Faculty Senate Minutes for March 2, 2012

President Jack Zibluk called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

I. Minutes: Approval of the February 17th meeting minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

II. President's report:

    A. President Zibluk announced that after a year-long search process Dr. Tim Hudson has been named as the new Chancellor for ASU Jonesboro. President Zibluk met with Dr. Hudson and talked with him about shared governance and the future of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Hudson promised to meet with the Executive Committee every month and consult them on policy before procedures or policies are passed. President Zibluk indicated that he is optimistic about the future. Several senators expressed concerns that the issue of below-average faculty salaries might not be a priority for the new Chancellor. Senator Mooneyhan stated that the Faculty Senate should take on the job of bringing attention to faculty salaries. Senator John Hall agreed and suggested that the latest report on faculty salaries be sent to Chancellor Hudson and give him time to review the issue. Senator Segall stated that the Finance Committee could review the issue. Senators Hall and Mooneyhan discussed providing the Finance Committee with a summary report on faculty salaries.

    B. Gate access update: The Excecutive Council responded to our resolution and stated that allowing gate access is not an idea that they support.

    C. Intellectual Property Update: President Zibluk reported that further meetings and discussions have taken place and that Lucinda McDaniel presented a new policy which addressed some of the issues of concern with the previous policy draft. However, the core issue of who owns intellectual property remains a point of contention. Lucinda McDaniel maintains that the university owns all intellectual property from the moment it is created. This blanket statement is a major concern for faculty. There is disagreement in the area of case law on whether or not such a blanket statement holds true. President Zibluk stated that several people including Dan Marburger and Susan Allen have submitted suggestions and examples of intellectual property policies at other universities. We expect a response to our suggestions from Lucinda sometime next week. Senator Mooneyhan asked about the timeline for the policy. Zibluk responded that Dr. Welch has indicated that this is not a pressing matter and that we have time. The policy will ultimately go before shared governance and we will have the opportunity to vote. Senator John Hall asked about Don Mixon's consultation regarding the policy. The led to the next item on the agenda.

III. New Business:

    A. Possible visitor/consultant on intellectual property: President Zibluk asked what we feel is the place of outside individuals as consultants on policies such as intellectual property. Zibluk does not feel comfortable inviting another person to come in unilaterally to review our policies. Senator Alex Sydorenko commented that since the issue is a legal matter that Mr. Mixon would have expertise that we may be lacking. Senator Hall moved that the Senate as a body take his service as a consultant in addition to Dr. Marburger's brother. He stated that this issue is so important and far-reaching that we should take advantage of any expertise that we can obtain. Discussion followed regarding whether or not such a decision would require permission from Lucinda McDaniel. Senator Hall believes the Senate could extend the invitation to Mr. Mixon and/or Mr. Marburger who would be there to address our concerns and meet with university counsel. President Zibluk then expressed his concern at this idea and stated that this is a shared governance process. Glen Jones has asked us

to work on the issue and now, since it is us who appointed the group, it may or not be incumbent upon us to ask for outside help. He is unclear whether or not such outside consultation "muddies the waters" in this process or not. Senator Mooneyhan inquired about the reason for Mr. Mixon to come in as a consultant. Senator Hall stated that his understanding is that we should come up with a policy that protects the rights of the faculty. He asked that we consider who is the legal counsel representing the faculty? Senator Larry Salinger then asked whether or not bringing in outside legal counsel would be seen as antagonistic. President Zibluk does not see it as antagonistic because at the present time the environment is collaborative. Dr. Glen Jones has accepted different language and suggestions to the policy. If, in the future, our suggestions are rejected then we can consider it possibly antagonistic. Senator Hall asks how we know whether or not our suggestions are valid due to the fact that we are not attorneys. Senator Mooneyhan commented that if we had created a policy and then brought in an outside consultant to look at it then it could not be seen as antagonistic. The consultant would be coming in to look at our policy and not to be "against" university counsel. Senator Hall stated that he does not feel that bringing in consultants is antagonistic at all. He sees it as having someone with some expertise come to examine and advise the faculty on legal language in the policy. Senator Brenda Anderson stated that she thought we had already made recommendations. President Zibluk explained that we did have an original policy and that we had a resolution regarding the issues we had with that policy. That brought a response that addressed some issues, but not the core issues. Then, Dr. Jones asked Zibluk to write some language that would address the issues, other committee members have made suggestions, and he expects a reasonable response. Senator Anderson feels that having a lawyer to help write such policy is reasonable and not antagonistic. She feels having legal consultation is wise. Senator Mooneyhan stated that since we were asked to provide feedback that having an expert to help us do what we were asked to do is a good thing. Senator Hall feels that the legal consultation is a safeguard. President Zibluk asked which meeting we would be asking Mr. Mixon to sit in on. Zibluk expects that Mr. Mixon would be asked to sit in during the next meeting of the sub-committee working on the alternative language for the intellectual property policy. Senator Mooneyhan asked for clarification on Senator Hall's original resolution in this matter.. Zibluk responded that the motion was: "That the Faculty Senate as a body representing the faculty accept Mr. Mixon's offer to provide legal advice on this matter." Several other senators agreed that this consultation is needed. Senator Hall's understanding was that Mr. Mixon would be able to consult with Dr. Marburger's brother. Senator Mooneyhan suggested that a courtesy call to Lucinda McDaniel is in order. Several senators commented that since a law can be interpreted in different ways that having legal consultation is a protection, not antagonistic. After a vote the resolution to accept Mr. Mixon's consultation was passed unanimously.

