

#7

Indiana State University

Faculty Senate, 2021-2022

February 24, 2022

3:30 p.m. via Zoom

Members present: S. Ahmad, A. Akgul, S. Anderson, A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Arrington-Slocum, S. Arvin, M. Badar, C. Ball, L. Brown, A. Czyzewski, C. Drew, L. Eberman, J. Frost, R. Guell, J. Gustafson, T. Hawkins, K. Hinton, D. Israel, A. Jay, B. Kilp, D. Knaebel, A. Kummerow, J. Liu, T. Nesser, R. Peters, M. Rivera, D. Selman, E. Southard, L. Walters, K. Yousif

Absent Members: J. Finnie, A. French, J. McKirahan

EX-Officio Present: President D. Curtis, Provost C. Olsen

Guests: M. Alesia, B. Balch, M. Bergbower, D. Bolk, K. Butwin, T. Exline, S. Gambill, N. Goswami, B. Haller, A. Hopple, T. London, S. Loughlin, C. MacDonald, S. Powers, R. Johnson, L. Mathers, W. Nesser, R. Noll, N. Rider, L. Sperry, J. Trainer, K. Wright, J. Wurtz,

1) Memorial Resolutions

Mr. Saul Rosenthal, presented by Jim Wurtz

SAUL ROSENTHAL
1929–2021
IN MEMORIAM

Saul Rosenthal earned a BA in drama and speech in 1949 from Catholic University of America and an MA in English, with a specialization in drama, in 1951 from George Washington University. After a subsequent year of study at American University, Rosenthal completed an MFA, with a concentration in drama, in 1957 from the University of Iowa.

Rosenthal's path to ISU was a varied one. Between 1954–1955, he taught as an Instructor at American University; between 1956–1959, he taught English at Howard County High School (Maryland); between 1959–1960, he taught as an Instructor at Florence State College (Alabama); between 1960–1962, he taught at Michigan College of Mining and Technology; and between 1962–1967, he taught as an Assistant Professor at Northern Illinois University. Rosenthal joined the ISU faculty as an Assistant Professor of English in 1967.

During his nineteen active years at ISU, Rosenthal regularly taught freshman writing and advanced expository writing, as well as introductions to general literature, poetry, and short fiction. Further, he taught Introduction to Poetry Writing, Advanced Poetry Writing, and Techniques of Poetry Writing. In the Department, Rosenthal served on the Always on Friday (lecture series), Creative Writing, Library, Prison Education, Staff Relations, and Teacher Education Committees. Additionally, he was a member of the American Association of University Professors, American Civil Liberties Union, American Educational Theatre Association, American National Theatre and Academy, American Teachers Association, Indiana College English Association, Modern Language Association, and National Education Association. Rosenthal's poetry appeared in *American Poetry*, *The Associator*, *Contemporary Education*, *Indiana English Journal*, and *Scholaria Satyrica*.

Rosenthal retired from ISU in 1993.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further expresses its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of English, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

Robert Perrin, Emeritus Chairperson and Professor of English on behalf of the Department of English

Dr. William Moates, presented by Alan Czyzewski

Memorial Resolution for Dr. William "Billy" Moates

Dr. William "Billy" Moates, Associate Professor of Management Information Systems, of Indiana State University passed away April 20, 2021. Billy received a Bachelor's Degree in Mathematics and Physics from Birmingham-Southern College. He then pursued graduate studies at the University of Alabama, receiving an M.A. in Business Statistics in 1971, an M.B.A. in 1973, and a Ph.D. in Management Science/Operations Management in 1981.

Arriving in 1987 at ISU, Billy taught in the administrative systems and business education department (now management, information systems and business education) while also serving as MBA Coordinator from 1987 to 2010. He had given loyal and devoted service to Indiana State University for 23 years, before retiring in 2010. Billy was an avid golfer and took part in many of the golf tournaments including the Insurance and Risk Management Golf Scrambles. During his tenure, Billy gained the respect of students and colleagues who knew him as a scholar, teacher and friend.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to Dr. Moates' family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Billy gave to his students, the faculty, the university, and the community.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

Dr. Norman Bucher, presented by Alan Czyzewski

Memorial Resolution for Dr. Norman J. Bucher

Dr. Norman J. Bucher, Professor of Management and Finance, of Indiana State University passed away March 9, 2021. Norman received his bachelor's, master's degrees and, in 1967, his Ph.D. in finance and marketing from St. Louis University.

Arriving at Indiana State, in 1982 Norman taught in the Department of Management and Finance while also serving as Chair (1987) and Director of the ISU's master's in business program (1989). He had given loyal and devoted service to Indiana State University for 10 years, before leaving, in 1992, to become the associate dean of Roosevelt University's Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration. During his tenure, Norman gained the respect of students and colleagues who knew him as a scholar, teacher and friend. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University expresses to Dr. Bucher's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication that Norman gave to his students, the faculty, the university, and the community. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

Dr. Eric Hampton, presented by Chris MacDonald

In Memoriam

Dr. Eric M. Hampton

Dr. Eric M. Hampton was born on January 31, 1970 in Upland, California to Mary and Paul Hampton and passed away on January 24, 2022 at the age of 51, after more than a two-year battle with glioblastoma. Dr. Hampton earned his B.S. in Psychology from Weber State University in 1993. He earned his M.Ed. in Counseling Psychology in 1996, and his Ph.D. in Educational Psychology in 1999 from Washington State University. He came to Indiana State University as an Assistant Professor in 2002, was promoted to Associate Professor and tenured in 2008 and was promoted to Professor in 2015. Dr. Hampton's excellence in teaching was recognized by ISU in the spring of 2021 when he received the Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award, one of the top honors at this institution. Dr. Hampton was widely respected as a terrific colleague; he was thoughtful and engaged in every aspect of his work, as well as serving as a role model of lifelong learning. As just one example, he completed the Master Teacher Program in May 2020 during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. He was highly valued for his versatile and broad teaching abilities. One example of his versatility is that he not only taught all of the statistics and research methods courses offered by the department, he has applied those same skills to his work with students as well as to serving the university and the community. In addition to teaching, Dr. Hampton has served as a mentor relative to scholarship in terms of his work with doctoral students and his expertise in assessment. He chaired 14

student dissertations and served as a member of another 58 doctoral committees for students, in every department within the college, as well as for those as far afield as Earth and Environmental Systems and Nursing. He was awarded the Dr. Nancy J. Smith Professional Award for Teaching and Mentoring in 2015. Additionally, Dr. Hampton has shared his expertise through his work on assessment at the college level and the university levels. He has worked on external grants worth more than \$3,000,000 in collaboration with faculty across the college. He served as a research consultant to students and faculty, notably through the Office of Educational Research and Evaluation, as well as to community groups. Dr. Hampton's research was often collaborative in nature and he published and presented with both students and faculty.

