

7-18-2002

AY 01-02 Meeting 2002-07-18

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://opus.govst.edu/facultysenate_minutes

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 01-02 Meeting 2002-07-18" (2002). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 3.
http://opus.govst.edu/facultysenate_minutes/3

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of OPUS Open Portal to University Scholarship. For more information, please contact opus@govst.edu.

**Governors State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes, July 18, 2002**

Senators Present: Dave Parmenter, Jagan Lingamneni, Michael Dimitroff, Russ Carter, Ralph Bell, Linda Proudfit, Jeannine Klomes, Donald Culverson, Mercedes Graf, Winfried Rudloff, Rashidah Muhammad, Maribeth Kasik

Guests: Paul Keys, Jeff Slovak, Colleen Rock Cawthon, Becky Wojcik

Dimitroff began the meeting at 1:10 p.m. and asked the Provost to present the administration's report.

Reports

Administration/Provost Office (Keys)

Keys presented an update regarding budget issues. In FY02, the cuts were approximately \$3 million. In FY02, the deans recommended that \$40,000 of the academic wing reserve be used for marketing and that \$20,000 be used for pursuing Federal earmarks. Their recommendations were approved and acted upon. GSU contracted a firm to pursue earmarks. The first return on that investment was the announcement of Senator Durbin's bill, which includes a \$600,000 earmark for GSU.

Keys informed the Senate that the Cabinet appreciated the feedback, setting targets, and attempts to prioritize based on program and college needs; it took into consideration several factors before making FY03 budget decisions. Quality was a major consideration. Another consideration was to not cut existing faculty positions. The Cabinet did not just plan for the announced state budgetary cuts for FY03, but it also anticipated projected needs for the whole fiscal year, such as a mid-year rescission after the election. Barring any future state changes, the FY03 plan should carry GSU through the whole fiscal year. Some funds were also set aside to begin implementation of the Strategic Plan and for future growth.

Keys stated that specific reductions/implications for FY03 are: reduction in adjunct lines (stay within budgeted amounts), reduced on-campus and off-campus sections, delays in hiring tenure-track positions, reduction in some nonpersonnel lines, reduction in overload payments (stay within budgeted amounts), reduction by the State of student aid, reduction of clerical staff, and possible delays in enhancing curriculum. There may be some larger class sizes and fewer sections in many areas due to this. For FY03, the University Library made a \$113,000 cut and a \$68,000 cut in its budget.

Keys stated that the administration determined which programs to support based on recommendations by the colleges. Each dean was asked to list the top three academic programs for his/her college (based on numbers, accreditation standards, perceptions from community colleges, etc.).

Slovak stated that the FY03 budget remains up-in-the-air. He believes the President will present a mid-year tuition increase to the Board of Trustees. He stated that through yesterday (July 17), compared to last year, enrollment is up in headcount by 1 1/2% and down in credit hours (CH) by 3%. He added that there is some variation from program to program and from college to college, but there is no specific pattern that certain programs or a certain college is down considerably more than the others are. A Senator asked if there is a direct relationship between the numbers of sections and the number of CHs. Slovak responded that during SS02, there were fewer sections opened, and CHs are going to be down approximately 1800. In Fall 01, when there were no reductions, CHs were down 1900. If a course section attracts NEW students, that is new revenue. But if a course section simply offers alternatives (different day or time) to existing students, it redistributes students and adds costs without generating new revenue. Keys stated that he would welcome an analysis from the faculty—perhaps some analysis and input for some of the trends we are seeing (such as computer science is down and BOG BA is up). Dimitroff requested data on program enrollments. Although there are daily enrollment reports posted electronically by Institutional Research (IR), Keys said that he would send the data to the Senate.

A Senator asked what GSU is doing in the way of aggressive advertising. Slovak stated that we are advertising more in print (newspapers, community college papers, program specific brochures, etc.) and there have been more e-mail contacts through Admissions. Keys noted that the community colleges have recommended that GSU have counselors on site at community colleges at regular times and advertise those times and that we are now doing this and they are very pleased. In response to a question about the "lousy" GSU website, Keys stated that a contract has been let and the process has begun to revise the website. Slovak added that some of the funds that were put aside for Strategic Planning initiatives and enrollment management will be used for the web revision.

Dimitroff asked how the APRC should articulate with the Provost its recommendations about which programs the committee feels are doing well and which ones are not. Keys responded that written recommendations from the APRC are reviewed, as are other data inputs.

