

**Faculty Senate Agenda  
Friday October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010  
3pm in HP 2027**

Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting on September 17th 2010

Report from Dr. Linda Bennett, President

Report from Donna Evinger, Director of Human Resources

Report from Adrian Gentle, Faculty Senate Chair

New Business

1. New Charges
  - a) Adjunct tuition support
  - b) Merit increases
  - c) Adjunct health insurance
  - d) Non-attendance policy
  - e) Minimum GPA
  - f) Publish four-year plans
  - g) At-a-glance Banner/DARS report

Adjourn.

**Faculty Senate  
October 1, 2010**

**APPROVED Minutes**

**Meeting Began:** 3:00

**Attendance:** Adrian Gentle (Chair), Stephen Zehr, Robert Boostrom, Manfeu Chen, Brandon Field, Marilyn Ostendorf, Kent Scheller (Vice-Chair), Vella Gobel, Donna Evinger (Director, Human Resources), Chad Tew, Lesa Cagle (Secretary), Robert Hooper, Daria Sevastianova, Linda Bennett (President).

September 17<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved as amended.

**President Dr. Linda Bennett's Report:**

1. Getting ready to present operating and capital budget “requests” to Commission for Higher Education on October 8<sup>th</sup> in Bloomington. Governor Daniels has already warned not to expect new monies.
  - a. Teaching theatre is on the agenda for the Oct. 8<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting. The project (along with several others from other universities) is being held up by the State Budget Committee. If the Commission moves the project forward, we must still await release of the project from the State Budget Committee.
  - b. Building projects are going to be more difficult to get approved in the next few years.
  - c. Next step for USI with regard to physical space will be to review the Master Plan in light of initiatives undertaken in our new strategic plan.
  - d. If the new funding formulas were fully implemented, USI's state support would increase by 9%.
2. The general tone from Indianapolis is highly critical of public higher education. Budget pressures drive some of this, and the diversity of institutions means that one solution will not fit all. Our own legislative coalition remains highly supportive of USI and our Board members are careful stewards of USI’s mission and resources.
3. USI has leased apartments from Eagle Village to help accommodate students for the fall semester. No further student housing will be built on campus until demand stabilizes.
4. My priorities when money comes available are:
  - a. Recruiting more full-time faculty
  - b. Developing new programs that relate to student success

**Discussion with Dr. Bennett:**

K. Scheller: If we gain 9% does somebody else lose? There is a \$5,000 dollar difference between USI and ISU in per student spending; this is a sore thumb.

C. Tew: On what grounds will productivity be determined? Is it based on 4 year graduation rates?

- Dr. Bennett explained that considerations will include course completion, number of degrees granted, and reported that in the last 10 years the number of degrees granted by USI has increased by 38%.

B. Field: When dealing with degrees completed on time, if a student comes to USI with two years of college experience and finishes from USI in two years, does USI get the credit from the First-Time, Full-Time calculation?

- Dr. Bennett: No, but it would add to degrees granted. Every time we go to Indianapolis there is a new measure to take into account. At USI, one quarter of our students are 25 years or older. This makes for a completely different dynamic. In 2009 almost 40 % of USI students completed in 4 years. Strict graduation rates hurt USI because our students are different.

C. Tew asked about raising GPA requirements and academic good standing for students in their first 31 hours of study.

- Dr. Bennett replied that keeping the GPA requirement too low for freshmen students is dishonest. Students become stuck in a hole that is extremely hard to get out of. Dr. Bennett expressed support for raising the GPA requirement from 1.7 to 1.8 in the first 31 hours.

C. Tew: The senate is discussing a bunch of issues including non attendance policy and four year plans. Are there any incentives for students to graduate in four years?

- Dr. Bennett told the senate that the issue needs to be dealt with within the colleges.

C. Tew: If a student has to take remedial classes, should they be required to take a summer class for each remedial class? The remedial courses, including math, puts students behind their peers in time taken to graduation.

- Dr. Bennett responded that Dr. Rodgers has done an exceptional job of dealing with this issue of remediation in mathematics. Dr. Rodgers has been asked to make national presentations on this topic because of the great things the USI Department of Mathematics has been doing. I am fully in favor of students graduating in 4 years, however we need to be careful not to push students. USI can not be deaf and blind to the type of students we enroll.

### **Donna Evinger Reported on the Voluntary Short Term Disability.**

1. Motivated by original request from Staff Council, HR has been investigating short term disability insurance. This came before the recommendation from Faculty Senate. See handout on Voluntary Short Term Disability insurance.

2. The university will launch these new benefits on January 1<sup>st</sup>, following open enrollment. USI achieved a great deal because of the intense competition between companies, and Donna noted that she feels extremely positive about the plan.
3. An assistant professor making \$50,000 at age 43 would pay \$14.46 monthly premium (paid after tax), and would be eligible for six-months of coverage at \$576.92 per week.

**Discussion:**

B. Field asked if you can change from the policy to regular sick bank if the six month period expires?

- D. Evinger told the senate that she will recheck the paper work and report back to the senate with that answer. Donna also noted that this is an insurance policy, and is tied directly to salary and age.

A. Gentle asked how often this policy can be used.

- D. Evinger responded that as an insurance policy there is no cap on utilization, except for the limit of six-months per year.

S. Zehr asked if the company cared about how many users of this policy there are?

- D. Evinger responded that there is a minimum number of users required, however this number is extremely low and it should be easily met. D. Evinger also noted that the rates for long term care is worse now than they were a couple of years ago. Therefore the committee is going to wait till the rates come down before exploring that option for faculty and staff.

