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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULITY SENATE, 2019-2020

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

August 20, 2019

3:30pm, HMSU 227

Members present: R. Guell, R. Peters, V. Sheets, S. Arvin, S. Kopaczewski, M. Chambers, K. Games, C. MacDonald

Guest: K. Butwin, S. Gambell

Missing Members: S. Phillips

EX-Officio Present: President D. Curtis

EX-Officio Present: M. Licari

1. Administrative Reports:
2. President D. Curtis
3. Welcome to the start of new academic year. I usually say welcome back but many of you haven’t gone anywhere.
4. I think it’s going to be a great year. There are a couple of items I want to point out that are on our horizon for this year.
5. The first is a review of our Mission, Vision and Values (MVV) in preparation for next year getting really serious about building the next strategic plan. We have had conversations about do we do it incrementally go to the next step or do we just blow it up. I am in line with just blowing it up, but we will see where it will go with input from campus. We really didn’t what to short circuit our time to talk about the three significant pieces of MVV. So be alert for those invitations coming out to engage in that processes. We start with the BoT, then hearing from Brad Balch who has garishly accepted our request to serve as the facilitator for this work. For those of you who may not know him as well he does this kind of work all over and he is quite good at it. The campus in going to enjoy experiences this with Brad’s leadership from the Bayh College of Education. Key piece there.
6. Also at the same time there will be an accompanying message to it Faculty Senate, Staff counsel, and the Student Government Association will be receiving the tobacco free campus task force course report for review and feedback from campus between now and the end of the fall semester. There will be more information coming with that.
7. Yesterday I was able to attend the Central Indiana Corporate Partnership (CICP) 20th anniversary event in Indianapolis and learn at the very being of that important group that does a lot of thought leading in Indianapolis on behalf of the state. Indiana State was at the table from the very beginning. ISU was one of three intuitions that was there. I actually had the pleasure of sitting at the table with the original director and his administrative assistant (of course they are both long retired) of that work and they were sharing that it was a two person job at the beginning and now there are 110 employees in CICP. They never imagined that or how grateful they would be that Indiana State for being a part of it. If you are not formal with their work I sit on the board and there are at least ten spin-off’s from that work in Indianapolis on behalf of the state that have grouped together like industries to promote the state of Indiana. Some of those groups are Bio sciences and that is the longest serving off-shoot of CICP. Mike and I recently sat and listened to sixteen tech which about growth of an innovation district in Indianapolis and there will be some university engagement in that. We were raising our hand say don’t forget us and the ISU would like to be a part of that, but there are multiple other endeavors. When it seems like a good time I would love to tell you about where CICP has come in the last 20 years and how we can plug into the work plan for the state of Indiana.
8. We have the governor coming in October. I have been reminding his staff since I been President that he hasn’t visited our campus. The main for him to be here is to not only visit campus but to help finish a fund raiser for the Habitat for Humanity. We are coming to the finish of that project. The ground breaking for that is tomorrow (August 21, 2019).

1. Provost M. Licari
2. Welcome back. We welcomed the student back at the north gym this year.
3. The Hulman center upgrade continues. If you are on that side a lot of work is done, but there is a lot of work to go.
4. Faculty and staff have moved back into the fine arts building. There is still a fair amount of work the needs to be done the classrooms as well as the faculty and staff offices. The building is open.
5. Looking forward to starting the planning of the renovation of Driser Hall.
6. No surprises regrading enrollment. We will have to wait until the fifth day census provides for ISU in terms of numbers.
7. Looking forward there will be a number of open sessions in September regrading Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM). There hasn’t been a lot of announcements about this, but now that everyone is back we will start publicizing this. Jason Trainer will be lead the SEM development. As you see those meeting please attend and encourage your colleagues to attend as well. This is a good way for everyone to stay informed with what is going.
8. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
9. Welcome back to the start of another exciting year! I hope you all had a relaxing and/or productive summer. I would also like to officially welcome Joie Harney, who will be serving as the administrative assistant for the Faculty Senate and for the Faculty Ombudsperson. Please be patient with her – this is only her second day on the job, and her orientation is scheduled for this coming Monday. One of the items on her to do list will be to schedule a photo session for both Exec and the full Senate. Once we have those dates set, I will let you know.
10. It is nice to be back with you in this role. I hope to continue the work I began four years ago, in maintaining and increasing our communication, transparency, and inclusion for the entire campus community. One of the first things I did four years ago was to write the Overview of Faculty Governance document. I am presenting you with a revised an updated version for your consideration today. Among the changes made are a renumbering of Policy Library sections, and inclusion of the role of Electioneer.

