

INDIANA UNIVERSITY EAST
SPECIAL MEETING TO DISCUSS RESTRUCTURING
FACILITATED BY FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, May 13, 1997
Room 132 Whitewater Hall
10:00 AM

Presiding: Walter Wagor, President of Faculty Senate

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 am by Faculty Senate President Walter Wagor. He asked for the will of the assembled body whether the meeting should be considered an official Faculty Senate meeting or merely facilitated by Faculty Senate. Mike Foos said the meeting was not announced as an official meeting, therefore he felt that a quorum was not necessary.

II. Chancellor's Report

A. Due to time constraints at the May 6, Faculty Senate meeting, the Chancellor was unable to present his report on the IU Budget. He gave the following report.

The state legislature has not finished its business nor has it set a completion date. The proposal is currently stalled but in some portions IU did not do as well as hoped. There was less than 4% increase in support for state institutions. It will be President Brand's decision to set tuition increases at different levels, with 4% the maximum. Salary increases will be set at regional campuses between 3 and 4%. The IU East goal is 3.5%. There was a special request regarding clerical salaries. Results of a salary survey conducted by the Human Resources Committee showed that IU East clerical salaries tended to be lower than comparable positions in other area employers. Therefore the committee recommended an additional 1.5% be added on top of the 3.5% increase in clerical salaries. The Chancellor recommended a 5% pool for clerical salaries and a 3.5% pool for other salary categories. IU East will continue to monitor all salary categories, i.e., faculty, professional staff, since President Brand is concerned about erosion of salaries when compared with peer institutions. John Kauffman noted that the total salary pool is 3.73%.

B. Chancellor Fulton said that for 1997-98, projecting the legislature increases the budget 4%, salaries are increased 3.5% and there is a 1% reduction in tuition/enrollment, the IU East budget would have a \$160,00 deficit. In consultation with Budgetary Affairs and representatives from Professional and Clerical, the following adjustments were recommended to keep resources in line:

Reduce one faculty position in Nursing	\$33,000
Reduction in adjunct budget	\$26,000
Reduce amount spent on computer equipment	\$28,000
Reduction of academic and science equipment	\$23,000
Contingency Fund reduction	\$22,000

Reallocation of money owed for Helms property \$25,000

The legislature has set 1% to be used for technology upgrades so that may help make up reductions in technology area.

These recommendations should make up the deficit. There should be a small increase in the 1998-99 budget, assuming a 4% increase again from the legislature, a 4% tuition increase, and a 3-4% salary increase. Monies to campuses will need to be reallocated to match SDC funding. The projected deficit for 1998-99 is about \$150,000, making a total of \$300,000 deficit for the biennium, assuming no further erosion in enrollment than planned. To offset this possibility it was necessary to make decisions relating to reappointments. The Chancellor expects to have all positions filled, which leaves little leeway for savings or shortfalls. The status of lecturers was reviewed and three people were notified that there was a possibility of their contracts not being renewed for 1998-99, if enrollment continues to decline. The decision was strictly budgetary and will ultimately be incorporating representation from all areas of the campus - Executive Committee, Budgetary Affairs and Professional and Staff Councils.

- C. Eleanor Turk announced that a chapter of American Association of University Professors has been formed at IU East. The association publishes the Chronical for Higher Education and addresses practices and policies relating to faculty. Anyone interested in joining should contact Anne Szopa, Membership Chairman. Current officers are: President-Eleanor Turk, Vice President-Joe Blake, Secretary-Phyllis Day, Treasurer-Ron Carter.

III. Restructuring

- A. Walter Wagor explained that there has been a lot of discussion among faculty about campus restructuring lately and several people had contacted him with questions. He spoke with the Agenda Committee about having a special meeting to bring everyone up to date. He also asked Agenda Committee members to do brainstorming with committee members about issues the individual committees would find relevant to evaluating current and proposed academic structures. Then there could be discussion about what needs to be done to move forward.

