#12

Indiana State University

Faculty Senate, 2020-2021

**Executive Committee**

November 10, 2020

3:30 p.m. via Zoom

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

Absent Members:

EX-Officio Present: President D. Curtis, Provost M. Licari

Guest: R. Gonser, E. Post, A. Waite

1. Administrative Reports
2. President Curtis
3. Good Afternoon. It was good to see that State Representative Tim Brown is well on the way to recovery after a September 2018 motorcycle accident. He finally had a twinkle back in his eyes. Over the past six months I have spent a lot of time with Tim Brown. Today we discussed the direction ISU is taking moving forward with our presentation to the State Budgetary Committee. At the presentation we will be going next to last, so we may be getting a lot of questions or not much attention depending on how long of a day it has been for them. It has been nice communicating with Tim outside of the presentation so he can get a deeper understanding of what makes ISU unique and how we don’t have the same margins for budget adjustments that some of our counterparts do. While we were at the State House it was pretty empty. We were told to try to be away from the area by 2 p.m. because there was a protest planned for that time.
4. Provost Licari
5. I have been having discussions with Lisa Spence-Bunnett and Katie Butwin about the email retention policy as we move towards the new approach starting on December 1, 2020. There will be communication coming out about the new policy and what changes are happening. The switch is going to be flipped to automatically keep emails so if you want folders to automatically purge they will have to be set to do that. This way you are still in charge of your email. We will also be sending out communications in best practices in terms of document and email retention. We need to make sure that documents of interest get stored in the proper place. An example of bad practice would be storing documents within the email system. If they are stored there and you leave, then gaining access to those documents becomes a mess. Communication about how all this will work will be in my newsletter. I will be working with Katie Butwin about revising the email and document policies.
6. Chair Report Liz Brown

I would like to report that University College Council (UCC) passed the learning objective for the new foundational studies category. It will be officially called *Race in the United States*. They voted to eliminate the category of Health and Wellness. This still has to go through the governance process. It will be going to CAAC next after that it will come here. Hopefully, that will be sooner rather than later.

