INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

September 30, 2014

**Minutes**

Members Attending: R. Guell, S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, E. Hampton, C. Olsen, V. Sheets, K. Yousif

Ex-Officio Attending: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

Guests: L. Eberman, R. Gonser, L. Maule, J. Powers

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. D. Bradley:
		1. Homecoming is next week. There are many activities planned; please try to find the time to partake in them. Many academic programs are involved with Tent City. There are plenty of things to do, and the football game will be fun to watch. They have amazing skill this year, especially in their passing game.
		2. The Board of Trustees will meet next week, as well as the Foundation Board. Their meetings will, however, be shortened by Homecoming activities, as well as the fact that they just had meetings approximately six weeks ago. The Foundation is continuing to deal with operating budget issues. They are doing a good job with bringing everyone to the realization of where it is now and where it needs to be. New members will add to the mix in terms of helping meet goals.
		3. Also, the Center for Student Success is the recipient of a $1.6 million FIPSE grant by the Department of Education. We are one of 24 schools to receive it, out of 500 applications. It is a great opportunity; it fits in with activities J. Powers and others have working at the moment with Stanford University and the University of Texas. The goal, of course, is to increase the degree attainment numbers for low-income students. Grants of that nature are not easy to obtain; credit goes to the team that put the grant proposal together.
		4. R. Guell: Will the Emeriti changes make it to the October Board of Trustees meeting? What about the changes to section 310 of the Handbook?
		5. J. Maynard: The Emeriti policy changes will go to the October meeting, but we are taking the Handbook changes as a package to the meeting on December 12.
	2. J. Maynard: No Report
2. Chair Report: R. Guell
	1. R. Guell: I have expressed to the Provost a level of frustration with the need to triple-enter grades in the last ten days with regard to MapWorks, Blackboard, and Interim Grades, and I believe he received and understood that level of frustration.
	2. Something that I want to make you aware of is that I became aware last week that the AMR department is revising its promotion and tenure guidelines with explicit reference to collegiality. That is the first, I understand, in a P and T document. The Handbook has all such documents going to the Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee for review but for my own purpose is that since I can control the Senate agenda, if PTOC is amenable to including it in a document then I will ask the Senate as a body to look into that document myself. The Handbook does give authority to the Senate body. I think this is a fundamental issue Senators may choose to weigh in on.
	3. Finally, regarding my inserted and then changed amendment, I just want to say I added that only after I became aware of a current issue regarding the lack of quality associated with Improvement Plans. It is not clear. We need FAC to define what an Improvement Plan is as well as what the consequences associated with them are.
3. Approval of the Minutes of September 16, 2014: C. MacDonald, K. Bolinger. Vote: 9-0-0
4. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
	1. R. Guell: There was a question submitted for the Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion that I’d like to take now and postpone the rest of the discussion for later. The questions are as submitted to J. Maynard.
		1. C. Olsen: This one was from a faculty member about the smoking areas. They sort of “move.” People sort of spread out from the shelter and smoke well outside it.
		2. J. Maynard: I don’t think we have an aggressive policy regarding those shelters.
		3. D. Bradley: I will have a conversation with D. McKee and J. Newport about what campus police can do about that.
		4. V. Sheets: There are many more smokers trying to use them these days.
		5. R. Guell: I understand and support the decision to regulate smoking on campus, but it would look like a bunch of people crammed into a VW Bug if they all stuffed themselves in there.
		6. D. Bradley: It’s more of a “flag pole” to gather around.
5. Report from L. Maule and J. Powers Regarding Academic Coaching
	1. R. Guell: Let’s let L. Maule and J. Powers describe the program and its successes before we ask questions.
	2. D. Bradley: I would say that I’m the one that made the decision that we were going to continue. The real idea with Inside Track was that they would show a three-percent minimum increase with pre-enrollment with freshmen going into the Fall term. I was worried about that from the beginning in terms of whether that was going to give us the information needed. With the Commission involved with the Twenty-First Century Scholars and the University’s contribution being reduced to a third of what we were doing, it sealed the deal, from my point of view. We had to cooperate with the Commission and we had data that was well in excess of three percent for some populations. J. Powers did agree to move forward. It’s all tied up in my view of making sure before we stop something we have sufficient data that said it wasn’t doing what we wanted it to. The current statistics are insufficient. Most of us know that one data point, or even two, does not define a trend.
