

Faculty Organization Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes
February 6, 2015
Library 140A
12:00-2:00 p.m.

In Attendance: Chuck Gallmeier – President, Subir Bandyopadhyay – Vice President, Mark Baer – Secretary, Linda Galocy, Scott Sandberg, Bill Dorin, William Allegrezza, Dorothy Ige, Surekha Rao, Iztok Hozo, Glen Lauzon, George Bodmer

1. Approval of the minutes of January 9, 2015 – approved without amendments
2. President's Report and Announcements:
 - a. Update - Dean and Director Administrative Reviews - Mark Hoyert and Tim Sutherland
 - i. No new information. Still pushing to try to make these happen this year.
 - ii. Chancellor's evaluation still set to begin this spring.
 - b. Monday, March 2 - Applegate meeting, 3:15-4:00 pm – ALCC, Room 110
 - i. Ex Com meeting may be cancelled.
 - c. In person UFC and RFC Meeting – February 24
 - d. EVCAA Search Update
 - i. Chuck has invited Jay Howard, Dean of Butler University to apply.
 - e. Barbara Walvoord Assessment Visit – Faculty Organization, February 20
 - i. She would like 30 minutes of the meeting from 2:30-3pm. She will share information regarding General Education and AQUIP.
 - f. Elegy for Professor Lloyd Rowe - Rick Hug - Faculty Organization, February 20
 - g. Will need to be done before 2:30pm.
3. New Business
 - a. Lauzon – Raised questions regarding advising surveys and first year experience program which have been implement over the last year without faculty input.
 - i. Committee Comments – Both of these programs are problematic.
 - ii. Malik's letter (Attachment 1) does not seem to sufficiently explain the committee's questions. Perhaps a March meeting will be necessary.
4. Chancellor Bill Lowe – 12:30-1:00
 - a. Thank you to the faculty for helping make Michelle Alexander's visit a very large success in conjunction with the One Book initiative. 1000 people on campus as well as streamed to other campuses for 100s more.
 - i. Committee Question – Will there be any follow-up from the campus on this important issue that affects potential IU Northwest students who are instead behind bars? Yes. The Chancellor has been considering inquiring about an IU-wide initiative regarding admissions and hiring that might look past an applicant's criminal record in some cases.
 - ii. Committee Comment – Public libraries may be a terrific resource in addressing this issue.
 - b. VC for Administration search was suspended last week on short notice. The request to fill the position was not properly vetted. There was an existing understanding that pre-

dated the Chancellor that if Joe left his position, his job would no longer be classified as a VC (due to the scope of the job in comparison to other VCs). On short notice, the position will have to be redefined and a new search will need to be executed.

- i. Gallmieir – In the past this position did not exist. Do we need an administrator to oversee the Police Station and the Physical Plant? This is a good question – It is certain that there will not be a VC. It is, however, the Chancellor's intention to keep the administrator in place due to the age of our campus (second oldest in the IU system) and the impending new building. There may be reorganization necessary to maintain the efficiency that we have enjoyed in Finance and Facilities administration.
- ii. Committee question – is there an age limit for mandatory retirement for VCs? No. At regional campuses, only the Chancellor is falls under this policy, and extensions are possible.

c. Financials

- i. Ongoing task is to balance this year's budget and next year's. Student retention initiative has been successful. Still below budget but ahead of most recent projections. Deficit is still close to \$1 million. The current plan is to delay and cancel filling vacancies. In addition we should be avoiding any expenses possible between now and June 30. These cuts will likely leave us balanced for this year.
- ii. The more painful process comes in looking toward next year and building a budget based on our poor revenue performance this year. This is necessary but difficult. The Chancellor believes we are making the necessary investments to move forward with confidence.
- iii. Committee Question – How are new development initiatives working. Very well – an average year has been \$500,000. So far this year we have raised \$2 million this year (including a large bequest).

d. First Year Experience Program

- i. Allegrezza – Regarding implementation of Freshman Year Experience, COAS Curriculum Committee has been asked to implement this by the end of the spring. Why has this decision been made without faculty vote? What is the evidence that it will work? Why the rush?
 - 1. Chancellor agrees with this concern. We've had some work going on around the first year program throughout the Chancellor's time at IUN. The Chancellor is anxious to have an effect program in place, because freshman retention is a major issue for this campus. But an ineffective program does not help anyone. Is there a program that can be implemented for the fall in lieu of a full rollout?
- ii. Lauzon – It is disturbing that this curriculum change is being made without full faculty participation. I am in favor of a First-Year Experience but feel that this new curriculum initiative has been thrust on the faculty without proper development.

1. Chancellor may have inadvertently caused this problem out of an eagerness for progress on this issue. Governance is thin at IU Northwest and at times it is difficult to balance the need to move forward with the need to allow proper processes to take their course.
- iii. Dorn – Has the specific problem with freshman retention been identified?
 1. Chancellor is currently having this data gathered by the new student retention efforts. They spoke to 100s of students over the last few months.
- iv. Hozo – It seems that the move toward Task Forces rather than Faculty Org Committees is connected to the communication gap between the faculty and the committee work.
 1. It's possible that reviewing the Faculty Org Committee structure would be a good project that might help alleviate this problem.
 2. The barrier to changing the Faculty Org Committee Structure is the 100 faculty votes necessary. We need better faculty participation in order to become more efficient.
- v. Ige – I fear that a large part of this issue has to do with communication issues from the Deans to their respective faculty.
- vi. Chancellor promises to follow up on these issues regarding first year experience. He still hopes that we are doing something in the Fall of 15 for new students that we were not doing before.
- e. Advising feedback surveys have been overwhelmingly positive. Almost 500 have been filled out with no negative reviews. Emphasis on advising is one of the Chancellor's initiatives. This good news is welcome.
 - i. Lauzon – I am a big proponent of the importance of advising. I am concerned about this new data that is being created that is already part FAR in Dept of Ed and I am worried that this evaluation tool will become part of our evaluation without proper discussion.
 - ii. Chancellor – The intention of collecting this data is continuous improvement. There is no intention to use this as part of the tenure process without addressing this question with the faculty.
5. EVCAA David Malik – 1:00-1:30 – not in attendance.
6. Agenda Items for February 20th Faculty organization Meeting (BCT, Barbara Dahl; Tech Tips)
7. Old Business – none.
8. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 2:01pm.