1. R. Guell: On that topic is there a recommendation from UCC regarding the rapidity with which this transition will occur?
2. L. Brown: The UCC would like to have this category in place for fall 2021.
3. T. Hawkins: It is not wise for us to presume that this is done deal. The way this is being presented, we are assuming a specific result. Something this controversial should be given more time and not rushed. We cannot assume that the governance is going to pass this at this given time.
4. L. Brown: There has been that discussion in UCC that this can be can be voted down. It is not presumed that this a done deal. My wording was meant convey a desire to avoid any undue delays. They expect CAAC to take its time and discuss this before making its decision. I expect us to do the same thing here.
5. L. Eberman: I had someone reach out to me with similar sentiments to what Tim was saying. They expressed that the perception at the meeting on the 5th was that it was pushed through with zero discussion. The questions revolved around whether there were any alternative suggestions rather than merging Health and Wellness with Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS). Was reducing the non-native language requirements to 3 hours instead of the merger discussed? The individual was asking for confirmation that the curriculum will go through the regular governance process? If you can confirm that part and then discuss whether there were alternatives discussed.
6. L. Brown: I can convey that alternatives were discussed. Yes, this will go through the regular curricular process.
7. R. Guell: Lindsey used language that concerned me. The notion that this a merger of SBS and Health and Wellness. We need to be clear in our communication about what the proposal is. My understanding is that is not what the proposal is. The way I understand it is to eliminate the Health and Wellness requirement, but because Social and Behavioral Sciences, Learning Objectives, and Course Arrays are being reviewed this year it means that courses that are not in it (whether in Health and Wellness or any other discipline) could be adapted to meet the learning objective for Social and Behavioral Sciences. Those are two very different issues.
8. L. Brown: Yes. I think Lindsey was misinformed by whoever sent her that.
9. L. Eberman: I was reading from what was sent to me. I apologize if I misrepresented what is happening, but I was reading from what was sent to me.
10. R. Guell: You touched a really sensitive spot.
11. L. Eberman: It speaks to misperception and if there is one then either the UCC or Faculty Governance needs to help people better understand.
12. R. Guell: On this topic I would hope (though it is Liz’s call) that we take this to Senate without regard to CAAC recommendation. This is something that is so important to the commitments that the President and the Provost made to the Black Faculty and Students. We need to present this so that there is better understanding of the topic and it needs a full Senate hearing. We need to at least have a full airing of this potential requirement.
13. T. Hawkins: If we are going to have this discussion then I need to react to that statement. The general discussion might be one we need to take up at a higher level, but if CAAC doesn’t pass a specific proposal then we should not be moving it forward. It can come back in a different form. I am happy discussing the theme but I would not support moving a proposal forward that has not been passed by CAAC due to curricular concerns.
14. R. Guell: That would treat CAAC as a special committee. Senate has the ability to take up things that are not brought to it through regular means based on the policy on policies. It would require by our bylaws a two-thirds majority to pass. What I am arguing is that institutional credibility is on the line if this proposal gets rejected in a committee of nine.
15. T. Hawkins: Credibility should not be based on something so narrow and I think that we are in trouble if it is. We should rest our credibility on our willingness to discuss the issue. We should seek out solutions and not rush this very specific proposal.
16. J. Gustafson: We were invited to discuss this course and new category and right away issues arose at the beginning of the meeting after it was stated that this was a done deal and it had been passed by UCC, so it was not open for discussion. The meeting became about which category to axe. It was improper in the way it was handled. I really want to see some version of this pass. I have to agree with Tim on this and that it is entirely rushed. Everything that I have seen so far has been very messy. I know that there is an urgency behind this. This is the first that I heard that this went back to UCC after saying it was closed deal but there was another vote and it was renamed. I am looking forward to what they are going to present to us but I think we need to keep everything on the table and reshape this if necessary. This process has been a mess.
17. L. Brown: James, I think you have been a little misinformed. The first thing that the council voted on were the learning objectives for new category and those were not up for debate in the listening session that Ann Rider hosted.
18. J. Gustafson: What she said at the beginning of the meeting was that there was a new category created and a new course was created for it called Social Justice. She stated that those were not up for debate. What was up for debate was what category to be replaced by this. At the beginning of your comments you stated is that it now *Race in the United States* this entirely new to me. I haven’t heard anything about this before. That is not what happened in that session. It doesn’t feel like the usual process is being followed and that process is there for a reason.
19. L. Brown: I disagree about the process not being followed. I am member of UCC and we are adhering to process. We are being more communicative about this curriculum than normal since this is such a huge subject and has university-wide implications. Normally it would not be discussed until it is brought before us. This idea that it is being rushed and not following the normal process is incorrect.
20. J. Gustafson: So has there been a vote since that meeting?
21. L. Brown: There was a vote, but not about the learning objectives or that it would a single course in the category. The vote was about what would be done with the other categories, because there is no appetite for adding three credit hours to the foundational studies program.
22. J. Gustafson: The course and the category changed also?
23. L. Brown: No. The name changed but the learning objectives did not.
24. C. MacDonald: I just want to second what Liz is saying. This often comes up that people don’t feel like the process is being followed when in fact the standard process is being followed, but we are just doing extra communication. I have never been to an open session before on any piece of curriculum that I can recall. That was novel and at that time what I had understand to have passed was the course learning objectives and potential name of the course, but not where that was going to go in terms of foundational studies. So there is more communication about what is happening. Perhaps that causes people to assume that things are finalized because they are hearing about them because that is when they normally hear about them. There has been more opportunity for input and at earlier stages than what is typical.
25. L. Brown: I think that is true Chris. You will see some changes. Just like the name of the course being changed because there was some faculty objecting to the title being Social Justice, for example. MST has a concentration called Social Justice and the title was reconsidered based on that input that was not normally part of the process.
26. T. Hawkins: I am concerned that much of our discussion seems to revolve around laudable goals and going down a very narrow pathway. Despite what Liz and Chris suggest, my perspective and many that I have talked to is that this emerged from nowhere at a committee meeting in August and was laid down almost fully formed with the expectation that is how we would achieve those goals. I am concerned that we are being led down a very specify pathway to those goals and that the momentum to do that will be overwhelming.
27. K. Yousif: I would say that is the normal process for curriculum. A subcommittee puts together a proposal and moves it through. I don’t think anyone here is wrong but I don’t speak for them. I don’t think anyone on the UCC is so naive to think that this a slam dunk. They know they have to go through CAAC, Exec, and Faculty Senate. We have had lots of discussions at Senate about curriculum. We will have lots of time to discuss this at Senate. It might be speedy but I don’t see this outside of the normal process.
28. J. Gustafson: I will have to say after putting a proposal together for three years that went through UCC there is a lot of scrutiny on every detail of a proposal. When I have reached out with questions such as who is going to be teaching these courses, how it is going to be funded, or anything about the practical end of it, I get no answers. I am looking forward to seeing this proposal because I am approaching this with the spirit of how to make it work.
29. L. Brown: This will be making its way to CAAC. Once it reaches us than that will be the time to ask these questions.
30. Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
31. COVID-19

M. Chambers: We have about a week and half until Thanksgiving break. I was wondering what the plans are with the rise of COVID-19 numbers? Are we just going to push through?

