INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**Executive Committee**

October 7, 2014

**Minutes**

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

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

Guests: D. Hantzis, D. Israel, J. Murray, S. Powers, L. Rosenhein

1. Administrative Reports:
	1. D. Bradley:
		1. This week is Homecoming week. The Trustees will be on campus Thursday and Friday. There are lots of events planned.
		2. Congratulations to you and thank you all for your efforts concerning the Biennial Review, especially R. Guell.
		3. We are continuing to work with the Legislature and others on the budget but it’s a long slog and there is no recent progress.
	2. J. Maynard: No Report.
2. Chair Report: R. Guell
	1. R. Guell: We have been asked by the Provost to give names for the Scott College of Business Dean review as well as the University College Dean review. I am suggesting that we name E. Glendening of Chemistry and Physics for the SCOB and H. Ganapathy-Coleman of CDCSEP for University College. We will need a quick endorsement.
	2. We have also been asked to provide a list of names for the Classrooms group. I sent some of you an email and a list of names that went to J. Maynard, and it was augmented. Names include: J. O’Keefe and B. Brubaker for Large Classes; K. Games, J. Harder, or F. Lattanzio for Heavy Technology Use/Dependence; E. Glendening, W. Ganis, or B. McLaren for Large/Special/Traditional/Lab Needs; and I. Land and L. Phillips for Traditional. That list is in J. Maynard’s hands and he will pick from that list unless you would like to add to it.
	3. I will be asking at the end of the Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion about personal property and how it is treated at the Library. As we understand it, if you put personal property, including a copy of your own text, there is a truly nominal cost to students for stealing it—much less than the cost of the text itself. The Board of Trustees has a limit on that particular fee. I will ask for change.
	4. We will also have a very brief Executive Session at the end of the meeting today to discuss a potential matter.
3. Approval of the Minutes of September 30, 2014: A. Anderson, E. Hampton. Vote: 9-0-0
4. Report from CAAC on Long Programs: L. Rosenhein, S. Powers
	1. R. Guell: When we received the charge to the Senate, S. Lamb and I were in our year of “forced exile” from the Senate, and we joined CAAC. It was CAAC that set the principles of a darned near impossible task at the request of the Board of Trustees and the President. Over the last 14 months, CAAC has had to deal with what we set the table for. This report, I will say, I leaned as hard on L. Rosenhein and D. Malooley on this to avoid what I thought was a disaster in the making. The President and the Board of Trustees have been very clear that they want only the bare minimum of programs to exceed the 71 credit/6 semester rules and I believe that CAAC, in this report, has done a most conscientious job—and a thorough job, even if the President is not comfortable in saying this is as good as the faculty can do on this process. I thank L. Rosenhein’s leadership for making that happen.
		1. L. Rosenhein: You have a long document there. Do you have any questions about it?
		2. D. Bradley: I will say I support L. Rosenhein and his efforts in getting people to look at this seriously. It is an annoying and difficult task. I particularly question the programs that say it’s not possible to obtain this degree without eight semesters of sequenced courses. I have a hard time with eight semesters.
		3. L. Rosenhein: In the case of two programs, they are in the process of becoming Masters programs. There won’t be much point into trying to force them in to smaller numbers when they are going in another direction.
		4. D. Bradley: I assume there is one path in Chemistry that doesn’t require eight semesters.
		5. S. Powers: All but one path requires less than eight.
		6. D. Bradley: You look at Nursing—you can get an RN in two semesters, three semesters, four semesters. To say there is no other way than lockstep eight semesters is a really difficult concept.
		7. S. Powers: In the case of Nursing they did trim it back at one point. A year and a half ago they put a proposal through to cut the number of courses and it passed, and the state board came back and said they can’t cut those courses. They have a number of students who are high-achieving and get through it easily in six semesters. They have a lot of students who struggle and can’t make it.
		8. D. Bradley: Music Business is eight semesters from the day you walk in the door.
		9. L. Rosenhein: Because they had the program within the Music program they had to meet the accreditation standards. I’m told there is a plan to transition into an Arts Management major which will be separate from Music.
		10. S. Powers: There is great interest in transitioning that into another accrediting body. It’s a far better fit.
		11. J. Maynard: The way they have chosen to be accredited has locked them into it. Are there other options that would be more economical? If they come forward with it they could join a general management track. I’m not sure you will get support from faculty to do that.
		12. D. Bradley: We just approved a Doctorate in Athletic Training because a Bachelors will no longer be considered a professional degree.