	3. J. Powers: Dr. Bradley contextualized it, and L. Maule and I meet regularly. Our process is that once a week she has a conversation with the coordinator of the Inside Track program, and I join them once a month. Certainly the Twenty-First Century Scholar piece came out of left field but the state was looking for an opportunity in closing the achievement gap. They knew we had piloted an experience. Those are the things in the report that we have. We don’t claim any statistical difference either.
		1. L. Maule: One thing I like better about this year’s look at what they can do for us is that all the Twenty-First Century Scholars are in the cohort instead of half-and-half. If there is a trend among all Twenty-First Century Scholars I can get that feedback from the coordinator of the program and we can quickly respond to that. They were able to identify a significant number of them who did not have access to books, for example. I was able to do one thing at the institutional level. I was able to give those names to the Financial Aid Liaison to see if they had aid available. Also, we were able to work with S. Wurtz to identify $250 stipends they could utilize. The other thing, we talked to L. Harris, hired by Inside Track, and we had a broader discussion with her in terms of books. For example, USI has a loan program, not a rental program. It’s a nice segue into why I have supported them until this point—not because of empirical results, but intangibles. We have a very nice relationship with them. We were receiving information from University College advisors which would reinforce that. There’s a feedback loop that was very positive that was created.
		2. C. MacDonald: Here is a new version of the table sent out—the gray highlights changed from the last draft simply because J. Powers sent me his data file, and some of the *n*’s were not what I thought. Re-running the analysis decreased some probabilities. Ultimately it didn’t impact anything significantly. Basically I conducted a series of z-tests between the “Coached” and “Non-Coached” retention rates. Arts and Humanities majors differed 15.4 percent; that indicated the “Coached” group did retain more students than “Non-Coached.” That is the only significant finding. Out of my own curiosity I compared “Coached” versus overall retention rate. Again, we found a few more things that were significant there among all 2653 students. J. Powers’ and L. Maule’s initial table did not break things out by gender or ethnicity.
		3. D. Bradley: If we have met the three-percent threshold, would that have changed the result?
		4. S. Lamb: Would it have been significant?
		5. D. Bradley: Yes, instead of a 2.2 percent bump if we had a three percent bump? What about the overall? Do we need more data?
		6. C. MacDonald: I’m guessing it would need more data.
		7. L. Maule: The point is that I don’t think we ever set out to suggest there was statistical significance.
		8. C. MacDonald: I’m not arguing that either way.
		9. R. Guell: In both there were described successes that were not statistically significant or were a stretch…and I again mind us lying to ourselves.
		10. K. Bolinger: Is that all we looked at? Did we look at credit completion?
		11. L. Maule: We can do that easily.
		12. D. Bradley: I want to know, what’s the “Coached” group’s junior year like? What’s the second-year retention? What is happening to these students after the first year?
		13. K. Bolinger: If we looked at credit completion the struggling students who dropped courses would not complete the 30-credit benchmark.
		14. D. Bradley: I agree. There are other metrics we should be looking at.
		15. C. MacDonald: I also did breakouts for “gender” and “ethnicity,” since there was a comment in the report that the coaches were primarily white and female. It appears the white females responded positively to them.
		16. R. Guell: Women are more likely to accept advice than men.
		17. C. MacDonald: Women have higher retention than men. There is a higher retention rate among white students as opposed to African-American students.
		18. D. Bradley: African-American men is a category on your sheet?
		19. C. MacDonald: It’s not that clearly defined.
		20. D. Bradley: In J. Powers’ report I thought there was a distinct difference that the African-American men were retained substantially differently.
		21. S. Lamb: Just going down the numbers, those of us who have dealt with proportions all our lives, there isn’t much indication at all that the program was effective.
		22. R. Guell: The concern I have is, and I want to make sure my facts are correct—there is a $700,000 annual cost? My concern about this is that the $700,000 had an opportunity cost. There were things we could not do because we spent $700,000 on something that had no statistically significant impact on what we were trying to move. It’s a real stretch to say the things we weren’t trying to target changed. There are things that could have had a greater impact. L. Maule could have needed $700,000 to integrate a learning community of specific classes. When I ran them we did it for under $100,000 a year and generated a 5-6 percent statistically significant difference between the learning community student and the non-learning community student. There were other benefits—fine—but if it didn’t do what it was designed to do, we need to think about where the money is going before we do it again.
		23. D. Bradley: The impact is not discernible in one year. If it does have significant impact it will take more than one year to discern. That’s where my decisions came from. We’re talking about a third of that for this year. We didn’t have a choice, politically.
