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Indiana State University

Faculty Senate, 2020-2021

**Executive Committee**

April 20, 2021

3:30 p.m. via Zoom

Members present: L. Brown, M. Chambers, L. Eberman, R. Guell, T. Hawkins, C. MacDonald, V. Sheets, K. Yousif

Absent Members: J. Gustafson

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

Guest: D. Selman, G. Bierly, B Eversole, A Hay, S, Barton, S. Powers, B. Butwin

1. Administrative Reports
2. President Curtis

Good afternoon. Well let’s hope that April showers will bring May flowers. At this time the State Budget is unfolding. There is still a lot to comb through before we can say anything, but the revenue report for the State looks better than anyone expected. It does appear that public school teachers are going to be the big winners. I do believe that we will be treated fairly as well. I am a bit a dither because of all of the months we have been waiting on this news. As you know I try to be optimistic about things. All of the signs look positive.

1. Provost Olsen

I would like to encourage everyone to keep track of the campus wide training in Canvas. Summer of ‘21 will be busy as we have a lot more direct support starting this summer. We will be able to access more hands on support.

L. Brown: So will more people be able to use Canvas in the fall?

C. Olsen: Yes, if they are trained with the additional Canvas support.

S. Powers: We are still talking about that with the Canvas group. We are still trying to figure out student training. We don’t want at risk freshmen trying to navigate both platforms. Maybe more faculty can have access to Canvas.

C. Olsen: We are trying to reduce the number of student to zero that have multiple platforms. On the faculty side whether they start their class in Canvas in the fall or not there will be more support. Academic Strategic Plan group will be meeting again on Thursday. We have been pulling some data about graduation rates in the four, four and half, and five years areas. We are going to have them start looking at some of that data. We have also asked for feedback from the committee members on what they would like to investigate. I just want to remind everyone about the faculty recognition banquet this Thursday from 6 to 7pm. I am looking forward to Arthur as toast master this year.

1. Chair Report Liz Brown

If you don’t have anything else to do please join us at the faculty banquet on Thursday.

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
2. Rave alerts

V. Sheets: I was wondering about the Rave warning that went out this week. Is there going to be an investigation into what happened? I thought the new system allowed for more targeted locations. It was really concerning as faculty didn’t know if they should let students leave the classrooms.

C. Olsen: It was bad timing with the new installations in some of the building. We didn’t have the warning in the build that I am in since we don’t have it installed yet. It appears to be a one off that was a combination of a number of things. One of those being a new operator. Retraining has been done already. We can at least look at this as a drill in the lock down procedures and a look at glitches in the system.

1. Faculty/student burnout

M. Chambers: Before the meeting we were talking about faculty burn. It is clear that some students are experience this as well. I know that many will have their GPA affect by this. I have students that say they can only attend by zoom because they are caring for a number of sick relatives. I was wondering if there have been talks about what we are going to do about low GPA’s.

C. Olsen: We have not talked about that in terms of a systemic response.

R. Guell: There is a considerable amount of student burnout. We had a to choose between a bad situation or one that could have been worse. We made the better choice given what has happened at other institutions after students returned from spring break. Last year at this time we all kind of nodded our heads giving Linda extraordinary grace with regard to how we (Executive Committee) treated their decisions on return policies for some students that would have required them to exit.

C. Olsen: I would like to hear from more Faculty before we make a decision.

K. Yousif: I have a number of students that have checked out do to fatigue.

R. Guell: I think Linda Maule did an excellent job last year. We need to know that we can trust our administrators to the same job this year as well.

1. FAD entry for part time temporary faculty

C. MacDonald: I am having issues getting the temporary faculty to enter information into FAD. When we began using the FAD we started with our adjuncts, which at the time seemed like a bad idea as they are the people that are the least invested and we pay the least amount of money to and we are having them learn this piece of software. As I am struggling with getting these eleven people to upload their material just for this semester and realizing that we are looking at staff cuts so that support to help get information entered is likely to go away in the future, so if we could reconsider the way that we do these reviews. Does it continue to make since to have adjuncts upload material into the FAD?