He could be counted on for leadership in service as well, especially with regard to faculty governance. Dr. Hampton served eight years on the University Faculty Senate, including two years as a member of the Executive Committee; 13 years on the Teacher Education Committee, including nine years as an officer. Additionally he served on the Graduate Council for four years, including one year as Secretary; two years on the Student Affairs Committee; and 6 1/2 years on the Bayh College of Education Congress, including 1 1/2 as Secretary.

Beyond all this, it was Dr. Hampton's positivity and humor that made him more than just a good colleague, but also a great friend. It was remarkable to witness how he dealt with terrible news with dignity and that sense of humor. It was devastating when Dr. Hampton was diagnosed with glioblastoma in November 2019. Yet, aside from the necessary time off due to surgery, Dr. Hampton has remained an active colleague and collaborator, even through his illness, up until January 2022.

Dr. Hampton met his wife, Denise Godfrey, in college, and they married and had three children: Elliana, who was born in 1999, Annelise in 2003, and Llewella in 2008. He loved teaching, the Lord of the Rings, Stephen King, Oingo Boingo, small dogs, long roads trips (especially to Disney World), and, of course, his family. It was an honor to know him, and he will be greatly missed by us all.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Dr. Hampton's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which Eric gave to his students, the Department of Applied Clinical and Educational Sciences, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

Prepared and presented by Dr. Christine D. MacDonald, Chair and Professor,
Department of Applied Clinical and Educational Sciences

2) **Chair Report: K. Yousif**

I am going to ask to for unanimous consent to reorder the agenda so that the administrative reports and fifteen-minute open discussion will be at the end. Both President Curtis and Provost Olsen have remarks to make and we want to provide ample time questions while respecting the items on today's agenda. If you agree we will move to staff council, temporary faculty, SGA reports then to minutes and final the agenda items. The president and provost will follow allowing ample time for open discussion. I would also note as with the discussion of the Leadership and Professional Development program at last month's meeting I expect critical discussion of the issues before us with the same collegiality and respect that senators have continually shown. Members of the ISU and Terre Haute communities along with others are present today. I will also remind you at the fifteen-minute discussion only senators have a speaking voice. I also ask you that you set aside rumors, innuendos, decontextualized numbers, and sensationalized headlines and listen to what the president and provost have to say. Most importantly I ask that you hear them. The enrollment challenges facing ISU are not new and they are not unique. Higher education in the United States is going through a paradigm shift and we must work collaboratively across departments, colleges, and units all over campus to creatively strengthen the university while continually prioritizing student success.

3) **Staff Council Report: M. Leek**

Our Staff Benefits committee has been working closely with Human Resources on identifying different ways to promote a better work life balance. They have also been in communication with the Student Recreation Center on how to get our staff more involved in their physical health. The committee has submitted a few proposals that have been forwarded to the Executive Committee for review. We hope to be able to discuss those at our next Executive Committee meeting at the beginning of March.

Our Staff Relations committee worked with Community Engagement on clarifications regarding our Community Service Leave that we are provided as staff. Following their meeting, they were able to provide a brief Q&A that clarified some of the staffs concerns in how to utilize this time and the process. This Q&A was featured in a newsletter that was sent out in the fall. The Staff Relations committee has also been working with Human Resources regarding the staff evaluations process. The committee has prepared a survey that will be disseminated within the next month, to the campus. We would appreciate any feedback from our staff.

Our Public Relations committee has been very busy with planning events to try to boost the morale for our staff. Some of which include the fan favorite, Lunchtime Bingo and an upcoming Easter Egg Hunt. The committee will also be doing two more fundraisers before the end of the academic year. They will be returning with the "Create-a-Bear" event that will allow families to stuff their own animals from the selection that will be provided. The other fundraiser that will happen prior to the end of the year will be the annual carnations sale for Administrative Professionals Day. The information for this sale will be going out in March. This is a small gesture that can be done to appreciate the hard work that our administrative staff do daily. The funds raised from these sales will go to our Staff Council Scholarship fund.

4) Temporary Faculty Advocate Report: C. Spicer

I would like to thank Provost Olsen for meeting with me at the beginning of the semester to speak with me about issues that temporary faculty are facing. I wanted it on record that that has been happening and that he has been working with me. I really appreciate that and I know that other temporary faculty will as well.

5) SGA Report: A. Nettrouer: No report

6) Approval of Minutes of (January 27, 2022)

Motion to approve A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Kummerow: 29-0-0

7) Informational Item: Diann McKee, Updated Retirement Policies

D. McKee: University policy 550: University Retirement has not been updated since 2010. A revision is long overdue. We did some language changes but didn't do a complete rewrite. We had three main changes.

First was that prior to 2010, faculty at age sixty could retire as long as they had twenty years of service. In 2010 we changed that to sixty-two. We are changing that back to sixty.

The second item we added was that faculty that are fifty-five can retire if they have thirty years of service.

The final items we added is faculty hired after 2005 can qualify for a health benefits bridge. Many that retire before the age of sixty-five find it difficult to find affordable health coverage or don't qualify for supplemental coverage. The Board of Trustees voted for this to become effective on March 1, 2022. Employees that are interested need to talk to Joey Newport or Margaret Welch.

R. Guell: I appreciate your attention on this. Where are the funds coming from?

D. McKee: VIBA funds. This is entirely permissible by the trust agreement and the IRS designation.

T. Hawkins: These are positive changes. I was wondering if there was faculty cooperation with this?

D. McKee: Yes. The Senate officers, FEBC, and Staff Council were involved.

K. Yousif: If you have further question you know how to reach out to Joey Newport or Margaret Welch. Thank you, Diann for coming.

8) Curriculum:

New Program: Certificate in History

<https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5314/form>

Motion to Approve J. Gustafson, A. Arrington-Sirois: 29-0-0

S. Stofferahn: Thanks for inviting me. This is a graduate Certificate in History. It is an eighteen-hour credential. It requires twelve credits at the 500 level, one three credit class of HIST 600 which is our methods course, and one three-credit class that is a reading seminar at the 600-level. The reason we perused this was to craft a credential for those who are seeking to become dual credit teachers at the high school level. They are required to have a master's degree in something plus eighteen credit hours in the area they desire to teach in. This is crafted to that particular population that might have a master's degree in education but want to teach in history. It requires no new resources.

