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| |  |  | | --- | --- | | UFS#3 Approved November 17, 2005. October 20, Minutes | Indiana State University Faculty Senate 2005-06 |     **Time:**          3:15 p.m.  **Place:**         HMSU, Dede III  **Officers:**      Chair S. Lamb, Vice Chair V. Sheets  **Senators:** C. Amlaner, V. Anderson, E. Bermudez, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, J. Conant,  B. Evans, B. Frank, D. Gravitt, A. Halpern, E. Hampton, J. Harper, T. Hawkins, P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, N. Hopkins, J. Hughes, R. Johnson, C. MacDonald, G. Minty, T. Mulkey, F. Muyumba, L. O’Laughlin, S. Pontius, J. Powers, Q. Weng, S. Wolf, D. Worley  **Absent:** Secretary Sr. A. Anderson, K. Liu, M. Miller, C. Montanez, P. Plummer, R. Schneirov, S. Sharp, S. Shure, G. Stuart, P. Wheeler  **Ex-Officio:**   President Benjamin, Provost Maynard, Vice President Schafer  **Visitors:**      C. Barton, M. Greenwell    **I. Administrative Report**              President Benjamin addressed:  1) the Library’s recent Voices and Visions project—a job well done;  2) upcoming events: homecoming this weekend; dedication of the Michael Simmons student Activities Center tomorrow;  3) meetings continue with college governance bodies and middle management to discuss key issues facing the campus;  4) PPARC met last Wednesday; budget updates were given;  5) the Enrollment Taskforce continues to meet every other week.    Provost Maynard addressed:  1) the University has selected a new Interim Dean for Graduate Studies, J. Kuhlman;  2) the Enrollment Taskforce has forwarded aggressive strategies for short-term and long-term activities to impact enrollment and retention of students; a new scholarship has been introduced as a result--the Laptop Scholarship; award increases have been made to the Incentive Scholarship and the 21st Century Scholarship;  3) Board of Trustees approval of the Handbook language related to University Initiatives/Appointments in General--recognition of faculty scholarship and service--recently approved by the Senate;  4) sessions on the Promising Scholars Program and Institutional Distinctiveness have been held with high faculty interest—80 have expressed interest in the Promising Scholars Program and the Institutional Distinctiveness session had good faculty attendance—50 attendees;  5) a Banner upgrade will be installed within the next few days.    **II. Chair Report**              Chair Lamb:        “Once again, I report to nobody’s surprise that the institution is under stress.  It needs to be able to respond quickly and appropriately to a variety of pressures. In order to respond effectively, careful attention must be paid to the governance process.  If we purposefully or inadvertently circumvent the process, the backlash may be harmful.   The Executive Committee has made efforts to incorporate many of the University challenges into our charge structure, so that standing committees may effectively give input into initiatives.  We have designed effective charges for FAC, GC and CAAC so that they would be correctly positioned to give substantive input to the Program Prioritization Committee. And by the way, our Graduate Council has provided very valuable input into that committee.  The Executive Committee was creative in determining mechanisms so that standing committees could give rapid input into the Distinctive Programs Committee. This was achieved.  We are doing are best to protect the stability of this University. The Ex. Committee took the lead on this.  We are due some consideration.  On a parallel note, the Provost has done much to ensure that faculty governance will play its proper primary role in conducting Program Prioritization.  That Prioritization committee composed primarily of faculty, many picked by the Ex. Committee, will need to have its findings flow through the faculty governance structure in a timely manner.  Nine of the 12 voting members are faculty, four of them are names we forwarded, plus the chair of CAAC is serving as a co-chair at our suggestion, and a member of the Graduate Council is serving at our suggestion. I appreciate the fact that much of the Ex. Committee’s advice was taken by the Provost in the construction of that committee.  Regardless, during this time of tremendous challenges, I plead with all administrative branches, in fact, all constituencies, to recognize the proper role of the governance structure, so that we may proceed effectively as a unit.  In this manner, we will be successful in dealing with common concerns.  As you may recall, I informed you that we would ask for reports from the faculty members of the subcommittees of the Enrollment Task Force. If there are no objections, I would like those reports to be given immediately after the SGA report. With that order, the fifteen-minute Open discussion may include some reaction to those reports.”    *Ad hoc* Committee Reports:  J. Harper, recruiting sub-committee of the Enrollment Task Force: “met three times during the month of September.  At this time, I am not aware of any plans for future meetings.  Of primary concern to the committee was determining ways to improve or enhance the recruiting of students in the immediate future.  The sub-committee, chaired by Rich Toomey, Director of Admissions, is composed of one individual from the support staff, myself as the only faculty representative, and eight EAP personnel.  