### Much of the work we will do today is getting us set up for the semester, including setting initial charges for our standing committees. All the committee last year, with the exception of the Faculty Affairs Committee filed their final reports, so I could tell what they had accomplished. But with FAC, I am less clear about the status of some of their charges from last year, so I hope you all can help me with that.

### V. Sheets- We wrote it. I thought it was submitted.

### C. MacDonald- It is not posted anyway. So if you have it.

### V. Sheets- I know we submitted it because it was way early.

### C. MacDonald- That’s probably the problem.

### V. Sheets- I was trying to figure out why you’d have a problem with our hard work.

### C. MacDonald- Because it wasn’t posted on the site

### V. Sheets- I am not in charge of posting it on the site. I was only in charge of sending it.

### C. MacDonald- It was probably lost in the transition of leadership and new administrative. If you have it send it to me and I will post it.

### V. Sheets- I will send it.

### C. MacDonald- That is why I am less clear about some of those charges.

### V. Sheets- I actually thought you were dissatisfied with all of the work we have done. I was like we spent a year on that report. My apologies that you didn’t receive the report.

### C. McDonald - That’s why it’s difficult to step in to the roll of chair without notes from the previous year. There are somethings that get dropped and that’s why I highlight some of those things, but we will cover those at the end of the meeting.

### Speaking of standing committees we have one change to the list that you all approved in the Spring Semester Whitney Nessesar since she is now Associate Dean of the college health and human services is unable to serve on the Arts Endowment Committee. The first alternate we have is Robin Lugger who is also from the College of HHS so that will be the replacement.

### I wanted to make you aware that there are changes coming to Title IX policy, which will affect our Policy 922, Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking, so I have invited Katie Butwin, the University General Counsel to give us a brief overview of what is coming. I hope that we will have a document to vote on in time for the September Senate meeting.