We are want to have a goal for those students only looking for those eighteen credit hours. This helps us too because we have had some cases in the past where students will apply to the program seemingly to complete the master's program, then disappear after eighteen credit hours. This is sad for us as we don't know what happened to them and it is sad for them because they weren't getting any kind of credential. This solves those problems.

University Foundational Studies: Learning Outcomes and Category Learning Outcomes <https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:5747/form>

Motion to approve: A. Arrington-Sirois, A. Kummerow: 23-6-1

Motion to revise language: T. Hawkins, D. Selman: 5-22-2

N. Rider: I am here representing a proposal from University College about the change in learning objectives for Foundational Studies in four categories. The proposal has two parts. The first part is a revision in learning objectives in ethics and social responsibility in the social and behavioral science categories. The second part is revisions to four categories: social and behavioral science, ethics and social responsibility, global perspectives and cultural diversity, and historical perspectives.

The first part is based on revisions that are part of our annual assessment review. This review gave us an opportunity to refine language in the objectives or solve problems with our articulation of the objectives that have become evident through the assessment process.

The second part is a revision or addition of specific learning objectives that are related to diversity in all four categories as a response to the University's strategic plan and the advancing inclusive excellence plan. In each case it is important to note that the council convened sub-committees of faculty with disciplinary expertise and teaching experience in these categories and disciplines. They were charged with crafting learning objectives that could be taught by faculty teaching in these categories because the knowledge base to do so is part of each discipline. The specific language of the learning objective in most cases comes from these committees and utilizes a common language to those disciplines. The proposal does not have any implications in terms of funding. It is simply a change to four categories learning objectives in the foundational studies program.

T. Hawkins: Can you explain what is gained by adding the new language when the existing common learning objectives already ask students to us lens such as race, ethnicity, gender, social class, and so on to examine their own and other cultures? It seems to me that this is redundant.

N. Rider: No, the council did not feel those were redundant and there was a desire in the specifically to make sure that very specific portions included in the advancing inclusive excellence action plan were being addressed clearly and directly in the learning objectives.

T. Hawkins: When an instructor reads the common learning objectives and first reads that they are expected to have students examine one's own and global cultures through multiple lenses such as race, ethnicity, gender, social class, environment, economics, target language, and or other social characterizes and then drops down and see in addition to they are expected to have their students also analyze race as well as ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation or other applicable categories in equality

and inequality there wouldn't be any confusion? The instructor will recognize the first part is distinct from the third instruction?

N. Rider: No, I don't see that there is a problem with that.

T. Hawkins: When we are talking about the proposal language 'analyze through the lens of race as well as ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation or other applicable categories'. Can you explain the discussion to use phrases 'as well as' in the context of that list? Is it race 'as well as' one of the following?

N. Rider: Yes.

T. Hawkins: Is an instructor expected to analyze inequality *and* equality and what does it mean to do both?

N. Rider: The expectation in the 'and' is that an instructor has an opportunity to make decisions within the classroom environment and the context of the class that is being thought to provide information to students that make sense within that particular course and look at aspect we identify as equality and inequality. In each of the disciplines that we are referring to have disciplinary lenses that are used in those categories that would allow students to understand what structures provide equality and what structures don't within a cultural environment.

T. Hawkins: When the proposed language uses the term 'other applicable categories', what does that mean? What are other applicable categories?

N. Rider: We deliberately left that vague. You will notice that one of the things that happened was that we left the language that two disciplinary experts wanted to use within their discipline. Some examples are the use of intersectionality and it was very clear that the disciplinary experts that were helping us draft these learning objectives preferred to use that. We wanted to leave it as broad as we could so that faculty members would be able to apply what it is that we are looking for their specific courses and disciplines.

T. Hawkins: Do you not think that an instructor that reads that list of very clear subjects then comes to a very broad term might be confused as to what would be applicable and would be unsure whether or not their choice of what to add to the study of race would fit under applicable if there is no clarity?

N. Rider: We plan on spending a lot time working with faculty. There will be workshops to address changes that faculty will be participating in. That way, they will have practice making those decisions. We wanted to leave this broad enough that there was some leeway. If we created something very specific then there would have been a whole laundry list of items.

T. Hawkins: Is it conceivable that one discipline decides that something applies within "applicable" and another disagrees?

N. Rider: I imagine it is conceivable as we are all disciplinary experts, that we will have a lot of disagreements. Within the Foundational Studies program we give guidelines through our learning objectives. We now have an assessment plan in place that allows us to look at the program at large. We are not looking over their shoulders to see what is happening in the classroom nor should we be. If a faculty member can argue that they are meeting the learning objectives with what they are teaching, then so be it. Also what is important is the culture shift within the University College Council and the University at large. When we assess learning objectives we are assessing the products of the students.; meaning what assignment has the faculty member provided that show they are meeting their learning objectives. What we will be looking for is the assignments themselves. I

can see where there would be disagreements about how some interpret the learning objectives. We just saw that as we finished up our artifact assessment in the area of arts and lab sciences.

T. Hawkins: I have a couple questions about the historical studies language. Can you confirm for me what the language is of the proposal before us right now?

N. Rider: For historical perspectives?

J. Gustafson: There is a small discrepancy in the language that is in curriculog and what is in the proposal.

N. Rider: There is a typographical error in the document. What is in curriculog is correct. If you are referring to the typographical errors they have been corrected.

T. Hawkins: Your answer will probably be the same in regards to the question with inequality and equality. I also had a question as to the logic behind the parenthetical and the use of 'such as' followed by socioeconomic status, gender, etc, as opposed to a longer list of explicit subjects in the previous discussion. Why did the committees decide in this case that the list of items would be more truncated? Why is it socioeconomic status instead of class? Why not include sexual orientation and that kind of thing? The specificity of language here is important to me.

N. Rider: I appreciate that concern. One of the things that was very important to us was that the learning objectives were generated by those faculty members teaching in the discipline. While we in the council looked at making some changes, we wanted to be careful to keep the language that was appropriate to each discipline. We could have gone through and made parallel each category but we didn't want to do that. We didn't want them to be the same because we wanted the disciplines to be able to articulate it through the language they used as to what is appropriate. There was a desire within the council not to create long laundry lists but to be concerned with learning objectives that have to last a long time. In some cases we haven't revised learning objectives in ten years. The goal was something specific enough to give guidance to the right direction without being so specific we would hamstring ourselves in the future and be required to revise learning objectives every time someone had another idea.

