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**Time:**          3:15 p.m.    **Place:**         HMSU, Dede III**Officers:**      Chair S. Lamb, Vice Chair V. Sheets, Secretary Sr. A. Anderson**Senators:** C. Amlaner, V. Anderson, E. Bermudez, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, J. Conant, B. Evans, B. Frank, D. Gravitt, E. Hampton, T. Hawkins, P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, N. Hopkins, J. Hughes, R. Johnson, K. Liu, M. Miller, C. Montanez, T. Mulkey, L. O’Laughlin, P. Plummer, S. Pontius, J. Powers, S. Shure, G. Stuart, Q. Weng, P. Wheeler, S. Wolf **Absent:** A. Halpern, J. Harper, C. MacDonald, G. Minty, F. Muyumba, R. Schneirov, S. Sharp, D. Worley**Ex-Officio:**   President Benjamin, Provost Maynard, Vice President Schafer**Visitors:**      C. Barton, M. Greenwell, J. Jakaitis **I. Administrative Report**            President Benjamin:            1) Noted the unfortunate death of ISU employee, Lynn Voll;            2) Reported the Board of Trustees will be meeting December 8; health benefits proposal on the agenda;            3) Extended wishes for a happy Thanksgiving holiday. Provost Maynard reported:1) the College of Education completed this week an on-site visit by the accrediting body for teacher education; final report is anticipated within 30-40 days;2) the Enrollment Taskforce continues to meet weekly;3) the administration met with the College of Business faculty today; enrollment issues were the main focus;4) John Gardner, the National Policy Center on the First-Year Experience liaison to ISU will be on campus November 28 and 29; presentations are planned for the campus community;5) ninth annual Sycamore Showcase was successful with good attendance;6) noted the resignation of J. Jakaitis as General Education Coordinator; thanked for his leadership in this capacity.             C. Barton invited to the table.  Vice President Schafer and C. Barton provided an update on proposed changes for 2006 health benefits: final negotiations were completed shortly before today’s Senate meeting; third party administration will remain with J.F. Molloy—Anthem’s projected savings were not attainable; however, Anthem will still provide prescription services; 7% rate increase for 2006—tiered fee structure is still in place; flexible spending accounts for medical and dependent care for employees desiring to participate will be available.            Senate thanked Vice President Schafer and C. Barton for hard work in employee benefits. **II. Chair Report**            Chair Lamb:            “Faculty have had sound assurances that program prioritization will not be used to reduce funds flowing into the totality of academic programs. And I am confident that is the case.  Nevertheless, the funding that is flowing into academic affairs is being reduced via another avenue. By now, you certainly have heard that tenure track hires have been dramatically impacted by financial concerns.  Apparently, the decision has been made to allocate funding for searches for only 14 or 15 tenure track faculty positions. This is approximately 1/3 of the number that could be supported by the vacant faculty lines. The Provost has been very forthright in revealing that we have approximately $2.3M in vacant faculty lines to be dispersed in the following manner:·Approximately 1/3 or $750K will be allocated for faculty searches.·Approximately 1/3 or $750K will be used to supplement the temporary faculty budget for next year.·Approximately 1/3 or $750K will be targeted to address a portion of our budget shortfall. The Provost has been forthright about the use of these monies normally devoted to tenure track lines. Nevertheless, only 1/3 of the $2.3M will be returning to tenure track lines.                         Do understand that only 1/3 of the $2.3M will be returning to tenure track lines. I heard from a graduate student in Ceramics that three professors in 3-D arts, ceramics, woodworking and sculpture are retiring and she is under the impression that none are being replaced. She speaks of the national reputation being lost, and of the start up cost being enormous.  We need to recognize that there are truly repercussions for our students.  Hopefully, the budget crises will be short lived, due to the aggressive enrollment efforts.  The use of program prioritization as a source of reallocated funds has tremendous limitations. The Provost has assured the Executive Committee that the cuts from EAP resources will, at minimum, be proportional to those from the faculty domain, and more than likely be a higher percentage than those from the faculty domain, in order to address the current budget shortfall. Frankly, I feel that we do need to go beyond assurances. Somehow, evidence must be presented that confirms the existence of these cuts.  The institution is aware of the percent of its budget going to faculty positions, as well as the percent of its budget going to EAP positions. This ratio should be under careful scrutiny in this time period.            