1. Other than the agenda items, I also want to remind you that we are in a biennial review year. Biennial Review Training is mandatory for all faculty and administrators conducting these faculty reviews. There are a number of changes to the process form the last time around, so even if you completed the training two years ago, you need to do it again this year. I sent out the link this morning, and you should all have received it. Like last time, you should be able to stop part way through and continue at a later time. You will receive a personalized confirmation of completion email once you have finished the training, and you should print it out and keep it for your records. The deadline is September 10. I will compile the list of completers once the deadline has passed and send it to the Deans and the Provost.
2. V. Sheet’s- Who received that email?
3. C. MacDonald- All regular Faculty, because anybody can take the training whether they need to or not and that way everybody has the information. So I have already had a question about somebody that is their second year if they need to do it. The Answer is “No.”
4. R. Guell- If they took the quiz they would already know that.
5. C. MacDonald- This is true. They don’t have to participate in Biennial Review training, because they don’t have to participate in Biennial review.
6. One last reminder -- if you have a long statement on an issue at any point during the year, either in Exec or at Senate, please send a copy to Joie, so she can more easily include it in the minutes.
7. Approval of April 30, 2019 minutes (File #1)
8. Motion to approve (R. Guell: M. Chambers); 5, 0, 3
9. M. Chambers- On the last page it’s the SAC report isn’t very clear. I have typed a clearer copy of what discussed.
10. Fifteen minute Open Discussion
11. Swipe cards
12. V. Sheets- are we getting rid of the ability to use swipe cards?
13. R. Guell- As a user of the now disregarded swipe card system was their faculty input on it being eliminated? I don’t recall any I just recall an announcement.
14. M. Licari- Well the system just died and wasn’t able to be used anymore. OIT could have waited but it was going to be dead regardless. So the decision was made to make it go away.
15. V. Sheets- So to follow up on that did it just die instantly or did we have some kind of warning?
16. M. Licari- There was no longer support for the system.
17. R. Guell- I know it didn’t work the last week of classes. That may have been the point at which it died. The first email said that equipment and software were no longer support by the company. It’s unusual that those of use that teach classes weren’t consulted in in it going away and what brought it on. Here’s a new system.
18. Selection of Parliamentarian
19. Mike Chambers (R. Guell, M. Chambers): 7,0,1
20. Selection of Electioneer
21. Virgil Sheet ( R. Guell, M. Chambers): 7,0,1
22. C. MacDonald- Electioneer this is not something that is normally done out in the open but in the purposes of be transparent that is why I have added it to the Overview of Faculty Governance. This is really a new position since we have started using online surveys to our elections and our surveys. So it’s typically someone who is knowledgeable about Qualtrics. This someone that helps run those election and surveys so that the officers don’t get to deep in the weeds on that. I am willing to nominations or self-nomination. I can tell of those in the room only three people have historically done it.
23. R. Guell- I am thinking Virgil, Myself and Chris.
24. C. MacDonald- That’s fine I am not going to arm twist anybody into doing it but if you have used Qualtics on regular basis. I think relatively simple stuff. Now that we have a faculty Senate account all of the previous surveys and elections are kept, but there is a lot of cutting and pasting from one year to the next.
25. R. Guell- Being the electioneer does not preclude you from running in an election that would require an electioneer. A temporary one would be assigned for that election so no doors would closed.
26. M. Chambers- So the last year or two I think it’s been Virgil.
27. C. MacDonald- I did it last year.
28. M. Chambers- Are there traditions along those lines where the chair fac will help over see.
29. C. MacDonald- The chair fac is mandated to oversee election. So that person is always involved in the election process.
30. M. Chambers- Is the electioneer always someone who is heavily involved with senate? So former chair.
31. C. Macdonald- We don’t have a lot of tradition.
32. V. Sheets- Someone who has a lot of experience with qualtrics. Comfort with sending out surveys.
33. R. Guell- There is also an importance that the person be considered of high integrity, because it has happen in the past that in front the previous admin a tie was broken with the picking of a card between the admin and the electioneer.
34. V. Sheets Absent any volunteers I would be willing. I prefer not to self-nominate.
35. R. Geull- I nominate Virgil Sheets.
36. V. Sheets- Who are the three that have the knowledge? (gestures to C. Macdonald and R. Guell) I wasn’t sure about Bob. Since you two have other rolls. I would be willing.
37. C. MacDonald- If someone would like to be a trainee under you. Perhaps you could help bring up some more people.
38. V. Sheets- I would be fine with that.
39. C. MacDonald- It would help create a more robust pool of secession in that.
40. M. Chambers- I second
41. C. MacDonald- Any other nominees? And thank you for your willingness.
42. Confirmation of Standing Committee Liaisons (File #2)
43. AAC – Robert Guell
44. AEC – Randy Peters
45. CAAC – Shawn Phillips
46. FAC – Virgil Sheets
47. GC – Shana Kopaczewski
48. SAC – Mike Chambers
49. URC – Kent Games
50. S. Phillips- Can I Just clarify? Are there standard meeting times?
51. C. MacDonald- There are not. They will be determined by the membership of the committees. So once these are set up. I will send out notices to the committees letting them know who you are so hopefully they will be taking into consideration your schedule.
52. R. Guell- Then there is swapping in September if it necessary.
53. C. MacDonald- If they happen to set a time when you absolutely cannot be there we will do some swapping around. Really this role is to help provide communication flow between us and the committees. To help make sure that the committees are taking actions on their charges. So a little bit of accountability out there. Everyone is confirmed.
54. Overview of Faculty Governance – for endorsement (File #3)
55. Endorsed (M.Chambers, V. Sheets): 8,0,0
56. C. MacDonald- Mike chambers has caught a number of additional typos and I have caught one. If you have any additional questions, issues, or issues I’d be happy to hear those. This is not an approval vote. When I first brought this to the executive committee four years ago we agreed endorsement of the document was the way we wanted to go with this. The major changes are renumbering like in the policy notebook and addition of the policy on the electioneer. Once this endorsed I will finalize these changes and post it on the university faculty black board site. It will also go out the standing committees.
57. Review of Title IX changes – K Butwin

a) K.Butwin- At the board meeting in August we provided the board with a draft of policy for information only that reflected some changes that we would like to make in the policy and we got the fee back from some board members that would like us to strip down some more and take out some of the process and put that in our internal procedures, so we are going to do that for the October board meeting and ask them to take action on it. As I know you know that these cases are coming fast and furious from the federal courts across the country. We are also waiting for the final regulation from the Department of Education that were proposed changes. I anticipate a lot of changes from the proposed regulations to the final regulations and an implementation date is uncertain. It’s a very fluid position that all universities are in right now especially from a legal prospective.

We are doing a couple of things. We are doing two phases. The first phase is we need to do some changes to the process right now. We have tried to limit those changes to legal things that have come out over the course of the summer. We are here to explain some of the changes that are happening right now that way everyone involved in these processes will know what to expect.