T. Hawkins: So what you are saying is that there is some implied understanding of the term "intersectionality" and that anyone that understands it will understand what to do with that word and doesn't need as much guidance in category as they do in the GPCD?

N. Rider: Again our goal was not to think at that level but to rely on the guidance of the disciplinary experts that wrote the learning objectives. I don't think you can interpret that the council was trying to give one area more guidance than another.

T. Hawkins: Can you tell me what would be objectionable about this language instead? Use methodologies from the discipline of history to investigate inequality and equality with respect to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, or other applicable categories.

N. Rider: I will not change learning objectives that have been vetted by the disciplinary faculty, the council, CAAC, and the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate on the floor. I have to respect the processes that it has already been through. I do not have a personal problem with that but I have articulated why there are differences.

T. Hawkins: You do not believe that the Faculty Senate has a place in amending this language?

N. Rider: No. I do not.

T. Hawkins: What role does the Faculty Senate have in the process? To just simply approve or oppose? So it has no amendatory power?

N. Rider: I would like the Faculty Senate to respect the disciplinary experts that submitted the learning objectives, the University College Council's unanimous vote, CAAC, and the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate that the learning objective we put in front of you have been well vetted. Even though that on the floor of a committee one might like to make some changes, I don't think it makes sense to do that. I would prefer to have all faculty that have worked on this weigh in and I am not willing to take it back. I would respectfully ask you to vote yes or no.

T. Hawkins: Would you consider me a disciplinary expert?

N. Rider: Yes, I do. That doesn't mean that I can ask you as a single individual to revise a category that included an entire group of people.

K. Yousif: It did pass Senate Executive Committee.

T. Hawkins: I understand where we are at in the process. I am simply surprised at the opinion of a colleague, who I hold dear, who would argue that it is simply the job of the Faculty Senate to give a thumbs up or down on material that reaches the floor.

N. Rider: Members of the Faculty Senate have had this proposal in front of them for some time. You could have contacted me and we could have set something in motion, but once it is on the floor I am absolutely not comfortable making changes to the learning objectives.

T. Hawkins: Again I am hoping that it would be surprising to the rest of the senators that we exist simply to yea or nay material that reaches us at this point. I would like to put forth a motion, since the language was supported, to read 'use methodologies from the discipline of history to investigate inequality and equality with respect to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, or other applicable categories.'

K. Yousif: There are a few senators that have had their hands up for a while so I want to give them a chance to speak. I would like to say that I believe there is a distinction between the Senate's role and writing policy on the floor.

R. Guell: I have considerable sympathy for T. Hawkins' position that the Faculty Senate is not the rubber stamp of anyone with two choices. I also agree with what A. Rider is suggesting that editing it here is unwise. Absent a second on T. Hawkins' motion I will make my own to recommit it to the University College Council to consider if T. Hawkins' language is better than that which has been submitted.

L. Eberman: I wanted to support the UCC and the fact that there are several layers of review throughout this process and I appreciate the idea that the Senate is not a rubber stamp but at the same time I have to respect the level of review and the rigor that happens at the point of delivery for those that built and confirmed this language. I want everyone to remember that we have these layers of review on purpose.

T. Hawkins: My motion was not a denial of that, by any means. I have respect for the amount of time and effort that my colleagues have given over last eighteen months to this particular proposal. I understand that they are motivated by a desire to improve ISU and address very real educational needs. I have long expressed my support for the overall goals of this effort, but I do believe as a senator and not a member of the other committees, but as someone that will be teaching these courses I have the right to do more than give a yea or a nay to this proposal and that is what I am doing with my motion.

N. Rider: This is a single proposal not a proposal for each category and there are reasons why it was submitted as a single proposal. To stop the proposal here would stop the learning objective changes for all four categories and keep it from being implemented for Fall of 2022.

D. Israel: I was involved with the discussion with the social and behavioral science category. The language here is what was discussed by the group. We hashed it out and came up with something we thought would be workable for all of our very different disciplines that handle their discussions and treatment of these areas in very different ways. I felt it worked for Economics. I hope that it is in that spirit that we wouldn't kick certain disciplines out because of the way they handle these issues.

My actual question is to inquire if you are splitting the ethics and social responsibilities into two separate pathways.

T. Hawkins: Sorry, to interrupt you but this is getting into a different discussion and I have a motion on the floor and I have a right to know if that motion is going to go forward.

D. Israel: But it is about the whole thing right?

T. Hawkins: It is only specific to the language in historical perspectives.

K. Yousif: Your motion is to amend the language as you read?

T. Hawkins: Correct. Current language is 'Use methodologies from the discipline of history to investigate inequality and equality with regards to race and at least one other intersectionality "such as socioeconomic class, gender, and other applicable categories' to be changed to 'Use methodologies from the discipline of history to investigate inequality and equality with respect to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, or other applicable categories.'

A. Kummerow: Having witnessed trying to revise language to proposals on the floor, I do not see this as a positive place to be doing this. I do think that T. Hawkins' language is perfectly acceptable but it should go through UCC in its proper way and come through and revise the language in the next cycle.

B. Kilp: I thought that if T. Hawkins had changed his language that this would have to go back to the UCC.

T. Hawkins: No, I am asking that we pass this package as A. Rider requests with this language change included.

B. Kilp: So everything that comes to Senate is up for an amendment and not just a vote? There is nothing that we pass or fail that we don't have the right a choice to change, no matter where it come from?

T. Hawkins: That is correct. Whether we do it is up to question but we have the right.

K. Hinton: I worked on this as well other members of the Senate. We wanted race to be in the forefront but recognized that there were other issues and places that we see oppression that could intersect with ideas of race, so the parenthetical notion of other places of oppression left it open for the faculty that will be teaching those course. Students could also have a voice into the connection with other systems of oppression that we experience in our country. So to open it up to a grocery list of oppressions is unnecessary. We understand that race is at the pinnacle and everything else falls into it. We can remove racism if we can learn more about race and the ideas behind it then we can get to some of the other oppressions. That is how we got to this notion of diversity and inclusive excellence. Race became watered down and not discussed. So then when

the George Floyd incident happened we decided again that race is something we need to discuss. We see how it has damaged our country for centuries. So if we start adding all of these others, it would be hard to start with race. We need to discuss race plus these others. It seems to me that you have only removed the parentheses from this language. If faculty and students can come up with what needs to be discussed at that time it can be a living syllabus rather than having to cover all of those issues. That is how we were thinking about it.