At the AAUP forum on the Enrollment Crisis which occurred last Wednesday, Scott Davis, the AAUP chair, did a remarkable job of conducting the forum in a very positive vein. I appreciate the input from the faculty. I would like to thank all the administrators who are serving as chairs on the enrollment sub-committees: Richard Toomey, Becky Libler, and Bob Guell, as well as a number of other administrators on the enrollment committees for attending and participating. The faculty panel [Jeff Harper, Virgil Sheets, and Arthur Halpern] gave quality information to the audience.             Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to Graduate Council and to FAC, and to CAAC for the excellent substantive input provided to the Program Prioritization task force. I have heard from several sources that the written reports provided by these standing committees have been judged to be of very high quality and a strong source of guidance to the task force. Your efforts in our behalf are appreciated.             Jake Jakaitis has asked to present a prepared statement for the minutes regarding the General Education Coordinator position. After his statement, we will move into fifteen minute open discussion period after the approval of the minutes. Since our agenda is quite slight, the fifteen minutes will be elongated.   Jake Jakaitis statement:I come before you today to offer an apology and an explanation for having resigned my position as Coordinator of General Education before completing my second—and final—three year term.  This was a difficult decision for me to make, and it is certainly not easy for me to stand here before you to say the things that I feel it necessary to say.  As I think most of you know, I assumed the duties of Coordinator motivated by optimism and energy, driven by spirit and heart.  I believed that I could work with the General Education Council and CAAC to fully implement, improve, and refine the quality program of university-wide requirements designed and approved by ISU faculty and this Senate.  I believe that—except for one small wrinkle—we have effectively done so.  However, for some time now I and the Senate committees I serve have been largely ignored in the curricular initiatives of Academic Affairs, omitted from the committees and task forces formed to re-shape organizational structures and with them curriculum on this campus, essentially dismissed from the process.  Under these circumstances, I cannot maintain my energy and optimism, and I have misplaced my heart.  I need to return to the motivations that drew me to an academic life in the first place to reclaim that energy, that heart.  Before I leave my position, though, I’d like to share with you my understanding of our quality General Education Program, of the progress that has fashioned perhaps the single most transfer and student friendly program in this state, and urge this Senate to insist that I be replaced by a full-time Coordinator possessing the energy, the optimism, and the heart that I had a short time ago, a time that seems so long ago to me now.Some of this will seem personal, for resignations are always—personal—but it’s not really about me.  It’s about the need for this Senate to aggressively take charge of the primary authority granted it by the *University Handbook*.  But to explain what I mean by that and to connect it to the rationale for my resignation, I have to first tell a story.  It’s about respect and heart.I spent the last weekend in October in West Chester, Pennsylvania, at a board meeting for advisory editors of the journal, *College Literature*.  I’ve worked for that journal some fourteen years and was promoted from referee to advisory editor about seven years ago on the strength of my detailed manuscript evaluations.  While in West Chester, not only was I allowed to speak, as a senior advisory editor, my opinions were solicited, heard, sometimes rejected, but always valued—respected.  It strengthened my heart.  Then I returned to ISU.  I returned and noted a President’s Enrollment Task Force that includes no representation from the General Education Council or my Office, but that—as has been reported to me by its members—comments on the role of General Education in recruitment and retention.  I returned to a Task Force on the First Year experience [TAFFY] that in its initial Steering Committee meeting agenda identifies General Education as one of its “spheres” of influence, claims the right to modify the mission statements of its spheres of influence, and lists quantitative literacy, information technology literacy, the English composition requirement, and contemplating University 101 as a General Education Basic Studies requirement as discussion items for its meetings—but without representation from the Office of General Education or the GE Council or even granting us the courtesy to inform us that these items are on the table.  Finally, I returned to a Prioritization of Academic Programs and Services document that contains the statement, “The faculty developed a conceptually strong general education program that has evolved to the point that it is extremely difficult to manage and difficult for many students and advisors to understand and navigate” (3). You should be offended. We have a straightforward distributed credit system in which students select a course from a published menu to satisfy each requirement and advisors advise them to do so.  