S. Powers: Originally I have worked with a number of chairs on getting this information in. For example Rob Perrin used to upload the syllabi and the ratings for his faculty. If it is necessary I can get the ratings as long as you have the syllabi. If you have the syllabi I can have someone here enter the information. We have access to the course ratings. If a department is having a hard time entering information for a part time lecturer Academic Affairs can help with support. Originally the goal was to never make a part time lecturer do this but because some department were have them submit next nothing while others were have them turn in binders we needed have something. I just need to have the syllabi because I am not going to chase that down.

C. MacDonald: I have had this discussion in my College because we are ones that require that massive amount of materials and I have asked for that to be cut back. I can’t imagine that Rob Perrin has time to entire syllabi and course ratings for all of his lecturers, because I am struggling with the amount of material that I am having to nag people for. If we could just send the syllabi to your office and get the information entered that would be great. Thank you for that.

R. Guell: Susan, I guess that I have been in this kind of chair at Exec for a while and did the FAD stuff for my own adjuncts in social work so I know of where Chris speaks about issues. I guess what I don’t what the value to the institution is with having that data in the FAD?

S. Powers: For HLC we have to have records. They have the opportunity to randomly select syllabi from anybody and they have to be equivalent and that can happen about four weeks out from their visit. At that point if I didn’t have a syllabus I would have been scrambling to get one. For a course that is taught by both instructors, tenure track professors, tenured professors, and lecturers they wanted to have a copy of the syllabus from each one of those because they need to know that the outcomes are the same. They remain the right to ask for any course and any persons syllabi if they want to and I have to produce that within five or six hours. So for that purpose it is radically easier to have the syllabi in there. It also needs to be in there so a chair can run reports if they are getting complaints from a student about something they quick access to a syllabi. We also have course ratings so if you wanted to go in and see who had what ratings you could go in a do that as well. It is the one stop shop for having all of that information in place. One of the reasons to have that part time lecturer report is we can have equal expectations across campus.

C. MacDonald: I think it is important to evaluate them on some kind of regular bases. My own college was probably airing on the side of the portfolio rather than the nothing. Which is on reason for my expectoration and exhaustion on this issue. I have spent days collecting materials. The amount of work that it has taken to makes sure that everyone is in there they way that they should be and then to track down the materials to make sure that those get loaded.

C. Olsen: I think it also adversement for not collecting as to how much material they require.

1. Campus announcement about Chauvin verdict

R. Guell: I was wondering if we are prepare for the student reactions once the verdict is released.

D. Curtis: We are on alert awaiting the release of the verdict. We do plan on having a debriefing no matter which way the verdict goes. Student affairs is sitting and waiting for the verdict to be released so they get the debriefing going as quickly as possible. Everyone is on alert watching this because everybody cares. We will move forward with opportunities to bring everyone together.

L. Brown: If something happens please tell me.

D. Curtis: I will. If I disappear quickly you will know.

T. Hawkins: The New York times said the verdict will be read in about an hour.

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of April 13, 2021 Files #1

Motion to approve as amended M. Chambers, K Yousif: 8-0-0

1. Exec Item: 210 Modifications File #3

Motion to approve R. Guell, M. Chambers: 8-0-0

Motion to change C- to a C L. Brown, T. Hawkins: 2-6-0

T. Hawkins: Are we moving to approve and replace the current 210? What are we approving?

R. Guell: My motion is to approve file 3 which is 210 and the separation of 215 and 220.

T. Hawkins: So this will replace 210 with this proposed language separated into 210, 215, and 220.

R. Guell: Correct.

M. Chambers: There are two typos and one of them is pretty important. On page three under 210.1.1 general policy in the second paragraph it says ‘ISU may admit students on a conditional bases with specific requirement a proscribed course of study’ instead of prescribed. In 215.8 which is the statewide Indiana transfer incentive, under the statewide transfer general education core in the second line I believe that should be a block of 30 earned credit. I thought that we were waiting to hear back some of the folks that had not been involved with the changes that were made. Am I correct to assume that Tim London and Jason Trainer are fine with the changes?

