

Approved 8-0-0
EC #20
3/2/10

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 16, 2010
HMSU 227, 3:15 p.m.

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, J. Fine, R. Guell, C. Hoffman, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald,
D. Richards, V. Sheets
Ex officio: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard
Guests: R. Lotspeich

- I. Administrative Report – President Bradley
 - a. Board will meet Thursday to discuss budget; approval of retirement package, and NHPH Physician Asst. program proposal/approval.
- II. Chair report. No formal report.
- III. 15 Minute Open discussion
 - a. A letter from the Library dean, A. Comer was brought to the attention of the Executive Committee members concerning the database program *Science Direct* and how expensive it is to run. Cost for program is \$60,000 per year or \$5,000 per month. In some months that \$5,000 amount was consumed quickly and entirely by a very few faculty, and then the database was no longer available for the remainder of the month. It might be possible to design alternative systems to allocate and absorb costs. It is the case that faculty can turn to different programs available at the Library to obtain their information. However, we need real solutions to control cost of this specific program and ensure appropriate allotments to avoid abuses/excesses by individuals. Need to look at all factors regarding central database related to charges (e.g. internal budget transfers, keeping better records, etc.) President stated that maybe this issue needs to be addressed by a Library committee. S. Lamb thought that some kind of maximum usage of this specific program should be imposed on departments/individuals to ensure equitable usage opportunities. C. Lunce described some of the extensive efforts of the library to assure best allocation of resources for library users.
 - b. Athletics and budget cuts – the president stated that Athletics experienced cuts last year but not this year. A fraction of the Athletic budget will have to be made up with private money. Their portion of “the pie” will be fixed in future. If they find themselves with insufficient funds, they will need to change ways of doing things. Athletics departmental budget, as always, will be based on student enrollments. The president stated that Athletics is important, but not the most important thing. Like everything else, it will be subject to change and to the realities of the future.
 - c. Employees seem to be getting mixed messages concerning employment/reassignments due to budget cuts. J. Maynard – we are giving employees opportunities to work with their individual deans. The president stated that there would be “no bumping.”

The d. How many retirees need to retire to effectively cut personnel budget? President-present budget shortfall position has been resolved through the elimination of positions as well as the savings resulting from specific decisions. However I know that approximately 18 retirees will be the result of eliminated positions.

The president stated that some retirement positions may not be filled. This pertains to both faculty and non-instructional areas. There are substantial costs related to severance packages and early retirement, but in the long run, we should be able to recoup these monies.

e. A question occurred as to whether the software package Elluminate was put forth with sufficient testing. If there is no back up to that software and it does not function properly, our students and faculty suffer. K. Wilkinson is presently reviewing some of the issues surrounding "Elluminate!" It was clarified that Elluminate was tested for 1 year, and that OIT had not been informed of problems with the program. Maynard stated that E. Kinley needs to be made aware of and have an opportunity to respond to issues and identify problem areas before the issue first appears at Faculty Senate. He agreed, that we do need systems that are reliable. C. MacDonald stated that the quality of some of software appears poor and that many of our students, especially distance education students, rely on these programs to work well. The president agreed that we need to solve these problems, perhaps by having a user group for the software. C. Hoffman noted that he had also heard about some of these issues and asked if CEP is still using IHETS, the former method of delivery. J. Maynard stated that he was not sure and thought it was being phased out.

IV. Approval of the Minutes of as corrected. (V. Sheets/C. Lunce 8-0-1)

V. C. Hoffman – Moved to invite R. Lotspeich to the table to report on *Chronicle of Higher Education Survey for 2009* – "Great Colleges to Work For."

Summary of Remarks by R. Lotspeich

In most categories of criteria the ISU score is lower than the average for public institutions, in five cases by more than 10 percentage points. The greatest differences are in the following categories: 4 – Compensation & Benefits; 8 – Connection to Institution & Pride; and 2 – Teaching Environment.

Table 2 shows the same scores disaggregated across major units of ISU. The most striking feature of this comparison is the low satisfaction reported by people working in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). They show the lowest overall score (17 percentage points below the ISU average). Personnel in Nursing show the greatest satisfaction, with the highest overall score (18 percentage points above the ISU average). In contrast, respondents from the College of Business show an exceptionally high satisfaction with Compensation & Benefits (31 percentage points above the overall ISU score). While we urge caution in interpreting these figures for Nursing, because the sample is only 6, it seems to us that the superior satisfaction of Business personnel with compensation is a robust result.

Table 5 shows counts of themes in negative verbal comments on the ISU work environment, as well as a count of how often blame for negative aspects was assigned to particular groups of personnel. It is notable that while blame was assigned to faculty in 6 instances, blame was assigned to administrators in 28 instances.

In Conclusion

The weakest areas of employee satisfaction in comparison to the average of other public institutions are compensation; institutional culture (pride and respect); and teaching environment. Other areas of notable weakness are: management practices, confidence in senior leadership and relations among Administrators, Faculty and Staff.

Administrators generally express a more positive view of ISU than do Faculty and Professional Support Staff.

Some distinct differences are revealed across major units of ISU. Personnel in the College of Arts and Sciences are clearly the most dissatisfied group, while those in Nursing are the most satisfied, although the Nursing result is based on a sample of only 6 respondents. Finally, personnel in the College of Business are distinguished by their positive evaluation of Compensation & Benefits.

R.Guell acknowledged R. Lotpeich's work—the thoroughness of his reports and the quality of his writing.

Meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.