

**FACULTY SENATE  
ACADEMIC ISSUES SUBCOMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**WHEN** 3:45pm Thursday October 14, 2021

**WHERE** via WebEx

**MEMBERSHIP**

Chair: Kouroush Jenab (COBT)–Annie Adams (Regent)–Robert Boram (COS)–Nettie Brock (CAHS)– DuWayne Dale (CAHS)–David Little (CAHS)–Dirk Grupe (COS)–Ahmad Hassan (COBT)–David Eisenhour (COS)  
underlining indicates that the member was absent.

**SUMMARY**

Minutes of the 9/23 meeting approved.

Guest to the meeting: Tom Kmetz from the library presents the total budget allocated by major function. The budget allocated from year’s Operating Budget back to FY 87/88 has been reviewed (see the last five-year budget).

Fiscal Year	Instruction	Research	Public Service	Academic Support	Library	Student Services	Institutional Support	Operations & Maintenance	Student Financial Aid
17/18	31.1	1.0	4.0	7.5	2.5	14.5	14.3	8.5	16.6
18/19	33.6	0.3	3.2	6.9	2.4	15.1	12.9	7.8	17.8
19/20	35.5	0.3	3.0	4.3	2.2	16.2	12.2	7.8	17.5
20/21	35.9	0.3	3.4	3.9	2.1	16.2	11.9	7.8	18.5
21/22	36.9	0.0	3.7	3.9	2.1	14.2	12.4	7.4	19.4
50% of peak	22.8	0.5	2.0	5.25	2.05	8.1	8.65	6.8	9.7

Note: Research budget allocated is Zero in FY 21/22! In FY 21/22, all major budgets allocated are above 50% of pick since FY 87/88 but Research, Academic Support, Library.

Questions:

- How would less/zero budget to Research, Academic Support, and Library improve MSU ranking and quality? Refer to MSU Mission!
- Do we have the benchmarking to do the better gap analysis? Tom, will explore more on this matter and keep us informed. It is noteworthy that the institutions may not break their budget down into these categories.
- Why do we see double digit percentage for Student Financial Aid? Where is the source? How does it impact MSU ranking?
- Why do we have the Instruction and Student Services budgets way above 50% of Peak?
- Are we experiencing systematic MSU policy and procedure violation in the budget allocation?

Since the topic would engage other sub-committees, the Academic Issues Committee decides to address it at Senate Session. Tom Kmetz will present this topic to Senate in the Spring session.

Double Dipping: Chair Jenab asked President Long to convey the following message to Provost

in his one-on-one meeting.

The committee decides to tell the Dean's council that we do not agree to limiting double dipping, but that we welcome them to come discuss with us the curriculum issues they seem to be having and how we can work together to resolve them.

The 50% rule: Chair Jenab asked President Long to convey the following message to Provost in his one-on-one meeting.

The 50% rule is traced back to the SACSCOC regulation for "program coherence" that used to be interpreted as the 50% rule, but has recently changed. There are no known issues with this, but it does come up as an issue occasionally when new programs are created. Also, any time a program comes up for revision this issue is reviewed and if they are out of compliance, they will be asked to come into place. There has been no issues on this in the past when it comes up at the curriculum committee meetings because there is a lot of disagreement on the matter. The UAR does define program coherence with the 50% rule and SACSCOC has approved of this definition.

The committee decides that we can change this definition of "program coherence" and that we are going to reinvestigate it and we would like to address the issue to the Senate as a whole.

ORSP: Chair Jenab has no update for ORSP. We are still awaiting to hear back from Senator Finch, Chair of Governance Sub-committee.

General:

- Senator Annie Adams agreed to present SACCOG 10.4 to Senate in order to clarify the faculty rights.
- Senator Ahmad Hassan discussed adding the MW option in the scheduling mix. Other committee members noted this option currently exists. The committee does not know why faculty in the College of Business were told this scheduling was not possible.
- Senator David Eisenhower addressed the undergraduate curriculum change proposals are only evaluated once a year which would create real hardships for both the committee that evaluates them and the faculty submitting them. After a wide-ranging discussion, the committee determined that the real hardship was the early deadline for catalogue approval. Why must programs have materials submitted almost a year in advance to get into the following year's catalogue?

New Business: None

---

**ADJOURNMENT**     The meeting was adjourned at 5:08pm

---

**NEXT MEETING**     October 28, 2021, via WebEx