L. Brown: They were some of the initiators for the request for changes.

M. Chambers: I thought this had not been ran back past them since this tried to come through last time.

R. Guell: They were in fact fully involved with this. To highlight, essentially what we asked was about the C-, C question. I think many of us still lean to the C but it appears as though a tidal wave of other institutions are moving towards this direction of a C-. I am at least persuaded it is not in our best interest to stand alone against that.

K. Yousif: Bob also argued that the word accredited should be put back in the document which makes it a different document. We also worked with April to clean up some of the language on ESL and language placement exams to have a little bit more precision. Those were the only major changes.

T. Hawkins: If someone could help me in 215.6 there is a sentence reads ‘Credit for military training and experience is granted based on official Joint Services Transcripts and/or discharge from (DD214).’ I am not sure what that is saying.

R. Guell: That should be form not from.

L. Brown: I will say that I am troubled with the C- as well. I am will to accept a C- if that is in fact the case that most institutions are moving towards a C-.

R. Guell: Jason did provide pretty good evidence that that is the case. I think it perfectly appropriate for someone stand their ground and ask for a vote on that. While I agree with you on principle it isn’t a hill I want to die on.

L. Brown: As chair am I allowed to make a motion that says I move that we change it to a C instead of the C-.

R. Guell: From my perspective there is no principled way to disagree with Liz. It is only a practical way to disagree with Liz and if the transfer world is moving toward C- it’s not something that we can substantly disagree with so I am not going to.

L. Eberman: If anyone from the working group can speak to if we have any data as to for the results in better/worse retention once student integrates and has matriculated. Do they tend to be equally or less successful? I think that would help inform the decision better.

R. Guell: We didn’t ask that particular question.

V. Sheets: I am wondering whether we have any data on how many students try to transfer with hours that currently being disallowed because of this.

A. Hay: We have looked at many different thing and off of the top of my head I don’t if we focused on how many more hours would have transferred in had we lower the grade from a C to a C-. If there is interest in looking at the data I would question as to how far back you would like to look at this data and whether the data is the student coming in or when the student actually took the course because that is usually how we would do that. One thing that I want everyone to keep in mind is the change from C to C- is just generalizing because the policy itself doesn’t allow a student just to come in without at least a 2.0. You are not going to be bringing in someone that is from the bottom of the barrel. There are admission standards that you have to think about. There are studies out there that say transfer student do just as well as when they transfer to another university. I would need to know more specifically what you are wanting.

L. Brown: That actually did help me remind me that there are admission standards and that we wouldn’t be bringing in someone with a bunch of C-‘s. That helps me think about it also. Thank you for that.

S. Powers: Keep in mind that those students that are coming in with block credit hours whether it is TSAP, Indiana College Core, or an Associate’s degree they will have C- or lower and we are still giving them that block credit for those classes. We may have essentially transferred in a student that has a D- because it part of that block transfer. If the prerequisite requires a C or better than they have to retake that class here. We are already in many ways accepting a C-.

T. Hawkins: This seems to be one of those cases where an argument can be made that the transfer world is moving in a certain direction than that is a simple case of show me the proof. I would like to see evidence examples of why that is true before making a change. That could be done at any point in the future. We don’t have to agree to something now if we don’t know if that is actually the case. I would like to have that as the case before we make a change like that.

L. Brown: You are suggesting that if we approve this and we change it to a C it can be changed to a C- later with additional information later.

A. Hay: I know we had forwarded some supplemental information and there was a list of schools that were accepting lower than a C-. I guess my question would be what additional information or evidence are we needing or is this group wanting when we are talking about changing the grade we would accept to come in for a transfer credit.

