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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2010-2011

March 24, 2011 3:30 p.m.

Holmstedt Hall, Room 103

Present: S. Lamb, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, J. Buffington, J. Conant,

B. Corcoran, C. Noble, R. Dunbar, R. Guell, L. Hall, D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins,

P. Hightower, C. Hoffman, N. Hopkins, J. Hughes, L. Kahanov, K. Kincade,

C. Klarner, J. Kuhlman, M. Lewandowski, J. Latimer, C. Lunce, C. MacDonald, T. MacDaniels, R. Osborn, W. Redmond, T. Sawyer, M. Schafer, R. Schneirov, V. Sheets, S. Shure, L. Tinnerman, B. Yousif

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard

Deans: A. Comer (Library), J. Gatrell (Grad/Professional Studies), J. Murray (A&S),

C. Tillery (Dean of Students), B. Williams (NHHS), B. Sims (COT)

Guests: A. Badar, E. Bermudez, M. Chambers, P. Cochran, R. English, M. Hayden, R.

Peters, D. Yaw

I. Memorial Resolutions

* Memorial resolution for Dean Myers, Professor Emeritus of Political Science , presented by Mike Chambers

Unanimously accepted.

II. Administrative Report by Provost Maynard:

a. President cannot be with us today; he is on a west coast development trip.

b. Last month was a busy month on campus, athletic events were exciting, and we are proud of our students for the job they have done.

c. Continue to get great feedback on our scholars.

d. Regular faculty searches are proceeding; we have made a number of offers.

e. Reviewed sabbatical leave proposals the end of last month and have supported approximately 30 faculty leaves. For the first time, in some time, we have the funds to cover instructional leaves for faculty.

f. Currently reviewing faculty for reappointments. Will have some of those sometime next week (all pre-tenured faculty).

g. Construction on Federal building will begin this spring with an opening date of fall 2012. It will be the new home of the Scott College of Business.

h. The beginning of the end of the year marathon - all faculty committees are trying to get stuff done before commencement (six weeks away). Lots of celebrations this week. Early this week we began with our community engagement report program, - tonight J. Gatrell will be hosting international services award program. So many activities are going on.

III. Chair Report, Steve Lamb

Senators:

Today we have a number of curricular items before you. They have been vetted through CAAC and through the Executive Committee and have received broad support.

As you evaluate them, please keep in mind their 1) viability to the ISU mission;

2) whether or not the proposed program has a good possibility of bringing sufficient students to ISU to both pay for the additional costs of the program as well as to add to the general health of ISU, economically and otherwise; and 3) whether the proposed programs are academically sound.

If ISU is to remain viable, it must continue to investigate the viability of new programs. It is also the case that the institution must hold the new programs accountable. We must continue to examine the success of the new programs as well as investigate the viability of existing programs. Certainly, enrollment is not the sole determinant of success, but in periods of scarce resources it must be one of the dominant factors.

I suggest that CAAC set up a procedure for the automatic evaluation of programs that successfully make it through the curricular process and determine, at minimum, whether the anticipated enrollments occurred, and whether the additional costs associated with establishing the new program have been covered by the additional revenue.  I intend to ask the Executive Committee to design such a charge next week.  That report should be made to the Senate, and appropriate decisions made.

We must also continue to assess the viability of existing programs. Again, enrollment sufficient to cover costs, which translates into student faculty ratios, cannot be the sole criterion, and there should not exist a specific ratio that must be uniform for all colleges and all departments. The reason behind this is obvious.

Regardless, new programs must be evaluated rigorously within a couple of years of their establishment, and existing programs need to be concerned as to their viability.  Evaluation must be a responsibility of CAAC and Graduate Council.

V. Sheets: Update on the Election process – we have nearly enough people running for Senate seats next year, but, we always need alternates. I would encourage you all to contact colleagues and urge them to run.

S. Lamb: I would encourage those who have served in the past and are eligible to also consider running again.

IV. Support Staff Report—Roxanne Torrence – no report

V. SGA Report- Steven Flowers – no report

VI. Special Purpose Advocate Report, Amanda Solesky – no report

VII. Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes of February 17, 2011, as amended

(N. Hopkins/C. Hoffman 31-0-2).

VIII. 15 minute Open Discussion:

a. J. Buffington – report faculty scholarship:

Megan McAndrews, Indiana State Foundation, has reported that the June 30, 2010 market value of the Faculty Scholarship fund was $27,702.61. As of December 31, 2010 market value was $32,362.05. The donor count in 2010 was 30, and $3549 was received in gifts in calendar year 2010. The Student Affairs Committee is grateful for these contributions. To facilitate contributing to this endowment, SAC has requested that the Foundation add “Faculty Scholarship” to the list of donor options at the Foundation web site.