		13. L. Rosenhein: There won’t be a clinical concentration?
		14. J. Maynard: This track is a clinical track and the other is under 60 hours.
		15. R. Guell: My understanding of the timeline was that we needed to figure out who would get exempted and who would need to trim. We didn’t need to have all the programs under the line at this point but needed to have decided who was exempt and the reasons for that. We needed to acknowledge that they were changing accrediting bodies and the paperwork would follow.
		16. D. Bradley: I don’t disagree. I would suggest in presenting it to the Board that it indicate where each program started and where it is now. If very few programs changed as a result of this, it won’t be looked at favorably.
		17. L. Rosenhein: I tried to do that with the table because that’s what the Board of Trustees asked for. The columns indicate where the program started. I should correct what I said before. AMR is six semesters but they are planning to reduce credit hours. Programs are in three categories: over 71 credit hours and over 6 semesters; over 71 credits that could be done in 6 semesters; and those under 71 credits.
		18. K. Bolinger: In the second row, does that mean these are allowed to exclude junior composition and integrated electives in favor of overlapping courses?
		19. L. Rosenhein: Anybody can do that.
		20. S. Powers: There is a charge CAAC worked from. The hope is the student will have decided on a major by junior year.
		21. K. Bolinger: I was wondering why you were doing that.
		22. D. Bradley: Can we get this in a final form for the Trustees? It would be useful. They need to see how much of the Foundational Studies courses are directed.
		23. L. Rosenhein: In the middle column, Geosciences started out over hours but they will send a proposal to reduce it to 71. The same with AMR. Aviation Management is a special case. They were potentially over because students had to have a minor, and it could have taken them over 71, but they agreed to limit the choice of minors. They were minors the students tended to choose anyway.
		24. V. Sheets: You didn’t worry about Interior Design and Dietetics because they would become Masters level. If that happens, we will no longer offer Baccalaureate degrees in these subjects?
		25. S. Powers: There are only four undergraduate programs in the country in Dietetics that allow you to sit for the Registered Dieticians Exam because they need 1200 hours practicum. To cram all that into an undergraduate degree is difficult. They are looking at a combined Bachelor’s/Master’s program. The Interior Design is not looking at switching to a Master’s degree, but NASAD targeted this program. The accreditors who came in said Interior Design is in an in-between state and is trying to be a BFA program. The Department of the Built Environment is looking at moving it to a BFA program.
		26. K. Yousif: With a BFA, are they maintaining the requirements? Are they adding 1200 hours practicum to the language?
		27. S. Powers: It’s a Bachelor of Fine Arts. The other thing was, a BA in Fine Art was too big. Art Education also needs trimmed.
		28. L. Rosenhein: Independent of that answer, they also said Interior Design required a number of studio courses for six semesters and with prerequisites before the studio courses could begin. They claim there wasn’t any other way to do it. In the case of Dietetics I looked at the eight-semester map and I spend hours connecting courses by prerequisites and there was just no way to change it.
		29. D. Bradley: Without changing the prerequisites? I am concerned that some programs may be overstating the prerequisites.
		30. L. Rosenhein: I took their word.
		31. D. Bradley: That is my concern. My gut is that some of these programs have overstated their prerequisites for various reasons.
		32. R. Guell: While I respect your gut, I respect the primary authority of faculty on curricular matters. We have squeezed out all of the cuts that are possible through this process. We have generated result that you wanted, and I hope and expect that with work of this quality that you are willing to accept that this will be as good as it’s going to be and that we don’t resort to another process that will not respect the authority of the faculty concerning the curriculum.
		33. D. Bradley: You misunderstand what I said.
		34. R. Guell: I think I understand, and I don’t want to be contentious. I think there is a high likelihood that if you got to the learning objective level, you could regroup the curriculum and the prerequisites in a way that would shrink the total number of credit hours of the length of the program—this came as close to the outcome that we both want as could have been developed.
		35. L. Rosenhein: In acknowledgement of your point, CAAC did what it could. It’s mainly a review body and not an enforcement agency. We don’t have the expertise to deeply analyze everyone’s program. If it is necessary to go further there should be some program of external reviews that is done with more insight.
		36. D. Bradley: I fully understand. It’s hard for anyone outside the program to do anything, particularly if others don’t want to cooperate.
		37. R. Guell: I was in the room for several of those conversations and I felt the heat coming out of the room during several others. CAAC took a lot of body blows on a policy they were not happy to enforce and got several programs to reduce what they were.