L. Eberman: Dr. Hinton thank you for that context. I think it is important to think about how these concepts have evolved on our campus particularly over the last year and half to two years. I just want to say what I said before about trusting the process. There are representatives from each of these entities throughout the layers of review. Has much as I understand and appreciate that T. Hawkins would like to revise the language as a single senator, there are also volume of people that have vetted the language, had these deep discussions, and considered the alternatives. It sounds to me based on what Dr. Hinton just said that it very clear that there was rationale behind the intention here. So I would encourage everyone that we trust the process of review as we consider the amendment.

L. Brown: I just want to point out that when these learning objective were crafted they were crafted by History faculty. I am not sure why we would want to bring something like this to the floor of the Senate. This does not seem like a good place to revise learning objectives for a program. Granted it is a wide-ranging program that all of our undergraduate students participate in but I don't think this is the place to do this especially when it was created by History faculty.

J. Gustafson: We had a very interesting discussion in the History Department about this language. While I am sympathetic to what T. Hawkins, is saying I do think it is unwise to make these changes right now. I teach Middle East studies, so I teach a lot of classes within both Historical Studies and Global Perspectives. I recognize that there are multiple systems of oppression and forms of inequality that I have to engage with along with my students in order to teach my classes effectively. Race is not particularly the most important factor within those contexts of the times and places that I am teaching and writing about but we are always engaging systems of oppression in one way or another. As historians we are always taking about the relationship between the past and the present. It is not much of a stretch even in the most remote circumstances to make those sorts of connections between past systems of oppression and current situations. There was some deep discomfort among other faculty within the History Department over making changes to this, especially given the background to this proposal. Last year we had a proposal on the floor for a Race in the US course that would have been a requirement for every student on campus, so after that proposal faltered this was a compromise solution and it has been watered down from the original goal. I think that this still meets those ends pretty effectively by dispersing it across categories. Nitpicking the language now might make some minor improvements, but in this case I think it is important that we respect our colleagues, the process, and goals behind this that are so much more important than any of the minor details in the language that we can point out right now. I would not support these amendment right now as an historian, as someone that teaches these classes, and as someone that is deeply involved in that department.

T. Hawkins: I would simply like to note that if my Senate colleagues believe that my recommended language changes the intention then they should not support it. If it is the

interpretation that it is a negative change than do not support it. As far as the contribution to the History Department as far a contribution to this proposal hopefully the made it better with their voices, but that contribution was not unanimous and by no means does contribution by individuals from that department constitute approval of this language. I can say again anecdotally that there are members of the department that are uncomfortable with where the language is now so in my own small way I was trying to address some of those concerns and hopefully improve the outcome.

K. Yousif: *Calls to question T. Hawkins' motion.*

R. Guell: *Withdrawals his amendment.*

D. Israel: There are two parts in the ethics and social responsibilities categories as they were already under review and I wasn't part of that process but it seems to me a really quick timeline to split the category into two parts and to have it ready by Fall 2022. Maybe it isn't for other people that teach in this category but the course that our department teaches in this category I have no idea which one it will fall into and how it is going to be affected. I don't have a problem with the split but I don't see how it will work. I know you did a similar thing for GPCD. I was just unsure if we had to have this decided and revised by Fall 2022.

N. Rider: Yes, Fall 2022. We will be running workshops with faculty to help them meet the learning objectives. We asked to make that split by the committee that developed the learning objectives. It was a request within that disciplinary area to do that. We felt very comfortable making that change when it was requested.

D. Israel: I am not sure what it means to say that ethics and social responsibility is a disciplinary area, because lots of disciplines are contributing to that category.

9) Pass/Fail Option Policy (CAAC, SAC, and SGA)

Motion to approve: A. Arrington-Slocum, A. Arrington-Sirois: 26-2-1

R. Noll: Thank you for having me here. This was a joint proposal from both CACC and SAC. SGA is also in support of this. This only applies for first baccalaureate degree. This will be for undergraduate only. It can be used for any course but we discourage it for courses that will be prerequisites for further courses. If you took it for CHEM 105 but you wanted to continue to CHEM 106 you would have to retake CHEM 105. I could imagine that programs could set their own requirements. The P/F option could be used up to the same time that the course could be dropped. They can use this for up to seven credits in a semester and for a total of sixteen credits. This is meant to be limited, but exercised as an option. A "P" is defined as a D- or better. Neither grade option gets calculated into GPA. You can't replace a grade previously earned with a P or F. It can't be counted for the Latin Honors or the Dean's List. You do not have to get the advisor's approval but it is encouraged. We actually wanted that but there was no way to implement that in our system. The course instructor is unaware unless the student chooses to tell them. The course instructor would give them the grade they earn and it would then be converted at the Registrar's Office. CAAC spent many meetings last school year discussing this. We wanted to make sure that it made sense from every point of view. We had advisors from Financial Aid, Veterans' Affairs, Athletic Advising, Linda Maule, the Registrar's Office, and Academic Affairs. The *ex-officios* felt that we had a good proposal. It was recommitted and we looked at the questions that had been asked. So this year we worked with SAC.

K. Yousif: SAC and SGA gave full support.

B. Kilp: How will this effect students that have a scholarship that requires a minimum number of hours and GPA?

R. Noll: I don't remember if that particular issue came up in CAAC. Perhaps those student would not be able to avail themselves of this.

B. Kilp: Someone would have to be able to make sure they understood that. If they don't have to have an academic advisor's permission, where would that happen?

S. Powers: These credits could still count towards graduation.

D. Knaebel: So for classes that have to have a C or better to move to the next level, students wouldn't be able to do the pass/fail option?

R. Noll: You couldn't forbid a student in your major from taking a course pass/fail. They would not be able to move to the next course without taking the class again and getting a C or better.

K. Yousif: April Hay from Financial Aid just used the chat function to state they and ORR were consulted by CAAC. Financial Aid were consulted about how many hours and how it affects financial aid.

R. Noll: My recollection is that they were all okay with it. I just did not remember all of the fine details.

K. Yousif: The only other thing I would note is implementation. This will not be instantaneous as we are going to have to figure out how to track things.

R. Noll: Correct.

D. Israel: It sounds to me that this is a positive idea. It also sounds to me that those of with majors that don't require particular grades for courses to count towards your major might have to come back and adjust.

R. Noll: I agree whole heartily. Every department has to decide for the programs that they have if P/F is something that are going to want to encourage among students taking their classes. I can imagine a variety of policies from different department depending on what they are hoping to achieve.