		24. R. Guell: That’s a different answer and I’ll accept that. When faced with the same decision I hope it will prove something, and not to spend $300,000.
		25. D. Bradley: I’m just as interested in finding things that work as well as anyone. If they don’t work we have to stop doing them or change them.
		26. V. Sheets; $700,000, and the impact is that 50 more students were retained? It seems like a huge opportunity cost. I’m all in favor of the decision-making you do, but set the criterion and don’t change it at the end. We have to look closely at it but stop if it doesn’t work.
		27. D. Bradley: I would say that we were not involved in the discussion to know what we need to do. The three percent was a contractual value.
		28. V. Sheets: I thought it was estimated on cost-effectiveness.
		29. R. Guell: When J. Williams came he said three percent would be easy because they anticipated six percent.
		30. D. Bradley: I think Inside Track was surprised. Their experience has been with the non-traditional student. Maybe this is a technique that works better with adults than 18-year-olds. It would be worth getting 50 more students across the stage.
		31. R. Guell: $700,000 to get $280,000 to walk across the stage?
6. For Passage on to Senate
	1. Handbook Change Suggestions from Grad Council: R. Gonser. Motion to Table: V. Sheets, S. Lamb. Vote: 9-0-0
		1. R. Gonser: We were charged with investigating changes to 310.1.8 and 310.1.8.1, and as we discussed them, we realized that graduate education has changed dramatically since these were written. We have a number of programs that do not have a dissertation or thesis as a culminating experience. We wanted to capture all the experiences as well and decided we didn’t need a separate one. We had quite a bit of discourse as to what that meant.
			1. R. Guell: This is a replacement?
			2. R. Gonser: Yes, and an elimination/consolidation of 310.8.1.
			3. C. MacDonald: On the fourth line, it says “research project, thesis/dissertation committee?”
			4. R. Gonser: The wordsmithing came out of Grad Council. They saw it as one type of culminating experience.
			5. C. MacDonald: Can we insert an “or?”
			6. S. Lamb: Same thing in the last sentence.
			7. C. Olsen: The last part was harder to follow.
			8. J. Maynard: It’s very cumbersome for a student to follow this.
			9. R. Guell: It’s to accommodate the non-thesis and non-dissertation experiences. Shoehorning everything else into existing policy. It’s a catch-all. The others have to go through a process.
			10. R. Gonser: Right. Many things have changed since this was written. We had to take out what wasn’t needed.
			11. J. Maynard: If you have the chair, do you need the dean also?
			12. R. Gonser: The student would go to the Graduate Catalog. This is more from a faculty perspective.
			13. R. Guell: Students don’t have to read this and understand it?
			14. R. Gonser: No.
			15. D. Bradley: “Appointee” is obscure. It is the role of the Dean to appoint someone, right?
			16. A. Anderson: In our department suddenly they have to be vetted all up and down the line.
			17. R. Gonser: Another consideration is with programs that we work with from another institution.
			18. V. Sheets: Can I try a rewrite?
			19. R. Guell: There is zero emergency on this. I am going to ask for a tabling and a rewrite.
			20. R. Gonser: There are a lot of other things to update. Can we do that? It will help this process.
			21. S. Lamb: Bring us back that which used to be so we can see the change.
	2. Biennial Review Amendment Recommendations: C. MacDonald
		1. R. Guell: C. MacDonald will run us through each change. L. Eberman is here to represent FAC and its motions. We will not send out revised documentation to the Senate; we will simply go through these and vote on whether to recommend them. Senate will change the document as needed on Thursday.
			1. C. MacDonald: The item on page 1, second paragraph: after the sentence in bold*—“Pre-tenure faculty and instructors in their first six years of continual contracts {and tenured faculty who were on leave from the University for one academic year or longer of the period under review} may opt not to participate in this review, but in doing so will forgo the opportunity to achieve the Contributing Exceptionally designation and the raise that might accompany that designation.”* This is by FAC. Vote 8-1-0.
				1. L. Eberman: It’s to leave room for someone who might not have room for evidence of teaching.
				2. J. Maynard: Shouldn’t they have evidence of it for at least a year? What about research?
				3. L. Eberman: I wouldn’t think so, if it was leave not associated with work.
				4. D. Bradley: What would we do for pay raise purposes for the instructors is someone has gone on leave?
				5. R. Guell: We have had leaves without pay.
				6. D. Bradley: Disability, for instance.
				7. J. Maynard: We have had people leave without pay to go overseas to do something. It doesn’t count based upon that year’s experience. There is a limit to sick and medical leaves. There is long-term disability. I don’t know what case would be impacted by this.