From our meetings, the following recommendations were made to the Enrollment Task Force:  Buses for group visits; develop a fund to plan for individual school visits from target areas.  Lunch Tickets available for visitors; develop a fund to provide lunch tickets to all prospective students visiting campus  Student Volunteer Program; collaborate with SGA and the Honors Program to develop student outreach to their high schools  Alumni Volunteer Program (*model private schools)*; coordinate with Alumni and Legislative affairs to develop “Alumni Admissions Ambassadors” to participate in telecounseling, regional events, career shadows, and mentoring  Faculty/Staff Telecounseling; expand current efforts of Faculty telecounseling and Dial-A-Student to additional months  Residence Hall accommodations for overnight visits;   Athletic events – free tickets to events for students visiting campus; Student Affairs will make available tickets to Athletic events that can coincide with scheduled university recruitment events and individual campus visitors.  Homecoming – material available in all tents;  Provide brochures and materials for other tents;  Internal Marketing – develop new avenues to ‘educate and engage’ members of campus community in outreach efforts;  Through the efforts of key ‘influencers’, offer seminars and sessions designed to increase the awareness among those within the campus community of recruitment goals, admission requirements and standards;  Directed contacts with secondary school teachers;  Establish correspondence between academic units and secondary school teachers to expand opportunities for information sharing, curriculum design;  Adult Learners; establish recruitment programs and marketing to appeal to non-traditional students.  Extend hours available to services on-campus (i.e., advising, bookstore, dining);  Cabinet Outreach to School Corporations (Principals and Superintendents);  Coordinate luncheons in regions throughout the State to link Cabinet level Administrators to individual school corporations;  Unique Special Event – Indianapolis area; develop a high profile event in urban center to present interactive and engaging event – suggestions include movie premiere or speedway experience  Website updates; infuse new high profile news updates; include more academic WebPages to branded look;  Facilities; develop a formal “Welcome Center” on campus.  Sycamore Squads (On-Site Admissions);  Target specific feeder schools and plan on-site admission with admissions, fin aid, student affairs, faculty, current student (preferably scholarship winner from the region)  Also, I am working with Mr. Toomey to identify a group of faculty to assist in determining an appropriate model for faculty involvement in recruiting.  If you know of someone who is student-centric and could help in this role, please let me know.  Finally, the Indiana State chapter of the AAUP is planning a forum to discuss the role of the faculty in recruiting.  If you would like more information on this upcoming forum, please contact Dr. Scott Davis in the College of Education.”    A. Halpern, Scholarship Subcommittee of Enrollment Management Taskforce:  Member listing:  R. Libler, Interim Assoc. V.P. Enrollment Services, Chair  T. Ratliff, Director, Office of Student Financial Aid  K. Hoolehan, Managing Director ISU Foundation  M. Larsen-Slavin, Manager, Scholarships, ISU Foundation  D. Nepote, Ass’t Treasurer  A. Halpern, Professor of Chemistry.  The committee met five times between Sept. 14 and Sept. 22, 2005. The charge was to recommend ways of using ISU’s institutional scholarship resources to improve recruitment; that is, use scholarships more effectively as a tool to attract high-performing students to ISU who might not otherwise attend the university.  Several ideas were discussed. (1) Give notebook computers to every student with a high school GPA greater than 3.0 admitted before March 1 – with no deadline for first-time-in-college applicant. The “break-even” point of this plan, which would cost up to ca. $540k, is estimated to be between 100 – 200 students. (2) Eliminate all institutional scholarships except for the Presidential level and create a sliding tuition scale based on applicant’s SAT scores. This simple plan allows a potential applicant to know about scholarship support immediately and might increase ISU’s attractiveness to better-prepared students. (3) Use a similar plan to attract out-of-state students by decreasing or eliminating out-of-state fees. (4) Reconfigure and simplify the array of various (non-Presidential-level) institutional scholarships. E.g., merge Creative and Performing Arts awards earmarked for programs in four departments ($60k) into the Dean’s Scholarships ($90k). (5) Use some institutional scholarship resources to students in strategically targeted areas as recommended by the deans and other academic leadership groups. (6) Increased incentives, such as book awards, application fee waiver, additional housing awards for 21st Century Scholars (cost: ca. $75k). (7) Increase Incentive Scholarship for out-of-state students from $3k to $4k; waive tuition for President’s Scholars.              A report, prepared by Assoc. V.P. Libler, was presented to the Enrollment Management Task Force.    V. Sheets, Taskforce on the First Year Experience (TAFFY):  “TAFFY has two purposes.  