

Faculty Senate Agenda
Friday January 21st 2011
3pm in HP 2027

Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting on November 19th, 2010.
Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting on December 10th, 2010.

New Business

1. Strategic Plan Update – Katherine Draughon, OPRA.
2. Core Curriculum Renovation Task Force.

Next Meeting: January 28th at 3pm in HP 2027.

Adjourn.

Faculty Senate Minutes
January 21st 2011

APPROVED

Meeting called to order at 3:00pm.

Attendance: Daria Sevastianova, Manfen Chen, Chad Tew, Brandon Field, Bob Boostrom, Maria Shirey, Peggy Shields, Kent Scheller (Vice-Chair), Vella Goebel, Steve Zehr, Lesa Cagle (Secretary), Adrian Gentle (Chair), Brian Posler (Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Affairs), Katherine Draughon, (Executive Director OPRA), guest

Absent: Dr. Ron Rochon (Provost)

Minutes from December 10th meeting approved as amended.

Report from Brian Posler, Assistant Provost:

- The Governor's budget plan includes a 3% reduction in all higher education funding.
- If the Commission of Higher Education funded Universities according to the funding formulas, USI and Ivy Tech would see an increase in funding
- The budget hearings are approaching, and President Bennett has asked that all budget requests be linked to the strategic planning goals. Dr. Bennett has signaled that any new funding will be directed to improving instruction and student support. The President has articulated two priorities: increasing the number of full-time faculty and improving student support services.
- Questions:
 - o Chad Tew: Suggested that the Office of the Provost distribute the full schedule for the budget hearings to the entire faculty.
 - o B. Posler: Will investigate.
 - o C. Tew: What is the big-picture goal for distance education? Specifically, how many courses, the preferred delivery methods, as well as targets to push for.
 - o B. Posler: Goal is to increase accessibility of courses. He noted that there is a struggle to find an online route through the core curriculum for many students; and that Dr. Bennett wants to have more programs offered online. No specific goals have been articulated. Rather, aim for continued growth.

Report from Adrian Gentle, Faculty Senate Chair:

- Dr. Rochon has a schedule conflict for the next two weeks, and as such would like to begin Senate at 2:30pm on January 28th.
 - Although there was general agreement, the College of Business representatives indicated that they are unable to meet early. It was agreed that Senate would meet and begin discussions, and the Chair committed to not entertaining votes before 3pm.
- The Board of Trustees met in Indianapolis on January 13th. President Bennett indicated to the board that her primary focus was on increasing the number of full-time faculty.
- Recommended the report “Crossing the Starting Line”, which was presented to the board by Dr. Bennett. Full report and data are available at <http://achieveindiana.com>. The report compares Indiana state institutions with their peers from the region.
 - K. Scheller described the report as being strictly business oriented, with a focus on productivity and funding.
- Julie Evey, Associate Professor of Psychology and Assistant Dean of Liberal Arts, was elected as our representative for the Nominating Committee for the Commission on Higher Education. Her name has been passed to the Office of the President. The Chair appreciates the Senate's willingness to vote electronically.
- Maggie Felton, Instructor in Psychology, has been elected by acclamation as the faculty representative on the Search committee for the Associate Provost for Student Affairs.
- There are currently five nominations for the Substance Abuse Committee. Statements from candidates will be emailed to the Senate next week.

New Business:

Topic	Discussion	Decision
-------	------------	----------

<p>Strategic Plan Update.</p>	<p>Of the six initiatives in the Strategic Plan, three were the subject of focus groups in the fall, and the remainder will be considered in the spring.</p> <p>The initiatives developed by the focus groups have been commented on by the President's Council and the Deans, and we are looking for feedback from the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Goal: Increase the Graduation Rate</p> <p>The 1st initiative focused on how students are being advised here at USI, and specifically about how advisors convey information to the students on various topics that include: classes needed for students to graduate on time and information regarding the study abroad program.</p> <p>K. Draughon mentioned that there was not funding for a university-wide freshman seminar, and invited questions and comments on advising, which was of highest priority for this strategic plan goal.</p> <p>Initiative 1: Advising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Field: The Pott College of Science and Engineering advises all students. Is this not the practice in all colleges? • K. Scheller: No. • C. Tew: Advisors should have a more extensive training requirement; and that the advising process as a whole needs to be looked at from another angle; and most importantly, on the various ways that students can receive advice. He also noted students need to be more accountable. • K. Scheller insisted that students be required to be advised every semester; and stressed the importance of the mentor-mentee relationship between the advisor and the student. • C. Tew agreed, but stressed that distributing advisees among advisers was an issue. u.Direct is a possible improvement to the advising process. He stated u.Direct is intuitive software to view a student's four year plan. • B. Posler added that there are numerous software tools, but good advising is a time intensive process; and that the main issue is an effective advising process. He noted that the majority of students, as reported from assessment day surveys, only meet with their advisor 0-1 times a semester. This is scheduling, rather than good 	<p>Information al</p>
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------