B. Family member in class "operating procedure": Concerns have been raised at shared governance meetings over some of the language in the policy. Dr. Glen Jones has withdrawn the policy for revision. The policy originated in Academic Affairs. Associate Vice Chancellor Dr. Lynita Cooksey then explained how this policy came about and described some of the scenarios in which such a policy would be needed. Safety and security issues are the primary concern. Also, she explained that employees need to receive permission before bringing a child or other family member into class or the workplace. Much of the policy is common sense and courtesy. Several senators commented that the language of the original policy was far too broad and could have been misinterpreted to mean that visitors are prohibited entirely. Dr. Cooksey stated that visitors are allowed, but permission should be sought from the supervisor or department chair. She requested ideas and suggestions regarding changes to the language of the policy. Senator Hall asked about allowing high school students to sit in on certain classes. Dr. Cooksey responded that these instances as well as job shadowing are permitted and written into the policy. She again urged faculty to send her ideas for improving the language of the policy.

C. Mace bearer: Dr. Beverly Boals Gilbert stated that the position of mace bearer is reserved for past presidents of the Faculty Association. The next in line for the mace bearer is Gil Fowler, but since he is also the Grand Marshall for the Commencement ceremony he might decline. The mace bearer would then go to the next in line, Dr. Mike McDaniel. Dr. Lynita Cooksey then asked whether or not we want to consider a redesign of the mace that is more current. Senator Hall expressed his feeling that the diamond insignia should not be retired. President Zibluk also indicated that there is something to be said for tradition. Dr. Boals Gilbert will ask Dr. Mike McDaniel to be the new mace bearer.

D. Faculty Senate election for president-elect, Julie Isaacson: As chair of the election committee, Dr. Beverly Boals Gilbert announced that Dr. Julie Isaacson was chosen by the nominating committee as the sole candidate for President of the Faculty Senate. She explained that a vote will take place despite there being only one candidate. Senator Hall stated that the voting always takes place at the spring meeting of the Faculty Association. Senator Hall then commented that the position of President of the Faculty Senate is an extremely lengthy commitment. It consists of one year as President Elect, two years as President, and then a year as Past President. He has talked with several faculty members who asked if we should reduce the length of the commitment in order to attract more candidates. Senator Sydorenko explained that his first year as President was spent learning and that at least a 2 year term is necessary to allow for development in the role of President. Several others indicated that the President Elect year is meant to be a time for learning procedures and preparing for the term as President. Other senators indicated that if we were to shorten the length of the commitment that the only time that could be taken away would be the year spent as Past President. Senator Hall mentioned that eliminating the year as Past President would be a change in the bylaws. Senator Hall asked if President Zibluk could add this issue to the agenda for the spring meeting of the Faculty Association.

E. Other committees, etc.:
President Zibluk asked if we should cancel the next Faculty Senate meeting due to it falling on the Friday before Spring Break. The motion to cancel the next meeting was raised, seconded, and passed unanimously.

Senator Todd Whitehead announced that he has had several faculty members approach him and ask if the identity theft protection could be reinstated. Dr. Cooksey stated that the question about extending the protection should go to Ed Kramer and not to Information & Technology Services.