		38. D. Bradley: Clearly there were significant gains, and we appreciate those efforts.
		39. S. Powers: With one or two colleges in particular, an external curricular expert should come in to work with faculty to help reimagining the curriculum. I think they are struggling on how to divorce themselves from existing courses they are very close to. Our people don’t have the moxie to help them separate. In the College of Technology, based on conversations, they can see change.
		40. K. Bolinger: People get invested in curriculum they built. To get someone to review it and say can we do all these things in just one course—it becomes a defensive posture. It is well-intentioned but I think there is an investment on the part of the faculty to protect what is there.
		41. K. Yousif: I thought the last paragraph was really helpful in suggesting we need outside assistance.
		42. L. Rosenhein: Many of us had the same idea independently.
		43. D. Bradley: Departments almost routinely, when accredited and hear them say “do something,” invent a new course. ABET says you can finish their program in three years. There are 20-25 Foundational Studies credits in that. There is fear, and reluctance. I thank you for doing all this and we will definitely take this under advisement.
		44. L. Rosenhein: One more point—we look at what other programs in similar institutions are doing, and comparatively we do very well.
		45. S. Lamb: I was consistent throughout the report. We had generally less credit hours than our peers.
		46. J. Maynard: Those programs that had proposed curricular changes—is there a time frame for them?
		47. L. Rosenhein: There was not.
		48. S. Powers: It had to be in place by next fall. You followed up with programs that told us they were going to put up a revision last spring. CAAC has stayed on top of pushing those through. The three-year plans were collected. Those will be added to MySam.
5. Handbook Change Suggestions from Taskforce for Transmission to SubTaskforces
	1. FAC and SAC Report
		1. R. Guell: The purpose today is not to go line by line and closely question. This is not headed to the Senate for immediate action. This summer the mini taskforces were created and the job of FAC was to do an initial review of the job the Departmental Success Taskforce had done. If you notice what the Departmental Success Taskforce did, there was a significant reorganization that took place as well as additional elements that were inserted. What we’re to do is to hear from FAC and their review of the overall direction to give FAC feedback as well as the Taskforce feedback on the degree to which the significant overhaul of this is on or off the rails.
		2. D. Hantzis: We had two deliberation meetings before we crafted our response. V. Sheets told us we could go further in our response. In some cases we made some very specific suggestions. We had robust discussions at both meetings. About these recommendations—I think they are clear.
		3. R. Guell: I have a couple of questions. One is related to the note about the insertion of a section on the chair’s responsibility regarding faculty mentoring and orientation on page eleven. Is that a taskforce suggestion that was brought to FAC, or was that FAC’s suggestion?
		4. D. Hantzis: We were supposed to comment on direction about mandatory mentorship. I’m sure we’d be thrilled to write it, but there are so many other committees.
		5. V. Sheets: As D. Hantzis suggested, they went a little further because we had heard from one of the sub taskforces that they hadn’t suggested anything of import. The other made suggestions that were primarily to add duties to the responsibilities section. We are anticipating that before we bring it back.
		6. R. Guell: What will happen is that our commentary will go to the taskforce, and they will bring their material back. FAC will see it before we see it again. The other commend I’m sure you won’t be happy with is on page 19, section 350.3, the sub bullets. Everyone was okay with the existing language except it was changed last year by Senate to strike the word “tenure-track” and insert “regular.” Was it a purposeful omission of the taskforce?
		7. C. MacDonald: It was not intentional.
		8. R. Guell: I understand it was pulled from the online version of the Handbook. It was in the March or April 2014 meeting we changed the wording.
		9. D. Hantzis: The Handbook is inaccurate in several places.
		10. R. Guell: The taskforce needs to pay attention to the language.
		11. D. Hantzis: We have brought it up before at FAC meetings—the online version of the Handbook versus what we believe should have changed.
		12. R. Guell: I understand the concern, and there needs to be a process for Senate verification once M. Sacopulos is done with her work.
		13. S. Lamb: Things go through, but they’re at the administrative office. They may not have been sent forward by the Board of Trustees and may not have gone through. Things the Senate have approved, that have been sent forward, at times take several months.
		14. D. Bradley: I want to know what it means in section 350.1 “based on the formal recommendation of the regular faculty of the department.”
		15. K. Yousif: Don’t departments normally vote?
		16. S. Lamb: It’s well specified what that means. The recommendation goes forward. The individuals are ranked. The dean doesn’t have to choose the first or second ranking.
