Minutes for the Executive Committee Meeting of 1 April 2013

In Attendance: Peter Bushnell, Steven Gerencser, Lee Kahan, Susan Moore, Carolyn Schult, Cyndi Sofhauser, Alison Stankrauff, Lesley Walker

I. Approval of the Minutes
The minutes for the previous Executive Committee meeting were approved as written.

II. Chancellor Reck
Chancellor Reck met with John Applegate about the 2013-14 budget but could not make headway because he did not have information about tuition increases, raises, and other matters necessary to calculate the budget.

Walker: I was at a UFC meeting and it seemed there was going to be a request for tuition increase at the Board of Trustees meeting. Good news on the legislative front: it looks like we will get a 3-3.5% increase for state appropriations. They're waiting for a report from the state about the financial outlook; things may change but they are cautiously optimistic. I asked McRobbie about raises, but there was nothing definitive on this head. He seemed to want to do a raise, but it will probably be small, around 1%.

Walker: The people involved in the natatorium were under the impression that we were going to purchase it, but this request was denied in Bloomington.

Reck: What they need to purchase the building are permanent funds, which we don’t have right now. The money to maintain the building cannot be one-time money: it has to be base budget or an endowment. I have been talking to interested parties: the lease can be extended for one year and then for another year. I have requested that it be extended. If the new chancellor wants to continue this, he can initiate a long-term lease, which enables us to operate it through one-time monies but still make people more comfortable that we have a long-term relationship with the natatorium. Our three-year lease is running out now, and the two-year extension gives us the time to either work on a new lease or find permanent funds to purchase it.

Q: How much does the lease cost?
Reck: $1, plus operating costs. There were three entities who covered the renovation costs; our responsibility was to maintain it. We have used soft money to do this, and we have enough for the next two years.

Q: How much would we need to endow the natatorium?
Reck: $40-50K a year, which would have to be interest. But if we do a long-term lease, we could probably make a commitment that there would be this amount in one-time money. But if you want to buy the building, you have to go before the board and show that you can operate it.

Q: Is there an advantage to buying it?
Walker: The concern is that Notre Dame might buy it.
Reck: But they just built their own.

Walker: Faculty have brought forward a resolution to purchase it, so that’s what we’re going to be discussing today.

Reck: I would be happy to pass that along to the board. We can certainly pass a resolution to continue to support it. With the budget shortfall, a resolution to buy it might be out of
tune with reality. Elizabeth Dunn will be the caretaker for the natatorium, and she is aware of the situation.

Q: Was there anything else from the meeting with Applegate that we should be aware of?
Reck: Not that I’m aware of.
Walker: We talked with him about tenure.
Reck: Was that resolved?
Walker: Not really. We talked about the ability to have more than one area of excellence. Applegate says the one area is best practice, but it is being interpreted as a rule. His office sent files back wanting to know the area of excellence. What our administration should have said is "there are two areas." John, with his strong personality, is de facto setting policy on our campus, even if he is not intending to.

Q: Didn't he say that was for record-keeping purposes?
Walker: Yes, but they need to update their spreadsheet to allow for two areas.

III. Agenda for the next senate meeting

A. Charlotte Pfeiffer would like to report at the next Senate meeting on updates to the Student Code of Conduct. This should form part of the Academic Affairs report.

B. Jeff Johnston wants to bring a proposal about the withdrawal policy, which would institute a campus-wide withdrawal form and allow the professor to determine whether the student can withdraw from the course. It will then go to the advisor and the Dean as an FYI. The Dean will continue to see the students but cannot overturn the professor’s decision. This should be classified as new business.

Q: Is there anyone who wants to give an F instead of a W?
Walker: There are supposed to be extenuating circumstances after the 10th week. Different professors have different approaches to this.

C. There will be a resolution brought forward to purchase the Natatorium. The resolution needs 10 signatures to be placed on the agenda. Lesley will ask Monica Tetzlaff and Jake Mattox to come up with some language.

IV. Appointed Committees
The deadline should be the beginning of May. Lesley will make an announcement at the next Senate meeting.

V. IT Centralization
We need to get Beth Van Gordon and the IT committee working together more closely. This needs to be conveyed to the committee as well as to Beth. Campus Technologies Priorities Committee produced a document that establishes the chain of priorities for spending sudden wealth with short deadlines.
VI. Academic Handbook
Steven Gerencser will chair the ad hoc committee for the revision of the IUSB Academic Handbook. He suggests that we separate it into a constitution and a handbook. There also needs to be a mechanism for review as we move forward.

VII. Applegate Visit
The committee debriefed about their meeting with John Applegate. The next president should be encouraged to keep up open lines of communication with him. Committee members expressed concern that his office is overly involved in the tenure process.

VIII. Scheduling Grid
The executive committee will contact the Academic Affairs Committee to determine if they would like to undertake a study of student and faculty opinions about Friday classes or if they would prefer that the executive committee empower an ad hoc committee to study this issue. Because the AAC already has a heavy workload, it would probably be best to address this issue through an ad hoc committee.

IX. Informatics Issue
$1.2 million accrued in their account as they were developing the program. Because they did not spend the money, it has since flowed into the general fund reserves. Informatics was not informed that they had to spend the money within a given timeframe and was planning to accumulate this money for scholarships. Houssein would like to address the Senate about this matter. The Executive Committee determined that this was not a Senate issue, and it was suggested that he take this matter up with the Budget Committee, the Faculty Board of Review as a "work conditions" issue, or perhaps the new Chancellor.

X. Meeting of the Outgoing and Incoming Executive Committee

President Walker will propose a meeting of the out-going and incoming executive committees on Friday, May 10.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.