T. Hawkins: If the rational to move to a C- is that because we want to be riding a wave of institutions that are doing this or do we want to be paddling faster to catch up to a wave of schools then we need to agree to be part of a wave movement. I don’t know what list you are talking about but a list of five or ten schools may or may not satisfy what is the transfer world.

A. Hay: Just a reminder if you look at the beginning of it as well ACCRAOS recommendation was to look a D or higher and we took the stance of a C- and we could certainly add that as a note to argue why we should accept something lower than a C.

M. Chambers: The March 30th meeting listed the schools that will take lower than a C. Those schools include Stanford, Louisville, Anderson, Maryland, Kansas State, Ohio State, GW, Southern Indiana, Purdue, Northern Illinois, and more. There is a list that we were provided.

K. Yousif: I would say this too as this came up in our discussions repeatedly while working with SAC and later with Bob that many programs, majors, and minors all have prerequisites or have programmatic GPA’s. That is another way that there is already built in guards. Just because they have the credits but not mastered the skill doesn’t mean they will be moving on.

1. URC Item: 360 Modifications File #4

Motion to approve R. Guell, C. MacDonald: 8-0-0

G. Bierly: The largest change that happened was the original 360 has been separated into two pieces. The original part that was grants and contracts externally funded and described as OSP has pulled out of this section and will become a new section called 625 Financial and Business policy. What is at least proposed to remain in 360 is the discussion of institutional research compliance. Part of the rational is that a lot of what is in the separated part belong in business and financial affairs and there is not a lot of functional overlap of these things. There are things throughout OSP that don’t relate to compliance and there is a fair bit of compliance that routes through OSP. I think that is the biggest structural change. From what you have of the original institutional research compliance section a couple new things on of them is that there has been a section on responsible conducts of research constructed at the beginning of this to provide a little bit of context about why there is compliance other than the law telling us we have to. There is more elaboration of what areas of research oversight that corresponded to compliance are. There is a mention of the Chief Research Officer (CRO) as the institutional official that is charged with this. That was really only mentioned as the signing authority piece in the part that is now in the 600 section. The last difference that you will notice is that once it got into the details of compliance in the original section it focused almost entirely on IRB. We have tried to balance that a little bit by putting in some parallel language. I talks you not only through IRB but IACUC and IBC. We didn’t really want to add or change any operation or function. Clarify and highlight a few things that weren’t emphasized before. We wanting to make a little bit more structural since out of the content.

V. Sheets: Thank you Greg for that information. I was confused when I saw nothing on sponsored programs in here. Is there an intent that the revised piece on sponsored program will be coming through for faculty review and input?

B. Butwin: It certainly can. One of the ideas about moving it was that we have staff that may apply for grants through sponsored programs. It really is about signature authority and the process for sponsored programs financially. If I remember correctly it doesn’t change a whole lot. We just picked it up and moved it while cleaning up some of the language. There is a section that is part of the uniform guidance that we have to include that is related to pay. That is part of that but none of that has changed. I am happy to send this out to you all but this has been part of the three year policy review cycle so we are just trying to get things where need to be.

V. Sheets: I am not saying it doesn’t make sense it’s just that faculty do have an interest in the operation of that office and how it works. I appreciate that it is not changing. I did not know that piece because it wasn’t in here.

M. Chambers: I have been asked by Donna Selman to ask about IACUC that have been added. Is there going to be someplace, if not here in the policy, qualification for people that would be on IACUC? Also how do address potential conflicts of interest by people on IACUC or people having multiple seats in the review process at different levels? Is that going to be put someplace and not go here since it is more process/procedure rather than policy?

G. Bierly: Those are great questions. The original version of this did not go into that depth on that matter. I mean in the conflict of interest domain is left as something that exists. I think currently in compliance areas I think ultimately winds up getting adjudicated by the CRO with advice from council and everyone else as it occurs. I know that within each of the compliance committees there all sort of guidelines for conduct of reviews and expectations expertise that the member of those committees will hold. I know that’s not a complete answer to that question. I guess the answer is that we didn’t push further than the original.