				8. K. Bolinger: What about an on-again, off-again Provost? You’ll get the standard raise is what this implies.
				9. K. Yousif: I was gone two semesters on family medical leave. Part of it was maternity leave and part was family medical leave.
				10. R. Guell: Is the Administration opposed to this insertion?
				11. D. Bradley: There would not be many people who fall in this category.
				12. V. Sheets: Did FAC consider the people who are on leave at the point of the review process?
				13. L. Eberman: That was not part of the conversation.
				14. D. Bradley: I’m not endorsing this, but I’m not fighting this either.
				15. C. Olsen: They would fall into the pre-tenure faculty.
				16. R. Guell: Yes.
		2. C. MacDonald: Original item 4, iv asks for a final paragraph to be added to the preamble: *“Neither the results of a biennial review nor any information submitted by the faculty member for a biennial review can be used in any hearing to terminate, or terminate the tenure of, said faculty member without said faculty member’s consent.”* Vote: 0-9-0
			1. E. Hampton: This seems almost unpassable because if you really did something bad and you wanted to confess and put it in the review…then no one could ever hold it against you in any way.
			2. S. Lamb: In the last go-round we did say “all information.” All information was public information and available to administration to begin a process or not.
			3. R. Guell: It’s actually already part of the document. The import is redundant to R. Schneirov’s win from four years ago.
			4. S. Lamb: Where is this R. Schneirov statement contained in the document?
			5. C. MacDonald: Paragraph one. “The faculty performance evaluation model is not a substitute for existing faculty dismissal processes.”
			6. S. Lamb: We did get that sentiment changed. I to recall the discussion that information is information and if it’s available it can be used in a decision-making process.
			7. R. Guell: I don’t need to ask whether administration opposes this.
		3. C. MacDonald: Page two, under Evaluation of Faculty with Administrative Assignments—this is the original agenda item vii.: FAC has suggested an amendment as a third bullet that would *read “Any faculty member with an administrative assignment that accounted for 75% or more of her/his assignment during one academic year or longer of the biennial period under review will be excluded from participation in the biennial evaluation for that period.”* Vote: 0-9-0.
			1. R. Guell: There is one faculty member who would fit into this for their first semester. They had one class second semester. They considered their assignment to be something else to build up the department—to deal with curriculum and a whole host of other things. Should they have been in the pool considered for review? There is another faculty member who would fit into this also. She has sent a comment on this and I think it would be apropos to include it.
			2. C. MacDonald: (Reading faculty member’s emailed concern): It seems inappropriate for a portion of faculty to be systematically excluded from the evaluation process. To do so violates the original mission of BFR process that called for all employees to be formally evaluated. I understand that there is a proposal being considered for department chairpersons to be evaluated, however, not all individuals affected by the aforementioned exclusion are department chairpersons. Work done by faculty members that advances the mission of the university should be appropriately considered and lauded in the BFR process. Work done by faculty that diminishes the mission of the institution should have a formal way of being recognized and remediated. Secondly, the ‘increase of salary pool’ noted in the BFR process is created to fund the potential salary adjustments. It appears to be gathered on the whole. The aforementioned exclusion, if accepted, would limit its potential distribution to only a selected portion. This is simply unfair. If this exclusion is supported, and I hope it is NOT, a separate evaluation process with the potential for lauds, remediation and salary adjustment would be warranted for those excluded.
			3. L. Eberman: No. We did a substantial evaluation of the review. The general impression was that the inclusion of faculty fellows in the process that have 75% or more of their contribution outside the department were being recognized for services unrelated to teaching. That was the general impression from the data. Speaking to FAC’s concerns, the discussion was about trying to respond to the faculty’s voice about the biennial review process.
			4. D. Bradley: I’d rather go back and say I think what we need is a set of criteria for review of that administrator’s job performance and put some substance in that process. Deal with the real issue.
			5. L. Eberman: Some cases are very unusual. I can also see the other side where we put emphasis on teaching. I can see both sides.
			6. D. Bradley: I would be fine with saying we would set up a separate process for those people to decide whether they were exceeding or not. We want to avoid person-specific policies.