	<p>advising. One possible solution is professional advisors, responsible only for advising students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Zehr: Noted that formal four-year plans and grids tend to assume the existence of a “standard student”, which they are not. This is especially true for students who don't declare a major until their late sophomore or junior years. • P. Shields commented that training is not the issue, but rather students do not feel the need or push to see an advisor. • M. Shirey noted that professional advisors are a very appropriate solution. • B. Field disagreed with B. Posler's suggestion that 0-1 meetings/semester is not good advising. From his experience, one meeting a semester can be enough to advise a student well. • B. Posler responded that it would improve the quality of the advising process for advisors to meet the students periodically to check up on how their classes are going and things of that nature. • B. Posler mentioned that he likes the college based intake model, where faculty from the student's major are their primary advisor. He is, however, open to any strategy, but feels that advising needs to be improved. <p>Initiative 2: Freshmen experience.</p> <p>K. Draughon mentioned the EBI survey, which gives students a report about their study habits and various other experiences, but wants input on how faculty can be incorporated into the EBI survey process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Posler commented on the efficiency of allocating resources to students who may not plan or be capable of staying at the university for an extended period of time. He noted the advantages of developing a profile of successful students, and then recruits more of those students. However, the process of comparing students to develop a profile of successful students needs to be more precise, and he is working on this through data mining. • C. Tew noted a correlation between late admitted students and the student's success. It is a struggle for those students to receive financial aid and to obtain books; and as a result, those students end up struggling in their courses. • K. Draughon brought to focus alternative methods 	
--	---	--

	<p>to speed up the completion of pre-requisites and core curriculum classes. She mentioned alternatives like eight-week “bi-term” courses, which allow students to complete two required courses in a semester.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Field noted that students would still not be able to go over the 18 hours. Even though 8 week courses would speed up the process, the student is still taking many hours in one semester • C. Tew noted that there needs to be another level of support, funding, and direction on the targets that need to come from the president and then to the provost; and most importantly, the funding model needs to match the work load. If not, the faculty is not motivated to develop more difficult courses. • S. Zehr commented that distance education is a huge cost to the institution; he also was concerned with the success rates between online courses versus the same on campus course; he was also concerned with students enrolling in distance education courses, who live on campus. • K. Draughon noted that students are taking distance education courses at other institutions because USI does not offer certain courses online; and therefore, the university is losing money in the process. • M. Chen suggested a GPA requirement to enroll in online courses; and if a student fails a course online, he or she should not be able to enroll in the online course a second or third time. • C. Tew recommended that Faculty Senate move on this issue. • M. Shirey stressed there is technology available to adapt to the changing world and to the development of distance education. She mentioned her use of Adobe connect in a virtual classroom as only one of many new advances in online education. • K. Scheller noted that the distance education comes down to demand; in particular, they need more bodies in their departments in order to offer a more extensive list of courses online. • M. Chen noted that for some disciplines, 8 week courses are necessary in order to get students started in their majors. <p>Initiative 3: Enrollment Management</p>	
--	---	--

(no discussion)

Initiative 4: More Flexible Ways to Earn a Degree

(no discussion)

Goal: Increase Experiential Learning

B. Field: Do co-ops fall under the category of experiential learning?

K. Draughon: Yes.

Initiative 4: New Harmony Experiential Learning campus.

Initiative 5: International Opportunities

- C. Tew inquired about incentives for studying abroad.
- K. Draughon responded that there is a definite emphasis on studying abroad, for students as well as faculty members going abroad to teach.

Goal: 24x7 Campus

- There was also a discussion about USI becoming more of a 24 hour campus.
- It was emphasized by several senators that the library was not on the list of campus departments to become 24 hour.
- K. Draughon stated that if the library were to become 24 hour, then librarians, not student workers, would need to be on staff around the clock.
- D. Sevastianova mentioned that Starbucks needs to be open for many faculty and students to want to work long hours on campus.

Initiative 2: Improved Campus Involvement

K. Draughon noted there is new software that allows students to receive updates on the university calendar, which will help improve campus involvement through communications.

	<p>Summary</p> <p>K. Draughon stressed that further faculty input is needed for a successful strategic plan. Faculty members are welcome to contact OPRA, and in particular, the committees working on each initiative are open to faculty involvement.</p>	
Faculty Senate Budget Priorities	<p>A. Gentle reminded Senate that the budget hearings would take place soon. The first hearings will be on February 4th.</p> <p>The Budget Recommendations from last year were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing the teaching load from 4/4 to 3/3. 2. Faculty Compensation: Increase or stay above peer average. 3. Conversion of Part-Time Faculty to Full-Time positions. 4. Establishment of a testing center in the renovated Orr Building. <p>It was noted that the only action on these items was a 2% salary increase.</p> <p>M. Shirey inquired whether the budget hearings were an open forum. It was noted the process is a public forum and anyone is welcomed to attend.</p> <p>The budget priorities for this year will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.</p>	Informational

Adjourned: 4:35 pm

Next Meeting: Friday January 28th at 2:30pm in HP 2027.