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**Time:** 3:15 p.m.

**Place:** Hulman Memorial Student Union 307

**Present:** Chairperson S. Lamb, Vice Chair B. Evans, Secretary C. Hoffman,

B. Frank, A. Halpern, J. Hughes, M. Miller, T. Mulkey

**Absent:** S. Davis

**Ex-Officio:** Provost Maynard

**Guests:** Sr. A. M. Anderson (CAAC), C. MacDonald (Grad. Council)

**I. Administrative Report** – Provost Maynard

1) ISU is a an active member of the "Destination Indiana" program, which encourages

recruitment of international students. Monthly meetings are held. Two "fact sheets" on

international enrollments, prepared by G. Fernandez, were distributed.

2) A two-day "retreat" with deans, associate academic VPs, and the Provost will take place 12/18-19 and will address topics including effectiveness and program prioritization.

Each dean will present, for discussion, plans for allocation of resources, implications of those plans, and priorities for each college. Also to be considered are college goals and means to accomplish them, notably, how to free up $2 M. for reallocation (Revision of General Education? Course Transformation?). This retreat is a first step to developing a plan to move the University forward. Further discussion of the University "Mission" will occur in the Spring semester. The present goal is to gather general information for potential savings over time (not possible all at once).

**II. Chair Report**

Echoing comments made by others, I extend congratulations to the Institutional body for its recognition from the Carnegie Foundation classifying ISU as one of two institutions in Indiana, and only 62 in the nation, to be included in a new Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships category.

I also extend congratulations to the Dean of Library Services for being one of the three academic librarians to receive the 2006 New York Times Librarians Award for public service and leadership. Congratulations to the Library personnel as well.

Today I was a guest at the support staff holiday luncheon. It was truly delightful. The individuals at my table were most gracious. It was such a shock to me, however, to hear that my host, who has been here for 25 years, is making $25K. I was, and am, saddened. The group did, indeed, have some interesting, enlightened perspectives.

**III. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

1) Program Prioritization

Questions: How will eliminating/combining programs in Categories III and IV save money?

Will cuts beyond Cat. III and IV be considered?

Is the process being driven by programmatic or fiscal considerations?

What is the correlation with the University "Mission" ?

Discussion / Suggestions:

A cost/benefit analysis is absolutely necessary, but information to conduct such an analysis is often not available, even when requested.Additional cuts are possible.

Would a faculty study group evaluating the "Mission," operating separate from

prioritization, be valuable?

2) Library Reorganization

Clarification of process to date: The Library Administrative Affairs Committee was not involved

during initial consideration of the changes but did later discuss them and reached a consensus

supporting the changes. The Library Assembly also did discuss the changes. No formal vote

of approval occurred in either group.

Question raised: Is it necessary to send the proposed changes back to the Library legislative

bodies for formal approval?

Conclusions: CAAC must be involved, and may have questions about procedures.

A formal vote of record is required at each level, after which the proposal(s) will follow the normal route specified the University Handbook.

The specified route is mandatory and will remove any possibility of future challenges to the legitimacy of the reorganization.

3) Prioritization – additional points discussed:

-- All the proposed reallocation is at the expense of faculty and academic programs.

-- When will the promised shrinking of the administration occur ?

[The Provost declined to address this issue.]

**IV. Approval of the Minutes – Minutes #12 (12/5/06): APPROVED (Evans, Halpern 8-0-0)**

**V. CAAC and Graduate Council Recommendations** – Prioritization "Next Steps"

S. Anderson and C. MacDonald were invited to the table (acclamation), explained the documents, and answered questions.

Points addressed:

-- When a Major Code is eliminated, the program ceases to exist.

-- Elimination of a program does not eliminate courses, which may continue to be offered.

-- Major codes can be eliminated, but courses retained to offer an "emphasis," to serve other majors, or to provide "service" courses.

-- Because courses are not eliminated, no significant cost savings result.

-- 13 of the 15 programs in category IV have responded with plans to "eliminate, consolidate, integrate, or change."

-- Remaining Category IV programs should have until the end of the Spring 07 semester to finalize their proposals.

-- Additional programs also may be targeted, particularly those in Category III.

(see: "Report of the Program Prioritization Taskforce, Sept. 28, 2006" – p. 12, V).

-- Deans' input will be coming in next.

-- These documents recommend proceeding with those changes which have been agreed upon.

MOTION: To accept the Reports and to proceed with those eliminations agreed upon.

APPROVED (Halpern, Hughes 8-0-0)

**VI. New Business** –

An apparent discrepancy may exist between the Constitution of the College

of Arts and Sciences and the University Handbook re: voting rights for students on the A&S

Faculty Council.

MOTION: To refer to FAC for investigation. APPROVED (Hoffman, Halpern 8-0-0)

**VII. Standing Committee Reports**

FAC – Discussion of proposed changes in Faculty Awards

Questions: How is the present system "broken"?

How are "external" reviewer" preferable to current "internal" reviewers?

FAC will continue discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. (acclamation)

Respectfully submitted,

C. Hoffman, Secretary