tossed, what could be kept. The only thing I see that came out of that report about a year or so ago is the email policy. I know there are concerns expressed by some of these areas re when they can start throwing things away; when E. Kinley left, there was no follow up on this particular application.

L. Spence: She will check into this matter.

1. Where are we on E-SIRs? S. Powers interjected that E-SIRs are $.90 each but can be organized for data analysis.
2. Will CIRT’s proper placement in the University be revisited? (Structural development within that unit.) Is there any discussion re institutional reorganization?

L. Spence: I will need to do a review each of my areas to determine their effectiveness and how we are assessing them as I learn more about them to determine where we are and where we need to go. It may be necessary to reconsider organizational ways and reposition different units…

Provost Maynard: I have asked L. Spence to do a complete reassessment of how we do CIRT’s and if our organization is aligned well - will conduct a review of its operations - part of that will result in a discussion of where it best fits.

L. Spence to S. Lamb: I would like to go back to what you stated earlier – it is definitely from my perspective and part of what every IT person would agree to do is not to only register on what is going on around them but to examine what is being done and offer solutions.

L. Spence: When someone does this - it balances things against what others are thinking about technology as it fits into the environment. Bringing those kinds of conversations to the table – our visions, our creativity and where we want to be as an institution and makes that a part of the conversation -that is important to all concerned.

5) S. Lamb: What is your view of the Laptop Initiative?

L. Spence It demonstrates a forward thinking campus. It will allows us to be as flexible and efficient as can be in order to do certain things. So, I think it is a great thing for positioning our students where they need to be in the world today.

1. What is you view of the Laptop Scholarship? Might we be better off offering students an option of a laptop or a tablet)?

L. Spence: It is time to start looking at how we are doing that whole process.

There is a meeting of the stakeholders involved with scholarship who will discuss all of these issues. There is a level of interest in who we are doing this for and the choices being made.

S. Lamb: I know that there are more students excited over laptops then there are in those receiving major scholarship awards. This is attracting both parents and students to the University.

Provost: The lap top decision was not taken lightly – it was a considerable investment, but we did reduce the number of labs needed.

President Bradley to L. Spence: Please give us a 2-3 minute analysis of “where are we” on technology?

L. Spence: ISU is very well-positioned. It has a good foundation. Its process, commitment and communication among people on campus is what we do. We also need to think about individual processes in how to best serve faculty, new faculty, as well as how we deal with terminations, retirements, etc.

Where can we go from here? We need to get more information, offer better communication, tie what we do to the strategic plan, and be prepared to conduct program review. Consider how OIT provides support for research efforts. Also, we need to look at external funding to see how we are positioned there. Good news: there is a lot going on on campus that technology can support in a variety of ways. I am interested in talking to some of you about programs and how you can engage your students. Experiential Learning is important – making sure we are doing that as completely and well as possible. I am trying to make sure that for all the things we are doing well we can determine where we can go today. So, more information, additional communication and really paying attention to the strategic plan I think are all important to building the strong foundation that we have today.

S. Lamb: One strong point - I am sure it has happened to many of us here – say something happens and your system shuts down – rather than going to others for help, I am finding that the Help desk is becoming more flexible (helpful) – it’s wonderful to have problems solved before you are actually generated a number (ticket) in order to have someone come to resolve your problem.

L. Spence: It helps us to have some level of process in order to do the best job we can, but we should never ignore the customer service aspect of this. This is something we will keep working on as we move forward.

S. Lamb: Thank you Lisa.

VI. University Committee names **Motion (T. Sawyer/ C. MacDonald Vote: unanimous**)

S. Lamb: re the University Parking Committee – I had to reformulate it some (R. Guell is out)

G. Gottschling, K. Bauserman

Archive Committee

Anne Foster, Maureen Johnson

VII. CAAC Items

1. Architectural Engineering Technology, New Undergraduate Major

**Motion to approve (T.Sawyer/ K. Bolinger Vote: unanimous)**

Dean B. Sims provided an overview: Comments/questions

* There are no comparable programs in Indiana.
* The SCH demand will precede any requests for new faculty hiring.