		17. D. Bradley: The opinion of the faculty must be included in what is sent forward? That should be clearer. That is what we need to say. Some would read it to say that the President and the Provost don’t have any choice.
		18. V. Sheets: Just “including?” I can see D. Bradley reading it as it can be taken to imply that the President and the Provost have no choice. We give a list of acceptable candidates, but the expectation…the interpretation that I heard though is different.
		19. D. Bradley: I would like to see a clearer statement. A separate sentence.
		20. V. Sheets: It may be taken care of in the section on hiring the chair.
		21. D. Bradley: Brevity is good but clarity is better.
		22. D. Hantzis: “The regular faculty” is a different body than “the faculty.” There may be another recommendation from the full faculty of the department.
		23. J. Maynard: 350.2.1 under Leadership—I have no problem with it but there is something not written there. It doesn’t talk about the responsibilities of the chair to advance the general goals of the university.
		24. S. Lamb: It is in here.
		25. C. MacDonald: It’s not all-inclusive.
		26. V. Sheets: It doesn’t include all the material from the taskforce.
		27. S. Lamb: I do know that it is here, however. There is that expectation.
		28. R. Guell: Are you prepared to talk about the others today? If you don’t mind I’d like to push those to another Exec meeting.
		29. D. Hantzis: We have a new working model for the definition but not the rest.
		30. R. Guell: The other document we will take up at the next Exec meeting.
		31. S. Lamb: We have to recognize the work done by the Departmental Success Taskforce and by FAC. As you read through everyone’s recommendations have much thought in them.
		32. R. Guell: We owe the taskforce a lot as well as FAC and D. Hantzis in terms of her leadership corralling this massive document.
6. For Passage on to Senate
	1. Department of Multidisciplinary Studies in the College of Arts & Sciences: J. Murray, D. Israel. S. Lamb, K. Yousif. Vote: 9-0-0
		1. J. Murray: What we have is a proposal to the almost culmination of a long process to create a new academic department. You have all the paperwork in front of you. Its purpose is to embed a current unit from Arts & Sciences called Interdisciplinary Studies that holds academic programs in International Studies, Women’s Studies (soon to be Gender Studies), and Multidisciplinary Studies along with the Department of Philosophy, which for a long period of time has had a small number of people in it and cannot be sustained as an academic department. In part, as a solution, the three Philosophy faculty will be included with the faculty from Sociology. This will give Philosophy a department and allow Sociology a chance to grow. More importantly to allow Interdisciplinary Studies and Multidisciplinary Studies to exist here at ISU. We have gotten to this point through lots of conversations and lots of faculty involvement. L. Brown chaired a work group last year to create the proposal in front of you. The proposal was reviewed by all constituency groups to be a part of the department along the way and they voted on it. Last summer, in anticipation of moving this forward, another work group came together to think about some preliminary bylaws and think about how to run the department, and have it voted on by department faculty. D. Israel represents the Interim Chair of Philosophy and the Director of Interdisciplinary Programs.
		2. K. Bolinger: Do you see it beginning Fall of 2015? It seems like a good place to house General Studies as well.
		3. J. Murray: General Studies is a very different degree than Multidisciplinary Studies. In the latter, students thoughtfully think through and invent a major, pulling a number of disciplines together. They would have an advisor related to their major. General Studies is a degree completion program, which is very different.
		4. R. Guell: To say this was not unanimous at the college level would be understating it. The vote was 8-6, and I was there at several meetings where it received tepid support and vocal opposition. I would describe myself as a realist and see the need of a home for Philosophy to be legitimate. To be next to Sociology for a number of years—I understand why they lost departmental status, and why this is a better answer. I understand this, and I would describe myself as an unenthusiastic, realistic supporter, but I would really like a reason to be more enthusiastic than that. I have followed this a long time and I don’t have that enthusiasm.
