

Approved 9-0-0
EC # 9
11/10/09

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
November 3, 2009, 3:00 p.m.
HMSU – 227

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, B. Evans, C. Hoffman, C. MacDonald, J. Fine, R. Guell,
V. Sheets
Absent: C. Lunce
Ex officio: J. Maynard

- I. Administrative report: No report.
- II. Larry Rosenhein memo re SAT scores plus copy of chart
 - a. SAT scores 2003-2009, comparison of the IU Trend with ISU
 - b. Any way we can increase standards?

Memo to: Steve Lamb, Chair, Faculty Senate

From: L. Rosenhein, Dept. of Chemistry and Physics

Date: Oct. 28, 2009

Re: Admission standards

I have collected some SAT information for freshmen over several years at ISU and have tabulated it below. It shows that scores reached a (relative) high around 2004 but in the last 5 years have dropped significantly. Meanwhile, Indiana University has had a remarkable increase in their freshmen SAT scores. [ISU data comes from OSPIRE; IU from links at their website.]

I find this trend disturbing for two reasons. We know that retention of students is increasingly important, but the data suggest that this is going to become even more difficult. However, my primary concern is for the status of the institution, which as you know is already compromised in the public view. We don't want to look like the place with uncompetitive students, but increasingly we will, and the changes at IU (and, I think, Purdue), just make the effect more pronounced. It may become harder to attract good students here because people do care about the reputation of a college in terms of the qualifications of the students it enrolls.

As far as I know, the faculty has never really 'owned' this issue. Maybe it's time.

ISU				IU
Year	SATM	SATV	combined	comb.
2003	474	471	945	
2004	474	477	951	1103
2005	476	473	949	1111
2006	472	476	948	1121
2007	466	473	939	1146
2008	466	471	937	ca. 1175
2009	464	469	933	(prelim) 1203

III. 15 Minute Open Discussion

a. B. Evans discussed questions from AAC regarding Distance Education -

B. Evans Questions from AAC presented at Executive Committee Meeting on November 3, 2009.

1. *Concerns expressed about the growth of distance education when the new person is hired. Will faculty be hired to grow the program? Where will the money come from for additional faculty? Currently, some programs feel they could offer more online distance courses, but don't have sufficient faculty resources to do so. The Provosts indicated that monies are currently available in colleges from distance course offerings that can be used for funding more online courses.*
2. *Who is in charge of First-Year programs and the rationale for it being out of Academic Affairs and in Enrollment Management? Jennifer Boothby is in charge of First Year Programs. Programs presented prior to students' arrival on campus (summer activities) are under John Beacon in Enrollment Management.*
3. Clarify Charge No. 5. "Evaluate to give input into administrative review and prioritization of non-academic units." Non-academic programs are to undergo a process similar to program prioritization to determine areas for possible cuts. Strengths and benefits of each area needs to be compared. The review process has not started. — D. McKee can give to give input to AAC - \$10 million over five years – is this realistic?

- b. Guell- Entrepreneurial model was used in the past– great deal of time and effort was spent developing courses – faculty were paid for such efforts. When hiring new faculty – they are now informed that they may be responsible for creating and teaching courses online – hurts the spirit of Entrepreneurship. Lamb- College of Business faculty shares this burden; many senior faculty and junior faculty develop online courses. Based on burden of sharing. S. Lamb – I am not opposed to the entrepreneurial model to create distance courses. I am surprised given the initial support for distance education, that we are not further along. J. Maynard – the entrepreneurial model – works with distant education in some colleges. Maynard- Distance Education Dean position - need to move this forward. Need to increase enrollment. Program is lagging behind other institutions.
- c. Who is in charge of First-Year Program? – Academic Affairs is in charge of everything post matriculation (Jennifer Boothby.) Enrollment Management (FYP) – in charge of everything pre-matriculation.
- d. Charge No. 5 to be AAC needs to be clarified. (see #3 inserted above). Evaluation and review of Administrative units– Hope this would be accomplished through Strategic Planning. S. Lamb – that charge sent to AAC, had to do with accomplish administrative evaluation in a similar fashion as was done with academic units when we went through program prioritization. However, the \$10 million re-allocation will force administrative function reevaluation. Administration will be forced to compare marginal values against marginal benefits. If administration is going to cut millions from non-academic budget - strengths and benefits of programs will be compared to each other. But, that has not happened yet. Evaluation will provide input. J. Maynard – this is an ongoing process. Need feedback/strategies on how to get there. Who is the liaison from administration on AAC – D. McKee and E. Kinley. Is the \$10 million going to be proportionally allocated to the different units? J. Maynard - \$10 million is not a definite amount – but how to get there is a more important consideration. In the first blush we will use proportionality, but we will move away from that as we evaluate costs-benefits. What programs do you make cuts in -- Student wages, health care? Need conversation that will push these decisions. \$10 million is the goal for what is needed to fund Strategic Plan groups – things are just beginning to come together. The final amount may be more or it may be less. J. Maynard – we do not yet know what will happen at the State level. D. McKee should be encouraged to give input on the domains in the non-academic units that the administration is considering cutting. She should have insight on this matter.
- e. FEBC –Discussion of benefits and wages for adjuncts. Were concepts advanced to the administration? J. Maynard suggested that D. McKee might inform us where we are on this issue now. Also get an idea from D. McKee as to the degree of use of tuition waivers – can we first increase it?
- IV. Approval of the minutes of October 27, 2009.
Minutes were tabled for corrections until the next EC meeting (8-1-0)
- V. New Business

- a. From FEBC-discussion of compensation issues; John Conant presented FEBC Survey – Spring 2009 – Discussion of report. Trying to get a feeling of what faculty want in terms of how monies should be allocated between compensation, professional development, and hiring new faculty.

Conclusion:

1. There are concerns about salaries and teaching loads. Salaries are important but putting a squeeze on everything else – causes discontent among faculty.
2. Evidence is clear that support exists for compression, market, and across-the-board adjustments. The current system may be a function of history and neglect - it would be wise to create a long run strategy rather than just throw money at the most recent problem.
4. President is working with a 3% model – 2.25% for satisfactory performance, 0.25% for equity, and 0.50% for additional equity. Performance right now is main focus; 75% of funds will go to performance adjustments.
5. After looking at data many faculty believe that the current compensation system is irrational. Salary structure is broken in several different ways. What needs to occur in the long run is for the administration to move everyone toward a rational model. Inequalities need to be addressed. Compression is only being dealt with insofar as it is related to market. Do not try to advance salaries too quickly and take funds from teaching or from professional development– the survey says be careful! Quality of life is important.

S. Lamb thanked J. Conant for his well-done report.

- b. Volunteers for implementation of Strategic Plan goals. A. Anderson will forward the initial list now and will include selection of additional one or two names for consideration.

VI. Committee reports.

AAC – met yesterday. Reviewed charges that has been completed and discussed the remaining

charges. The AAC representative for the NCA report review is Susan Frey and the AAC representative for goal 6 is Rick Lotspeich. The next meeting is December 7, 12:00-1:30, lower level of Library.

AEC – no report

CAAC – did not meet today but sub committees continue to work on charges.

FAC – met on Thursday.

FEBC – met two weeks ago – work on charges. Will meet this week on Thursday – continue with review of benefits for adjunct faculty.

GC- meeting today

SAC - meeting a week from Thursday.

URC - met twice – evaluate applications for this semester – funded 4

MOVED INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 4:40 PM.

MOVED OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION AT 4:45 – Meeting adjourned.