It is insulting to suggest that you or our students cannot understand or navigate it.  Perhaps those in Academic Affairs who wrote this document have confused the Program itself with DARS, with software designed to report student progress toward their degree—progress that changes each time a student changes major.  No.  No one could possibly be that inept, that out of touch with our curriculum.  By the way, no discussions were held with me or with anyone from the Council and no warning was issued to us about the release of the comment quoted above.  More important, no evidence to support its claims has been provided.  I realize that the prioritization Task Force is primarily comprised of faculty, but I do not understand the exclusion of GE Council representation or why the other committees without significant faculty representation are also inspecting the GE program, as noted earlier.There is clear intent in these actions to undermine elements of a General Education Program fashioned through two years of faculty task force and working group deliberation, open forums, Faculty Senate standing committee inspection, and approval by this Senate.  When in 1995 Provost Wells—confronted with a partitioned credit general education program that actually was confusing and unmanageable—decided to enforce change, he proceeded by insisting that faculty enact their primary authority over curriculum.  This is not what we experience today.  Instead, our administrators release unsupported claims about our Senate approved program and appoint task forces and sub-committees granting only token representation to faculty.  I’d like to take a few minutes to respond to some of these implicit if not directly stated claims.In the past four years we—the GE Council, CAAC, and I—have fashioned a transfer friendly General Education Program that also supports the needs of high achieving ISU students.  1) We adopted a “comparable not equivalent” approach to transfer course articulation, resulting in literally hundreds of courses from our “feeder” community colleges and nearby four year institutions being awarded general education credit at ISU and facilitating development of strong and flexible 2 +2 articulation agreements.  2) We eliminated substitutable sequences for the Scientific and Mathematical Studies requirement so that high achieving ISU and transfer students satisfy the two course SMS requirement by taking any two 100 or 200-level non-general education laboratory science courses. and 3) We approved for literature and life credit any general education introduction to literature, poetry, fiction, or drama course transferred from another institution.  This is by no means a complete catalog, but these three refinements illustrate the tenor of things, the heart we have put into the process and the respect we have shown for our four year students and our transfer students.  I’m sure that some of you are now thinking, “What about that Math 102 requirement?”  The quantitative literacy requirement with its complicated program-based substitutions, of course, has been seen by some as a barrier to student recruitment, especially of transfers.  I am pleased to report that last Friday, responding to a request from my Office, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science unanimously approved a change in the requirement to “Math 102 or Math 115 or a higher mathematics course [except for Math 205 or Math 305].”  If this action achieves further approval, program-based substitutions will have been eliminated and students—both local and transfer—will complete our requirement by taking either Math 102 or algebra/trigonometry or a higher mathematics course.  I would like to publicly thank the Department for their support, for the respect they have shown for high achieving students.  Their action renews my faith and strengthens my heart by eliminating that last little wrinkle in program implementation that I mentioned in my opening comments.  Despite the gains we have made, however, a few aspects of our Program continue to be questioned.  Before I close, I’d like to address just two unsubstantiated claims.  I’ll do so by providing actual evidence—something that seems not to be required of administrators questioning the design and requirements of our General Education Program.  During the approval process there was, as I’m sure many of you recall, considerable resistance to the foreign language requirement.  This was understandable.  After all, upon returning from a trip to Europe, even H.L. Mencken is said to have expressed his disappointment that he could find no Parisian who spoke second year college French.  And we were only requiring one year.  I’d like to share with you, however, the effects of our requiring one year of a foreign language:  Since the implementation of our FL 101 & FL 102 requirement, we have experienced a 73% increase in the number of students studying at the 200 level and a 102% increase in the students studying at the 300 and 400 levels.  The requirement is working.  Our students in ever increasing numbers are recognizing the value to their life experience and professional growth of studying a foreign language.  