**Chair's Report:**

A. Gentle, Faculty Senate Chair reported that:

1. Senators are encouraged to attend the meeting to discuss the search process for the Associate Provost for Student Affairs at 9am on October 8<sup>th</sup> in BE3024.
2. Dean Barry Schonberger to become Interim Associate VP for Student Affairs. This VP position will evaporate when the new associate provost arrives.
3. Provost Rochon is very supportive of Faculty Senate's recommendation to standardize promotion portfolios, although he is reluctant to make immediate changes to the promotion and tenure criteria without understanding the existing practices (see next point).
4. The provost is interested in a wide-ranging discussion on promotion and tenure issues, and a meeting will be scheduled in late October. Faculty senators, and members of the Promotions and Faculty Affairs committees will be invited.
5. Suggestions for spring workshop topics from the fall survey were distributed.

- V. Goebel suggested David Warlick, a keynote speaker for EVSC technology presentation this summer. His focus is making technology work in education.
  - An ad-hoc committee was formed to plan spring workshops. Members: A. Gentle, L. Cagle, V. Goebel.
6. The Political Science Society bid to establish a voting station at USI was approved by the district commissioners.

## New Business

TOPIC:	Discussion	Decision
Adjunct Tuition Support	<p><b>Motion:</b> K. Scheller moved that the Economic Benefits Committee develop criteria to provide fee reductions for the children of long-serving adjunct faculty as is done for other employees of the university.</p> <p>L. Cagle seconded the motion.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>S. Zehr thinks it is appropriate to send to economic benefits. K. Scheller stated that EBC should develop specific criteria (years of service, number of courses taught, etc) to determine eligibility for adjunct fee reductions.</p>	<p>Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Send to EBC.</p>
Merit Increases	<p><b>Motion:</b> S. Zehr moved that Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost that merit-based salary pools be distributed across colleges based solely upon the number of full time faculty. The outcomes of college and/or departmental decisions can then <i>truly</i> be based upon merit rather than salary base.</p> <p>V. Goebel second.</p> <p>Following discussion (see below):</p> <p><b>Amendment:</b> B. Field amended the motion to send the issue to the Economic Benefit Committee, instead of the provosts office, for further study.</p> <p>R. Boostrom second.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>S. Zehr emphasized fairness between the colleges; under this plan, decision on raises at the college level can be made entirely on merit.</p>	<p>Vote on motion to amend: 9 in favor, 2 against.</p> <p>Vote on amended</p>

B. Field asked who makes decision on merit. motion to send to EBC:

K. Scheller: Each college is given a percentage increase based on current salary budget. Raises are then determined within colleges by the dean and chairs. Motion passed unanimously.

R. Boostrom: The charge has to do with how the money is sent to the colleges not how the colleges distribute it. Which colleges get more, and which get less. Send to EBC.

S. Zehr questions exactly what there is for the economic benefits committee to investigate?

Senators suggested that EBC should consider:

- the history of salary increases (K. Scheller)
- where is the money coming from, and where is it going to: "winners and losers" (B. Field, B. Boostrom)
- practices at other universities
- precedent set by Provost Bennett when promotion raises changed from fixed amounts to percentages, and back again (K. Scheller).

Definition of Adjunct Faculty

**Motion:** S. Zehr moved that the Faculty Affairs Committee develop language to redefine the term "adjunct faculty" in the handbook to recognize that they are compensated for their work.

Vote to postpone:  
8 in favor, 2 against, 1 abstention.

Second: ????????

K. Scheller moved to postpone discussion of the motion until later date.

Motion passed.

V. Gobel: Second

**Discussion:**

K. Scheller: This motion, although implicit in the charge on adjunct faculty, was not provided before the meeting.

Postponed until next meeting.

C. Tew: Postponing a charge for this reason is not in keeping with the past practice of the body.

Adjunct  
Health  
Insurance

**Motion:** S. Zehr moved that the Economic Benefits Committee explore the measures necessary to provide health insurance benefits for the adjunct faculty: including, but not limited to, a change in the terminology found in the University Handbook that codifies the inequitable allocation of such benefits between the full-time and the part-time faculty.

Motion passed  
unanimously.

Send to EBC.

Second: M. Chen

**Discussion:**

C. Tew recommended EBC should investigate practices of other universities; IUPUI already have a group plan for adjunct faculty.

Non-  
attendance  
policy

**Motion:** C. Tew moved to send the following charge to the Students Affairs Committee: determine if the initial non-attendance reporting by faculty and the later deadline for student response to the report could be moved earlier, so that the actual administrative withdrawal by the instructor could remain timed with the mid-term grade reports as they are currently. If so, submit a revision of the schedule with a rationale, or if not, state specific reasons why a change could not be made with suggest for other possible solutions.

Motion passed  
unanimously.

Send to SAC.

S.Zehr seconded

Revisit the  
minimum  
GPA

**Motion:** C. Tew moved that Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost that the academic progress standard for the first 31 hours be raised to 1.8, as was discussed \*\*\*\*\* years ago.

Motion passed  
unanimously.

B.Field seconded.

Send to Office of  
the Provost.

**Discussion:**

Several years ago \*\*LESA\*\* Faculty Senate recommended, and Provost Bennett implemented, an increase in the minimum GPA for good standing from 1.6 to 1.7 in the first 31 hours. In that discussion it was agreed that Senate would revisit the issue in a few years to consider further increasing the standard to 1.8.

**Adjourn:** 4:55 pm