The second phase will be the policy changes that we would like to take to the board of trustees in October and with that with that some updated procedures as well. Some of what we are doing is to make sure we are addressing really specific pieces of the process to make sure that we are matching what is legally required and also what’s best practice. We are going to have an external law firm help us identify if there are particular procedures that we have in place. How do we handle certain situations. These changes are really being driven by respondent litigation and additional due process for the respondent. I won’t say that we have been doing it incorrectly. Once again this is an evolving area. We want to make sure we are addressing what we need to in a timely manner.

1. R. Guell- I am not sure if this is a Katie or Stephanie question. One the last page of the procedures in part C. I am trying to figure out what it says. It went from witnesses can’t be compelled to that they can be.
2. K. Butwin- Correct
3. R. Guell- Is that the result of a legal decision?
4. K. Butwin- So there are decision across the country the handle this slightly differently. In the sixth circuit there was an ugly set of circumstance that lead to the sixth circuit saying you must allow cross examination. So in the sixth circuit which is not us we are the seventh they have already started doing a direct cross examination or by an advocate. I am not sure that all of the courts are going to head in that direction. In the seventh circuit the courts what the decision maker to make the creditability determinations. The only way to make a creditability determinations is to have that person present or participating. There are somethings we have to deal with about orders of protection to have that person present at the actual hearing. So the goal of this whether the party or a witness is to have them participate is that students have to be present. This is with students only and the due process under title IX. We are not touching at this moment the process for faculty and staff.
5. – How do we compel the witness?
6. K. Butwin- That is going to be hard. So we do have it in the student handbook that requires them to comply with the University mission corrective. We are not going to throw them in jail.
7. S. Gambell- We do have some witnesses that are not associated with the university. So we really have no jurisdiction over them.
8. K. Butwin- So some of this will be persuasion. So we recognize that this can have a chilling effect on claims to begin with or on moving forward with a claim are the requiring of people being present in the room. So we are working how we can address the chilling effect up front. We are really transparent about how the process will work and to put something in place so there won’t be a direct confrontation among the parties. I suspect that we are moving in the direction of a moderator. Really our students don’t show up to these panels with lawyers. That’s is where we are going to talk to our friend nationally and find out what best practices are. If a witnesses or party does not show up from a legal perspective then the panel can’t use their information in the decision but there might be other evidence and information available. So this could be challenging to find creditable witnesses and parties.
9. S. Gambell- we are luck that we have a title IX panelist here and I think she would only agree that most of our situations the witnesses don’t actually witness events but are only there to construct timelines to get a gauge of what happened leading up to the incident. Statically it might be interesting for you to know we are talking about in numbers. 2017-2018 we had 11 panels. In 2018-2019 we had 7 panels. In the 7 panels last year they were all sexual violence. Very rarely will some report a relationship violence. It usually RA’s that report, or a neighbor called the ISU PD. Since 2017 we have had eighteen cases go before the panels. In 2017 we started inviting the participants to attend and they were not mandated and advised that it was not held against them if they chose not participate. For the most part they attend. If they got to the level of filing the complaint they want to see it through. Over the years we have had 2 cases where the complaint did not want to participate. They were intimate partner violence. They were still dating they didn’t want the other party to get in trespassed from campus. There was independent video that was that bad it made the case move forward. So in that case neither party participated. The investigator discusses that with the title IX coordinator. It my responsibility to determine if the threat assessment needs to go forward.

So please a take a look at the procedures and we can take a look at the minor changes we are making right now. One of the move that we are making with the proposed regulations. Interim measures we making are to protect both parties. On page2 section C interim measure to protect the complaint is really to protect all parties. Mutual no contact orders.

F,G,H those are all addressing that it really the title IX coordinators decision to make the threat assessment not the investigator so that just bring the actual procedure in compliance with the actual practice of what we are doing.

On page 3 section A We are trying to move away from the respondent Advisor as the Associate Dean of Students. Positions change from reorganization so we are wanting to train individuals as university process advisor. Their role would be to help the student walk through the entire process. That’s coming to the interview with the investigator, responding to reports, attending the panel with them, and file their appeal if they choose too. So those process advisors will be help to either complaint or respondent. Were as the victim advocate is that confidential complaint support person, where a University Process Advisor will be available to help with the process.