S. Ahmad: Aren't there some requirements for international students as well in terms of how many classes they have to take, and was that considered?

R. Noll: Dr. Powers says in the chat that international students' sponsors might have requirements. I do not remember if we addressed international students particularly in our discussion. Financial Aid and ORR thought generally that the policy would be acceptable but I do not remember if we talked about international students.

10) Administrative Reports

a) President D. Curtis

Just before the start of the meeting, we canceled some events for tonight. The weather outside is not great so be careful driving home tonight if you aren't already there.

C. Olsen and I have been having conversations about the type of messages that we are going to start presenting at Faculty Senate meetings. They are going to start being more content-driven starting with today's meeting.

We are in an environment where we are informing the Trustees as to where we are and where we stand. I want to say a few things before C. Olsen gets his turn. Indiana State University is stable and strong. We are going to move out of this. We already have indicators that we are going to be moving out of the enrollment challenges starting this

Fall. Here is what I want to say about that. In taking a look at the landscape of higher education nationally, we have a unique the mission and role in the state of Indiana. I regularly talk about this while I am walking around the state house as I make budget presentations. A key piece of that is who we serve, not just today, but who we have served for a long time. It is a distinctive mission in the state of Indiana. I don't think I need to run the list but I am going to do it one more time. Our student population is fifty percent first generation college-goers, fifty percent Pell eligible (which also means that fifty percent are not Pell eligible). We have to keep that in mind as we take a look at the environment we have been in. We are also asking that you look at it when we put information out there. When the pandemic stuck, the students and families that pushed pause the most were low income and first generation families. We have seen that directly at Indiana State University. In Indiana, the only two institutions that did not see an impact like that were IU and Purdue. This is consistent with what we see around the country for flagship schools. We have talked about this and I want this to be clear. Their response was to open up enrollment to more students. So where do some of those students come from? Places like Indiana State University. They could typically be some of those talented lower-income students and some that would have normally come to Indiana State University. So it's not just people staying at home. Those are facts. What we have done is to try to craft a plan to address this. It is plan we are working on right now and the plan that we have put out for the last two years. Yes, we need to recoup enrollment but there are other measures that we need to talk about. How do we encourage that population that has made the decision to pause or stay home right now to say if you are going to take advantage of the opportunities available in Indiana and this great society you must get back into the process of completing that baccalaureate degree? Many of you know that I sit on the Indiana Chamber of Commerce so through that I listen to a tremendous amount of reports from numerous sources as they navigate this environment that we are in.

I also want to say something about the distinction between two words: excuses and explanations. That is going to drive what I say next. To me excuses means "here is how we got here and there is nothing we can do about that, so let's just let it happen and we will do our best." Excuses are excuses not to have a plan. Explanation is to know how we arrived at this point and more importantly how are we going to move out of that. I want to be clear that we have had working groups on this campus throughout the last two years, even pre-pandemic, that include faculty representation, to talk about the plan we are going to work through and how are we going to navigate the course for this institution. I really want to be clear about who we message, which is who we serve and who we are. Most of our students come from Indiana and most of them stay here so that brings with it special consideration and opportunities for us to move this institution forward. We are seeing some very positive signs in some of the data. We need to work through the plan. I am going to ask you as we go through these next few months and even years to do more review of the writing that is out there about the higher education landscape. We will not return to the Fall of 2019 situation. The landscape has forever shifted. What we need to do is decide how Indiana State University is going to navigate

this situation and become better. This institution has done that for one hundred and fifty years and will continue to do so. I am grateful for the type of dialog that you just engaged in for the last hour and half because you are taking on tough topics and you are acting at intellectual level. I believe the outcome will be a better Indiana State University.

b) Provost C. Olsen

I echo all of those statements in particular encouraging people to look around the country to see what is happening. There are a lot of morning news feeds that give good perspectives to what is happening around the country. There are a lot of higher education challenges. None of this is unique to Indiana State University. There is a lot to consider in broad a national perspective.

I will give a little information and figures about enrollment as well as a few other things. We have been taking about enrollment for the last five or six years even going back before the pandemic. We track those in a lot of different metrics. There are head counts, there are FTE's, SCH production, and there's net tuition revenue. Those vary by program and cost. I am grateful to the Faculty Senate's strategic planning group which has been looking at those program reports the last six to eight months. They are getting ready to get together and read the reports again. All of those metrics are in there and they are all in Blue Reports. There is nothing special or secret about any of those things.

SCH production mostly generates tuition revenue. This is an important number for us. As you know over the last five or six years our SCH production is down more than twenty-five percent and that is due to a combination of things. I will tell you that our staff and executive numbers are down about seventeen percent over that same time period. While the number of regular faculty is down eight and a half percent. The enrollment has gone down close to thirty percent. Faculty numbers are down about half of what the staff numbers are. I am biased but I think that is what we should do. I believe that we should protect faculty because when we recover and numbers go back up we need the faculty there. I think everyone should know that we have gone out of our way to protect every job that we possibly can. It has been a charge from the Senate to do that. We all agreed to do that and I think it was the correct decision. One consequence of that is we have absorbed a lot of retirements. We have gotten to a point where that is hard to do that in some programs because retirements don't happen in a perfect distribution. We are running a lot of searches this year. We are actually running more than twenty regular faculty searches right now. That is a lot in the midst of some budget cuts but that is the result of so many retirements. Thinking about enrollment in the context of staffing and faculty members those are important to track.

To talk about enrollment more specifically it is important to remember that this is a multi-year effort to rebuild and restore enrollment because we are in our third class that has been affected by the pandemic. Those smaller pandemic classes are going to be with us until they work their way through the programs to graduation. It is also good for all of us to remember that before the pandemic hit we as an institution decided to limit the number of conditional admits that we had in our freshman class. We did that consciously and deliberately as a decision we felt the university should make and I feel it was the correct decision. You can say the timing was unfortunate but you can say that we made those decisions to limit the size of our freshman classes in certain ways and then the

pandemic came at the next moment. Those things have built on each other. The freshmen classes were smaller before we entered the pandemic.