First is to do a thorough evaluation of the freshman experience at ISU, following a rubric developed by the Policy Center on the First-Year of College’s Foundations of Excellence program that is being used at a number of institutions.  For instance, as part of that process, we are compiling a list of offices, policies, and university programs that impact our first-year students (whether designed with the first-year student in mind or not) and we are attempting to develop a "philosophy" to guide our educational and co-curricular objectives for first year students.  We are certainly interested in faculty and student input throughout this process; not only are faculty and students included as TAFFY members, we are also--as you may know, because you may have already received an invitation--surveying faculty and staff who are involved with freshmen as well as our freshmen students to assess what works and doesn't among our first year initiatives.  A second, and related goal to the first, is to identify new procedures, programs, policies, or whatever, that might impact the first year student (and most importantly, retention of the first-year student) in a positive way.  If you are interested in the work done thus far and monitoring this committee's progress, please go to the TAFFY website, which is accessible from the First Year Programs web page.”    **III. SGA Report**  The SGA has appointed students to Senate standing committees; measures have been taken to ensure better attendance at the standing committee meetings; timely submission of book orders was encouraged.    **IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**  1) Noted the high turnover of personnel within the recruitment area of the Admissions Office; central administration has provided positive support for changes to better attract and retain EAP in this area.    2) J. Harper read the following statement:  “I want to make some brief comments about the recent, highly publicized initiative that provides a free laptop computer to in-coming freshmen with a 3.0 grade-point-average who complete the Core 40 requirement and are admitted to the University by March 1st.  My comments do not concern the merits of the initiative.  I have so little information about it that I cannot possibly make an informed decision about whether this idea is a good thing or not.  Instead, I want to highlight what I believe is a clear case of the failure of University officials to participate in the shared governance model that has been an important part of this campus since long before I arrived.  When I read the article in the *Indianapolis Star* announcing the initiative, I was surprised that I had not heard of it previously.  I talked to other faculty members – individuals who are active in the workings of the campus.  None of them had any previous knowledge of the new policy, either.  I talked to the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.  Then, I talked to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.  This announcement was a surprise to them, too.  As a matter of fact, I have yet to find a faculty member who was aware of the impending announcement.  I don’t think it’s a stretch to say that the Faculty arm of shared governance was not included, in any meaningful way, in the discussions leading up to the decision to pursue this new policy.  Again, I’m not saying that the idea of providing laptop computers to higher-achievers is a bad idea.  Instead, my concern is that, once again, the Faculty were not consulted or allowed to give formative input for a significant University initiative.  Clearly, this action is not in keeping with the advisory role of faculty governance, as outlined in the *Handbook*.  This is the second instance in the past few months where University officials have shunned input from faculty governance.  You may recall the notification we received this summer about our one percent pay increases.  At that time, University officials informed us that, if enrollment projections were met, $100,000.00 would be allocated to pay one-time performance bonuses.  The decision to pay these bonuses – a significant departure from past practice – was made by the University administration, without consulting the FEBC for input and guidance on the issue.  It is my opinion that we are seeing a disturbing trend.  It appears that University officials no longer feel that it is necessary to consult the faculty and obtain the advisory guidance that shared governance requires.  Granted, neither the paying of bonuses (which never occurred) nor giving a free laptop to certain in-coming freshmen is not nearly as important as some of the major issues facing this campus.  Nonetheless, recent actions by our University officials give me great concern that, in the future, an important, major issue may be decided without advisory input from the Faculty.  This is not shared governance.  This is not the way we should do things at Indiana State.  One final note:  We have elected a Faculty Senate Chair, Vice-chair, and Executive Committee to provide leadership to the Faculty and to actively work toward making sure that shared governance remains a healthy, viable structure for decision making on this campus.  If I were one of these leaders, I would not only feel blind-sided by this initiative, I would also feel somewhat betrayed.  