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| |  |  | | --- | --- | | UFS#6 Approved February 16, 2006. January 19  , 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, Secretary Sr. A. Anderson  **Senators:** J. Allen, V. Anderson, E. Bermudez, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, J. Conant,  B. Evans, B. Frank, D. Gravitt, E. Hampton, J. Harper, T. Hawkins, P. Hightower,  C. Hoffman, N. Hopkins, J. Hughes, R. Johnson, K. Liu, M. Miller, G. Minty, C. Montanez,  T. Mulkey, L. O’Laughlin, S. Pontius, J. Powers, R. Schneirov, S. Shure, G. Stuart,  S. Wolf, D. Worley  **Absent:** A. Halpern, C. MacDonald, F. Muyumba, P. Plummer, Q. Weng, P. Wheeler  **Ex-Officio:**   Provost Maynard  **Visitors:**      E. Kinley, M. Murphy, K. Schmid      **I. Memorial**              A memorial for Celeste Eunice Burgeson, Associate Professor of Home Economics was read and accepted by unanimous voice vote.    **II. Administrative Report**  Provost Maynard reported:  1) President Benjamin is attending the Foundation Board of Director’s meeting;  2) noted the recent fire in the Student Services Building; commended the campus community’s response with a unified effort for continuance of service;  3) enrollment: official spring enrollment, 9,990 registered students; this count is 105 lower than last spring but exceeds budget enrollment projection;  4) the administration received the tuition benefits recommendation approved by the Faculty Senate in December 2006—currently under evaluation; hope to bring to the Board of Trustees this spring.    **III. Chair Report**  Chair Lamb:              “The purpose of these enrollment reports is to make sure that all of the University Community realizes the seriousness of our enrollment challenge.  We must all be involved with its solution.  This is our health.  I would first like to comment on the information contained within the January 15, Undergraduate Admissions Report dealing with new freshmen and transfer students for the all important fall semester of 2006.   This report is very similar to that given to the Board of Trustees with the exception that the data has been updated, and the news is somewhat improved.  The total Freshmen and Transfer applications for the fall Semester of 2006 as of January 15 is about 3,400 (actually 3,411) as compared to 3,300 (actually 3,282) for 2005, and 2,950 (actually 2,960) for 2004.  Good news. Actually, we are 129 students ahead of the most recent year of 2005.  From applications, we move to admits, those that the Admissions Office has determined to have met the criteria for admission from the available pool of applicants.  The total Freshmen and Transfer admits for the fall semester of 2006 as of January 1,  is 1,900  students as compared to about 2,000 (2009) for 2005, about 100 down, and nearly 2,100 (2,102) for 2004, about 200 down.   Not positive news (for enrollment).   The percent of the applications admitted in January 15, 2004 was 71%, that of 2005 was 61%, and that of 2006 is 56%.  There is some good news embedded in these declines.  However, we are becoming more selective. And that news will out. Nothing will change our image more rapidly than the knowledge that unqualified individuals are being denied.  From admits we move to confirms, those individuals from the set of admits that in one way or another have made a commitment to the institution. The total Freshmen and Transfer confirmed for the fall semester of 2006 as of January 15 is 344 students as compared to 532 for 2005, (reflecting a drop of 35%).  I next calculated the ratio of the confirmed over the admitted and expressed it as a percentage. Remember if we admit them, we want them. That is to say, the ideal is a 100% confirmed.  But this percentage has slipped.  It was 26% last year on January 15; this year, it is at 18%. Fewer people are choosing to come here, after we admit them.  It may be that this set of more select admits has greater choices.  Nonetheless, this does not bode well.  However, it has moved up a percentage since January 1st, in just fifteen days, and I know that the Provost’s Office is dedicated and determined to making vast improvements in this yield.  Frankly, the data picture was more disturbing 15 days ago, than it is now.  And I understand the angst associated with these reports, and I am very appreciative of the increased efforts made by so many in behalf of enrollment including the volunteer efforts made by the faculty.  Today, we will hear from the chair of the Program Prioritization Task Force, who is also the chair of CAAC. The Program Prioritization Task Force has taken most seriously the written input from CAAC, from FAC, and from the Graduate Council.  Curriculum is in the area of our primary authority.  All proposed mergers, combinations, and eliminations have to go through the faculty governance process. The Program Prioritization Committee is well aware of the governance process. I am pleased to see their emphasis on the involvement of governance units in the individual colleges. I ask the faculty senators to take this process extremely seriously.    **IV. SGA Report**              H. Scales requested standing committee chairs forward meeting times for this semester; new SGA officers will be elected at the next SGA meeting.    **V. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**  1) Difficulties encountered when trying to speak directly with admissions counselors conveyed; wisdom of having student workers as gatekeepers for Office of Admissions questioned.  2) Faculty were encouraged to enroll in the voluntary flexible spending account at Staff Benefits.  3) The College of Education has initiated a national search for dean; faculty are encouraged to refer good candidates; Josh Powers, assistant professor of Educational Leadership, Administration and Foundations is serving as chairperson of the campus search committee; applications for the position will begin to be reviewed in early February, and finalist candidates will be on campus for two-day interviews sometime in March; a final announcement on a new dean is expected mid- to late-April.  4) In response to inquiry: Provost Maynard indicated a comprehensive internal communication system is under development.  5) In response to inquiry: Provost Maynard reported remodeling of the University School is presently on hold; structural difficulties with the 22 N. 5th Street property are under evaluation—remodeling on hold.    **VI. Approval of the Minutes**              Minutes of the December 15, 2006 meeting were approved as amended. (V. Anderson, K. Liu 33-0-0)    Agenda reordered by consensus.    **VII. Old Business**              Handbook Language: Department Chairpersons              After lengthy discussion, the document was tabled.  (Hopkins, Harper 22-8-0)    **VIII. Program Prioritization Update**              Guests invited to the table by acclamation.  Program Prioritization update information is available on the Academic Affairs web site, http://www.indstate.edu/acad-aff/prog\_prior.html  .                M. Murphy, committee co-chair, relayed background preparation for today’s draft documents: Report, Recommendations, and Timeline.  Why? NCA report indicated the University has too many majors; harsh judgment from the ICHE—influence funding through legislature.  Intent is to sharpen focus, improve programs, and function more effectively.  Guiding principles applied with balance between efficiency and effectiveness with check points along the way.  This collaborative process will sharpen the University’s mission as a consensus emerges.  Quality and efficiency to internal and external demands will advance the University’s mission.  Input will be gleaned and modifications to these drafts will occur during January.              Provost Maynard will not make his recommendation to the President until feedback is received from faculty governance’s review of the taskforce’s recommendations.              Chair Lamb reported he had sent a communication to the committee, as a faculty member only, expressing his apprehension concerning the method for arriving at the final rankings and the need for weight clarification. He stated that he would be comfortable with a much more defined process, and felt that generally faculty would feel that need as well. He suggested that ordinal weights were too ill-defined a process to be used in arriving at a final score.  He felt that the weights should be given interval values.              Chair Lamb noted that curriculum was within the primary authority of the faculty.              Concern expressed that a targeted reduction percentage was derived before looking at OSPIRE data.              It was noted that administration overhead has begun to be reviewed.    **IX. New Business**              None    **X. Standing Committee Reports**  None    The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m. |