1. R. Guell- Can I go back to something that is not changing? Having participated a support person in other processes this language that the support person isn’t allowed to participate by asking or answering questions, making comment, or discussions about the complaint strikes me has not helpful, because the parties get wrapped up in their heads and cannot articulate questions as well as a dispassionate support person can. I don’t want to invite lawyer, lawyer want-to-be faculty, or mom and dad into the processes. My hope is that this is a process where something approximating justice is the goal and knowing that the parties themselves are going to be emotional not dispassionate, not clear headed. Would it not be better to have a clear head support person doing the examinations?
2. K Butwin- I have a couple of comments. First in these cases there is an investigation report. There is for the panel a report of what everyone has said in the past. And in this case the panel has the report and it less important to have someone there to tell the entire story. Varifing the story asking follow up questions as a panel member. The second this mirrors the student conduct matters.
3. R. Guell- I don’t like there either.
4. K. Butwin- I understand. In the proposed regulation I would say we have to revamp this process and provide those advocates and it would cost thousands of dollars to do that. If we are responsible for providing them then they better do a good so we don’t have legal issues. I think that all of the years of conduct hearing do not make this a court hearing and I understand that we are heading toward cross examination because I think Supreme Court will agree with this circuit court decisions. That is not what it is really what it’s supposed to be. We don’t really want to have too many trials. Because I party might get a lawyer and the other party might have a parent that don’t have college degree. We would some unequal situations. That’s why we should be careful going down that path.
5. S. Gambell- In our process the support person is the most visible when they attend the investigative meeting. They are there to ask if they need a break. To say you told me this. We absolutely respect that role.
6. R, Guell- My experience with this is that you can sit next to a person, who’s life in the their view is in jeopardy, and counsel them to ask in the question. It seems artificial to prevent the question from being asked.
7. K Butwin- So this one of those situations where we want to gauge where everyone is nationally and where best practices is headed. When the Obama administration pushed out all of significate guidance they did tell us what the model should like. They gave pages and pages of what not to do and do. Eventually we are going to come to a place where everyone has generally the same model that address thing like should there be a moderator to provide questioning or there be direct questioning? Should the support person act as an advocate? I think we are going to get an answer on what best practice will be but we are in a very fluid situation. We are see court cases weekly.
8. S. Gambell – And the DOE decision to drop any minute.
9. R Guell- I understand this but Universities are losing almost every one of these cases and if the courts we have system that involves an adversarial process and that defines due process why don’t we just go there?
10. K. Butwin- There is some strategies that haven’t been handled very well by universities. I am not really sure how this all going to come out. I think we are two to four years way from some calming of the waters. I think everyone is going to be looking at the conduct process in general and we just we want to be doing the thing we need to be doing right now and figure out where things are headed.
11. K. Butwin- These are procedural changes that are happening right now. We will consider whether there needs to be addition changes to the procedures. There needs to be changes to the policy. For example it very clear that there be equitable resources available to both parties. Those are the kind of thing we wanting to change in the policy.
12. S. Gambell- So just to pick up where we left off E on page three once the preliminary report is ready it is supplied to both parties. They both have the opportunity to read it and respond. They can make clarifications or amendments based on the report. These will provided to the Investigator not the coordinator. So this is just a correction.

On the back page C that is the most significate change. It is requiring both parties to participate but not attend. There are methods of participating that require the parties to be in the same room. The panel needs to be able to that creditability assessment that really difficult to come through in a investigators report.

