

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
2012-2013
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
October 23, 2012
3:30pm, HMSU 227

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, E. Lorenzen, C. Olsen, T. Sawyer
Absent: J. Conant, K. Bolinger
Ex Officio: President Bradley; Provost Maynard
Guests: N. Hopkins, L. Maule, J. Powers

- I. Administrative reports
Provost Maynard:
 - a. Doctor of Health Science was approved by the Commission last Friday.
 - b. General discussion regarding Indiana school budgets, particularly our FTE relative to other Indiana institutionsPresident Bradley:
 - a. Anything the faculty can do to help with the United Way campaign would be appreciated. It is important that Indiana State University is looked upon as a generous contributor.
- II. Chair report, V. Sheets: No report.
- III. **Motion to Approve** Executive Committee minutes of October 16, 2012 (A. Anderson/B. Kilp; vote: 7-0-0)
- IV. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:
 - a. Parking issues surfaced yet again, and the President said changes will be coming down the road.
 - b. Searches will be announced by end of the month. It will most likely be a two-tiered process with the clearest needs announced first, and others later.
- V. New Business:
 - a. Student Success Presentation: Josh Powers/Linda Maule
Overview:
 1. Study of December 2011 Dismissal Policy Change for First Semester Freshman
 2. 2011 to 2012 retention rates overall for FTFT bachelor's degree seeking students were 60.6%.
 3. Those conditionally admitted to the university, the retention rate was 41.6%.

4. 80 students provided dismissal exemptions with GPAs below .85, 12 were retained to year two (15% retention rate), just two of whom is in good academic standing.
5. Associate deans, in collaboration with the Dean of University College and the Office of Student Success are in the process of examining ways to enhance what is provided to freshmen placed on probation. This would include the possibility of a new required UNIV 102 course to further reinforce skills for academic success and for which an unsatisfactory grade would be grounds for dismissal, in addition to the policy expectation of a minimum term GPA as indicated in the continued enrollment policy.

Discussion/Comments related to Overview

- a. Chair expressed surprise that only 4 of the 19 peer schools have a policy of academic dismissal based on first semester GPA.
- b. I (the president) would be in favor of getting rid of this thing (the policy for dismissal of first-semester freshmen), as many of you know. We need to treat people fairly. Most students decide, on their own, not to come back. We give everyone else an opportunity to come back, and they do not have nearly the transitional problems that freshmen have. What we need to do is put them on probation. Let them come back if they want to come back, and provide them services.
- c. Do we have any data on the amount of money per student we are investing here as it relates to success? I know we say it is more cost effective to keep a student than to get a new student, but I am wondering if this is true pertaining to this particular group.
- d. The answer is that we are not putting enough into student success because we are not successful. So, it is either energy or money. The bottom line is the Commission wants to take \$3 million away from us next year, and the year after, because we are not being successful enough. All the Commission cares about now is numbers. Either we are not getting enough students in the front door, or we are not retaining enough. When the Commission compares us to our previous norms, we are not doing enough.
- e. Example relating to a faculty member's job experience: I know of a company who spent a vast amount of resources for the bottom 10%-it was cheaper to keep them...but they neglected the top percent of the staff because there was a general consensus that they were doing fine. But many of the top percent developed issues because they were neglected. So are we setting ourselves up to be in the same position putting more and more resources into that bottom percent with very little chance, even if we double it, of getting them not just through the first semester, but getting a degree in their hand? We're looking at the student's first semester, but what will these same students be doing over the next 5 or 6 years? Maybe we should re-think the whole thing and get them out of the system as soon as possible.

- f. Need to look at who those 80 students are who weren't successful and requested to return...they were not all AOP students. We need to try and divert some of these students before they get to us. We also need to think about what to do on the admissions end to try and weed some of these students out. Basically, we need to know how to obtain information before the students get here.
- g. We are looking into doing a non-cognitive analysis to help us do this. There has been a lot of research done on what motivates students to learn. A lot of universities are starting to make this part of the admission process. Universities are definitely looking at students' ability to persevere. The student's basic knowledge, the ability to persevere, and also the desire to learn-those are the kinds of things that don't necessarily get measured by SAT's.
- h. If they do not go to class, they will fail. They don't have to do extra credit, just come to class, and fill out the required exams. The problem is that with some students there is no such thing as an unexcused absence. They don't understand the concept. We need to be united as a faculty.
- i. It doesn't need to be uniformed-some classes are different-(e.g. Math vs. Psych). If not showing up at all the first week, they are going to flunk.
- j. We can put contracts in place and be willing to send students home. If we are going to be serious with students on probation, (290 freshmen below 8.5 now). There could be a series of steps they could go through. This could happen before the next semester begins.
- k. Question was asked about instructor withdrawal based on 3-week attendance. If these students are not doing three weeks attendance, we would need to get legal consultation (reimbursement of tuition, fees, etc.).

VI. Motion to Adjourn: At 4:48pm (E. Lorenzen/C. Olsen, vote: 6-0-0)