As background information Walter Wagor used an overhead to display the events relating to restructuring, beginning in the Fall of 1996 when Chancellor Fulton circulated a memo first to Executive Committee, then to ASAC and Chancellor's Cabinet, describing what he termed reorganizational criteria. The criteria focused on Vice Chancellor and administrative reorganization. In the September 3, 1996 ASAC minutes outlining goals for the 1996-97 academic year, one goal was to discuss and make recommendations for restructuring academic and administrative units. During the fall, ASAC completed a new position description for a Vice Chancellor for Enrollment

Services. Academic restructuring was discussed at the ASAC Retreat on December 13. as to what was successful in the current system, what were some obstacles to change, what positives could come from change and a set of principles guiding restructuring was developed. Walter Wagor combined these principles and the Chancellor's criteria for restructuring to create the following reorganization criteria:

- Reflect vision
- Designed around campus mission/goals
- Process to carry out mission
- Units sharing of information
- Accountability

He explained these criteria should also be used against the current structure to judge what is working and what is not.

Marilyn Watkins suggested checking criteria in terms of the 1993 values audit.

George Blakey asked if there should be something stated about the new model being more cost effective than current structure. Chancellor Fulton said that it is the intention to maintain current level of administrative overhead costs and out of the question to increase those costs in any restructuring, and ideally, to reduce the costs. Any restructuring cost indications will have to be analyzed carefully before they can be considered more or less expensive. He added that the purpose of restructuring was not intended to be a budgetary issue, it was an opportunity to look at the process of changing things.

Mary Fell suggested that these criteria and criteria developed in recent divisional discussions be condensed into one document, possibly by the Agenda Committee.

Walter Wagor again referred to the December 13 ASAC Retreat where brainstorming sessions produced essentially two models for restructuring which were shown on overheads.

- The "tinker" model where we would work with what was already in place
- Option two was to rethink the entire system.

Chairs were asked to take the proposals to Division for discussion and be prepared for further discussion at three building open meetings in late January/early February.

Following the open meetings the Chairs met to develop a proposal which came out March 11, which was similar to option one with Professional schools, Arts and Science and a Freshman year Experience.

Marilyn Watkins said the Chairs did not develop the proposal, that it was given to them for discussion.

George Blakey inquired who did draft the proposal. Walter Wagor said probably Academic Affairs.

Mary Fell questioned the efficiency of the proposal where it looks like there is additional administrative funding while retaining current administrators. She also asked where the Library fit into the proposed plan.

Walter said that is the background, bringing everyone up to date, trying to address some of the questions people have been asking. Standing Committee Chairs were asked to make brief presentations to help see what kinds of issues should be looked at by the committees in evaluating current systems and looking at changes.

Standing Committees

AAA

The Chairman, Kumara Jayasuriya, was not present and committee member, Vandana Rao-Dev, did not know of any suggestions the committee had to offer.

Walter said Kumara had told him the committee did not come up with any criteria. He will contact the committee again to see if anything has been discussed.

Budgetary Affairs

Lora Baldwin, Chairman, said it seemed more layers are added to administration.

The committee would need to have a list of who has time off to be administrators to evaluate.

Also more clerical support would be needed for Deans.

Joe Blake said it is hard to ask questions when there is no firm plan which seems to increase the number of administrators while decreasing the number of faculty.

Chancellor Fulton suggested getting issues of current and proposed changes out and on the table and not try to answer all the questions.

Mary fell felt any proposal would have to take into account 3 year plans, merit ratings and reassigned time.

Delores Jackson said the proposal discussed a month ago, in her opinion, had little merit.

Were we going to start all over again?

Chancellor Fulton felt it was part of Agenda Committee's responsibility, as the Senate's governing authority, to ask Standing Committees to address needs and goals in their particular areas and evaluate the proposal in terms of that criteria. He added that the proposal would provide further discussions when the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs arrives July 1. He would hope to have some decisions made for implementation by July 1, 1998.