I would also like to point out that the college-going rate in Indiana has been going down for the last four or five years. It had declined significantly before the last report for the Fall of 2019. At that time the college-going rate went down about six percent and that was on top of a previous decline. We then have had the Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 pandemic years. The college-going rate has declined dramatically in Indiana over the last four years. Retention declined during the pandemic. Retention for the Fall of 2019 reached sixty-nine percent. We are working on that and have made progress. The Fall of 2020 fell to a sixty percent retention rate and that was already a smaller class due to the pandemic. It was a difficult year in 2020 as there was not a lot happening on campus so the retention fell. We know what happened this year with the decision of IU and Purdue to admit thousands of students off of their waitlist. Those two schools know there were fewer eighteen-year-olds, that the college-going rate was declining, and that they had a lot fewer international students. So their response was to admit thousands of more students. That is their choice and that has always been their choice. Every other college in Indiana was down in enrollment and that has been the case for the last four or five years. The five-year decline for those other schools are between ten and thirty percent. The regional colleges are down in the mid-twenties like we are. Ball State is down eleven percent. USI is down fifteen percent. Vincennes is down forty-eight percent. The pandemic has had the greatest impact on Pell-eligible students, Twenty-First Century Scholars, first-generation students, and students of color. Those are big parts of our demographic, more so than the other schools. Last fall our Pell Eligible rate was forty-six percent while IU and Purdue was in the teens and Ball State is about twenty-two percent. We take a lot of pride in serving all of our students. The fact is the pandemic has affected our demographic of students more than other colleges in the state.

What are we going to do about it is more important than any of those numbers. I feel like I have done nothing but talk about the Indiana State Advantage plan since September. The Indiana State Advantage is a set of programs that are designed to help our students in two broad areas. We have a lot of students that aren't Pell eligible and can go anywhere financially and academically. A big chunk of our freshman class qualify for the Honors College. We are really appealing to those students by supporting them with experience grants, which is about student success and career readiness, while offering high impact practices. Those apply to all of freshmen and appeal to many students. We have a tuition free guaranty and housing stipends for eligible students. Those are designed to help our students that have a financial need. We have this broad range of students that typically come to ISU. Indiana State Advantage is designed to appeal to a broad range of students. We have a lot of students that are academically well-prepared and can go anywhere. We have students that can financially go anywhere. We have students that need our help financially at a greater level. The advantage is designed for all of those students and to be consistent with our mission. We need to get students to come to Indiana State University because we do things better than other schools. There are things that we are more committed to here. So far the numbers are very positive but we aren't trying to get overly enthusiastic because we know what has happened the last few years. My appeal is that we are all in this and working towards the same point. We are committed to our students. We

have the programs and the plan in place. That is what we need to work towards. We need to appeal to students but also need to support them in the academic and financial ways. It is important for us to keep reminding ourselves that we have what we feel is a very good plan. It is doing well so far and it is how we are going to launch ourselves out of this.

11) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

a) Tuition Raises

R. Guell: For the last decade, maybe decade and a half, we have pegged tuition rate increases at or near CPI. CPI was ten percent in 2021. I can't imagine the political damage that would be done if we raised tuition by ten percent but one and half percent is just going to bleed us dry. It there some talk about something between our usual small amount and principle CPI?

D. Curtis: It isn't just CPI driven. The Commission for Higher Education comes out with a number that they recommend. They can modify the funding that we get if we don't follow that recommendation. It makes up a big part of why we do what we do as we want to keep getting funding. If someone goes outside of the commission's recommendations they could lose funding if they can't give reasons for the need. We are driven by that. Yes, our bigger cousins have stated that they aren't raising tuition but we are still more affordable than them.

b) Increasing Graduate Students

A. Kummerow: Are there plans to work on increasing graduate admissions? We seem to be focused on four-year students.

D. Curtis: Since I have been here I have been surprised looking at our data that we have not actively recruited transfer students before I came here. That is one of those pieces that I looked at. If we remain the most affordable public college for four years and beyond our number should increase. If a student chose IVY Tech for financial reasons then ISU should be a no brainer for those students that want the lowest cost possible. We have not marketed that in the past.

Graduate students are another population that we are working towards increasing. We have worked with Denise Collins. I know it tends to be a foreign concept at the graduate level to look at time to a degree. Those colleges that are drawing those types of students are taking time to analyze those issues and making sure they push that out. What they are saying is what they offer, how long it will take, the total cost, and the quality of the program. The ones that are getting the students are the ones offering this information in some sort of way. We need to make sure that we are listening to what students need and want.

C. Olsen: As we have talked about with the first-time, full-time freshmen, transfer students, and graduate students, we have a series of metrics and goals for each of those areas. We have been working through some transfer-related questions. Some of that is process oriented, like what the array of programs are and how to best use the resources we have to be in that market. A lot of schools are looking at student populations in the same way. The Senate approving a flexible leadership degree was much appreciated. That is one that can be offered in different chunks of time and schedules. We need to look at those kinds of things but a lot of our internal process are not that conducive. I know a lot of department chairs are reviewing transfer credits as quickly and efficiently as they can.

I think that we have made some improvements there but it feels like we keep uncovering some road blocks in our own processes and we can't let that hinder us when trying to appeal to transfer students. As for Indiana State Advantage we are looking at how, when, and where we can apply some of that to transfer and distance students. We would be happy to take suggestion or ideas on those things. We have talked about crafting graduate programs that are within the Indiana State Advantage philosophy, taking an approach that is unique to us and that we take pride in.

c) CAS Faculty Non-reassignment

D. Selman: We have had faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences that have not been reappointed. Can you let us know what formula you used to make those decisions? Let faculty know how you came up with how people were selected might make the decision more palatable. I was also wondering if the departments affected were consulted and if they were able to give ideas as to how this could have been solved differently.

C. Olsen: Through careful planning we avoided letting go of a number of people up until now. There are other college letting go of hundreds of faculty. We have not had to do that. We have cut everywhere we can and it has gotten to the point that we had to this. Deans do have a say over their budget. Part of what we looked at was enrollment numbers and program demand. The number of faculty we let go is small and yes it has been a painful decision.

D. Selman: Why was the decision made to get rid of full-time faculty when we have people hired to teach one class? Was it looked into to removing part time faculty?

C. Olsen: We have cut from part time faculty budget. We have already removed one million dollars from their budget so it is hard to cut more out of that. I will let you know as well full time faculty numbers are down eight percent while part time faculty numbers are down ten percent.

D. Selman: It was also disappointing to see that faculty are being cut as two new coaches were hired.

D. Curtis: Those were not new hires, they were replacements. Our athletic department runs a shoestring budget and they are lowest funded area. If you take all areas of the college and take their budget to place in academics it wouldn't make a dent in the cuts we have had to make. We have cut in other areas and have gotten to the point that it harder to absorb the funding cuts and lower enrollment rates.

