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

**Place:** Hulman Memorial Student Union 227

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

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

**Ex-Officio**: President Benjamin, Provost J. Maynard

**Visitors**: E. Kinley (Information Technology), D. McKee (Business Affairs)

**I. Administrative Report – President Benjamin**

1) The Board of Trustees will meet this week.

The Thursday seminar is titled "Internationalizing ISU."

2) PPARC will discuss distribution of the one-time compensation funds.

Recommendations also will be sought from faculty governance.

**II. Chair Report – S. Lamb:**

"The President announced in his most recent speech that there would be a disbursement of $1.5 million. He will be asking for input at PPARC as to the best use of these one-time monies. He is going to seek counsel from other venues as well. I would like to have part of the fifteen minute open discussion reserved for this purpose. I will get my two cents in early.

"I must admit that I still feel that a healthy use of a good portion of this money would be for support staff. A one-time payment for most faculty would not impact upon their lives greatly. However, if the University were to give support staff an average one-time payment of $750, this could make a significant difference in their well-being. Assuming 500 support staff, this would be a total outlay of $ 375 K, leaving $1.125 million. Perhaps we should not reserve this treatment just for support staff, but for all full-time employees making less than a specific amount. Longevity might be a consideration. However, I do know from my years of service on numerous disbursement committees that a complicated system is often fraught with problems. And I do think that support staff have enormous economic hardships. "I also feel that reserving a healthy portion of this for the temporary faculty pool would alleviate much of the hardship that is presently on the backs of faculty and students. It would also be in keeping with the motion that Betsy Frank championed at the special session of the Faculty Senate last year, that of providing

superior service to students."

**III. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion**

1) One-time compensation – points discussed:

-- First priority must be low-paid support staff.

-- Additional funding for instructional support (faculty and services) is critical.

2) Course proposals not being processed (effectively a "pocket veto") in Arts and Sciences

3) Enrollment and Marketing

-- Effectiveness of EMG expenditures in 2005; Implications of the EMG report of 5/27/05 concerning external image of ISU

-- Encourage implementation of prior Senate recommendation for a working committee to address enrollment issues; coordinate committee service of faculty and students through new VP for Enrollment Services

4) Nursing / HHP – B. Frank read the following:

**STATEMENT TO BE READ AT**

**THE UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2006**

Preface: While the College of Nursing faculty and staff are willing to look at the

variety of health care disciplines on this campus, (in the spirit of synergy), we stand

by the concerns expressed in the College of Nursing Position Paper dated February

28, 2006 concerning the merger with any other academic unit.

ISU COLLEGE OF NURSING

MERGER POSITION PAPER

(abbreviated version)

The ISU CON faculty and professional staff, having as their priorities (1) the

maintenance and enhancement of their nationally accredited, quality programs and

enrollments and (2) excellence in service to their students, and in realistic recognition

of university, state, and national facts and trends (which can be provided),

**at this time** **oppose a merger of any kind.**

Should there be, in the future, evidence and reasonable assurances that a merger

would result in the following enhancements to CON programs and an appropriate

process through faculty government is followed, the nursing faculty would be open to

discussion of accommodation to any reorganization proposal presented for consideration:

**1**. The addition of **11 tenure-track faculty lines.**

2. The institution of an equitable teaching load policy that reflects the actual

value and intensity of clinical teaching which would, in part, provide nursing

faculty with opportunities for scholarly endeavor and service that are **equal to**

**that of their academic peers** and is commensurate with an obvious and

irrefutable need to improve the **CON market position** for attracting qualified,

new faculty.

3. The **preservation** of our current administrative and support **positions**.

Discussion - comments:

-- Strong "disappointment" with the apparent "closed-minded" attitude of the statement

-- Both faculties should debate with open minds, which might produce useful ideas

-- CON faculty should be willing, at least, to "come to the table" and continue dialog

-- Insistence on a guarantee of 11 new faculty positions before discussion can begin is

neither reasonable nor helpful.
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5) 22 N. 5th St. (Prudential Bldg.) -- What is the current situation?

President Benjamin:

The Board of Trustees will receive a report and tour the building on Thursday, and be

and be asked to act Friday on a prepared proposal.

[Proposal available at the Friday public meeting]

6) Adjunct Faculty -- Does a Policy exist? How are these positions defined and counted ?

-- Senate has approved two documents: 1) Operating Policy and 2) Handbook language.

-- Not all information appears in the on-line Handbook.

-- Documents need to be easily accessible.

-- Numbers are included in the annual administration/faculty count, both as head count and FTE.

**IV. Minutes #3 (9-12-06) APPROVED (Davis, Mulkey 9-0-0)**

**V. Information Items**

1) Enrollment – budget implications

D. McKee provided an historical overview and explanation of computations:

-- Under CHE guidelines, ISU is a "stable campus," and basic state funding is determined by on-campus fiscal-year FTE enrollment of Indiana residents. FTE = 30 credit hours. As long as FTE count remains within the established "bracket" (FTE [annualized] = 7400 - 8300), funding is level. The University is expected to manage enrollment to remain within the bracket. Variations outside the bracket (+/- 5%) result in a one-time adjustment. ISU FTE for fiscal 2004-05 = 7773. Data for 05-06 will be provided as soon as available.

-- Additional state funding comes from "changing campus" enrollments. At ISU these include extension, off-campus, and distance FTE. "Students must be enrolled in more than 50% of their credits through mediated course sections and reside outside…Vigo Co." The number is of "annualized 'Hoosier' FTE students only," is computed on a 4-year rolling average, and has resulted in additional appropriations of approximately $400K, $300K, and $200K over the last three state budget biennia. The $200K for 2005-07 was not actually received because of state budget cuts.

Discussion:

-- ISU is "most expensive per student" – Have we compared ourselves to other schools to determine how/why we differ? -- Comparisons are difficult.

-- Was the $700K Laptop Initiative cost-effective? -- Difficult to determine which students would have enrolled without the Initiative.

-- Is our "mission" being driven by budget considerations? --The ISU "mission" is not sufficiently clear.

Chair Lamb thanked Ms McKee for her presentation.

2) Information Technology - Updates

E. Kinley distributed documentation and answered questions concerning strategic goals, recent IT enhancements, items in progress, and issues / concerns. He explained that we are making considerable progress but much remains to be done. He is optimistic about the future.

Committee members thanked Kinley for his efforts on behalf of the University, and Chair Lamb thanked him for his presentation.

**VI. Old Business – none**

**VII. New Business**

Charges – The Committee agreed by consensus to forward two recommendations for

consideration by SAC and FAC.

The Committee went into executive session (Frank, Davis – acclamation)

The Committee came out of executive session and adjourned at 6:00 p.m. (Miller, Evans - acclamation).

Respectfully submitted,

C. Hoffman, Secretary