We must support our leadership and continue to encourage them to ensure the faculty’s collective voice is heard at the highest levels on this campus.  The trend of bucking shared governance is disturbing and must be arrested.  Now.                Provost Maynard took exception to this portrayal and fervently defended the administration’s efforts, “the administration is trying to work with faculty in partnership--at least six hours each week is spent in conference with Faculty Senate leadership toward this goal.”                Discussion: surprise of learning of the Laptop Scholarship from an out-of-town newspaper—the out-of-town news release was a marketing ploy; with current budget constraints—reduction in dollars expended on administrative positions should be balanced with cuts to funding for faculty lines; faculty government should be included in the program review initiative and all other initiatives; SAC should have reviewed the Laptop Scholarship before finalization—other scholarships were not considered by the SAC before finalization; to achieve greater faculty “buy-in” faculty governance must be included in these processes.              A. Halpern, Faculty Senate representative to the Scholarship sub-committee conveyed he had consulted with colleagues, took the idea to the sub-committee, and that the sub-committee was pleased with the addition of the Laptop Scholarship.              Chair Lamb noted the Executive Committee has aggressively pursued opportunities for involvement with the challenges currently facing the institution and will continue to work aggressively to fulfill its proper role.    **V. Approval of the Minutes**              Minutes of the September 22, 2005 meeting were approved. (Hoffman, Muyumba 29-0-0)    **VI. FEBC Recommendation: Health Plan Proposed Changes for 2006**              Guests were invited to the table.  (Hoffman, Hampton 29-0-0)              C. Barton provided background for today’s recommendation.                Approved the below FEBC recommendation (Hightower, V. Anderson 29-0-0):  1. Change third party administration from J.F. Molloy/The Principal to Anthem.  Justification:  ·      Anthem’s administration should be more comprehensive.  ·      Anthem’s fees are higher than Principal, but provides greater discounts.  ·      Discounts on medical providers should be approximately 10 percent greater.    2. Change provider networks from Sagamore to Anthem.  Justification:  ·      Anthem’s network is larger than that of Sagamore.  From a review of the claims for the past 30 months, Anthem’s network contains 96 percent of the physicians/provider facilities utilized by ISU employees; Sagamore contained 93 percent.  ·      Anthem has network providers across the nation which can be utilized by our retirees.    3.    Increase wellness payment from $200 per person per year to $600 per person per year.  Justification:  ·      Wellness items are not subject to the $250 deductible each year.  ·      In network charges are paid at 80 percent; non-network charges are paid at 50 percent.  ·      Wellness items include well baby care, immunizations, annual physicals, OBGYN visits, mammograms, PSA testing, etc.    4.    Adopt a flexible spending account for employees desiring to participate.  Justification:  ·      Employees will designate a calendar year amount to tax defer from paycheck to be used to pay for eligible medical expenses.  ·      Will save the participating employee tax money, (State, Federal, FICA, and local taxes)  ·      Will save the University by having lower FICA payments for participating employees.  ·      Cost is approximately $60 per person per year, which will be paid by ISU.  ·      “Use it or lose it” scenario is expected to have few, if any, amounts “lost” by employee who over estimate; but such funds could be used to offset benefits paid to employees who die or terminate after a large purchase without having full year’s deductions completed.    5.    Develop a fourth “tier” for prescription drug coverage – with 100 percent co pay for charges that are not covered on the plan. (Anthem has not yet approved this proposal)  Justification:  ·      Allows employees to purchase prescriptions through the Anthem Rx system and receive the discount provided through the program.  ·      Employees then pay 100 percent of the “discounted” charge for non-covered prescriptions.  ·      Prescriptions purchased could be lifestyle drugs, oral contraceptives, impotency medicines, or any other drugs approved by the FDA but not covered on ISU’s plan.  ·      Payments made by the employee can also be considered eligible charges for the flexible spending account and reimbursable with pre-tax money.    6.    Maintain the current Retiree prescription drug program.  Justification:  ·      Apply for the Medicare subsidy.  ·      Provide credible service letters to employees/retirees over 65 by November 15.  ·      ISU retirees will not be required to purchase Medicare Part D or alternate program    7. Rates and tiers will be brought to the appropriate University Faculty Standing Committee for its advisory input before taking effect.                C. Barton confirmed that contributions continue to the VEBA Trust.  The Senate expressed appreciation for the report and applauded the presentation.    The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.   |  | | --- | |  | |