They, at least, understand our GE Program.  Please, insist that this requirement continue. A second claim is that our GE Program requirements are a barrier to student success in healthy distance education programs offered by various units at ISU.  The truth is that courses are being offered by distance in every liberal studies category of general education and most areas of basic studies.  Since our distance education degree is designed to be offered to students who have completed or nearly completed a two year degree, with appropriate administrative support, these degrees are deliverable without modification of the GE Program.  Unfortunately, there is no administrative support for a simple solution to the actual barrier to distance education student success.  Here are the numbers:  in spring 2005, there were 910 “seats” available in General Education courses offered on the web.  507 or 56% of those seats were taken by students also enrolled in on campus courses, leaving only 403 or 44%  of the available seats for true distance education students.  This fall, 52% of available seats were taken by students also enrolled in on campus courses.  Distance students are not finding it difficult to graduate because of General Education course offerings, but because of available seats.  There is a simple solution to this situation.  Establish a registration period for true distance students prior to that established for seniors; give the distance education students first shot at the seats and advise them accordingly.  Unfortunately, although I and others have proposed this change—and similar ones—[in UAAC and to two Provosts] administration will not act.  It just seems easier to allow the notion that our Senate approved requirements are to blame than to effect an obvious solution.This situation, like many others on this campus recalls for me a statement attributed to Casey Stengal after he managed the New York Mets to 120 losses in their inaugural season:  “Can’t Anybody Here Play This Game?”We have a quality General Education Program in place.  It is envied by faculty and General Education directors at other institutions, academics who just last year elected me President of the Council for the Administration of General and Liberal Studies largely in recognition of what we have accomplished here.  Recently, on a visit to our campus, Carol Geary Schneider, President of AAC&U, complimented us on successfully instituting a two course comparative multicultural studies requirement including both U.S. diversity and the study of international cultures.  She remarked to me that everyone else is trying to accomplish what we have already succeeded in doing.  Don’t let this requirement be reduced.   At this fall’s Association for General and Liberal Studies meeting in Fairfax, Virginia, Jane Spalding, a United States government official directing the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific [UMAP] program called for undergraduate foreign language requirements to prepare students for professional lives in a global society.  Significantly, she rejected traditional grammar and drill approaches and called for language and culture foreign language courses—like those developed by faculty in our Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics Department.  We are at the forefront of general education program development; other institutions are trying to emulate us. Yet, upper administration at ISU continues to claim in public that our Program is too difficult to understand and navigate, denying the point, the quality and integrity of what we have accomplished.  Can these people play this game?  I urge this Senate to acknowledge the threat to primary authority currently sustained by administrators who wave around a budget crisis—partially of their own making—like so many weapons of mass destruction or hidden terrorists, distracting us from the fact that recently formed task forces and their sub-committees include only a minority of faculty voices destined to play a secondary role in the re-shaping of curriculum on this campus.  I urge this Senate to renew commitment to primary authority, to demand faculty oversight of curricular change, and to insist on the hiring—through a  Senate search committee—of a General Education Coordinator with the energy and optimism, the strength and heart necessary to take up the fight to maintain this Program.  I again apologize for losing my energy, for losing my heart, and for taking so much of your time. And I thank those in the Senate who have supported me during my tenure as Coordinator of General Education—and especially those who supported my status as a faculty senator when that status was called into question.  I apologize for having failed you.  So.  I’d like to leave you with a comment from someone who certainly does know how to play this game.  Recently, ISU solicited applications from students interested in speaking at the December commencement.  One came from a student who has earned her ISU degree entirely through distance education courses.  