SAC’s scholarship committee is currently reviewing more than 50 applications for scholarships, an increase of 20 percent compared to last year. Last year, we awarded one scholarship; this year, we have plans to double both the number and the value of the scholarships.

b. N. Hopkins: A thank you to S. Lamb for your remarks at the Board of Trustees meeting about the faculty Performance model. I believe you stated the faculty’s position very clearly.

S. Lamb: Thank you, Nora.

N. Hopkins: Question for the provost - I would like to understand why the administration does not support the amendment to the faculty evaluations model that the Senate made.

Provost Maynard: Dr. Bradley made that decision and would need to speak to that matter at the next meeting of the Senate.

IX. Graduate Council Item; PhD in Health Sciences, Tim Demchak, Eli Bermudez, Dean Biff

Williams

Dean B. Williams presented an overview of program.

E. Bermudez and Y. Peterson answered questions.

Review/discussion

Concerns:

* The Commission of Higher Education (CHE) looks at the number of programs – can we justify the program to the Commission?
* Dean Williams: I believe CHE does care about good quality programs – I believe we need to be concerned about how the proposals are packaged. We need to continue to grow and survive.
* Provost: The CHE does look at our productively and if they see a lot of programs with low enrollment – that would draw their attention. It would have to be a program that justifies its existence. They will look at those numbers.

R. Guell’s statement:

I believe that new lines for new programs promising new enrollments to the University be viewed as an advance against future enrollments. That is if the enrollment targets are hit, then the lines pay for themselves and that they need not be “paid back” because they are paid for. Those “advanced” lines must be new to the University and not from reallocations.  Additionally, if those enrollments do not ensue that those lines be paid back to Academic Affairs in the form of future lost replacements of retirees (resignations/terminations) from that college.

I have decided that the draconian reallocations we have seen recently now blur the line between the traditional role of faculty curricular review and the administration resourcing the curriculum. I now feel compelled to examine new programs not just against a simple standard of “is this program worthy of ISU” but against the following standard: “is this program better than the ones it will make worse as the resources of existing programs are removed to pay for new ones.”

I fully recognize that there are programs that we offer that do not pay for themselves. We are a University and not a proprietary school and for this reason we will have expensive programs such as in Music that are more costly than the tuition revenue they generate. That being said, at this particular time we cannot afford any new such programs. That is a consideration best left to times when we are flush.

I also recognize that there are programs that ought to be eliminated through a thoughtful process. I implore the Provost to use the Program Prioritization document to identify such programs and place them at the head of the line for program review next year.

It is with some regret that I will ask, at the end of the discussion on this program proposal to be recognized to make a motion to table pending an agreement by the administration to consider new lines as advances and not to fund them through reallocations. It is with regret because Dean Williams and the team that prepared this document did so in good faith and with considerable care. They answered all the Exec questions forthrightly and completely. I was the sole voice of dissent at Exec on Tuesday and it was on this ground only. I believe, on the merits, and viewed against the traditional standard, it is a sound program. That’s not enough. It has to be better than the programs it could well injure by claiming the line of a retiree.

For these reasons, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to make my tabling motion prior to the Chair recognizes a “call of the question.” I want the entire debate to be heard by the entire Senate but do not wish to forgo my right as a Senator to call for this vote.

Provost Maynard:

There is no doubt that these are challenging times and resources are tight. Pressures, there are many: the state budget has been decreased; the need to educate/graduate more students; increases in technology for student success and finding places to work for our graduates in light of the present economy, etc. All of these are issues, and more, we are faced with along with every other public university in this state. Even in the face of all this, it is not the time to bury our head in the sand. The challenges are significant. This institution has done a lot of great things. The president and I have asked that each of you, deans, faculty, come together with our programs and look at new programs to see where this institution can go to support programs. The deans were asked to work with their individual colleges to develop programs that have a great potential to grow and to align them with the mission of the University. We are encouraging programs to grow in other areas also, not just in NHHS.

Resources for programs must come from enrollment growth. Clearly we may have to find some necessary bridge funds, but we are getting there. There has to be some solid plan. The CHE has to see that there is real potential in these proposed programs. We need to know where the dollars are coming from – we will continue (as many times in the past) to reallocate resources – it is part of what healthy organizations do.

I support that we work together for a more standard process of program reprioritization – it will be challenging – one of the questions that we should all ask ourselves is – Is this program essential to the growth of our institution? (e.g. Music – what would this university look like without a music program?)

I am working with the deans on productivity standards. I try to balance individual programs. My intention is not to micro manage programs; I want the faculty of the college to have that responsibility. We need to look at a standard of productivity. I do understand R. Guell’s frustration, but I don’t think that is the model that ISU should adopt.