T. Hawkins: Are there comparable programs in the country?

* B. Sims: Yes. These programs tend to be with Colleges of Technology where there are Colleges of Engineering. Students will often start in Engineering and discover that they are more interested in the practical aspects of the discipline and therefore become interested in the technology version.
* We will have to recruit both new freshmen directly as well as attract those in school of architecture who want to transfer.
* Are the credit hour requirements similar to those in the College of Technology? Yes. They are actually smaller. This is largely determined by accrediting bodies.

T. Sawyer: Did CAAC count prerequisites? D. Malooley: Yes.

* Was there a response to F-4 questions of Dr. Badar? Yes.

T. Sawyer: Those reactions would be helpful if they were added to the record.

* Are there any new courses? No.

President Bradley: A 4-year curriculum guide should be added to proposal review process.

T. Sawyer: The Commission Report should also be required.

D. Bradley: Because much of the same information is required for the Commission reports and the F forms, we should adjust out F forms to match those of the Commission.

Provost Maynard: The Commission wants to know about employer demand, statewide needs, and assessment, and want to be assured that the institution will be seeking no more resources.

1. Facilities Management, New Undergraduate Major, Dave Malooley, Dean Brad Sims, **Motion to Approve (T. Sawyer/ C. MacDonald)**

**Motion to Table (T. Sawyer /T. Hawkins Vote: unanimous)**

Discussion/comments/questions:

* Chair of Built Env (name) This does not require new courses. ABET doesn’t require Facilities Management courses. A collection of courses, though a stretch initially, can be used to create a program. Only 3-4 universities offer BS in FM.

B. Sims: This would fill a niche market. We are imagining our students involved in projects focused on hospitals.

K. Bolinger: Will this just cannibalize existing students?

S. Lamb to the President and Provost: Please provide an on the record context to the 20:1 direction

Provost Maynard: We will, over the course of a few years, have to get to 20:1 (Full Time Students to Full Time Equivalent Faculty).

This need not be at program level. For some it will not be realistic. It may be easy for others. The 20:1 target will be an institutional target. Cannibalization will not work.

President Bradley: I second what Jack said plus add that the difference between colleges will be smaller than the differences between departments.

T. Sawyer: Is there an answer to the question about FM courses on the F-4?

No. And it needs to be. Students will have a hard time meeting the 50 hour rule for 300/400 level courses.

* IVYTech transfers are not bringing right courses (according to the ACCE) in many of the current programs It ends up being a 2+3.5.
* The FM program would likely work as a true 2+2.

J. Conant: I am worried about so many courses (in finance, risk and insurance etc) listed without prerequisites. Even if the courses are taught internally, a small amount of capital budgeting, insurance, etc. is too little.

President Bradley: It seems that there are too many accreditors in CoT.

If there was ever a program where the commitment to Experiential Learning should be evidence, it is here. There should be an internship in this program.

R. Guell: In conventional majors with so many courses, faculty lament the inability of students to draw the connections between the concepts in the various courses. To think that students will be able to do that without any major-based courses, is fanciful.

VIII. Possible additional charges for FAC **Motion to Approve (K. Bolinger/T. Sawyer vote: unanimous)**Faculty Evaluation Process S. Powers

**Motion: For the purpose of the present pilot, every department will adhere to the University-wide recommended weights. They are encouraged to use this year’s experience to consider their department adjustments to these weights for the next review period. (R. Guell/ C. MacDonald vote: unanimous)**

**Motion: The Calendar of deadlines presented by S. Powers will be those for the pilot. (R. Guell/ C. MacDonald Unanimous)**

**Motion: The evaluation period for this pilot will be July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011 (R. Guell/ C. MacDonald Vote: unanimous)**

**While recognizing the limitations of Qualtrics, for this pilot all tenured and tenure-track faculty will submit their review materials through the Qualtrics link provided by Academic Affairs. In accordance with the Board approved policy, tenure-track faculty with a record of continuous unconditional reappointments may opt out. (R. Guell/ C. MacDonald Vote: unanimous)**

IX. At the last Senate meeting FAC’s response to the following PTOC concern was tabled. Different language was desired.

X. **Motion Amend Section 305.2.3 Regular Evaluations. (T. Sawyer, C. MacDonald Vote: Unanimous)**

Evaluation feedback **shall** linkto specific expectations established by the department and college as spelled out in the respective tenure and promotion policies.

Meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.