		5. D. Israel: I’d be happy to speak to that. I think, yes, this does answer practicalities, but I think knowing that all of the programs ended up supporting this—that wasn’t an easy process. There were many compromises. I think that process ended up being a very good one. The working group L. Brown had the year before and the last academic year coming back with proposals to each of our programs and going through that process had a good result. To step back, Interdisciplinary Studies includes Multidisciplinary and Women’s Studies. Multidisciplinary Studies already has a major and a minor that can be designed on your own. Even faculty have been designing their own; Genomic Advocacy is a great example. Interdisciplinary Studies has been in existence since January 2010, and it hasn’t been easy, but it’s been a great learning experience. I am a member of Interdisciplinary Studies and Women’s Studies faculty, and we were able to work together and see the possibilities with students who have a Gender Studies major and we are starting to see the steps of what we hope this will become. What people started to realize is that we might be less invisible if we had departmental status. As a unit, we fall off the radar. We don’t always want the same level of scrutiny but being invisible is not great either. The three programs, working together, have come a long way. Sociology and Philosophy have been accepting of this in a much more enthusiastic way than was expected. I’m very hopeful it will lead to very positive things. There are some economies of scale by simply having more people to do service work. There is no reason to be in the same unit to work across units. We all have faculty from across the university. Faculty are already working together. Having these two smaller programs within may give students more convenience. The Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, I have been told by others, is a great association; I was skeptical. It turned out to be really interesting from across so many disciplines. I saw the potential for having this be a way to invigorate the program. I am quite enthusiastic at this point. I should also say in 2015 that Women’s Studies will be called Gender Studies.
		6. D. Bradley: I think the idea of bringing this set of programs together makes some sense to me. Who will be in the department for promotion and tenure purposes? If it’s just Philosophy and Sociology people I worry because of past history regarding size. I’m supportive of the programs being together, but not so sure of the faculty for promotional purposes.
		7. D. Israel: One thing I do know is important is that in the past we have gotten bogged down into personal issues with particular faculty members. The individuals in the positions will change, and are already changing. There is a new faculty member in Sociology; she is very nice and one of the explicit charges for the search committee was interdisciplinary interests. Sociology has already committed to that. V. Sheets had a Psychology professor associated with Multidisciplinary Studies to be the chair of that committee. There’s also one three-year position in Women’s Studies so there are actually seven faculty members.
		8. D. Bradley: I will be harder to convince than R. Guell. If there were 14 I could be convinced.
		9. D. Israel: Plus there are 57 affiliated faculty.
		10. R. Guell: In promotion and tenure they wouldn’t have a role, would they?
		11. D. Israel: There would be some role for affiliated faculty in the department.
		12. S. Lamb: In the Scott College of Business I’m chair of a department that has three areas. Much of the destructive politics in individual areas was virtually eliminated by combining areas. We were six departments before; now we are three. The individual destructive politics that can exist when a single unit is in charge and there are power plays going on can be greatly reduced when you have representatives from each discipline on committees. What we saw that worked was that if we needed a faculty member from each discipline, the most reasonable individual was picked from each section. Power plays were not able to dominate.
		13. R. Guell: I would behave more enthusiastically if I could see an organizing principle other than just “how to deal with Sociology and Philosophy.” The Interdisciplinary program of what is about to be Gender Studies would fit well with African and African-American Studies, and its absence is conspicuous. Just as Philosophy and Sociology goes in for practical political reasons, African and African-American Studies is out for purely political reasons and that bothers me. Could you respond to that?
		14. J. Murray: There are a number of ways to go with this. We work with what we have. In some ways it is an inelegant solution but these are two disciplines that are pliable. I’m not answering that question as of yet. Sociology and Philosophy are there. We need a home for them. That is a given. It works in a multidisciplinary context very well. Our new hires are great examples of that. We will go forward with that in mind. That can be the beginning of how this department is run and what it is to be about. Who is to say African and African-American Studies won’t join us eventually? It has a home at the moment, and to pull the program away from a home where it is nested satisfactorily seems to be to insist that it move…but the folks involved are not wild about the idea. I think it is appropriate; I hope it is not a deal-breaker.
		15. K. Yousif: I think you have a superficial understanding of Multidisciplinary Studies. The faculty in these programs are already interdisciplinary in their interests.
		16. D. Bradley: We need to worry about junior faculty that are brought in and the culture in which they will exist. I would like to have considered some process that would ensure they are being mentored toward promotion and tenure.
		17. K. Bolinger: Why not involved affiliated faculty in promotion and tenure?
		18. D. Bradley: That’s my concern. We need to make sure they are nurtured and treated fairly and reasonably. I would suggest that needs to be a part of this.
		19. J. Murray: We have a faculty member that was brought into Philosophy. Her department created a custom committee of people who matched her scholarly interests. She was mentored. They looked in on her classes and commented on them.