S. Lamb: It reminds me of developing a winning attitude. The last couple of years ISU has been winning. Our enrollments have blossomed. Unless we maintain that momentum, I don’t know how we will be able to move forward – to pass such a motion – to table considerations of all programs until the Lord himself can solve our problems…that will not happen. I do believe that serious issues have been raised by Bob. Are we draining resources from A&S? Are the programs being proposed capable of generating student dollars and enrollments? Are these proposed new programs capable of paying for themselves? Will they put money into the health and viability of this institution? All these questions need to be looked at and it needs to be the domain of the GC and of CAAC– no doubt – but if we passed the motion proposed by Dr. Guell colleagues, we would lose an opportunity to make individual decisions on the worth of specific programs. Individual decisions need to be made. If we don’t make individual decisions who the hell will? We must involve ourselves in the curricular process. It is our responsibility to evaluate, but we need also to address the legitimate concerns raised by R. Guell.

* N. Hopkins: R. Guell is not asking us not TO deal with the PhD in Health Sciences, he is asking us to get some sort of commitment on the part of the administration that the new lines being discussed here would not be drained off. He is asking for a commitment that when the program is building up that other departments and colleges won’t be hanged for this with a loss of other lines.
* R. Guell: Yes. Not demonstrating the viability through one faculty member in communications and one faculty in education - that it is the university using the reserves of the university to invest in a program that it believes will be able to pay for itself. And, when it does, there is not a problem and when it does not, then that area needs to pay it back.
* J. Gatrell: The provost is correct – these are very serious discussions about the reallocation of resources and how to acknowledge enrollment. I actually support the program (Health Sciences). I appreciate concerns but as someone who has lost 20% of colleagues due to reallocation. I understand, as a faculty member, and I am confident that these programs (health sciences) will generate resources.
* Important to take risks, but only as long as they are controlled risks.
* R. Schneirov: I share the concerns of A&S, as an essential part of the University, it is important that we address the issues previously stated. It seems like we are in a philosophical clash with the president. The president seems to think we have too many faculty (I am not privy to the conversations that are going on). If we are going to add more faculty, we will have to take faculty away in other areas, and I don’t agree with that. This is a question regarding the allocations of resources, so I would like to see from EC and administration some plans going forward that would try to reconcile two things going forward – more programs and maintaining the viability of A&S.
* S. Lamb: Well said Rick.
* J. Conant: I have to believe that these concerns relate to all of the colleges working together – not just A&S.
* R. Guell asked the provost to identify existing programs that he believes are in trouble to place these at the head of the line for program review next year.

R. Guell: Move to Table with a statement to the Provost and the Deans that we will continue to table new programs requiring new resources until they develop a strategic plan for resourcing new programs without reallocations from existing programs except when those reallocations are the direct result of program reviews. (R. Guell/N. Hopkins) defeated 9-25-0.

* Statement from C. MacDonald:

Dear colleagues,

I am  concerned about the proliferation of new programs we have seen (and continue to see) on campus since we went through Program Prioritization.    The Commission maintained that we have too many programs, even before we approved those that have gone through or will go through this year.  Meantime, we struggle to maintain funding for programs that are currently enrolling students.   We need to ensure that we can support the students we currently have (especially as those numbers increase) before promising funding to support new programs and hypothetical new students.

**APPROVE**  PhD in Heath Sciences (T. Sawyer/ L. Kahanov) 24-8-1.

X. CAAC Items: All first time items for the Senate: These three items were removed from the February Senate agenda at the request of the Provost and Dean Brad Sims. Both wanted to be present to argue in their behalf, and both had to be at the Trustees meeting that day.

* New undergraduate BS program in Engineering Technology, Randy Peters, Phillip Cochrane, Affan Badar, Dean Sims

APPROVED – Voice Vote

* Creation of M.S. program in Technology Management, Mike Hayden, Dean Sims, Randy Peters, Ex. committee vote (9,0,0)

M. Hayden, Deans Sims presented:

**And**

* Elimination of a M.S. program Industrial Technology, Mike Hayden, Dean Sims, Randy Peters, Ex. committee vote (9,0,0)

APPROVED TOGETHER: MS in Technology Management and Elimination of MS in Industrial Technology Voice Vote.

XI. AAC Charge, The Transparency of the Strategic Planning Process, Dorothy Yaw

ACCEPTED - Voice vote

XII. AAC. Change Academic calendar for fall semesters

D. Yaw presented rationale.

APPROVED (J. Kuhlman/T. Sawyer – Voice Vote)

Adjourned: 5:55 p.m.