Cathy Ludlum mentioned some confusion by faculty since the recent proposal received by faculty indicated a timeline for discussion of implementation of recommendations only as April. Faculty felt that if they did not respond immediately the plan would be put in place without discussion.

The timeline was a misprint. Serious discussions of possible restructuring plans are now beginning and more concrete criteria will be used vigorously and in detail.

George Blakey expressed his anger at "wasting time" when he thought there was a proposal for restructuring and now found out there is no plan.

Walter Wagor explained that this meeting was not designed to be a "venting" session. This meeting is to develop criteria for a restructuring plan and give everyone the opportunity to participate in creating that criteria. The previous process to develop a proposal clearly didn't work, some people knew about it, others did not. The plan that had been developed received such adverse reaction that it is no longer a plan.

Ron Carter noted that venting can be constructive, not destructive. At any rate, Chairs should be instructed to figure out a baseline for reassigned time, stipends, and release time to evaluate merit and cost effectiveness. Workload Committee should already have this information.

Mary Folkerth said while we are reviewing the process what is the role of Faculty Senate in restructuring.

Tom Osgood said he felt there is some mechanism missing for approval/acceptance of a proposal and a criteria of some form or way should be adopted for faculty to generally approve the concept. He also asked if it was agreed that the previous proposal no longer exists, and who would come up with a new proposal?

Chancellor Fulton said when Diane Roberts arrives we will have to work with the criteria developed today. The purpose is to establish the criteria and then "fine tune" it over the summer.

Delores Jackson said after Walter's clarification she now understands the direction of the restructuring process.

Cathy Ludlum read from the Constitution the responsibilities of faculty in designing standards and procedures for academic restructuring, and concluded that perhaps Faculty Senate should have been consulted a year ago to begin restructuring discussions rather than ASAC and Executive Council.

Mary Fell said that in addition to compiling the criteria faculty have developed, that the strengths and weaknesses of the current structure should be evaluated so there will be a "jumping off" point to begin discussions in the fall of other proposals.

Ron Carter expressed his concern and wanted to be sure that something is not implemented over the summer without appropriate faculty input - specifically the part of the proposal which would create a third unit which would constitute the Freshman Year Experience.

Chancellor Fulton said there would be no "unit" created but said there is no doubt he hopes to make some progress in regard to implementing phases of the Freshman Year Experience that are already designed and subject to SDC grants.

Robert Hertzog suggested following some problem solving strategies in an organized manner in dealing with restructuring, i.e., nature of problem, establish criteria, alter criteria, solution, implement the best solution.

The main issue for Budgetary Affairs Committee is cost.

- Any restructuring should address cost
- Core of programs which need to be funded. Are we going to be teaching all of the sections in all of the disciplines?

Curriculum Committee - Cathy Ludlum

The Committee developed the following criteria

1. Current degree distribution requirements refer to thematic areas of Humanities/Fine Arts, Natural Science/Mathematics, and Behavioral & Social Sciences. Disciplines within each area should remain closely enough linked for the affinities to be apparent to student.
2. We should try to keep interdisciplinary degrees within the same administrative unit. If interdisciplinary degrees currently in one administrative unit are divided among more than one administrative unit, a detailed plan for administering the degree, for student advising, and for marketing (including how degree will be described in Bulletin) should be developed.
3. An administrative unit should be able to articulate what it is that unifies the curricular offerings of the unit.
4. We should strive to avoid "service course ghettos." That is, there should be balance among the units with regard to number and size of degree offerings.
5. The unit responsible for approving new course and program proposals should be clarified - - does a proposal go directly from a department to Curriculum Committee, or does the whole academic unit vote on proposals before they come to Curriculum Committee?
6. The academic structure should facilitate, not hinder, the accreditation process.
7. An improved academic structure would be one which provides consistency (so far as feasible) among degree programs, thus simplifying advising and facilitating changes of major.
8. If faculty are reassigned to full-time administrative positions, we need to look at the impact on programs of losing their particular area of expertise.
9. Responsibility and accountability for assessment need to be clear.