		20. D. Bradley: If you have a process like this, let’s clone it and keep it up.
		21. D. Israel: She also has a commitment to teach in Women’s Studies every semester. So, her committee had a Women’s Studies faculty member on it. Similar things were done for African and African-American Studies as far as promotion and tenure. Women’s Studies actually had joint appointments. There were processes put in place at that time also. You had cooperation across disciplines. We are hoping this unit will go that way in the future. The working group over the summer have talked over these issues and have solved some of them. They were creative and also included making sure the candidate had someone submitted who was closely related to their discipline for the committee. I don’t know about Psychology but we were pretty open with candidates coming in and saying, “These are the principles, and we want you to succeed.”
		22. J. Maynard: I have the same concern. Working with a larger body of faculty makes sense to me. Your department has a history of following what’s written. Growing a body of people who think in a multidisciplinary manner is good. You should put a sentence or two in there that describes it. Right now you could end up with a personnel committee of just 3-4 people and no one else. Having representatives from other areas like Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary and Gender Studies is a good idea.
		23. D. Bradley: Or having a committee defined for each new hire.
		24. K. Yousif: The committee for the new hire will never change. They signed up for the entire period.
		25. K. Bolinger: Nothing in the language precludes them from tapping into the 57 affiliated faculty.
		26. D. Bradley: Trust, but verify.
		27. E. Hampton: In Appendix C, 6 and 7, “Personnel Committee,” I think there is that attempt already there.
		28. S. Lamb: It has been addressed somewhat.
		29. E. Hampton: That would be a clear indication that it should be adaptable.
		30. R. Guell: Are there any other avenues anyone wishes to explore?
		31. S. Lamb: It impresses me that it has been a long effort to solve some very difficult problems. There has been a lot of support from other than the Arts & Sciences Faculty Council. It is obvious that we can’t go with what has happened previously. They have worked hard to accomplish this.
		32. J. Maynard: J. Murray knows I’ve been supportive. Tell me how this group would grow. They always had great potential. How will it start to take ownership and grow? What is the vision?
		33. J. Murray: Once we cross the boundary of being a department and there is a chair that can represent and co-create with residential and affiliated faculty and start really talking about what multidisciplinary means, this program will host existing and create their own programs. We will be able to create blends of disciplines that we don’t have the energy for or mental space for now because we don’t have the structure for it will start to happen. It’s about the people. You can’t have it without that. When this gets approved and we get the right personnel in place changing them the plan for creating programs is doable at that point.
		34. R. Guell: I would like the administration to consider whether they wish it to be on the October Senate agenda or percolate given J. Maynard’s and D. Bradley’s concerns. My inclination is to go ahead unless you suggest otherwise.
7. Classroom Study Committee: Motion to Approve Slate: A. Anderson, V. Sheets. Vote: 9-0-0
8. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
	1. R. Guell: This is for the President and the Provost: with regard to the Library policy on personal property, if I have a text I am trying to make available to my students by putting it on reserve—a $160 personal copy—and it is stolen, they have essentially stolen $160 worth of property and their only consequence is a $5 fine.
		1. D. Bradley: What are the consequences concerning the theft of other materials?
		2. R. Guell: The cost of the materials. I would ask you to work with the Library and explore that because conscientious faculty were trying to deal with the cost of texts, and personal property is vanishing. A couple of colleagues removed their personal property from the Library.
		3. J. Maynard: I have talked to the Dean of the Library. She’s bringing a policy forward.
	2. R. Guell: Also, a freshman I had the occasion to talk to reported receiving an email from her advisor in University College, and it was essentially pushing freshmen off until late October for advising and planning. Is there a reason behind discouraging freshmen to talk about Spring planning?
		1. D. Bradley: I don’t know. I had lunch today with a freshman who said she already received her PIN.
		2. R. Guell: I will communicate with L. Maule.
		3. D. Bradley: It would seem you would be a masochist to do that, having all those freshmen descend upon you in late October.
	3. K. Yousif: I just wanted to ask about searches? I know you will probably say “not yet.”
		1. D. Bradley: I have all the information.
		2. J. Maynard: We are just trying to get together.
	4. D. Bradley: I wanted to make everyone aware the Provost Search Committee did have its initial meeting.
	5. S. Lamb: The Biennial Performance Review passed through the Senate and we need to receive administrative feedback as quickly as possible, and I wonder when that will occur.
		1. J. Maynard: Forward it to me and we will respond. The action taken last week was consistent with what we approved, so there should be no surprises.
9. Executive Session 4:51pm
10. Adjournment 5:10pm