C. Spicer: D. Selman, when you stated why didn't they get rid of the part-time faculty, that really hurt to hear. We have gotten rid of a lot of temporary faculty. There are many temporary faculty that are experts in their fields. There are also many that teach at multiple colleges to make ends meet. There many items that the temporary faculty have asked for and have let go of during this difficult time.

D. Selman: I didn't mean anything by saying let's get rid of the temporary faculty. I was just wondering if there would have been a way to combine multiple courses to keep some of the full-time faculty.

K. Yousif: C. Spicer, you do an amazing job representing the temporary faculty.

d) **“Right-Sizing”**

J. Gustafson: I have heard a dozen different version of the “data” question from different faculty members, about what numbers these decisions are based on. In the absence of that, there is space for a lot of rumors, innuendos, and articles in the news to take over the conversation. I appreciate you coming and presenting this to us directly. I know in Exec we have discussed downsizing an institution vs rightsizing the budget. A lot of the trends that you are discussing are clearly national trends. Anyone in higher education clearly knows this to be true but it also not happening uniformly. Students are *choosing* to go to places like Purdue and IU when they open their waitlists. This caused us to lose a large number of students. Does that not make it imperative that we invest in our scholarly and creative activities while developing our programs? That must be prioritized to be competitive. But how could we possibly do that and make it a priority in the context of rightsizing the budget? I know faculty are feeling squeezed as they are seeing instructors in their departments not being reappointed. Pay has not kept up with inflation. Summer courses are being cut for faculty with lower salary so they are losing that benefit. The solution presented, the ISU Advantage Plan, just promises more faculty time and energy.

C. Olsen: I think my initial response is twofold. I think that we have done that for the last few years. That is why I started with the numbers. We have gone out of our way to protect the instructional parts of the budgets. You grow your way out of enrollment declines with excellent faculty and programs as that is why students primarily come to universities. I would say the same thing about the Indiana State Advantage and the programs that are a part of that. We need students to come to Indiana State University because we do things better and that is founded on the relationship between students and faculty. We are doing that wherever we can. The number of searches we are running this year is more than I thought we would be able to do. Those numbers would be a normal year across a campus our size and we are doing those in a year of rightsizing the budget. It is never going to be perfect and it is never going to be enough. I think that we have invested as much as we can in that part of the mission. In the past several years our student ratio has gone from 22:1 to 17:1. Those are numbers that can’t continue for a state university of our size. We still have a tremendous faculty in place and we are working on restocking that. We need to continue to build on why students have historically chosen to come here. We are working with alumni to find out what they liked about Indiana State University and building from there.

D. Curtis: We are doing a brand survey in the Wabash Valley. What we are seeing especially with the parents and future employers is that they are concerned about the quality piece. Past choices to admit more than those conditional admits have led to that perception of not having quality education here which is not true. What we are doing from the university level is that we are going to get very loud with our next campaign that we are having in September. One of the four pillars of that is faculty excellence and we need people contributing to that the way other universities have with endowments. I am surprised that we almost no named professorships or chairs here and we have not sold that to donors. I will tell you one success story was an alum that came back to visit. He wasn’t sure where to donate and it was in a conversation with a dean that they explained what professorships do in attracting and retaining high quality faculty. Even if we didn’t get enough to pay that professors salary, it at least gives them an annual gift that would allow them to do things. We are going to be doing more of that with people this Fall that

just don't know what impact that has. Another pillar is student scholarships. I mentioned the other day at Exec that we have made sure to get two issues of the State magazine out each year. The next one will focus on our high-quality faculty as this goes out to more than just alums. This is part of our campaign for people to know that we have a tremendous amount of high-quality faculty.

e) **Cost of Living Raises**

R. Guell: I think I know more than the usual faculty members, having been around quite a while and having been in various positions. One of the things that has struck me is the multi-phase consequence of our enrollment challenges is that a faculty member that is teaching at their 2015 salary and hasn't seen appreciable increases since that time relative to inflation has actually lost income. They are also not eligible to teach during the summer because of their college's summer consequences. They could easily be making thirty to forty percent less in inflation dollars. I don't have a solution for you but there doesn't seem to be a considerable amount of empathy for being here and being loyal. Now we are dealing with a great deal of financial pain among faculty. In this hour-long discussion of what we are going through I haven't heard an acknowledgement from either the Provost or the President on how much this is hurting.

C. Olsen: I am hoping that people don't feel that we are not empathic to what has happened. One of the consequences to our approach to the instructional budget is that we have protected as many jobs as possible. One of the consequences of that is that we haven't been able to give the same kind of raises that we did previously to that. That was a call from across the institution to prioritize keeping as many employed as possible with full benefits. We have not done any benefit cuts, layoffs, or furloughs. Many other institutions have done that. One of the consequences of that is that we have not had the budget to do across the board or targeted raises in the same way. From my perspective was that it was a collective decision across senate, staff council, and administration. I agree that cannot go on indefinitely either.

D. Curtis: There are a couple of ways to go. C. Olsen did a good job saying it isn't both. You can't keep as many people employed and give cost of living raised. We have listened and have tried to interact with that. Every time I put out a message I am saying thank you because we know this is tough. I know that a thank you is great but seeing something meaningful is better. You will see that in some of the budget assumptions. We are trying to build that back into the budget starting with next year. It is a modest raise but it is back on the path of giving raises. I would pay everyone twice what they are earning if we had that. The question is how do we get more dollars in. That is what we are talking about when talk about working this plan. State appropriations are not going up and the goal is to not have them deteriorate. Indiana is doing a good job as compared to other states in the Midwest in maintaining their appropriations to us and I hope that continues into the future. That is why I spend so much time walking around the state house saying we are thankful for that and discussing other ways they can help us. The other ways we can improve this is enrollment and fund raising, but fund raising is not a replacement for growing enrollment. The plan we are working is to move in that direction. No one has ever cut their way out of this kind of challenge. I think I take every chance I get to say we appreciate where everyone is at.

f) House Bill

T. Hawkins: Last month at our Senate meeting we passed a resolution asking the administration to condemn House Bill 1134. As the bill is moving forward, does the administration plan on lobbying against it?

D. Curtis: Yes.

g) Faculty Recruitment

A. Arrington-Sirois: Are we working on recruiting diverse faculty?

D. Curtis: We are getting a late start on searches, but we have put extra money towards advertising. We would like to have diverse pools. We have to step up our training to reach a better audience. With the late start, that limits our pool, which is why I dislike Spring searches.

12) Adjournment: 6:19pm