L. Brown: IRB has many of those things as well but they are not going to appear here.

C. Olsen: Just in terms of IACUC we have always had a separate lease as long as I have been involved. There is a separation between IACUC membership and the Animal North Care Facility (Science North Care Facility). So the supervisor of Science North has been the chairs of the Biology department and then that person does not sit on IACUC. Therefore the protocols are not mixed in terms of oversight. I don’t believe that is written anywhere. That is just what we have done to satisfy federal guidelines.

B. Butwin: I will just say really quickly. I think this policy review has raised a couple of those questions about putting the protocols in place on how things will actually operate. This is actually a Board policy so we don’t want to overwhelm it with items that might need to change over the years. I think as we work through the summer on details we have talked about how these things might roll out in terms of how people get information and what is on the web and then you can revisit that in terms of protocols if that is something of interest.

L. Eberman: All of these boards have policy/procedure handbooks that specifically speak to the criteria for which individuals should sit on the committees and what we might suggest is that Greg simply charge those boards to review their handbooks to make sure that they are avoiding conflict of interest that you pointed out Mike. OSP section is really procedural heavy so I actually had the same instinct when reading the policy and went back and looked at that section. It states items like who signs what when and who distributes the money. It didn’t real seem policy centric by any means. As a person that has been on IRB for 12 years I know that we have not reviewed our handbook in some time and that might be a good charge back to the boards.

G. Bierly: The compliance committees themselves had their leadership review this document and had some input on it before it went to URC.

1. FAC Item: Changes to 305 Files #5

Motion to approve 305 and 310 R. Guell, V. Sheets: 8-0-0

Motion to make that switch in 310 and the language to go with it and to move the word external so that it is between appropriate and resources and remove the remaining parenthetical from that sentence R. Guell, V, Sheets: 8-0-0

L. Brown: What you have here is what officers and Provost came up with over the weekend. I think I fixed the grammar errors that James brought up in the new version here that is with the mark up.

T Hawkins: I want to clarify we laid the motion down on Thursday and we were discussing new language. Don’t we need to do something with that?

R. Guell: This is a slightly amended version of that but Thursday’s motion was laid on the table. Bob shares screen of 305.2.1.3. What has been changed since the last time that you saw this in a significant way was the addition of the italicized language. The principle I was operating under when I made this was that we have good underlying principles regarding promotion and tenure. We have not always adhered to our good ways and principles regarding promotion and tenure but we have good principles. This paragraph here takes a lot of the very specific language of diversity and inclusivity out but you can still read it within the document. James Gustafson argued for the sentence that had been there on service but what I struggled with was a way to include it without using the very specific language. My underlying world view is that have good principles and because of our human failings we don’t always follow them. The issue in question is that our minoritized faculty are repeatedly asked to do the same thing over and over again and are not recognized for it. The rest of this is what I believe you saw before. There is not too much new other than what Chris MacDonald indicated in a motion in regards to this portion, and the preamble to that portion, and another section just clarifying what was going on but those had been passed last Thursday.

K. Yousif: Her language sets up who should be reviewed. Chris wrote that it help to have all people involved in the process to be trained.

C. MacDonald: By write, you mean stole it verbatim from the biannual review.

L. Eberman: In 310.1.3.2 in the second sentence it says evidence of teaching effectiveness is required in the review of all regular faculty. To Chris’s point earlier we also require teacher effectiveness of part time temporary correct?

L. Brown: Don’t we say that down below.

M. Chambers: I don’t have a problem but I am looking to make sure that we are okay with some language that we have. I am not sure it is a clear as we think it is. So in 305.2.1.2 research scholarship I completely understand and support the idea of admitting additional items to contextualize what people are doing. The language we have is ‘faculty are encouraged to supplement the documentation and substantiation of their scholarship with appropriate resources’. Is appropriate resources going to signal to people outside of this call what we are wanting? I am wondering if this isn’t quite clear enough. We all understand what we mean because we have been dealing with it for a couple of weeks, but will out colleagues that have not been in on these meetings understand.