M. Licari: At this time numbers are on the rise but they are not blowing up. We are not yet at point to flip the switch and make an unnecessary decisions.

1. COVID Assessment for Graduation

V. Sheets: I received an email from a student that wants to participate in graduation but is confused about the message regarding COVID-19 assessment and when they need to take it.

M. Licari: They will need to complete the assessment on the day of commencement and show the green check mark when entering.

1. LMS Adaption

L. Eberman: My first question is about the LMS conversion. They want to know what the timeline is for LMS adoption. Will there be any early adoption?

M. Licari: Let me get back with Lisa Spence-Bunnett on those program dates. We are still planning on running both current version of Blackboard and the new platform Canvas. For those programs that are targeted or want to jumpstart early there will be professional development during the spring and summer.

1. HR Email about COVID-19

L. Eberman: I have had faculty express frustration about the recent email from Human Resources (HR) that was released about COVID-19. I have a faculty member that found the wording frustrating in that the expectation is that staff and faculty increase their vigilance in protecting the campus community. They are frustrated that this was not a campus wide email that included student behaviors.

R. Guell: Why would HR talk to students?

L. Eberman: That is an excellent point but it is a University Communication and I think person’s perspective is if the university is not adopting a more aggressive approach to decrease cases why is the burden being placed on the faculty and staff which is being messaged through HR.

M. Licari: There is a difference between students and employees. HR will be the one contacting employees. Student Affairs has been running campaigns that target students that employees might not be aware of. We need to be careful when jumping to conclusions about intentions.

D. Curtis: We have seen a rise in number of employee cases recently.

L. Eberman: First thing I want to say is that all of my statements is just me trying to represent my colleagues that contact me.

M. Licari: We thank you for that and I am sorry if I killed the messenger.

L. Eberman: I communicated my experience about having to quarantine due to tertiary contact. While I work in an office space and I understand that. I will say that the rise of faculty and staff cases might be happening due to student behavior.

1. Burning Glass

C. MacDonald: I have asked this question a couple of times before so I am going to reword it. When might we know the cost of using the consultants Burning Glass?

M. Licari: The nice thing about the assessment is that it not a one and done. We can review more programs as needed. The cost was $60,000.

1. Approval of Executive Minutes File #1
2. Motion to Approve Amended Minutes: M. Chambers, V. Sheets: 9-0-0
3. Motion to Strike FEBC conversation: L. Eberman, R. Guell
4. Withdraw Motion to Strike FEBC conversation: L. Eberman, R. Guell
5. Motion to give Secretary and Chair the ability to simplify FEBC conversation: R. Guell, L. Eberman: 8-1-0
6. GC Items
7. Exceptional Needs: Intense Intervention Licensure (see curriculog)

<https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4438/form>

Motion to Approve: C. MacDonald, T. Hawkins: 9-0-0

R. Gonser: The state has announced that it does not have enough certified individuals to fill all of open spots for Special Education for students with exceptional needs. This 12 hour certification will allow for individuals to get the needed requirement to receive a certification from the Department of Higher Education. This will also allow for ISU to have more students attend.

J. Gustafson: Are these new or existing courses?

R. Gonser: Existing.

1. Master of Science in Athletic Training (see curriculog)

<https://indstate.curriculog.com/proposal:4787/form>

Motion to approve: M. Chambers, L. Eberman: 9-0-0

R. Gonser: Back in 2017/18 this program did not seek recertification due the upcoming changes in accreditation. They hired Eric Post and he has looked at learning outcomes that will be happening in 2023 and put together a new curriculum with new courses. The old courses are still on the books and can be deleted once the new program achieves its accreditation.