Dimitroff led a discussion about professors, lecturers, and adjuncts. Some key comments by the faculty were:

- It has been said that lecturers are cheaper than tenure-track professors. Has anyone done a study of that? (Keys stated he is not aware of any such study.)
- Adjuncts are cheaper; overload is cheaper than regular time; faculty refuses to have evaluations so that it can prove that professors are better.
- APRC is stuck with input information; there is a need to measure outcomes & compare the outcomes of adjunct teaching to tenure-track teaching. (Keys responded that IBHE has changed the academic program reviews to emphasize measurable outcomes, as opposed to input data.)
- Rudloff, former IBHE FAC representative, stated that there were many discussions about adjuncts and how they fit; quality control, payment, etc. Some of their reports would be helpful. Kasik, current IBHE FAC representative, stated that there is a report, *Making All People Count*, online at www.ibhefac.org.

- In some programs, there are certain courses that tenure-track faculty members teach and certain courses that adjuncts teach.
- Should agree not to personalize the process of comparing tenure-track, lecturers, and adjuncts.
- The Senate would like to look at the process for hiring and assigning courses for all three classifications.

Dimitroff stated that faculty has concerns about the registrar and admissions offices. They need to improve efficiency and be more civil. Keys stated that the registrar and admissions are aware of the problems and are working together to develop a "one stop shop" for students, and the Registrar has made changes to their telephone system. The staff would be cross-trained so that students' questions can be answered and concerns resolved.

A Senator asked if all positions vacated by retirement or resignation will be filled. Slovak replied that many positions that were open during the course of FY02 were not filled and in fact, some were eliminated. Some positions that come open will be filled; some will not. Keys added that many factors are taken into consideration before approving that a position is filled.

At 2:15, Dimitroff opened the floor for discussion of other issues.

Elections

Dimitroff informed the Senate that there is a slate, which is being printed and will be distributed shortly. There are still some openings that need to be filled.

Bylaws

Dimitroff recommended that a priority item for the upcoming year be to review and revise the Senate Bylaws.

Tenured/tenure-track, lecturers, adjuncts

Dimitroff opened a discussion about tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and adjuncts. Some key comments from the faculty were:

- In English, graduate level courses are taught by PhDs only. The tenure-track faculty has first choice at the courses, then lecturers, then adjuncts. The program coordinator reviews adjuncts' resumes and recommends which adjuncts should be hired; the faculty does not interview them.
- In some programs, faculty has no input into the hiring of adjuncts. Program faculty need to decide who teaches what course.
- The tenure-track faculty should be able to bump lecturers and adjuncts in their programs before being moved to another program.
- Lecturers and adjuncts should never be chairs or deans, even interim.
- Chairs determine the one-year schedule through the AOD process.
- Deans and chairs should "keep their hands off" faculty assignment decisions. Program faculty, not just the program coordinator, should decide.
- The union contract has a hierarchy regarding tenure-track, lecturers, and adjuncts.

- One program has a "revolving door." If the responsibility [to hire adjuncts] falls on faculty members, they could not begin to find coverage for the courses.
- Some chairs do a very good job about getting input from faculty about new adjuncts. There are certain tasks that are by nature administrative. Hiring is one of them.
- There should be a request for faculty input in hiring and evaluation of adjuncts.
- Faculty should recommend adjuncts; the structure forces some of the deans to micromanage.
- If there is a problem with an adjunct, it is not my job as a faculty member to correct it.
- Adjuncts should be used to teach entry-level courses.
- Some adjuncts, with appropriate credentials and experience, should be allowed to teach graduate level courses.
- A problem with the union contract is that faculty is not allowed ownership.
- Tenure-track faculty should have the right of first refusal to teach program courses.

Carter stated that the PT accreditation criteria tend to have general interpretive guidelines. Perhaps something of that nature would be helpful in developing guidelines/procedures for this issue. Maybe each program could create its own policy and procedures regarding filling teaching assignments: program courses will be determined by core faculty (core faculty being defined as . . .). The programs could state the hierarchy that would allow programs to have ownership. The Senate asked Carter to get wording from an accreditation document, to possibly use as a format for a proposal.

Kasik proposed the following resolution: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recognizes that lecturers and adjuncts should not serve as program coordinators, chairs, or deans, including interim positions. The resolution was approved by unanimous voice vote.