

AAC#5

Approved 13 December 2010

2-0-2

**Indiana State University
Administrative Affairs Committee: 2010-11**

Minutes for Meeting of Monday, 29 November,

Time: 12 noon – 1:30 pm

Place: Myers Technology Center, 103

Present: Carole Yaw, Chair; B. Blyukher; B. Kilp; R. Lotspeich, B. Skinner, J. Conant

Absent: C. Olsen; Feng-Qi Lai;

Ex-officio: E. Kinley (Academic Affairs)

I. Approval of minutes for meeting of 15 November. With one minor amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved. Vote: 4 – 0 - 1

II. Old Business: Discussion on proposed centers for ISU

A. Center for Homeland Security and Crisis Management. The discussion on this center proposal was wide ranging but fell into a few themes. First, the sense of the committee was that this center could be a beneficial addition to ISU. Second, even with the detailed business plan presented by its proponents, members of the committee noted that in some respects it was not sufficiently developed. Most prominent among these was lack of a clear indication of sources for funds to support the center. With respect to early goals of the center – providing workshops on crisis management and a certificate program in the area – after clarification on the nature of certificate programs, members of the committee reached a consensus that these objectives were adequately clarified in the business plan and seemed to be practically attainable with reasonable assumptions on resources available. However, with respect to establishing a program for a Master's degree in crisis management, the sense of the committee was that much more planning would be needed.

J. Conant noted that application to funding sources to support center activities would likely be dependent on having a center established. He maintained that ISU should support the effort in order for it to develop to potential, and that the committee may be overly concerned with the lack of specified funding sources in the business plan.

The committee decided, by acclamation, to respond with an opinion on the proposed center indicating that it seems like a good idea but the proposal needs more development. B. Skinner will write the reply and circulate it by e-mail to members.

B. Center for Gypsum Products and Center for Construction Risk Management. C. Yaw opened this discussion by noting that she had talked about the proposals with members of the Faculty Council of the College of Technology and of the Department of Built Environment. For the

most part faculty were uninformed of this initiative. One member of the D. of Built Environment had heard it was under development but had no role in it. R. Lotspeich noted that since such centers are a part of academic and/or research structure, faculty have primary authority over decisions to move forward and found it troubling that relevant faculty were uninformed.

The remainder of discussion focused on the lack of detailed planning. While the proponents for the Center for Homeland Security and Crisis Management had provided a business plan with many details, the proponents of these other two centers had provided only a vague sketch. Among concerns was lack of any information on budgeting. Members also noted that specific people from outside ISU were cited as likely personnel for the centers, but there was very little information about them provided. Some members suggested that providing CVs for these people would be appropriate. This was contested by J. Conant, however, who argued that it was inappropriate for the Administrative Affairs Committee to be involved to this level of detail. It was also noted that these centers and their activities would be contained entirely within the College of Technology, and that this College, rather than the University Administrative Affairs Committee, should take primary responsibility for considering the initiative.

The committee decided, by acclamation, to respond with an opinion on the proposed centers indicating that they have potential but the proposals need much more development. Moreover, they should be considered by the Faculty Council of the College of Technology. B. Skinner will write the reply and circulate it by e-mail to members.

It was recommended that both responses of the Administrative Affairs Committee should be sent to the centers' proponents, to the Faculty Council of the College of Technology and to the Senate Executive Committee.

III. Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
R. Lotspeich, Secretary of the Day