**Indiana State University**

**Administrative Affairs Committee**

Wednesday, October 7th, 2015

Meeting commenced at 2pm in the Federal Hall Conference Room, Chaired by Kelly Wilkinson.

**Present**

Brian Bunnett, Cindy Crowder, Eric Hampton, Steve Hardin, James Hughes, Brian Johnston, Leah Nellis, Lisa Spence, Kelly Wilkinson

**Excused**

Tim Hawkins, Don Richards (Sabbatical)

The Administrative Affairs Committee (AAC) convened for the purpose of beginning work on the staffing report and to review Deans’ duties as indicated in job descriptions provided by Human Resources.

Kelly Wilkinson called the meeting to order at 2:03pm. Eric Hampton was introduced as the Faculty Senate Liaison to AAC, replacing Tim Hawkins. Minutes from September 2 were approved (7-0-1: Hardin; Nellis) pending changes.

K. Wilkinson proposed a change to the meeting agenda so that the AAC first address the charge pertaining to Deans’ fundraising efforts and take up the staffing report charge second. All were amendable.

K. Wilkinson spoke to the Deans’ duties as per the job descriptions provided by ISU’s HR department. Student workers will “crosswalk” the descriptions’ data into an alternate document so that the data is more easily compared. The purpose of this comparison is to evaluate Deans’ duties in relation to Deans’ fundraising efforts. K. Wilkinson asked how the AAC is to gather additional data given that different Deans have differently defined administrative structures? Some Deans, for example, do not have academic departments.

Brian Bunnett requested the charge to be repeated. [Included Below]

Compile report on the results of the Deans’ fundraising efforts by college and include the costs of these efforts in terms of costs of travel and percentage of Dean’s time spend as well as the time away from campus associated with those efforts.

K. Wilkinson asked if the AAC should survey the Deans, noting the delicate nature of such information gathering. B. Bunnett interpreted the charge as asking for a comparison between fundraising effort and time spent in that effort. K. Wilkinson agreed such a comparison is part of the charge, but believes a review of Deans’ academic responsibilities is necessary for fairly evaluating that comparison. B. Bunnett stated such a review is not in the charge. Eric Hampton surmised the charge is asking if money raised by way of Deans’ fundraising efforts is cost efficient to the institution.

K. Wilkinson proposed a Qualtrics survey for gathering data pertinent to fundraising efforts to cost. E. Hampton added that Deans’ academic calendars might be useful. However, this begged the question whether the AAC’s review should focus upon past fundraising efforts or start now and keep an ongoing record until enough data is gathered to proffer a fair analysis. Lisa Spence mentioned that the travel portion of cost is accessible. Cindy Crowder cited the Tribune Star as a potential information source. K. Wilkinson asked if the ISU Foundation might also be a potential information source. E. Hampton inquired as to how long it takes for fundraising efforts to translate into money raised, noting a typical lag of approximately two-years. L. Spence suggested the AAC look at the “Razors Edge” system for tracking Dean-to-Donation and noted Amy Westgard as a contact for that system. E. Hampton iterated the notion that the AAC collect as much data as possible before requesting Deans’ assistance. K. Wilkinson concurred, and reiterated that the charge is to compare cost of fundraising effort to time invested in that effort. To that point, K. Wilkinson added that in their fundraising capacity, Deans forge relationship rather than directly solicit financial gifts to the university.

C. Crowder asked if the AAC could seek clarification from Faculty Senate regarding the charge. K. Wilkinson emphasized the need to know if the AAC is to focus upon past or present efforts. E. Hampton added that one year’s worth of data would be insufficient and the AAC would need at least 3-years worth of data for an accurate average, at best. L. Spence stated the AAC seems to be missing the reason for the charge, adding “What is the cost in time?” that Deans spend in fundraising efforts compared to what else Deans are supposed to be doing. “Also, what is the financial cost?” B. Bunnett asked if the emphasis on Deans’ fundraising efforts is new, and if the expectation is that Deans spend a third of their time in such efforts?

The AAC next focused upon the staffing report. The AAC needs to interpret current staffing data to measure compliance with the handbook language, as well as to consider evolving definitions of “instructional staffing.” K. Wilkinson noted that this is also a “Student Success” issue and as such it impacts everyone. Therefore everyone impacted should have access to the findings. Additional implications of the report may include change in handbook language. B. Bunnett recalled that senate conversation on the topic was not as concerned with staffing as with issues related to remuneration, insofar as categories in the report are not well organized. L. Spence mentioned that changes in classifications occur too often. K. Wilkinson added that FTE shifts every semester, making an effective review difficult: “Are we looking over time, or at this point?” (Wilkinson). K. Wilkinson iterated that the handbook language says there “should,” not must, be a ratio of 65-35 (Tenure, Tenure-Track to Non-Tenure, Non-Tenure Track faculty). K. Wilkinson asked, “What does the senate want to see?” in order for the AAC to craft a staffing report with meaning to the senate. For instance, should changes be made to FTE and/or how we define “instructor.” Put differently, what variables should the AAC consider in crafting the staffing report? C. Crowder added, rhetorically, what needs to be addressed and why are we not meeting the mark? According to the handbook language, the charge is to determine whether or not the university is meeting the 65-35 ratio.

K. Wilkinson asked whether the 65-35 ratio was realistic given our contemporary environment, therefore should the AAC change the handbook language to complement the new environment? L. Spence suggested the AAC look at the historical context wherein the 65-35 ratio was produced. Brian Johnston suggested the university’s identity as a “teaching” verses a “research” university is at least partially tied-up in this report. K. Wilkinson pointed out that we are losing tenure and tenure track faculty who are being asked to do more with less. L. Spence noted that only one aspect of the staffing report deals with the 65-35 ratio and the make up of the instructors.

K. Wilkinson summarized the discussion into three points: (1) Parameters for Deans’ responsibilities, (2) find out what the senate wants from the staffing report, and (3) create a Deans’ job description matrix for reference.

C. Crowder proposed another item for discussion. The President’s recent email update referenced a promotion, but the promotion did not come through AAC. L. Spence replied that the promotion might not have included the creation of a new position. K. Wilkinson said the AAC should ask for an organizational chart before and after the promotion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:51pm (L. Nellis; B. Johnston).

Respectfully submitted by,

Brian Johnston

AAC Secretary