Faculty Affairs - Joan Lafuze

The following list of concerns was presented.

1. Proceeding too far before the new VCAA is "on board."
Should utilize the expertise of the new VCAA

2. What "cost neutrality" means. Is proposed structure "cost neutral" compared to the designed current structure or to that structure as it has been implemented and now operates. (For example, we seem to have created another administrative layer with large amounts of reassigned time and assignment of duties that are not assigned consistently). The structure will lend true cost neutrality.
 3. Adding another level of "hierarchy" at a time when we are "contracting" rather than "expanding"
Consider as "flat" a structure as possible. There should be as few barriers as possible
 4. Proposed plan regarding "uneven tiers." (For example: in one unit being formed from 2 current divisions there is a proposed a division with a chair from one and departmental coordinators from the other).
 5. Having some deans rotate and others not.
Service workload equity
Full evaluation of current structure compare design to implementation
Units shall have "even tiers."
"Consistent reassigned time for like expectations" (For example chairs re: responsibilities/reassigned time
- Cathy Ludlum asked about things Faculty Affairs would need to be aware of, such as policies needing to be changed, i.e. Division representation on committees.
- T.J. had a question about service workload criteria, because under the proposed plan he would have to attend 2 unit meetings, and 5 different department meetings.
- Robert Hertzog would not want a flat structure.
- Mary Fell said the P & T process would have to be reconsidered.
- Cathy Ludlum spoke to Bob Hertzog's comment - if there were fewer Division Chairs there might be more efficient communication coming from the administration to the faculty, but it would seem there would be better communication from faculty to administration if the administration was hearing from a larger number.
- Eleanor Turk noted that there had been discussion of the nature of the administrative role but she suggested there should be discussion of the faculty role. For instance, in the Freshman Year Experience it was stated that faculty would be "assigned". She wondered how much would be controlled for faculty, how much competition between units would there be for faculty, and what would be the service role? She felt there should be a clear definition of the way faculty roles are handled and what impact the Freshman Year Experience would have. Joe Blake mentioned joint appointments and how to figure to whom and how much a faculty member is responsible.

Workload Committee

Since the committee chair was absent, Joan Lafuze, who is a member, said she knew of some of the problems. She said the committee does not have all the information it should have and asked for help in determining reassigned time. Joe Blake requested that appropriate information be made available to the Workload Committee. Walter Wagor stated that in terms of criteria from the Workload Committee, what is needed are the amounts of reassigned time and how that factors into current structure and proposed restructuring. Cathy Ludlum said it is important that information gets forwarded to next year's committees.

George Blakey commented that this meeting has been a very good start. It became obvious that several of the committees were under the assumption that the proposal was still intact while others were talking about what we should be thinking about. He suggested that another meeting where everyone has a clear idea of where we are in the process. Walter asked if there should be a compilation of everything to be discussed at the retreat.

Bob Hertzog said the this body cannot develop a set of comprehensive criteria from scratch.

The committees need to pull all academic criteria together and vote on it at a later date.

Eleanor Turk said the most productive part of this meeting was to listen to each other and suggested setting some "special" Senate meetings to discuss and explore restructuring through collaborative discussions.

Joe Blake suggested the Senate return to a format of meetings with no time constraints to allow for complete discussions .

Delores Jackson asked if there are other models available that faculty could read over the summer.

Walter Wagor said criteria things need to be added to and clarified and ask the questions How well are we doing now? and What is out there?

Robert Hertzog agreed that some additional Senate meetings to discuss restructuring issues is a good idea, and he felt that time limits for Senate meetings are a good idea.

Walter Wagor asked if it is agreed that the topic of restructuring is appropriate for the Fall Retreat. Some of the points for discussion could be How restructuring might be strengthened or changes made. Look at the compilation of the criteria. The new VCAA should be part of the process. Refine the brainstorming of the December 13 meeting.

Mary Fell said to trace the process of restructuring to see if it has taken on a level of administration.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 pm.