She was not selected but her speech was forwarded to me because it references General Education in the following comments:  ‘As I began looking at my options, I briefly considered taking an accelerated program, but I quickly decided what I really wanted was a well-rounded quality education that comes from an accredited four year university. But I did need the flexibility provided by an adult distance program; Indiana State offered both….I’ve had a biology lab set up in my kitchen; taken PE; taken music and various humanities classes, a remote sensing geography class, history, English, and Economics; all this in addition to my classes for my degree in Human Resource Development..  By taking the comprehensive program offered by Indiana State, I have taken classes that have been thought provoking and exposed me to new ideas and concepts.  I believe this makes me a well-rounded individual.  I have no regrets for taking the longer path.’This student has strengthened my heart.  Because I will not sell my heart—not for the illusion of authority or for the hollow satisfaction of increased income—I am returning to my Department and to our students who will help me, I think, reclaim the respect and heart that I have lost.  If upper administration at this institution would learn to understand the message conveyed by the student just quoted, perhaps they would also learn to do their jobs and leave us to do ours.  Perhaps they would learn to successfully recruit students by publicly praising the quality and integrity of our curricular requirements instead of nudging us toward the kind of “accelerated program” that this successful distance education student disdained and that is unlikely to result in effective recruitment strategies.  Perhaps we faculty could then, in appropriate committees and with appropriate deliberation, direct the shape and fate of this institution, making it a university again.   Thank you.” Agenda reordered by consensus.**III. Approval of the Minutes**            Minutes of the October 20, 2005 meeting were approved. (V. Anderson, P. Hightower 32-0-0) **IV. FAC Select Committee Nominations**            Approved. (Hopkins, Hightower 32-0-0) **V. SGA Report**No report. **VI. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**1) J. Hughes made the following statement:“The College decided to split the Department of Life Sciences due to longstanding problems, an impending vote of no-confidence, and a negative AAAS report.The College arbitrarily determined that Life Sciences would split into a Cell-Molecular Group and into an Ecology group.  However, there were two problems with this decision:(1) The dysfunction in the department was not related to discipline, so the C-M group       contained ecologists;(2) C-M biology had been reduced to such an extent that only one broadly trained molecular             biologist remained.During the split, which consumed approximately 2 years, the C-M group asked for 2 positions to replace 2 C-M biologists lost in just the year surrounding the split.  The 2 positions would not undo the damage fostered during the previous 10 years, but they would allow some rebuilding.The Dean of the College rejected the request.  Her idea was that the C-M positions lost by Life Sciences would be sacrificed for a “revenue-neutral” chair.  This “voluntary” sacrifice of two positions for a new chair was trumpeted at every meeting in the approval process, including in the Senate hearing.  The faculty of Life Sciences signed the MOU based on promises made by the College, including the written, signed promise of a new chair.  The MOU would not have been acceptable without the hiring guarantee, because the department could not hope to succeed in C-M biology with the minimal expertise that remained after 10 long years. It never occurred to Life Sciences that a contract signed by the Dean and passed by the Board of Trustees would not be honored.  How could the University fail to honor a document that the Provost has characterized as a legal contract?However, that’s now the case.This year, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences recommended 12 positions to the Provost and the Chair of Life Sciences was not among them.  Indeed, two of the 12 slots were reserved for groups that MIGHT need faculty after the prioritization process.  In other words, two years of promises and a signed contract meant less than a program that has not been identified but might be elevated by the prioritization process.What does this say about the credibility of the Administration?  If the Administration does not feel compelled to honor a signed contract, then there is no promise the Administration could make that would carry any weight.  We have been told that the Chair position is too costly at this time.  This is the same argument that has been used time and again to avoid hiring C-M biologists.  It is almost unbelievable that a University as large as ISU cannot see the importance of maintaining a C-M program at a time when molecular biology is the heart of modern biology.We have also been told that a Chair position MIGHT be possible some time in the future.  Of course, this is not even a promise, much less than a contract.  