E. Post: It is nice to virtually meet all of you. Athletic Training programs are moving from the Bachelor’s level to the Master’s level for entire level professionals. The previous Master’s program didn’t seek reaccreditation in 2017/18 so we decided to revamp the entire program meet the accreditation standards for the industry in 2020. This is what all of our courses are designed around. We didn’t want to be tied to any of the previous courses because this is an entirely new program. We designed this from the ground up to meet and exceed the new requirements. That was a lot of curriculog work. There are 46 different proposal in curriculog, but we are banking 24 courses and we have 21 new courses. The accreditation process is that we will not receive it until the first cohort goes completely through the program. They are going to come in and we are going to do a self-study the first year and a site study the second year. We will receive the accreditation so that the first cohort can still take the licensure exam and become certified athletic trainers. It is a 54 credit program over six consecutive semesters. First year is focused on core knowledge and skills. The second year clinical experience. It comparable to other programs in the area. Ball State is 62 credits and the University of Evansville is 48. Most programs are 48 to 62 credit hours.

K. Yousif: Just to be clear. In good faith you will suspend some of the 24 courses that are banked once you see how accreditation goes?

E. Post: Yes, our plan is to just use our 21 new courses.

M. Chambers: What kind of demand do you think there will be for this program?

E. Post: We have 12 that are interested in the 2021 cohort. We are wanting to be in the 15 to 20 student range since ISU has a strong history in the Athletic Training field. The first cohort will be smaller but we are working with Lindsey to establish recruitment practice for the Master’s Program.

J. Gustafson: I would like to say that this is a well thought-out plan with the complete reshaping of the Master’s Program. So there is no need for new resources?

E. Post: This is an internal change. The nice thing about the Master’s program is that we have complete control and don’t have to balance it with any other requirements. So all of the courses are self-contained within the program.

1. Standing Committee Reports
2. AAC (M. Chambers) - No report. Will meet on Friday. They want to know if there is anything they need to put on the books from Executive Committee?
3. AEC (R. Guell) - Finalized agreement to move funds to the spring.
4. CAAC (C. MacDonald) – Met today and dealt with some curriculum. Going to postpone dealing with the fast-track certificate proposal until additional certificate languages coming from the taskforce becomes available since the two may affect each other. They are continuing to look at the S/U course per semester.
5. FAC (V. Sheets)- Met on Friday. They talked more about the outside work policy. The plan is to review the proposal that was passed a few years ago that R. Guell wrote.
6. FEBC (L. Eberman)- Met on Friday. Currently reviewing summer pay.
7. GC (T. Hawkins)- Met on Thursday. Action item was to approve a change in title for Organizational in Leadership and Learning Certificate. The council also discussed the current language of Certificate of Strategic Importance but did not take any action. They want it to be refined a little bit more.
8. SAC (K. Yousif)- They met on Friday. There was a lively conversation on the possibility of doing a pass/fail (S/U) course option for students. Most of the voting members on SAC were for it while most of the EX-Officios were not enthusiastic about this. The other big item on the agenda was a report from Richard Toomey on the Admissions Conduct Review Committee that is being created. The way I understood it is that it is an admissions review that is looking at conduct with potential candidates with an appeals process. Trying to make campus safer by actually having a conduct review board. This was an informational item only.

R. Guell: This is for people that may have done something in high school that might lead one to believe they would be a poor fit.

K. Yousif: Yes. Part of the problem is the revamping of the application so they can’t really do a background check. So they are trying to figure out this committee. Hopefully it will be a process that works better. This would be for conduct pre ISU, for example being kicked out of another institution.

R. Guell: I think what you did in high school would be while you were a juvenile and those records are normally sealed.

K. Yousif: There would be two boards, one for undergraduates and one for graduates.

L. Brown: They have reached out as who should be on this board. This would be more for transfer and graduate students.

R. Guell: I understand. This would include those that have a sexually violent history and not for someone that has a sealed record for a minor offense from their early teens.

D. Curtis: You are correct about the minors. This would also look at if someone reported an issue about someone they went to school with and the behaviors they during that time. Parents want to know that we are paying attention to that information.

K. Yousif: I may not be paraphrasing this very well. Rich would be happy to talk about his report. This would not be discriminating.

L. Brown: This is why they are creating the committee.

k. Yousif: There will be two different committees.

L. Eberman: Did this include social media behaviors?

K. Yousif: Someone brought that up but there is nothing in the minutes about it, so I can’t answer that.

1. URC (J. Gustafson)- No report
2. Adjournment 4:33 pm