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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2019-2020

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

January 14, 2020

3:30pm, HMSU 227

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

Absent Members:

EX-Officio Absent: President D. Curtis;

EX-Officio Present: Provost M. Licari

Guest:

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. President D. Curtis- no report
   2. Provost M. Licari-
      1. Welcome back – We hope that everyone is ready to get going with the semester. There are many important items that need to be addressed this term here on campus that are not going to be easy, but these will be discussions about what we need to be successful in the future and not just today. This is work that needs to be done to ensure that the University will be successful now and in the future.
      2. We all know the demographic challenges of trying to recruit large freshman classes. These challenges are going to become more difficult and expensive to successfully execute. These are conversations that we need to be having so that we have the opportunity to set ourselves up for success and make ourselves more distinctive to prospective students without giving up who we are as an institution.
2. Chair Report: C. MacDonald
   1. Welcome back! I hope you all had a relaxing Winter Break. The proposed Sports Wagering Policy you have in front of you is a draft, and we are being asked to share our initial feedback on it. We are not voting on it today. A final draft will go to FAC, back to us, and the Senate before going to the Board of Trustees in May. In terms of providing some context, ISU currently has no such policy in place. The recent legalization of online betting in Indiana has also influenced this. Purdue has recently also proposed a policy similar to this one.
   2. We will also be discussing the Biennial Review today, and the Officers in consultation with the Provost, have developed an outline of a process which might simply faculty reviews, while still meeting the intent that all faculty are reviewed on a regular basis. I expect this conversation may be lively, so please let’s try not to talk over each other.
   3. In addition, the Senate Officers and the Provost recently gathered a small group of faculty leaders to begin the conversation about planning for the future of ISU, given the related challenges of demographics, enrollment, and budget. Some of you were there. The group was designed to be relatively small, yet also broadly representative of the faculty. The faculty and administration agree that we need to be more nimble and agile do that we are able to take advantage of opportunities as they come along. A number of ideas were generated, including adding the flexibility to offer 8-week courses as a standard format, and to offer them year-round. We realize the complexities of such possibilities, I can assure you. We also reinforced our non-negotiables, including faculty control over the curriculum and the maintenance of tenure and promotion.
   4. The next step is a campus-wide open forum on the topic on Thursday, February 6th at 3:30 in Dede III. We believe that the ideas that are generated will lead to the creation of a taskforce co lead by the Provost and a faculty representative that will work through the next 18 months to create a more specific plan of where we want to be and how we get there.
3. Approval of October 29, 2019 Minutes -- File #1