February 5, 2015

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: David Malik

SUBJECT: Requests for clarification of some recent events and changes on campus

Several years ago, the campus leadership, with input from the academic deans and faculty, concluded that it was in our interest to prepare for the vagaries of university enrollments by creation of an Enrollment Management Group. The Group is composed of persons on campus with responsibility for various dimensions of campus planning, academic affairs, student services, and public visibility. The members were faculty (some administrative faculty and FacOrg representatives) and professional staff. The group provided feedback and analysis of enrollment-related activities and ongoing statistics associated with student recruitment and success. The group also provided perspectives on a cross section of functions related to best practices and sought survey results that could help shape improvements in function. Reports on the progress and recommendations of the group were made regularly to Northwest Council, FacOrg, Town Hall meetings, campus senior leadership, academic deans, and others.

In several surveys conducted by campus units or on behalf of the whole campus, data on advising and student satisfaction suggested that we had areas that needed attention. The data implied that we could improve many of challenges in retention and persistence to the degree by doing a more effective job in the general area of advising. We had previously had external reviews on the Office of the Registrar and also NACADA (a professional advisor group). The former discussed improving services of our student services groups (Registrar, Financial Aid, Admissions, and Bursar) by creating local improvements plus consideration of a "One Stop" for students where students could be better served. The latter examined advising on campus that led to a report on advising and identified top issues that could improve our interactions with students.

Based on the NACADA review (2013), the report concluded that our Advisor Council could serve as a group that might examine in detail what we could do to improve our work. A survey in Spring, 2013 of students assessing their satisfaction in various components of student services also was conducted by Student Affairs. The report (December, 2013) from NACADA was distributed widely to faculty and staff groups. Ultimately, these reports led to the formation of a Task Force to study improving the operation of advising on campus. A survey of faculty (May, 2014) provided insight into prospective faculty engagement and interests in advising, and to provide guidance to the Task Force. This Task Force was composed of faculty and staff involved with advising (both nominated by deans) and staff from Student Affairs. A subset of the Task Force attended a planning session in Portland during the past summer. Their recommendations were vetted to constituency groups including faculty, staff, and others. The Deans discussed the report and provided feedback to Academic Affairs on potential improvements, leading to an endorsement from both Deans and Academic Affairs. Feedback came from other constituencies as well including a presentation at FacOrg. There is now an Advisory Board (largely the Portland group) for reviewing advising progress and overseeing implementation on campus. The board has representation from every academic unit and Student Affairs. Ultimately, the revised report was endorsed by the Chancellor to go ahead with the recommendations. The "authority" to proceed was derived from the Chancellor who had consulted many constituencies to further improve the report. The

Office of Academic Affairs will ensure that advising can be a consequential element of faculty advancement and will help develop metrics that can aid review committee assessments.

FYE. The original 2012 Task Force on First-Year Experience (FYE) proposed a plan for implementing timeline for broadly improving student success via these courses. This Task Force, composed of faculty and others, offered many recommendations, most of which had been in progress already but also included items that would improve learning outcomes. Academic units develop first-year courses through the usual channels for course approvals. There was no rigorous timeline in my memory. Keep in mind that the Blueprint was a major driver in accelerating this work.

POS Evaluations. Point-of-service evaluations came out of the advising Task Force. Since it was already being done by Education, they believed that the campus would gain from doing them as well. From discussions with IT, we found a relatively inexpensive electronic approach to so quickly. Since then, we have had nearly 600 responses from students with remarkably favorable feedback. The survey is quick and easy for students and they have enjoyed doing it thus far. The next group to do a POS evaluation will be the Registrar. As far as faculty are concerned, I reported that this project is to improve advising. The feedback is on advising from both faculty and staff. There are no plans to use this data in any faculty advancement. We do the same thing with the Senior Survey. We ask students about their experiences and they are able to give feedback. The faculty and staff that are named in that survey receive feedback on the citations, but there is no formal use of that data other than to improve what we do. The devices used cost about \$150 each and it's a small investment to improve what we do. The data is secure (to the extent possible with computer systems). Each unit was asked to suggest how we might ensure a higher level of security of the systems.

Conversion of Undecided to Exploratory Meta-majors. The Meta-majors are part of the degree map law and we are embedding it into a new term: Exploratory which is deemed a best practice and avoids the negative connotation. We believe that students can choose a broad area (by identification with an academic unit) so that better advising can occur. It also helps with degree maps and generally giving more focused advice to students.

I believe that overall, faculty have been consulted throughout these processes. We have gone to formal groups and sought advice. We sought input and endorsement from a number of constituencies. Most important was the opportunity for feedback throughout so many steps of the processes. But I doubt that everyone was consulted and some people may have had more input than others.

I am happy to elaborate on this in my next visit to the executive committee. I apologize for all the typos or omissions of clarity, but thought a response was needed.

-David