			7. R. Guell: My own look at the list of 44 was that chairs were underrepresented, not overrepresented.
			8. L. Eberman: The perception of the faculty is alternate. They shared that it wasn’t accurate.
			9. C. Olsen: How do you calculate 75% or more? We don’t do workload reports anymore.
			10. R. Guell: 75% in either year.
			11. C. Olsen: It’s just a self-designation as far as I can tell.
		4. C. MacDonald: This was offered by C. Olsen. On page five in section 1c: Change *“has evaluations\* somewhat to well below those of departmental colleagues, or generally provides a marginally appropriate to inappropriate environment to facilitate learning”* to *“has evaluations\* well below those of departmental colleagues, or generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning.”* Vote: 9-0-0
			1. S. Lamb: Why?
			2. C. Olsen: I don’t want to rehash all my objections. I think the language is problematic. We have different documents, different evaluations. What is a marginally appropriate environment for learning? I think the word “inappropriate” would be better.
			3. R. Guell: “or generally provides an inappropriate environment to facilitate learning?”
			4. C. Olsen: “has an evaluation well below those of typical colleagues.”
			5. C. MacDonald: That fuzzy language came from when we were trying to raise the bar.
			6. K. Yousif: I wanted teaching evaluations as part of that, although they have lots of problems.
			7. R. Guell: Evaluation will stay. This document always was evaluations—not student evaluations—purposely allowing departments to weigh what students and departmental colleagues said. All we are doing is de-fuzzying the language. It does re-lower the bar on what bad teaching is.
			8. D. Bradley: I don’t see that.
			9. R. Guell: The intent of inserted additions eight versions ago was to raise the bar.
			10. E. Hampton: In terms of the somewhat to well below, how is “well” operationalized? Are we just talking about below?
			11. R. Guell: There is a massive difference between well below and just below. My colleagues cluster closely on evaluations, and we have had, at times, people that were not in the cluster. They are typically in the median.
			12. D. Bradley: The question is are we trying to protect the individual from the big bad colleagues, or are we saying if someone’s below…
			13. R. Guell: If you’re below the cluster you qualify as below expectations.
			14. V. Sheets: Someone had to mathematically be below average but not well below average. There is always a median.
			15. C. MacDonald: “Has evaluations well below those of typical colleagues?”
			16. J. Maynard: It reaffirms that what we’re looking at are SIRs if all you’re going to is a number.
			17. C. MacDonald: It reflects any kind of evaluation.
			18. S. Lamb: What about meaningfully or significantly below?
		5. C. MacDonald: Page 6, section 3a: *Change “A faculty member consistently participates in service activities within the profession, discipline, University, college, and /or department, making a meaningful positive difference for colleagues as a result of that service”* to *“A faculty member consistently participates in service activities within the profession, discipline, community, University, college, and/or department, making a positive difference for colleagues as a result of that service.”* Submitted by C. Olsen. Vote: 9-0-0
			1. K. Bolinger: There are ways to be of service that do not influence colleagues. Stuff I do that doesn’t affect the college but promotes the University.
			2. C. MacDonald: I would read “colleagues” wider than that.
			3. R. Guell: Can we strike the word “meaningful?” Vote 8-1-0
			4. K. Bolinger: If we delete that could we add community service as a way of being recognized?
			5. R. Guell: I will go ahead and accept that. Are we able to recommend the addition of community between discipline and University?”
		6. C. MacDonald: Page 7, in Compensation Adjustments: Replace the last sentence with: “These awards will be made as one-time stipends.” Offered by C. Olsen, C. Ball, K. Bolinger, and D. Hantzis. Vote 3-6-0
			1. R. Guell: I have heard it not as a FAC amendment, though it was part of FAC’s original recommendation.
			2. L. Eberman: It was clear in responses we received from faculty. Contributing to base pay was a reward that was in perpetuity and that seemed to be an issue for some faculty.
			3. S. Lamb: Not to provide a mechanism for the base salary of our exceptional performers to increase is ludicrous. If others can make the case that they are as productive as the top performers, there have always been mechanisms present to adjust salaries. Also denying a colleague a salary adjustment just because one did not come your way this period is insane. You lose the opportunity for future base salary adjustments yourself. Do we enjoy shooting ourselves in the foot?
			4. C. MacDonald: I believe C. Olsen made a compelling argument in our email discussion of the topic. At the same time, I know D. Bradley has said that changing these awards to stipends won’t happen this time around.
			5. K. Yousif: I don’t support it. I have always supported base salary. I agree with V. Sheets and D. Bradley. A system of rewards is convincing. I am against making things like the Caleb Mills base pay.