Senator Mooneyhan then announced that he was asked to bring up the number of students in online classes. As enrollment in online courses continues to increase he asked if we need to reexamine the maximum number of students allowed to enroll in each class. At one time there was an old policy limiting the enrollment to 25 students. Mooneyhan explained that over time he has allowed more and more students into each class and asks if we need to examine how to manage online classes that continue to grow? Dr. Cooksey stated that assistance is available with grading if needed. She also cautioned that federal guidelines state that any course that can be completed independently and finished early (with little to no faculty interaction) could be considered a correspondence course. Senator Mooneyhan stated that he doesn't feel comfortable having a grad student help with grading. Dr. Cooksey explained that there are other ways in which a graduate student could help lessen the workload for faculty teaching large numbers of online students. Senator Hall announced that his colleague, Dr. Craig Jones, has just published an article on class size for online courses. Senator Mooneyhan stated that he has researched course delivery methods for online courses. He described his success with courses that allow for students to work ahead if they want to. Dr. Cooksey stated that if students are able to work at their own pace and can finish the entire course early that federal guidelines state that it could be considered a correspondence course. Federal financial aid is not provided for correspondence

courses. Senator Mooneyhan then clarified that what he was asking is whether or not we have a policy regarding class size for online courses and if not, do we need to create such a policy? Dr. Cooksey then announced that a committee is forming to look at the quality of teaching as well as the reinstatement of the Faculty Center. That committee will be looking at many issues including class size for online courses. Several senators then expressed concern over the idea that a committee would be looking at issues (such as class size) that they feel should be left up to the department. Dr. Cooksey responded that the committee will not be mandating requirements, but rather making recommendations based on research and best practices. She warned that the push for more online courses will continue as the demand from students and competition from other institutions increases. Class size for those online courses will continue to be discussed as there is no magic number for class size. Senator John Hall expressed his feeling that the faculty teaching the online course should have the power to make a decision on class size. He explained that one instructor may be able to successfully manage 100+ students in an online course while another instructor might feel that he or she cannot manage or maintain quality when teaching more than 40 students per course. Senator Mooneyhan stated that he hopes that the committee will come up with some guidelines for class size due to the tremendous increase in workload for faculty teaching larger numbers of students. He described the increase in his online students contacting him and requesting assistance at all hours. Dr. Cooksey feels that the instructor can establish a schedule for assisting students and have control over their availability to answer emails and calls from students. Senator Salinger then explained that he has experienced students who become very frustrated and impatient when their emails are not answered right away (even in the middle of the night). He expressed concern that despite a large increase in enrollment the number of faculty has not increased. Senator Mooneyhan then expressed that this is his reason for wanting the committee to come up with guidelines. He fears that without the guidelines the class sizes could grow without limits while we are not able to hire more faculty to manage the increasing enrollment. Dr. Cooksey expressed her understanding of faculty concerns and her hopes that the committee (which she clarified is a task force) will be able to provide guidance on such issues. She finished by saying that we have all had to do more with less and we need to look at what size institution we want to be and balance quality with quantity.

In the absence of further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:20pm.

Attendees:

Association officers:
President Jack Zibluk
Andy Mooneyhan

Business:
Faye Cocchiara
Richard Segall
Jollean Sinclaire

Communications:
Pradeep Mishra
Larz Roberts

Education:
Joanna Grymes

John D. Hall
Andy Mooneyhan
Patty Murphy
Ann Ross
Joe Nichols

Fine Arts:
Claire D. Garrard

Humanities and Social Sciences:
Alex Sydorenko
Jerry Ball
Larry Salinger

Library:
Wendy Crist (proxy for Tracy Farmer)

Nursing and Health Professions:
Loretta Brewer
Brenda Anderson
Bill Payne
Todd Whitehead

Science and Mathematics:
Hai Jiang
Jim Bednarz
Suzanne Melescue

University College:
Margaret McClain

Arkansas State University
Analysis of Technology Fee Effectiveness
February 14, 2012

At Issue

How can the technology fee and related planning process be better streamlined to improve the purchasing power of fee revenue and reduce overhead/complexities of the planning process?

Background

The technology fee was created in 2001 in order to fund the technology infrastructure that enables all activities of the university. At that point in time, students were paying an infrastructure fee that was used to outfit classrooms and other spaces that were dependent on technology. Departments were funding computers for faculty and staff. As the classrooms and other spaces were upgraded and improved, the gap between the edge of the network (where classrooms and other spaces are virtually located) and the capabilities of the infrastructure to support them was widening at a rapid pace with no consistent funding vehicle available to address the issue.