C. MacDonald: All faculty that are going to read that are going to think that they need all these external documents to prove their research even if I am publishing in the journal of developmental psychology.

R. Guell: If you are looking for a response. I believe the last sentence is where you are going to get the clarity and where you should get the clarity and that is in departments and colleges stating their policies.

C. Olsen: I would echo that. It is also really incumbent on faculty and department colleagues to contextualize scholarship. It is ultimately up to the faculty member but a review committee that doesn’t contextualize your scholarship is setting you up for failure at the college level. So this is on both sides. Frankly peer review is peer review but that varies a lot.

V. Sheets: First I would like to thank all of the officers for the work that you did on this. I recognize that it was a lot of work and I think it keeps the intent that came out of the sub-committee for minoritized faculty. I certainly will express that as I share what has been proposed going forward? I did have a question on 310.1.3.1. In that you have the strikeout of ‘course evaluations will be collected via software provided by the university’. Is that meaning we are actually intending on removing that sentence? I know that the university is look at some other software but I didn’t know if we were just prepping for the possibility that we consider as a university other strategies.

R. Guell: So again my own view was it was an unnecessary changing of the words that we had approved long ago the it didn’t have to be the SIR and that we had approved long ago that it was the administration’s job to create a manner in which these were approved. The way in which this is collected is not a board issue so by specifying software it actually seemed to make a problem where none currently exist.

T. Hawkins: I think that we are creating problems where none exist. I do continue to have some problem with the language that is proposed here. Let’s start with 305.2.1.2 we either accept the logic of including lists in the handbook or we avoid the use of lists. To me etc. is a red flag. It is meaningless while having meaning and so I would argue that we either be explicit about what appropriate resources are or avoid the pitfalls of opening that up to much interpretation. For 305.2.1.3 last week I noted language in 310.1.1.3 ‘a faculty member maybe released from part or all of the teaching load for research where other professional activities including significant service or administrative assignments. It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to equate such assignments to the normal teaching load.’ So what we have in the handbook among other things is that it already says maybe. We are contrasting that here in attempt to do the same thing here is say should be. The difference in language is a difference in meaning. So what do we want to say? Should these achievement be recognized or may they be recognized. When we say one verses the other we are creating a potential problem. It should be parallel in both places or not included in that section. Then to the italicized portion. I understand the basics that we are trying to figure out how to write language into the handbook. We do not have any parallel language with respect to scholarship or teaching that we are trying to construct by identifying extraordinary contribution in service. I think is a problem. Faculty can argue that they are doing extraordinary scholarship compared to what might be a basic expectation. Faculty can argue they are doing extraordinary teaching compared to the basic load. In 305 promotion and tenure language by inserting the concept of extraordinary service and ignoring the potential for that to exist in other categories we are elevating one above the other. I would like in 310.1.3.1 to strike the first sentence. I understand that student evaluations are problematic and I understand it is appropriate to include language like that in instructional evaluation but what this suggest to me is that we are deemphasizing student course evaluations. By removing a sentence that says we can assess quality of teaching via student evaluations and if we can’t then why do we do student evaluations.

L. Eberman: I am in agreement with Tim about the use of etc. I am flustered about the use of relevant research within the parenthetical because wouldn’t that be part of the evidence anyway. So I think to both Tim and Chris’s previous points I think it possible to strike the first sentence in its entirety and do something along the lines of units are required to have policies that recognized and foster documentation that addresses range of scholarship within the department. I think that gets to the removal of the parenthetical. I don’t think it is common practice across all colleges and departments to do external letters so I am interested to have more people to think about that. The use of relevant research in that parenthetical seems redundant to the entire purpose of the entire section.

