MINUTES

Present: Karen Feldt, John Strait, Francisco Guerrero, Kristen Shuyler, Katherine Raichle, Allison Henrich, Mark Maddox, Rob Rutherford, Mary Graham, Jeremy Stringer, Chips Chipalkatti, Sonora Jha, Maryann Bozzette, Mary Rose Bumpus, Brenda Broussard, Chuck Lawrence, William Kangas, Isiaah Crawford, Jason Wirth, Jacquelyn Miller, John Weaver, Vinay Datar, Jacqueline Goade.

Guests: Nalini Iyer (Associate Professor, College of Arts & Sciences), Vicky Minderhout (Professor, Chemistry), Jeff Philpott (Assistant Professor, College of Arts & Sciences), Greg Prussia (Professor, Albers School of Business), Ron Smith (VP for Finance & Business Affairs), Sean McDowell (Associate Professor, English), Bradley Scharf (Professor & Chair, Political Science), Steen Halling (Professor, Psychology), John Bean (Professor, English), David Powers (Dean, College of Arts & Sciences).

1. Welcome

2. Minutes from 1/24/11 were reviewed and accepted.

3. Core Revision: Update on Progress and Plan (Nalini Iyer, Vicky Minderhout, Jeff Philpott, and Greg Prussia)
   a. The Core Revision team is on target. There has been input received from discussions and forums and, from those, a workable draft of the new Core curriculum is being formed.
   b. The Core Revision draft is built on 1) input from faculty, staff, and students about aspirations and concerns and 2) the study of our 11 peer institutions
   c. The team is getting feedback now from their revisions.
   d. By the end of this month, a survey with be online about the new Core draft to get input from the university community.
   e. After input is received from the survey, the Core Revision team will revise the draft once more and report back for Academic Assembly’s nod of approval.
   f. Particular changes include the writing class changing from 3 credits to 5 credits and the articulation and clarification of learning outcomes (especially module 1)
   g. The Provost and E-Team try to budget for the Core as closely as they can – will fund as necessary as it is brought forward, agreed upon, and implemented.
   h. FY12 developed to take into account implementation phase of this new Core.
   i. One hope of this draft is to make the Core more attractive for tenured faculty to teach (as this has been a problem in the past)
   j. The issue of having an additional writing support class and university writing standards was discussed. This is a bigger, university-wide issue (not necessarily the Core’s responsibility).
k. Process of the Core Revision team: survey from faculty, nod from Academic Assembly, then determine what they need at that point. Then, it will go to the Provost for review and, finally, the Board of Trustees has the final vote on the new Core curriculum.
l. This has been a faculty generated process all along – a lot of input has been received and is being heard.

4. **Mandatory Direct Deposit Proposal** (Ron Smith & Kim Crewey)
a. Direct deposit increases the efficiency of the institution and of the Payroll office. It is much more convenient to use electronic processing. This is in line with the university’s sustainability efforts.
b. There are significant cost savings by using direct deposit ($6.50 per check).
c. There are 100-125 manual checks written each pay period.
d. Resistance to direct deposit has included being wary of banking institutions, not wanting to share personal information, and having trouble getting/qualifying for a bank account.
e. If an employee does not have a checking account, there are options through US Bank to accommodate the individual. US Bank also has an excel pay program option, which acts like a cash debit card for individuals.
f. **Future goals**: to create a mandatory direct deposit policy for reimbursements and to apply this mandatory direct deposit policy to student employees.
g. **Academic Assembly approved the Mandatory Direct Deposit Proposal with a unanimous vote.**

5. **Report of the Budgetary Advisory Committee**
a. Two Academic Assembly representatives (Rob Rutherford and Vinay Datar) are part of the Budgetary Advisory Committee in order to give faculty a voice in the budgeting process.
b. There have been only three meetings so far. They have had verbal discussions on the current budgeting cycle, per Ron Smith’s report.
c. Some of the information from the committee is confidential, as it is tentative information that still needs final approval.
d. The Budgetary Advisory Committee was formed with these questions in mind (all around the budget formation process): *How do we make the budget process a little more transparent? How could we do this better? How could we make the communication better? What would you like to know sooner or later? How could we formulate this budget with a better process? How do we make sure everyone has a voice?*

e. It has been a challenging year for the budget being in the current economy. There have been reductions of state and federal financial aid creating a lot of needy students.
f. The E-Team had three days of thoughtful deliberation and study on the new budget formation for FY12. Faculty/staff compensation is always the first order of business when forming the new budgets. The E-Team also tried to address strategic initiatives, to increase the athletic budget, and to propose a salary
increase. There is also a significant amount of money put aside to address whatever comes out of the Compensation and Benefits Study.

g. The draft of the new budget will be proposed to the Board of Trustees on February 24th.

h. Once the final budget is approved, the make-up of the budget and significant aspects of the budget, as related to the previous year, are sent out to all faculty/staff. This is usually a two-page, detailed document distributed in early March.

i. Debriefing on the existing budget might be a good thing to do (i.e. why have you made these shifts in the budget for the new year?)

6. Arts and Sciences Task Force on Compensation and Governance

White Paper on Request for Transparency in Determining Faculty Salaries

a. In October 2010, the faculty/staff assembly in the College of Arts & Sciences unanimously voted to create this task force. The Arts & Sciences Task Force started in the fall of 2010 to consider concerns within the college about compensation and governance. Their job is to advocate to make real change within the college, then make sure their voices can be heard beyond their college to the greater university community.

b. The A&S Task Force advocated for three requests in their White Paper:
   i. Greater transparency
   ii. Stronger faculty voice on the issue of budgeting conversations
   iii. Creation of Faculty & Staff Impact Statement

c. The faculty has two new representatives on the Budgetary Advising Committee, as discussed previously, and the Provost is the faculty representative on the E-Team. We have a good faculty voice here. Faculty members can also go directly to their dean with specific issues they are having.

d. The issue of transparency and having clearer, broader communication is an important one that is trying to be improved upon greatly throughout the university. Academic Assembly has been discussing this topic frequently.

e. With the quantitative and qualitative data from the Compensation and Benefits Study (a collective and collaborative study), the concerns about compensation will be addressed.

f. We need to look at an enhanced governance structure, as we are a growing university.

g. The issue of salary compression was also discussed. Keep in mind, compensation is a prioritized university wide initiative when forming the new budgets.

h. Anticipate that faculty salary data will be routinely published.

i. When proposing new programs, impact statements are always included and related issues are thoroughly discussed before approval.

j. The Academic Affairs budget has grown 44% over the last 5 years. The College of Arts & Sciences budget has grown 57%. In FY11, the A&S budget grew more than any other college/school.

k. The Provost and the A&S Task Force will meet later on to discuss these issues more fully.

Minutes taken by Jacqueline Goade