1. R Guell- So in the shuttling of moving people in and out of the room are they still hearing what is being said in the room?
2. S Gambell- It is very structured. We have a moderator in the room and the three panelist. So typically we start with the complaint. The panel normally start asking the complainant questions first. So the moderator is taking all of the notes. All of the questions asked and responses. So when the respondent is brought in they start with the relaying of all that information and before any one leaves everything is ready back.
3. K. Butwin- The shuttling of participants is what might be changing. But I think your question was even if they aren’t in the same room can they listen.
4. R. Guell- that is the assents of due process to be able to confront accusations that have been made against you.
5. S. Gambell- we are hoping that when the panel meets there are not a lot of questions or decision to be had. If the investigation was done well the panel has very little questions. We tell the parties this isn’t your chance to retell your story. You’ve had that opportunity to even supplement it. The only questions should this came to me today or I don’t feel this conveyed very well.
6. S. Kopaczewski- I think that investigative report is really useful and that there is ongoing process and addendum that both complaint and respondent can provide. They can share that report with whomever and get feedback in writing to provide information. The process is very structured even though there have been a few difficult cases. I feel confident in the decisions that have been made and that due process had been made.
7. K. Butwin- And I’ll just say that we have very good title XI panel and that they are very committed to reading the investigation report before they get there. We really well trained investigative team. People that go back and ask question. They go back and follow up. We have really good people that support from both side. All of the people involved have really good support. We have not had any title IX litigations at ISU. One of the reason I believe that that is we tell the people what will happen and give them support.
8. S. Gambell- It is very transparent. I tell the complaint when they come in that this is not private. The things you tell me I will tell the respondent. You each have a right to respond what is said about you. I tell the witness. The things you tell me will likely end up in this investigation report.
9. Charges for Standing Committees (File #4)
10. AAC
11. Respond to the administrations draft of the Academic Calendar.
12. Review the Progress of University Restructuring
13. Continue with regular annual reports of the Faculty Senate on staffing
14. Review BoT minutes for new administrative appointments not passed through AAC.
15. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
16. Invite the UC to discuss the BoT Bylaw changes of the review of the president prior to Oct 1.
17. R Guell- There was change on the agenda for BoT for the bylaw regarding the review of the president
18. K. Butwin- yes so that was an information item that we hope to present to the BoT in October. It is a check it off the list HLC requirement. In my view that already exists in Indiana laws.
19. R. Guell- I would be stunned if anyone would have interpreted our current bylaws that the BoT couldn’t conduct a review of the president. Because it intersects AAC charge regarding hiring of University wide personal you need to spend 10 minutes saying that the administrators.
20. AEC
21. Administer the University Arts Endowment fund, review proposals for grants and distribute funds.
22. Provide assistance to faculty on methods for UAE grants.
23. Identify Nominee for Theodore Dreiser Research/Creativity award Committee
24. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
25. CAAC
26. Continue with regular reports to the Faculty Senate on undergraduate curricular proposals
27. Maintain due diligence in tracking enrollment and graduation rates on new programs, coordinating with Graduate Council on graduate programs.
28. Review process of Career readiness in the curriculum
29. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
30. FAC
31. Select Nominee for Service on PTOC (per 305.10.3)
32. Once the Biennial review is complete, review the effectiveness of the review process in meeting goals, per the “Faculty Performance Evacuation Model” document, and issue a report to Executive committee (**Mandate To complete**)
33. Investigate and identify trends in Standing Committee service- **Not Done**
34. Revise Faculty Grievance Policy for clarity and to include the provost in the process.
35. Brian Bunnett to formalize the chairs Council group- currently nothing in writing about how the group operates.
36. Consultation with Katie Butwin and SAC, review 912.3 (Conflict of Interest) and consider updating
37. Bring sections 310.10.1.13 (instructors) and 310.1.1 (normal teaching load) into alignment
38. Select nominees for service on Awards Committees
39. Maintain grievance Committee pool
40. Oversee Constitutional votes and Senate elections
41. Review and consider revisions to Senate nomination/election process, specifically EC succession policy -Complete
42. Clarify the timelines of activities in HB 350.2.9.1.3.4, 350.2.9.1.3.5, and 350.2.9.1.3.6 ( following notification of continued deficient performance) - **complete**
43. Review PTOC recommendations for handbook language on MOUs. - **complete**
44. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
45. FEBC
46. Continue Regular annual reports on salary and health insurance recommendations
47. Review the wellness changes
48. Evaluate temporary faculty benefits as compared to those for regular faculty
49. Review and consider simplifying the policy on summer pay
50. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
51. GC
52. Identify nominee for Theodore Dreiser Research/ Creativity Award Committee
53. Review and produce annual reports on graduate curricular proposals
54. Maintain due diligence in track enrollment and graduation rates of new programs
55. Continue to conduct graduate program reviews. Draft any desires enforcement
56. Review changes to university policies and procedures that affect graduate programs
57. Review current graduate program review procedures to better align expectations with other review processes(i.e, Assessment Council review, external program review accreditation review)
58. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
59. SAC
60. Identify a faculty member to serve as representative to SGA Senate meetings
61. Monitor international enrollment
62. Review admission/scholarship standards and retention statics: consider making recommendations regarding adjustments to admissions and or retention standards
63. In consultation with Katie Butwin and FAC, review policy 912.3 (conflict of interest) consider updating
64. Administer the Faculty Scholarship; work on promotional program
65. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
66. **Item tabled- Non degree students having to reapply to take classes every semester**
67. URC
68. Administer the University Research fund, review proposals for grants and distribute funds
69. Recommend establishment or change of university research policies and procedures
70. Study methods of making available to faculty members information on sources of research funds
71. Identify nominee for Theodore Dreiser research/creativity Award Committee
72. Produce and submit and Annual report in time for the final meeting of 2019-20.
73. Adjournment 4:43 pm