The Administration won’t have to stall too long, because Life Sciences won’t survive long in the absence of a hire.  Indeed, one of our strongest researchers already has lost a year trying to learn the chair position, and our young faculty are buried under large-enrollment classes.Perhaps the Administration will simply “prioritize” us out of existence, based on our reduced size and capabilities.  Or, perhaps the Administration will re-constitute the old department so that the total dysfunction described by the AAAS can continue.In the case Life Sciences, loss of the chair position has the potential to bleed the department into nonexistence and eliminate C-M biology from University.  Pre-professional students in biology certainly will not choose a school with no molecular training – not even if they receive a free computer.The consequences are even more dismal for the University, because by voiding signed agreements, the University simply voids its own credibility.” 2) M. Miller made the following statement:”I am an enthusiastic email aka Groupwise user. I archive. I understand that part of my daily life, until and perhaps after death, will include dealing with email: sending and receiving, saving and storing. I consciously work at this. Indeed, I help my colleagues work on their email organization & maintenance issues and have even offered a campus-wide workshop entitled ‘Conquer Groupwise.’ As of this morning I am at 253 mb. This would put me over the ‘eventual’ limit of 200 Mb.I am concerned that I have no idea why the online permanent mail storage limit was set at 200Mb. I am also concerned that I do not know when this will take effect. But more than that, I am concerned with the approach that email can and must be controlled in this matter.I have a limited amount of filing cabinets in my office. Periodically I have to clean them out or be overwhelmed. However many items must stay in those cabinets. Likewise I have many network ‘filing cabinets’ and ‘folders’. I realize that space is not infinite and I try to address my network storage issues in a responsible manner--so too, with Groupwise email. But, I work with many ongoing issues wherein it is essential that I have access to all outgoing and incoming emails regarding a number of matters. I am sure I am not alone in this regard.As stated above, I do archive and I can easily find what I have archived. However, eventually that archive could get full or my hard drive could explode; since I cannot archive to the network this is somewhat worrisome. I need a lot of email to be in my active folder, and be there, quite frankly, indefinitely. The amount of active email differs from person to person, but I feel that 200Mb is simply unacceptable. I am further stymied by the approach that says: you have this technology but it must be limited. Meanwhile we are using more and more technology, from Blackboard to Captivate and being encouraged to use this technology and NOT being told there are limits. Email is a much more basic technology, and one that needs to be approached in a positive way. To me this means: Don’t take my space away! Don’t make me beg for more. To further exacerbate the problem, I am now limited in my ability to physically print as much as I have in the past. So, I cannot simply say to myself, fine, I’ll just print out every email I need to keep. Please re-visit this issue. It is not just a Faculty issue, it is a campus-wide issue, but I urge the Senate to focus on this matter, as they see fit, before it is too late.” **VII. Standing Committee Reports**AAC: met once; discussed merger of Instructional and Research Technology Services and the Center for Teaching and Learning; a memo of concern was forwarded from the committee to the President on the proposed merger; on the agenda for the next meeting is the reorganization of Human Resources. AEC: no report. CAAC: met three times; discussed program prioritization. FAC: met three times; discussed and submitted a report on the program prioritization initiative to the Executive Committee.  FEBC: met once; discussed charges, health benefits issues, and the dependent child fee waiver. Grad Council: meets weekly; discussed program prioritization and graduate assistantship awards. SAC: met twice; subcommittees were formed to investigate four of the committee’s charges; two $1,000 faculty scholarships will be awarded again this year, unless contribution levels increase.  Our March mailing resulted in five new payroll deductions and six gifts to date.  We now have 27 faculty who are contributing via payroll deduction.A SAC-initiated charge was adopted: to investigate the low attendance rates for student representatives on University Faculty Senate standing committees.  Student attendance rates for committees during the 2004-2005 averaged 26 percent.  Student attendance by committee during 2004-2005: AAC, 18.75%; CAAC, 8.82%; Grad Council, 75%; URC, 0%; SAC, 7.14%; AEC, 0%.SGA, under the leadership of Hobart Scales, has promoted the importance of student attendance at these meetings.  Attendance thus far for this year has averaged 79 percent.   URC: no report.  The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
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