			6. R. Guell: I do believe that there are very few major awards that have been unjustly given. By and large the best teachers on this campus have received those awards and very few mediocre ones have received the Mills, Dreiser, and Service awards. However, on the table is base versus stipend.
			7. K. Bolinger: You can only support S. Lamb’s opinion if there’s not a limit. Only recognizing a fraction of those people in any two years.
		7. Added sentence: “FAC will, by March 1, 2015, recommend consequences associated with the failure to submit a biennial review document; it will define an improvement plan and specify its components; establish an approval process for an improvement plan; and specify consequences associated with the failure to produce one.”
			1. R. Guell: We have heard over the last two weeks, though it has since been resolved, a faculty member had refused to produce an improvement plan. The plan submitted in that refuser’s case was not statistically different than the plans submitted by others, and as a result it is a problem of refusal to either participate in the process or a refusal to produce a genuine improvement plan. I believe the plan put forward was following the pattern of previous improvement plans that had no structure. I would simply like to add that we will be charging FAC with defining obstinance as it regards this process and improvement plans.
			2. A. Anderson: You have the first and last parts saying the same thing, just slightly different. Can it be pulled together?
			3. R. Guell: One if for the biennial review, one is for the improvement plan.
			4. A. Anderson: It didn’t read easily.
			5. R. Guell: I will present it to FAC as separate components.
			6. K. Bolinger: Is this a separate charge? It looks like we will put it in the document.
			7. R. Guell: As the last paragraph.
			8. K. Bolinger: I think we should send this as a charge to FAC.
			9. R. Guell: Then I think on Thursday I will include a brief statement about the necessity of the charge going to FAC.
		8. R. Guell: One more that came in late: From L. Borrero in NHHS: Page 5 under Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creativity, and Service, Line 1—Change *“…shall focus on quality of the effort and the results of that effort”* *to “…shall focus on the quality of the work and the results of that work in each domain.”* Vote: 9-0-0
			1. D. Bradley: Work as a product rather than an effort?
			2. L. Eberman: We wouldn’t grade our students on effort.
			3. E. Hampton: It does imply a product in the first.
7. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion (continued)
	1. C. Olsen: I sent around questions about teaching evaluations. Pre-tenured are going to have evaluations they’ve never seen. Departments that have their own should just use their own and not be asked to use the unapproved university-wide. There’s no good way around this.
		1. S. Lamb: Do they have to, particularly?
		2. R. Guell: My counter to your idea is that you’re not clairvoyant enough to know what the questions will be. The data on testing will help us evaluate them. I would not suggest discouraging your students from answering the university-wide questions.
		3. D. Bradley: We are happy to say the only negative consequences of not doing it is not doing it. Everyone is required, but it will be used as a trial.
		4. C. Olsen: I think we need to be explicit with pre-tenure, especially those who have conditional reappointments. We are stuck for right now. We have to be clear that we will be careful.
		5. R. Guell: It is my hope that SAC and FAC will produce questions that ask students things they know something about.
		6. J. Maynard: We need to do this and collect the data. We also need to give pre-tenure guidance on their progress. You need to be advising young faculty. You may have concerns with their teaching.
		7. E. Hampton: A couple of faculty participated in a group deciding on some questions. What happened after we chose those?
		8. R. Guell: They will be used university-wide this fall. Departments need to get their questions to S. Powers ASAP this fall.
		9. E. Hampton: Your concern is that it won’t be very good?
		10. R. Guell: I don’t have a concern at this point, though it would be well-intentioned. We will be running blind until we can validity-test them.
		11. C. Olsen: That is my concern. We don’t need the fall to give us more data. We theoretically have the data.
		12. V. Sheets: Departments can add ours this fall.
	2. R. Guell: I would like to express my frustration…this thing (gestures to laptop) was meant to travel. It was not meant to sit in a dock station. It would be safe if it never left my office but it’s not meant to do that.
		1. D. Bradley: First we have to protect the network and protect university-identifiable data and secondarily to protect your laptop. If L. Spence can convince me that we can protect data, then if you want to take the chance…
		2. R. Guell: I think the number one goal of having this thing is to use it to help students learn, just like the number one goal of a ship in the Navy. The safest place for a ship is in port. Having your entire Navy in port doesn’t win. We need to make sure our network is secure. That’s the second thing. The number one is to use the devices for students.
	3. C. MacDonald: Please tell us about faculty searches soon.
		1. D. Bradley: During the remainder of this week J. Maynard and I can have a conversation.
8. Adjournment 4:55pm