V. Sheets: I recognize the issue with that parenthetical. What I was going to propose is a simpler solution which was to move the word external to be between appropriate resources to become appropriate external resources. I think Lindsey tries to get there but I am still missing that word external and I think people really want something saying that you should in some cases get external resources. I wanted to respond to Tim’s issue with extraordinary service. I recognize that it is not quite parallel but I think we do really recognize extraordinary scholars. We do by nature a weight that more heavily. So it really is the service where that extraordinary has to be there. It is a little different then what 310 has written about service. 310 is just about work load accommodation and this says it can be done other ways.

C. MacDonald: I agree with Virgil. In looking at 310 section. I almost feel like 310.1.3.2 instructional evaluation should come first because it is talking about all instructional evaluation and that course evaluations should be a sub-section of that. That solves a couple of problems. I think to address Tim’s point student course evaluations do evaluate somethings about performance however given the multiple levels of bias I don’t think they should be the only measure of evaluation particularly for people they tend to be bias against.

L. Brown: By making that a subsection of instructional evaluation. That shows that this is just one piece and not the first one. So it is just one piece of instructional evaluation. I think that is an excellent suggestion.

T. Hawkins: I never argued that student evaluations should be the only evaluation.

R. Guell: If you look at the broader handbook 310.1.3 is methods of instruction and 310.1.3.1 is currently course evaluations and 310.1.3.2 is instructional evaluations and 310.1.3.3 is pushing people to the center for excellence. In terms of the board contexts of 310.1.3 it does actually fit to switch 310.1.3.1 and 310.1.3.2.

L. Eberman: Is there a reason that we are using encourage instead of required?

R. Guell: I would argue that we are not going to require units that have no ambiguity to require them to do it, but have them fix issues as they arise.

V. Sheets: I just want to note that adjusting the placement in 310 was Chris’s idea.

R. Guell: Can I ask a question before we go to standing committees? Assuming that everything gets done for the senate meeting on Thursday we still have the report for the committees on committees on the senate at large. Does that mean we are having a May meeting for that agenda item only?

L. Brown: Our next senate meeting is not Thursday but the following Thursday. So we still have one more Exec meeting before the senate meeting.

K. Yousif: If more stuff get stacked on it from last Tuesday the last senate meeting will lengthy. I am thinking FAC 912.

L. Brown: we decided we send it to staff council.

D. Selman: The only other thing I wanted to say is that we have three changes to constitutions and by-laws for the College of Technology and Health and Human Services. We are going to try to get that done on Thursday so if you need to make an extra plan for that.

R. Guell: These are actual college’s that have made the changes?

L. Brown: Yes.

T. Hawkins: A week ago I wasn’t the only one of the group to express support for some kind of campus forum regarding changes to 305. I am wondering if at the very minimum reaching out with some sort officer communication that identifies and explains the proposed changes that we have made.

R. Guell: I will be happy to craft something and have the other officers review it so that it can go out on Monday or Tuesday.

1. Standing Committee Reports
2. AAC (M. Chambers) they will meet on the Thursday. We will be looking over the final draft of the staffing report and get annual report ready to go to Exec.
3. AEC (R. Guell) Have concluded business at the beginning of the month.
4. CAAC (C. MacDonald) We have been meeting weekly and is still chewing on across department program.
5. FAC (V. Sheets) Meeting again on Thursday for review the college constitution reviews.
6. FEBC (L. Eberman) The last two meeting have been filled with guest speakers. Generally speaking Amy has echoed all of the wellness and Joey provided an update on faculty and staff benefits. Diann has spoken to enrollment not matching expenditures.
7. GC (T. Hawkins) We have had two meetings. The meeting on April 7th there was discussion on revisions to the grad review process. On April 14th we did three program reviews. We are also discussing changes to admission in different grad programs.
8. SAC (K. Yousif) Met for the last time last week. Wrapping up and preparing their yearend reports. Dr. French will be presenting the faculty scholarship at the last senate meeting in April.
9. URC (J. Gustafson) No report.
10. Adjournment: 5 pm