Motion to approve M. Chambers, S. Kopaczewski: 9-0-0

1. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion:
   1. V. Sheets: Do we have any sense of what the fall to spring retention rate is?
      1. M. Licari: Not yet. Some of the early indicators from last fall were positive, but as you know there are a lot of factors which contribute to our retention rates. Certainly by later this week, we will have updated information. I have had to work with some students on financial aid.
   2. M. Chambers: The Georgetown School of Public Policy ranked all of the Universities in the US on ROI, Indiana State ranked 1504 out of 4500, confirming our work and value as an institution. The report showed the importance of Liberal Art degrees.
      1. S. Phillips: What is the ROI?
      2. R. Guell: It is Return on Investment or the future money that is gained or lost from an investment early on. During the first few years after a college investment are normally negative but as time goes on this gap moves to a more positive investment.
   3. M. Chambers: As an instructor of global studies foundational studies courses, I got an e-mail reminding faculty to include required and recommended languages. There was a listing for required Title IX language. I don’t ever remember nor can I find where this is located.
      1. R. Guell: They can be found in three places: The academic affairs website, the foundational studies website, and the FCTE.
      2. M. Chambers: My request is that we create some consistency in the presentation of this information across campus.
   4. S. Phillips: I’ve heard from a couple of the faculty about some challenges with the bookstore. We would like some better policies or requirements related to ordering books.
      1. C. MacDonald: I don’t know if we can do much about the challenges. We have had the manager of the bookstore at the Faculty Senate Meeting without much change. My recommendation is that individual faculty members directly reach out to the bookstore to express their frustrations and specific challenges.
      2. V. Sheets: Some students have reported being told that the books might be in the back or on back order.
      3. S. Arvin: I just want to remind everyone that the library doesn’t normally order textbooks.
2. Sports Wagering Policy—File # 2&3
   1. For Discussion Only
      1. R. Guell: During the Fall term I asked if Indiana State University was going to make a policy about sports wagering now that it’s legal in Indiana. The President wanted B. Butwin to draft a policy to cover this. The drafted policy brings up fantasy sports, but did not discuss bracket challenges. Do we want to add bracket challenges to the policy?
      2. M. Licari: I think we are so early in the process that it is difficult to know what limits to set. The main goal is at the end of the day we want to disentangle the University from sports betting. We need to determine where the line is in terms of at what level (if any) of wagering would be allowed by University employees.
      3. R. Guell: This will ultimately go to the Faculty Senate on Thursday and then back to FAC for review.
      4. C. MacDonald: It will also be presented to the Staff Council and SGA.
      5. S. Kopaczewski: Would this going to SGA be to cover student workers that might have insider knowledge?
      6. M. Licari: Yes. This policy is being created to cover as many possibilities that can be thought of ahead of time. We don’t even want to have the door open for anyone to offer something gained by throwing a game.
      7. C. MacDonald: Indiana laws already cover most of the students as gambling is not allowed for any under the age of 21.
      8. M. Chambers: I understand the idea of the policy is not to create a new disciplinary policies, but do we need to have any direction to point directly back to the disciplinary policy.
      9. R. Guell: We don’t do this for any of the other policies which could lead to potential disciplinary action.
      10. S. Phillips: I don’t place wagers so I was wondering how a person would be caught?
      11. R. Guell: It would be after the fact. They could make a statement or do something that seems out of place.
      12. M. Licari: Another way would be for a student to make an appeal on a final grade based on games result not being met. However, the point of the policy isn’t police. We aren’t going to be looking on phones to see if there are sports betting apps down loaded. The purpose of this is policy is to set an expectation for the campus community.
3. Biennial Review Discussion
   1. For discussion only
      1. R. Guell: At Senate on Thursday, we are going to present two potential paths for alternative approaches to the biennial review process. At that time we will determining if we will be asking FAC to spend it’s time modifying the current system or making a new system, both of which will be simplified version.
      2. C. MacDonald: The replacement proposal intends to expedite the process. Narratives are only required in the event a full review is required. This process will eliminate the need to have biennial review training.
      3. R. Guell: There is protection in the process with the College Review Committee as the final review after the Chair and the Dean initial reviews if any were flagged. We believe that this alternative could meet the needs of our accreditor, the legislature, and the university while also saving on resources.
      4. M. Licari: My recommendation would be to replace the biennial review (BER) with this replacement proposal or some iteration of the proposal. I think the current BER process is creating work and stress far beyond the need of the review. Every couple years we create a long list of items that people don’t like about the BER but we don’t seem to be making any progress on making the process easier. We have far more important things to spend time on.
      5. S. Kopaczewski: Is there a reason that it is switching from two years to one?
      6. K. Games: With the change in FAD the faculty will be checking boxes and won’t be requiring items to be submitted. The Chair will be able to pull information automatically.
      7. M. Licari: I spent a lot of time involved in the process because of procedural policy disagreements. This wasted a lot of people’s time.
      8. S. Kopaczewski: How functional is FAD at letting chairs see what is entered?
      9. C. MacDonald: The Chair can see everything that is put into FAD.
      10. S. Phillips: Should the review only happen if someone fails two years in a row?
      11. M. Chambers: Some disciplines are more focused on research and book writing. New books aren’t being produced every year.
      12. M. Licari: They will be able to add in grant submissions, synopsis for the editor, or even works in progress to help keep failures from happening.
      13. M. Chambers: What if it a research year and they don’t have their synopsis ready?
      14. C. MacDonald: There are a lot of comment boxes and I suggest using them.
      15. R. Guell: Do we want to give V. Sheets suggestions or direction to take to FAC?
      16. M. Licari: I believe that it should be direction.
      17. R. Peters: I like the replacement proposal. I like the involvement of the Dean and College Review Committee if a person fails FAD. I also like the way it will let me as Department Chair have more meaningful conversations other than just telling them they did it wrong. This presents the opportunity to provide a nurturing environment. As a Department Chair I also don’t have a problem with the Department Dean reviewing my FAD as there is a College Review Committee to do a final review if needed.
      18. C. MacDonald: We wanted to put in protections.
      19. V. Sheets: I know this will take us to a better place but I would like more clarification. Why is it that the Deans are reviewing the Chairs on their duties?
      20. M. Chambers: Why is it the Department Dean is reviewing the Chair’s FAD and not the Department Committee Chair?
      21. K. Games: The problem with that process is that the committee chair could change yearly and granting rights every year would be time consuming.
4. Liaison Reports
   1. AAC – No report
   2. AEC - No report
   3. CAAC – Heard 14 proposals today, but did not vote on any.
   4. FAC - No report
   5. FEBC - No report
   6. GC - No report
   7. SAC – SAC met on December 6th, and the major item of discussion was a request from Enrollment Management (represented by Jason Trainer and Rich Toomey) and from CGE (represented by Zachariah Mathew) for the creation of an Admissions Appeal Committee with faculty representation.  There are a few students who are not admitted to ISU (c. 1-2%) who either come very close or are denied for a technical reason (e.g., an international student applicant whose language proficiency expired a couple weeks before they were credentialed).  An ad hoc committee comprised of Admissions staff has been formed (since the appeals process had already gone live on the website), but Enrollment Management and CGE asked for a committee to be created that included faculty representatives and representation from the office of Student Success.  SAC voted unanimously to send this request to Exec to consider.
   8. URC – No report
5. Adjournment 4:30 pm