For consideration

- Regular, consistent investment in the technology infrastructure and desktops has since kept pace with student and faculty demands for both technology and services.
- A committee is assembled each year, as per the board resolution, which recommends to Executive Council a technology fee budget plan for the upcoming fiscal year.
- Each year, the committee generally spends a substantial amount of time and energy in controversial conversations and debates, arriving at the same outcome: The same percentage of the budget allocated to critical or mandated technology infrastructure investments and the same percentage of the budget allocated to faculty desktop replacements.
- An improved process and updated principles are needed in order to reduce controversy in the planning environment, and to increase the purchase power of technology fee revenue.
- A study of five-year technology fee spending trends indicates that infrastructure expenditures consistently equate to 80% of the total technology fee revenue for each year.
- A study of five-year spending indicates that faculty desktop replacement consistently equates to 20% of technology fee revenue for that year.
- The 80% and 20% trend is in accordance with the original board resolution and presentation.
- Using current trends and projected needs, this 5-year trend will continue. The allocation amount of technology fee revenue to each category will remain consistent with anticipated institutional growth.
- Using the current model for computer replacements, the university currently purchases a total of 371 individual units annually with technology fee revenues.
- Using the current model for classroom upgrades, the university currently implements 5 technology-enabled classrooms per year.

Technology Fee Changes, 24 February 2012

Advantages

- Changing the planning process to use a fixed percentage will streamline the planning process by eliminating hours of committee meetings each year with the same outcome.
- Adopting a standard-purchase model, which is common at most institutions as well as in private industry, will provide a increased number of machines with greater capabilities, at the same cost currently expended.
- Lifecycle maintenance of the purchased computers will guarantee each faculty and staff member a new computer every 36 months.
- Pairing the existing classroom funding with Classroom Renovation Funds will decrease the cost of technology implementation in the classroom and provide for a more effective and well-suited technology-enabled teaching and learning environment. Significant savings are achieved when classrooms are outfitted with technology when the walls and ceilings are already opened for construction. Similarly, lighting and sound upgrades can be implemented at the same time. The recent Wilson Hall upgrade is an example of the success of this model.
- Purchasing computers through the ASU IT Store will position the university to receive a certain percentage of those purchase dollars back into the university.

Disadvantages

- Bulk purchasing of computers can create a backlog in central receiving and in IT. Purchases and distribution will have to be staged carefully.
- Initial perceptions will be that funding is being taken from various areas on campus. However, this is projected to be overcome after the first year when the impact of increased purchasing power is realized across the campus.

Analysis

The current and proposed effect of purchasing power is better understood by the analysis below.

	Current Model	Proposed Model
Total Personnel Covered	371	500
Computer Price Per Unit	$ 1,620	$ 1,282
	$ 601,020	$ 641,000

The Total Personnel Covered is an estimate based on current enrollment and student credit hour production (SCH). As enrollment and SCH increases, total personnel covered by the plan would increase also. Simultaneously, the Computer Price Per Unit would decrease, since the quantity purchased would increase.

The price per unit drops substantially when like units are purchased together. The analysis below indicates how acquisition cost decreases and purchasing power increases when like-units are purchased in larger quantities.

	Current Model	Proposed Model
Price Per Unit under each model		
Dell Desktop	$ 1,255	$ 924
Dell Laptop	$ 1,627	$ 1,281
Apple Desktop	$ 1,598	$ 1,281
Apple MacBook	$ 2,000	$ 1,642

A proportionate allocation model to accomplish Classroom Renovation, Technology Infrastructure renewal, and faculty/staff Computer Replacements would be structured as follows:

Proportionate Analysis	Classroom Renovation	15%
	Desktop Replacement	15%
	Technology Infrastructure	70%

Recommendations

- Streamline budget planning through a proportional model.
- Require any initiative funded by the Technology Fee to have a permanent funding source identified within a maximum of four years, although the least number of years should always be selected if possible.
- Create a Classroom Renovation committee comprised of the Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, Facilities Management (2), and Information Technology (1) to prioritize classroom renovation schedule.
- Create a Computer Replacement Committee of Faculty (1), Academic Deans (1), Information Technology (1), and Student Affairs (1) to advise on computer configuration and catalogue options for purchasing and lifecycle replacement.
- Fifteen percent of technology fee revenue will be allocated to classroom teaching and learning systems. This will be paired with Classroom Renovation Funds in Facilities Management in order to reduce the cost of technology renovation to classrooms and to make each implementation more effective for teaching and learning. Funds will only be spent on the classroom renovation schedule established by Classroom Renovation Committee.
- Fifteen percent of revenue will be automatically allocated for computer/lifecycle replacement through bulk purchases. The Personal Computer Committee will complete recommended configurations by April of each year. Each participant will select his or her system from Campus IT Store Catalogue in May of the preceding fiscal year. Each program participant will receive his or her new computer by August 1 of each year.
- Seventy percent of revenue will be allocated for the Technology Infrastructure. Prioritization will be coordinated through the Chief Information Officer, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and the Provost.
- Transition current "continuing costs" over 3 years beginning in FY 2012-2013 to permanent E&G sources.